

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
<u>Admin / Headquarters</u>	Administrative	20	Carotid should remain an option.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	Some of the new terms are things we are already doing, so we should take credit for that. What we cannot do is change Graham/Connor standards of objective reasonableness. We should fight to get the Carotid Restrain back and CEDs should be issued to all members of patrol We are one of only a handful of agencies that does not have CEDs. The Commission cannot make decisions based on a small vocal majority of this liberal city.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	we don't have the staffing officers or Sgts to contain, meaningfully contact. not enough Sgts to respond to the amount of qualifying incidents. The supervisors duty to recite that mission statement during officer/sgt response is ridiculous. That can be handled at AO/CPT. We may not use the carotoid often but we should keep it.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	A. Physical Control/Personal Body Weapons 1. Replace "minimal amount of force" to reasonable amount of force. C. Impact weapon 3. Prohibited uses b. Strike a handcuffed prisoner with an impact weapon. Add unless exigent circumstances exist. If the goal of the Department is to use less lethal force, why is the carotid restraint eliminated and ECD not added
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	Proposed changes to use of force increases the likelihood of officers being injured or killed. Proposed change also increases the chance of officers being brought up on charges for taking the correct action. The thought of not being able to use a taser on an unarmed person simply has not performed the job. I believe the taser can be a great tool for officers in the field. This tool would, in my mind, prevent unnecessary injury to both an officer and suspect. The removal of the carotid would also be a big mistake. I can't recall a suspect who has died in my 20 years of service in San Francisco due to the carotid being used. I believe most officers attempt to de-escalate all situations, if allowed, prior to using a force option. Officers I have worked with over the years don't relish using force due to possible injury to themselves and the suspect.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	Taking away Carotid Restraint - bad
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	too short, not thorough enough to cover all situations
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	"sanctity of life" being pushed infers officers don't already value human life. "proportionality" is a slippery slope which will lead to crimes going unenforced and officer safety issues.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	Negatives: 1) To begin with, it's lacking the verbiage from the current policy in section I.Policy. This proposed order says nothing to us officers about the importance of protecting ourselves and each other. It provides us no protection or reassurance for when we do need to use force- for example, in the current policy, "I.C. The purpose of this policy is not to restrict officers from using sufficient force to protect themselves or others, but to provide general guidelines under which force may be used." The main paragraph for the new policy says, "These are key factors in maintaining legitimacy with the community and safeguarding the public's trust." Where is the line that says these options are for the protection of the officers? 2) In Section D. Proportionality- I have a hard time imagining what better weapon to protect myself or others

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>from a person armed with a baseball bat, edged weapon, improvised weapon, brick, or bottle than my firearm. Each of these weapons described are extremely capable of causing death or serious bodily injury. As we all should know by now, weapons other than fire arms are often presented in a moment when an officer can be least suspecting. This order seems to imply that an officer may be in violation if they use their firearm to protect themselves or others from someone who uses anything other than a firearm against an officer. 3) In section II.F.2. Supervisor’s responsibilities- as brought up by the POA, is the supervisor supposed to announce the reminders over the air and tie up the radio? Or are these reminders going to be put on cards for us supervisors to remember- and if so, we may have to pull over to read the list thus delaying our response time to the situation. 4) In section III.A.3.- The Carotid Restrain is one of the more useful control holds that we have available, especially when it comes to a smaller person against a larger person. People who are most proficient in this use of force are mostly the ones who use it and find it most effective. Also, I’m not sure why the new draft includes the Choke Hold as a prohibited control hold considering it was never an option for us to begin with. 5) In section III.B.2. Warning-to expect an officer to give a warning before administering OC spray is ludicrous- may as well tell the suspect to cover their eyes because they are about to be sprayed with something that may cause their eyes to burn and their sinuses to open up causing massive amounts of mucous to exit. OC is most effective as an element of surprise to allow for it to make contact with the parts of the face that make it most effective. 6) In section III.C.Impact Weapons, Prohibited Uses- In a life or death situation where the officer cannot get to their firearm and all they have is their impact weapon, they should not be prohibited from using this weapon in any means possible to save their life or the life of someone else. This draft does not allow that option anywhere. And to assume a handcuffed prisoner cannot cause death or serious bodily injury is also ludicrous. *** This is another example of where a sentence similar to the one in the current order -”If exceptional circumstances occur which are not contemplated by this order, officers should use any force reasonably necessary to protect themselves or others; however, they must be able to articulate the reasons for employing such force” should be included.</p>
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	<p>Uses of force are all individual circumstances - none of which are the same . This proposed order generalizes uses of force and also will create hesitation to endanger every officer to react appropriately based on each individuals physiological response to circumstances. This cannot be a template for all officers. The SCIENCE of every use of force situation needs to be taken into consideration.</p>
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	<p>Taking away a force option (Carotid Restraint; NOT a choke hold) and then providing another alternative (CED Device) ONLY to TAC & Specialists is not a reasonable solution as the device is not readily available to first responding officers (Patrol units) who have to react to quickly to developing events. The proposed policy is too rigid and restrictive and causes an officer safety issue by taking away a viable tool (carotid restraint) and replacing it with a potential force option with limited availability to first responding officers. Both the carotid restraint and the CED Device should be incorporated into the use of force continuum as it will only increase</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			the probability that the situation will be resolved in a safe manner for both the officer and the suspect.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	“Thoughtful Communication” is a ridiculous catchy/flashy buzz word that implies officers need to be trained/told how to communicate thoughtfully. That phrase is ridiculous. “Proportionality”.....this reminds me of the “Balance Test”.....again, another attempt at catchy buzz words. At the end of that paragraph how about include some Penal Code sections that that justify the force being used. We learn about these penal codes during Continued Professional Training. Why not include that language in DGO’s??
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	Members are unnecessarily going to get hurt/injured or worse
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	This will cause officers further pause in their decision making, which can lead to increased risk of serious bodily injury or death to the officer or others.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	11-15	This use of force policy appears to be written by someone with no law enforcement background. This policy will get one of our officers seriously injured or murdered.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	11-15	The new use of force policy is very restrictive. It will cause officers to second guess themselves and will ultimately injure or kill an officer. The new use of force policy will also leave officers out to defend themselves when involved in an OIS, meaning when your policy dictates where you can and should shoot first, but in a split second decision you shoot more times or not in the area your policy states, it leaves the officers hang to dry in an “out of policy” shoot. Although lawful, still in the public perception “out of policy” would suggest you were wrong. This policy along with all the “de-escalation” training and “reform” seems to send the message that police officers are the problem. This is absolutely ridiculous.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	6-10	It does not take into account the vast array of situations officers are placed into, at no fault of their own, by individuals encountered while operating in the course of their duties.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	6-10	Dangerous, confusing, impractical, unlike any other in the country.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	20	This policy treats us like we are in the customer service industry instead of dealing with violent people whether mentally ill or not
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	20	Example; there being ZERO reported problems with the use of the carotid restraint, and many reported successful uses of this technique, why would anyone take this lifesaving tool from officers?
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	11-15	This policy restricts and hampers officers from the point of first contact. This policy directly allows anyone who does not like a particular law ie: Traffic Laws to confront the contacting officer. The officer is then required to assess what the initial contact is for. This ignores that the person has escalated to the point of a 148 or a 240 on the contact officer. This automatically places the contact officer on the defensive in every instance as it almost assumed the officer is wrong. Why would they take away the carotid restraint? This is a very valuable tool which needs to stay. Being unable to control a suspects head leaves the officer open to getting head-butted and thus possibly injured

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	11-15	<p>1) There is wanton misuse of legally critical terms such as “imminent” vs. “eminent;” 2) A sensibly restricted policy with respect to vehicles has been eliminated, placing members and the public at risk and failing to take into account past history in this City. A prohibition at engaging subjects in vehicles is in opposition to IACP best practices and will create liability for the City; 3) Why is the carotid restraint removed? Particularly when other force options are not replacing it, including CEDs. 4) Why are CEDs a tactical tool ONLY, when the large majority of OISes involve patrol officers? Stupid. We’re going to call for a CED while the guy is assaulting someone? Great thinking. 5) De-escalation concepts suggest that the officer acts and the suspect reacts. That is backwards and not based on reality. The suspect controls deescalation. An officer may INFLUENCE it, but cannot control the decisions of the armed suspect. 6) WTF is with the advisories for supervisors and the admonitions to create time and space? Why is tactics and training equated with policy and why are we dictating that supervisors direct officers to follow common sense during an emergency response? 7) The presence of sanctity of life language suggests we wouldn’t have it without a written policy. It’s patently offensive. It was up to my parents to teach me respect for life and a morale code. If I don’t have it, a piece of paper ain’t gonna imbue me with it. Moreover, it would suggest a massive failure by DHR and the backgrounds unit, for enabling a psychopath to be hired. 8) “Choke hold”? Is that the “Chokey thing” one of the commissioners railed against? A prohibition against something we don’t do is like teaching to a negative. We should probably put in a prohibition for ax murdering people, too. 9) We are setting up cops for failure, in criminal, civil and administrative proceedings. If you don’t believe this is the aim of the DOJ and their PERF hired guns, you are not paying attention. BTW, Gascon is a PERF guy...you KNOW he’s licking his chops in the wings.</p>
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative		<p>How many things are you really expecting us to now actively consider that weren’t already being done prior? Also, officers SHALL render first aid unless refused or medical personnel are available? Lets say someone is injured, no 408’s available or are delayed. Is the SFPD going to equip a backpack full of necessary medical equipment and provide us with EMT training? I know we have a tiny medical kit in the cars now and that we receive first aid training during AO, but that mostly covers what to do in the case of needing an AED and providing CPR. Does the department consider who is going to take the liability if first aid is rendered and inadvertently aggravates the situation? How cooperative do you think someone who has had force used on them will be when having aid given to them by the same officer that injured them (and injured in a lawful manner consistent with 5.01) Taking away the Carotid Restraint. Seriously? A technique which when applied properly has the ability to end a lengthy physical altercation? But you will now allow us to “headbutt” a suspect? I can see the photos on social media now of suspects bloodied faces or broken noses, or even officers getting injured when applying a headbutt. Have we as a department killed anyone applying the carotid restraint? I already know that the “choke hold” is a no no, but it’s been one since I entered the department and definitely should remain that way. There are other items, but I’ll end with this. Adding the language that “The Department’s highest priority is safeguarding the sanctity of all human life” should be sufficient. It will remind us (not that we need reminding) of our mission. There</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	6-10	is no need to complicate things to a point where we give the advantage to those we mean to arrest/detain. Yes, their safety is important, but so is ours and the rest of the population around them.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	6-10	No more carotid??...wow! That's a big negative. This draft falls right into the hands of OCC and the Public Defender. While Tasers would be a positive addition, word is that they will take out the carotid. I think this is a huge mistake as when officers are rolling around on the ground with a subject (As will happen 100% of the time when officers and subject are not trained professional boxers), they need to be able to subdue a subject and quickly. If we can NEVER tase an unarmed subject, we need another tool that can subdue a subject rapidly and humanely. I am 5 foot 5 and 140 pound female. I find it disheartening that if a 6 foot 4 parolee with no body fat were actively resisting me without a weapon, I couldn't tase him and I would have to heavily consider, more than I already do as a psychology-educated college graduate and person with common sense, that they may be high or drunk. Sometimes those two factors alone make a fight more deadly and in more need of intervention as pain compliance ceases to exist. I also don't care for all the de-escalation jargon. Sorry to state such, but many many many SFPD officers are lazy and have been practicing de-escalation forever if for no other reason than to avoid tying up an ambulance, getting hurt before playing in the police Olympics or just plain cutting paper. Good luck isolating the subject to de-escalate at 16th and Mission or anywhere in the Marina, Polk Street, Van Ness etc. Every person hoping to catch the next Mario Woods or Rodney king incident will hover and holler and intervene from this point on.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	6-10	There are too many generalizations in the proposed General Order that I do not feel protect us and opens us up to being terminated or litigated against.
Admin / Headquarters	RTO	20	I believe in keeping the "Carotid Restraint" as an option for police to use during rare but real occurrences when fighting with resisters.
Admin / Headquarters	Range firearms instructor	20	#1. I'm offended by the "sanctity of human life" in the GO. I took an oath when I took this job to protect life. #2. there are several areas where the proposed GO would endanger officers and cause a delay in their decision making. #3. how do you isolate and contain a subject w/o a risk of injury? #4. the word "Proportionality" #5. Taking away the carotid restraint is a major blow to smaller officers who are able to control and secure a much larger suspect without injury to the suspect or officer. #6. shooting from a moving vehicle. Shall not. Even if being fired upon or a much larger vehicle ie dump truck? #7. The CED procedures are unsafe for the operator and not realistic
Admin / Headquarters	Training Division	20	The proposed order seems to suggest that officers have not shown respect for human life in the past. It also, the way I read it, offers "black & white" solutions to difficult and fluid situations. Considering the lack of practical, hands-on experience in our current patrol force, I believe this could lead to placing our officers at risk. Lastly, the carotid restraint was and is an effective technique and should not have been removed as a force option.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Admin / Headquarters	Evoc Instructor	20	The new DGO 5.01 is a joke. Maybe the people that want this adopted need to go back to the streets or find a new job. The same people that did all the things they want eliminated throughout their career and worse need to open their eyes. I offer this to them whether they are cops or not. If there is a person with a knife and we are supposed to retreat, what do you do if there is nowhere to retreat to. I am not going to go on forever but the bottom line is we are cops not cowards. We are the front line and not supposed to retreat. The same community groups that are so upset over someone that was killed by police, and call us murderers, will call us when their family member or they themselves are in need. The command staff needs to remember where they came from and stop being puppets.
Admin / Headquarters	Training	11-15	There are numerous issues with the proposed new 5.01 including but not limited to: -No Carotid Restraint, a valuable tool in our toolbelt -Dangerous, required, de-escalation -Supervisors should NOT be on the air during a dangerous situation when the air needs to be clear for officers involved in an emergency
Admin / Headquarters	teaching	16-19	
Admin / Headquarters	instructor	16-19	to vague, and a lot of the new policies are going to get officers injured
Admin / Headquarters	Instructor	6-10	-Far too much focus on de-escalation. De-escalation should be a consideration, but placing so much weight on it will likely result in officers hesitating, and getting hurt. -The loss of the Carotid Restraint as a force option is a poor policy decision. -Requiring supervisors to communicate with officers on scene over the radio will often prove unrealistic, as radio traffic will not be open.
Admin / Headquarters	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Certain proposed language is suicidal. I would be happy to explain
<u>Airport Bureau</u>	Administrative	20	There are too many areas in the new DOG 5.01 where Officers are not properly covered for use of force especially when it's justified. If this current draft is enacted you will see a full retreat from Officers.
Airport Bureau	Investigative	20	Seems like a vote of no confidence for the working men and woman of the SFPD that handle calls for service.
Airport Bureau	K9 Handler/Sergeant	20	The new proposed General Order seems to value everybody's lives except the Police Officers who are trying to keep the community safe. A police officer is required to use force to effect an arrest against an armed and non-compliant subject. It's pretty bad when the "department" is telling officers to create distance, deescalate, and try to "talk" to this subject? When do the officers get leaders who will support them rather than bend the knee to the political machinations of the vocal minority? This General Order will create doubt and confusion in the minds of officers, and it will get officers hurt.
Airport Bureau	canine	20	The new proposed policy is cumbersome and takes too much discretion away. The wording appears contrived and intentionally ambiguous. No one in San Francisco has died from the

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			Carotid restraint, and if I ever saw an officer using a choke hold I would attempt to stop him\her because it is not taught or acceptable practice. I believe more officers will get hurt or killed if this is implemented.
Airport Bureau	explosive detection k9	20	Unrealistic, maybe we can throw rocks at the criminals. Some officer will get killed if adopted!!!!
Airport Bureau	explosive detection k9	20	Proportionality should be discarded. We have been trained to de-escalate as needed to control the subjects. Proportional means equal. Our job requires us to make arrest/detain. Majority of the time, de-escalation resulted from having an advantage over the subjects. example: gun over a knife, baton over a subject who wants to physically fight.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This proposal will have a negative effect on officer safety and will lead to potential harm and second guessing of an officer in a use of force situation
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	negative officer safety hesitation
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	you want me to be a monitor
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	it sounds like the mayor and command staff have set themselves up pretty good. If we rush in and things go bad they are covered. if we hold off and things go bad they are covered as well. it sounds like the suspects safety is of the utmost concern. the officers and public are secondary. the officers are put into a bad spot.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I feel that this proposed General Order will put SFPD Officers lives at risk. Also having a negative impact on residents quality of police services.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	seems to put officer safety last. De-escalation sounds nice but does not seem practical when most high risk situations move fast and require an equally fast response to protect the public and officers.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The proposed new Use of Force policy is ridiculous and is an embarrassment to our department. In this policy, it wants police officers to basically analyze the suspect from head to toe. Those have been involved in critical incidents where as a suspect has a weapon, we don't have time to analyze the suspect from head to toe. Action needs to be taken immediately. This G.O. is too specific to what we should or should not do. I believe an officer will be injured trying to determine how to act or speak to a suspect based on how the suspect is behaving. This G.O. is asking officers to retreat rather than move in and take immediate action. The sooner the officer moves in to defuse the suspect the less there will be injury to the suspect or the officer. We don't beg a suspect to comply. We give one order, if feasible, to comply with our orders or we will use the force necessary to subdue the suspect.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The new policy will cause an officer to pause and the suspect will gain the advantage. Its gonna get cops killed.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It put officer's lives at higher risk of injury or death.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Carotid restraint is very valuable
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Loss of carotid restraint use of force which has been used without significant injury or death since its approval. It places officers in harm's way with the new 5.01.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The way that this policy is written I feel that not only are we going to see an increase in the amount of physical injuries to officers, but we may be attending a lot more funerals due to officers being killed in the line of duty.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	many incidents do not offer the opportunity to de-escalate, yet we must describe in narrative our attempts. Sounds like OCC chomping at the bit!
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It makes a dangerous job more dangerous.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	All force options are almost next to impossible to use. The proportionality section is setup to put all liability on Ofc's and away from department.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Too many negatives to list.... "level of force be proportional"...since when do we have to match the level of force. Shouldn't we have the advantage??? Prohibiting the use of the carotid restraint. That's another useful non-lethal tool.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Eliminates the "reasonableness" from the General Order
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	These new changes will definitely put officers in danger by second guessing themselves as well as performing less proactive police work. Hesitation in the performance of a police officer will result in more injuries to both parties. There is no need to revamp the general order 5.01 just to satisfied or appeal to the negativity the bad public has. We all know what police work is and how criminals are. Criminals do not follow or conduct themselves in any rules or regulations so this makes them very unpredictable. Officers have to be very flexible in dealing with any situations. More rules and regulations will only obstruct the officer's ability to perform his duty to protect and serve the people of San Francisco
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I feel this new use of force will get officers killed. once the bad guys know our rules of what we can and can not do, they will use it to their advantage. Bad guys do watch and learn our rules of what we can and can not do!!
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	any hesitation could result injury or death to officer
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Police Officers will not take any action due to this new use of force policy changes. The public and everybody safety will be in jeopardy for sure, its already happening. Newer cops are 2nd guessing their decisions and are going to get hurt or killed.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Rushed with no street officers input!
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	this order puts not only the officers lives in danger it also put public lives in danger and does not provide us with any options to making an arrest
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Anything can be improved. Overall, it reflects what the courts have mandated as proper under Graham vs Connor.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I BELIEVE IT WILL CAUSE OFFICERS TO HESITATE WHEN ACTION IS NEEDED.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It puts the criminal's well being ahead of law abiding citizens and officers. It places officers lives in danger.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The term proportionality in section D is highly ambiguous. "When officers are encountering a subject who is armed with a weapon other than a firearm, such as an edged weapon, improvised weapon, baseball bat, brick, bottle, or other objects. Officers may only use the degree of force that is reasonable and necessary to accomplish their lawful duties." Officers encounter unique situations on a daily basis. Each encounter presents its own challenges. What might be deemed proportional to one Officer might not be to another. The thought of what might the public deem proportional now must enter into the Officer's thought process while under stress to effect an arrest or in defense of himself or others. The intent of this ambiguity appears to allow either the Police Commission or public to decide what is considered proportional. California Penal Code 835a is highly misquoted and key critical sentences were left out. In particular, "A peace officer who makes or attempts to make an arrest need not retreat or desist from his efforts by reason of the resistance or threatened resistance of the person being arrested; nor shall such officer be deemed an aggressor or lose his right to self-defense by the use of reasonable force to effect the arrest or to prevent escape or to overcome resistance."
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I am afraid this order will leave me open to both physical harm as well as liability and that the department will try to scape goat me should something happen.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Don't believe taking away use of force options is a good thing for over all officer safety!
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The de-escalation mandate is unrealistic for many of the calls we go to. We do not go into a situation and take control of the situation out of choice, but out of necessity. The longer we take to take control of a situation the more volatile the situation may become and the greater risk we put ourselves and the public.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I don't believe an officer should jeopardize his or her, safety under any circumstances when dealing with an armed or potentially dangerous suspect.
<u>Bayview Station</u>	Administrative	20	It's not always practical to have a supervisor respond when there might be only one sgt. working doing the 100/200 job.
Bayview Station	Investigative	16-19	It is too limiting and will lend itself to officer's holding back and endangering themselves. It feels like an over reaction to the recent Mario Woods shooting because so many shots were fired. A more leveled approach to this sympathetic fire situation would be to open a dialog about using enough force as is necessary to stop the threat while not defining hard-fast rules. Cops by nature tend to be of a black and white nature — by this I mean, we are rule followers, like clear cut guidelines and a structured environment. This is exemplified when new officer ask every imaginable scenario to better understand what he or she is "allowed" to do in various scenarios. Setting the force policy up in the manner it is being proposed will endanger cops, and potentially the public, because they will hold back in an effort to comply. The excessive

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			amount of rounds used in the above mentioned shooting can be used as a teaching point rather than a jumping off point to redefine. My belief is that the shooting itself was a “good shoot;” the issue is, in the eyes of the public, especially in this current climate, the number of rounds. Rectifying this can and should be handled better.
Bayview Station	Investigative	6-10	Negatives: no more carotid restraint??
Bayview Station	Investigative	6-10	comparing our department to others in the state and country, we are moving backwards
Bayview Station	Plainclothes	11-15	Its all a reaction to what’s currently going on all over the united states. If we revert to the new policy, somebody is going to hesitate and get hurt or killed. The department has to understand that we are not either Drs., Psychologists and or a Psychiatrist. when we respond to calls for service and or on view certain crimes we could and or most of the time we only have certain limited information. Most shootings and or OIS always will happen within minutes and or seconds of arriving at any incident location.
Bayview Station	Plainclothes	11-15	Why? Because there’s nothing wrong with the current one. Most people that write these Policies have never been involved in a critical incident and look at critical incidents after the fact.
Bayview Station	Plain Clothes	6-10	Carotid Restraint needs to remain, there is too much language about de-escalation, something we already do. The large discussion about de-escalation, calling for HNT, etc will open up everything we do to detailed review....picking apart decisions that are made in 2 seconds. I could pick apart anyone’s split second decisions. The current wording will make Officers scared to go “hands on” and will create Officer safety issues.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Unnecessary language and restrictions
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It talks about things that we already are trying to respect and take care of, I don’t need to be reminded of these things. This pandering to political nonsense plus you are taking away a useful tool with the Carotid that IS NOT A CHOKE HOLD!
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It has made use of force even more vague and the ability to use force is dictated by the criminal. If I feel that someone is about to use force on me, based on all my years of experience, I could beat them to the punch. It seems now that I have to wait till I get punched before I can use one of my options.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	will put cops in the position of hesitating in critical situations that will put them at risk
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Not realistic to our duties. Is confusing and does not give proper direction. Allows Department and City to harass Officers for Political reasons, a lot easier, (or that “Gotcha” moment that Attorney’s and politicians salivate at).
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement		The proposed General Order for use of force do not provide enough safety for the officers.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Implementation of such proposed GO would jeopardize community members safety as well as officer safety.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	This policy looks out for the safety of suspects, not officers. Disappointed that carotid was removed. Focuses too much on de-escalation.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Negatives: -The de-escalation implies that officers have to follow a scale of force from lowest to highest without choosing which one they deem is appropriate for the situation -The GO states officers should use proportionate levels of force. This will cause officers to second-guess themselves. Officers will get hurt or killed. -Officers must make split second decisions and if a level of force used is not deemed proportional they will be scrutinized more severely than they already are -Supervisors already monitor calls involving subjects with edged weapons and the like. Officers will feel as if they are being micro managed and again question their ability to make decisions. Officers are trained to de-escalate. Plus, radio communication should be kept to a minimum during these types of incidents because things can go bad in a second. -We should be given more tools and taking away the carotid restraint is providing us with fewer options. In many situations this may be the officers only option before discharging their firearm. Why would anyone want to give an officer fewer options prior to discharging their firearm? -If a subject is not listening and being non-compliant why would they listen to the officer if alerted to the fact that they are going to be sprayed with a chemical agent or struck with a baton? They are not. Sometimes the only thing on the officer's side is the element of surprise, and in reportable uses of force incidents the officer is reacting to the subject. The subject is surprising the officer. -This GO second-guesses every decision the officer makes
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	This proposed DGO appears to have very little input from actual law enforcement officers. It seems to be written out of fear. Fear from not getting re-elected. Most of the things in here, we already do. It implies that we have had a problem with our use of force. Why not look at actual statistics and draw conclusions instead of protest and chanting. Saying it loudly over and over does not make it a fact.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	This order seems to try and train our officers in the language it uses. Training and policy are definitely linked, but they are not the same thing. The order cannot substitute for training. The area that states when we can use force states that we can use force to prevent a person from injuring himself or herself then goes on to say unless the person also poses an imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury to another life or officer. The order then directs you to an entirely different order. The language of this is awkward, stating "another life" another person would be more clear. Also, since this part of 5.01 says when we can use force, putting the word "unless" after gives the impression that under those circumstances, we are not allowed to use force. It is just one of several confusing components of the order. This order states that deploying of spike strips is considered a use of force. There is no explanation as what type of reporting is required for that. The ERIW portion of the order now states that it may be used to subdue an aggressive subject who poses an immediate threat to another person or the officer. In current training an Extended Range Impact Weapon (ERIW) is just that, an impact weapon with extended range, the new order appears to place it in an entirely different category with no explanation of immediate threat (whatever that is). Regarding physical controls, which officers are currently trained is the least intrusive level of force after verbal persuasion,

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			this new order says that different physical controls involve different levels of force. This portion also says that some physical controls may actually involve a greater risk of injury and pain than other force options (currently every other force option other than verbal persuasion is considered a higher level of force). That segment of the order would seem to indicate that an officer should resort to some type of weapon i.e. OC spray, baton, rather than attempt a physical control first. This would seem to be in direct conflict with their “proportionality” part of the order. The bottom line is that anybody who wants to call into question any force used by an officer will be able to, and use our own policy to do it because it is so poorly written.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The proposed DGO change seems like a knee-jerk reaction.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	very bad for officer safety, think of the CHP over that was just stabbed
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	No carotid restraint... takes an extra tool away...
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Why do we have shields and no training.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	- The terms within the policy is highly restrictive to officers and can get officers hurt (removal of carotid restraint and expressly prohibits it even as an outside training technique)
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It is plain simply dangerous to police officers. specially to new officers where they will be confused and doubt themselves in the using of force. We are not like Oakland where they are Federal mandated to report things that the rest of the country doesn't have to report.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	carotid should still be an option. Have we in SFPD ever done unlawful harm when using the carotid technique...not that I recall. Plus it is another great tool prior to using more deadly options. Speak with officers that have frequently used the carotid and form a clearer picture as to its pros n cons.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I've been trained for the last 10 years on properly using the carotid hold. I do not know of any officer in the last 10 years using this hold incorrectly. I do not understand why a useful tool is being taken away from us. I also do not understand how the use of OC, which has always been used for and “unarmed suspect” to know being used for a “suspect with a weapon other than a firearm.” We are we now lowing our use of force to that of the suspects??
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Obviously written by people who are not cops. How about including cops or the POA in the conversation. This proposed policy will set cops up for failure and get cops hurt. I also think intentional pointing of firearms should be a “display of deadly force” rather than a “use of force”.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	going to get Officers killed or is going to leave them open to get sued
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I think the new policy will get more off us hurt because it will prolong situations that require an immediate action. It also adds to many elements leaving us open for further mistakes and takes away from our judgement and ability to make good quick decisions.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I don't like that the carotid restraint has been removed. I have had it applied to me before it is a very effective way to subdue a subject.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The proposed changes start with the original points, "Prevent escape, overcome resistance, self defense, etc.", but then goes on to contradict those with grey areas that can be interpreted in different ways. It also has language that states we should consider the severity of the crime when deciding whether to use force. I feel that means if we make a stop based on a minor infraction and the subject resists and there is a reportable use of force, that we might be in violation. We are asked to consider if a subject may have mental health issues, drug use, or language barriers before we use force. This is nonsense. If someone is actively resisting we have to defend ourselves. People with mental health issues need to be treated with care and respect, but if they are having an episode and are out of control, we must defend ourselves and sometimes that means we strike, grapple, pepper spray, or baton them. Why we have to worry about someone's primary language when they are resisting is beyond me. Every country has police officers.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This new order removes tools for us to do our job. The new order is so unrealistic and is dangerous for the officer. It ties their hands and takes away tools that they already had.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It ties our hands to effectively do our job. It is part of the current de-policing of America.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	we need the carotid restraint very effective -restricted Tasers and new firearm policy needs to be looked at from an officer safety perspective
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	you can not untrain a technique, which always works. talking or hugging it out with a suspect will only create more injuries for officers. too many issues to type out.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The proposed revisions are poorly worded, and leave officers open to any number of legal liabilities.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Leads to Officer's placing themselves in a more dangerous situation. Most techniques stated are used on a daily basis, however this may now leave Officer's actions up to more scrutiny when using force.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Removes carotid. Prohibition of techniques removes my discretion from the situation at hand. Considering why a subject is non-compliant or resisting arrest is something to be figured out through investigation when the subject is subdued and no longer a danger to others. Supervisor duties will unnecessarily tie up radio and compromise safety.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed Use of Force general order appears to be rushed and created without "thoughtful communication" between the command staff that created it and the officers most affected by this policy. It addresses a small number of the inadequacies of the current version but does not seem to help the average patrol officer articulate a Use of Force. As with the current DGO, it fails to cite the standard for establishing the objective reasonableness of a use of force. It also fails to address how a use of force will be judged to determine if it was reasonable. Failing to adequately specify the factors used or at least generally used to determine reasonableness

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>creates a situation where officers struggle to articulate why their actions were necessary. An example of how this could be inserted into the DGO comes directly out of the LAPD Use of Force Policy and it is as follows: Objectively Reasonable. The legal standard used to determine the lawfulness of a use of force is the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. See <i>Graham v. Connor</i>, 490 U.S. 386 (1989). Graham states in part, “The reasonableness of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight. The calculus of reasonableness must embody allowance for the fact that police officers are often forced to make split-second judgments - in circumstances that are tense, uncertain and rapidly evolving - about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation. The test of reasonableness is not capable of precise definition or mechanical application. The force must be reasonable under the circumstances known to the officer at the time the force was used. Therefore, the Department examines all uses of force from an objective standard rather than a subjective standard. Factors Used To Determine Reasonableness. The Department examines reasonableness using Graham and from the articulated facts from the perspective of a Los Angeles Police Officer with similar training and experience placed in generally the same set of circumstances. In determining the appropriate level of force, officers shall evaluate each situation in light of facts and circumstances of each particular case. Those factors may include, but are not limited to: The seriousness of the crime or suspected offense; The level of threat or resistance presented by the subject; Whether the subject was posing an immediate threat to officers or a danger to the community; The potential for injury to citizens, officers or subjects; The risk or apparent attempt by the subject to escape; The conduct of the subject being confronted (as reasonably perceived by the officer at the time); The time available to an officer to make a decision; The availability of other resources; The training and experience of the officer; The proximity or access of weapons to the subject; Officer versus subject factors such as age, size, relative strength, skill level, injury/exhaustion and number officers versus subjects; and, The environmental factors and/or other exigent circumstances. In addition, the proposed DGO overreaches and compromises officer safety. It requires supervisors to interrupt an officer’s communication with additional resources during a tactical situation. These situations are constantly changing and officers are expected to make split-second assessments. I personally know from experience how vital it is to have an open radio frequency during these situations. Requiring supervisors to interrupt communications to “remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources” is absurd. It is not practical and will expose officers/supervisors to civil lawsuits when the Use of Force is deemed “Out of Policy” simply because this requirement was not fulfilled. It also cites the need for de-escalation techniques (I.C.) without defining or explaining those techniques. In section II.B., the title refers to reasonableness and then cites when force is legal. However, what is legal is only a portion of what is reasonable and this proposed order fails to communicate that. It does however, cite and define Penal Code section 149 and I find that interesting. In section, III.A.3, the order lists the prohibited control holds. I noticed that it includes the carotid restraint and</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>choke hold. It has been my understanding that the choke hold was never an authorized option. Including this seems politically motivated and unnecessary. I also noticed that the minimum range for the ERIW is 15 feet. This seems out of sync with industry standards and in some instances, too far. Since the Mario Woods incident, there have been two videos that have surfaced that depict officers using the ERIW with no effect on the suspect. Officers already know that the ERIW is unreliable and potentially does not have the stopping power needed to render an incident safe. When combined with the requirement that officers aim for the suspects legs, many are not willing to gamble their safety on such a tool. A more reasonable minimum distance requirement is 6 feet.</p>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Ties our hand and will have people seconding guess uses of force when time is an issue.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	There is a strong likelihood that the proposed GO will put members in harm's way.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This policy is like what would happen if you asked me to make a manual on how to build a space shuttle, it seems like it was written by people who have never done this job.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>The proposed General Order fails at several levels. Sections on Thoughtful Communication, De-Escalation, Proportionality, and Duty to Intervene. These topics are just new “cute” terms to appease the general public on what we do on an every day basis. Sections B, C, D, E only more opportunities for members to be exposed to unnecessary litigation and complaints. No member shows up to work to use excessive and or unnecessary force against anyone. SECTION I. E. DUTY TO INTERVENE is an overreaching subsection that should be struck from the proposed order. A decision to use force is specific to each officer. Each officer's safety is self determined and 20/20 hindsight should apply to each force situation as well. II. CONSIDERATIONS GOVERNING ALL USE OF FORCE. FEDERAL LAW, STATE LAW, AND CASE LAW IS WHAT GOVERNS USE OF FORCE. Verbatim cite of relevant standing laws is necessary to prevent ambiguity and debate of use of force scenarios. The Law Governing Uses of Deadly Force by a Law Enforcement Officer The federal criminal statute that enforces Constitutional limits on uses of force by law enforcement officers is 18 U.S.C. § 242, which provides in relevant part, as follows: Whoever, under color of any law, . . . willfully subjects any person . . . to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States [shall be guilty of a crime]. To prove a violation of Section 242, the government must prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: (1) that the defendant was acting under color of law, (2) that he deprived a victim of a right protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, (3) that he acted willfully, and (4) that the deprivation resulted in bodily injury and/or death. The Constitutional right at issue is the Fourth Amendment's prohibition against unreasonable seizures, which encompasses the right of an arrestee to be free from “objectively unreasonable” force. <i>Graham v. Connor</i>, 490 U.S. 386, 396-97 (1989). “The ‘reasonableness’ of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight.” <i>Id.</i> at 396. “Careful attention” must be paid “to the facts and circumstances of each particular case, including the severity of the crime at issue, whether the suspect poses an im-</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>mediate threat to the safety of the officers or others, and whether he is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight.” Id. Allowance must be made for the fact that law enforcement officials are often forced to make split-second judgments in circumstances that are tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving. Id. at 396-97. The use of deadly force is justified when the officer has “probable cause to believe that the suspect pose[s] a threat of serious physical harm, either to the officer or to others.” Tennessee v. Garner, 471 U.S. 1, 11 (1985); see Nelson v. County of Wright, 162 F.3d 986, 990 (8th Cir. 1998); O’Bert v. Vargo, 331 F.3d 29, 36 (2d Cir. 2003) (same as Garner); Deluna v. City of Rockford, 447 F.3d 1008, 1010 (7th Cir. 2006), citing Scott v. Edinburg, 346 F.3d 752, 756 (7th Cir. 2003) (deadly force can be reasonably employed where an officer believes that the suspect’s actions place him, or others in the immediate vicinity, in imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury). PC§ 835a. Peace Officer Use of Force to Arrest Any peace officer who has reasonable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed a public offense may use reasonable force to effect the arrest, to prevent escape or to overcome resistance. A peace officer who makes or attempts to make an arrest need not retreat or desist from his efforts by reason of the resistance or threatened resistance of the person being arrested; nor shall such officer be deemed an aggressor or lose his right to self-defense by the use of reasonable force to effect the arrest or to prevent escape or to overcome resistance. In regards to SECTION E. DUTY TO PROVIDE MEDICAL ASSESSMENT, we are not DOCTORS AND OR MEDICAL PERSONAL. We provide the best aid possible in each situation. Sacrificing the safety of 1st responders for non-cooperative victims and witness should not be an option. In regards to SECTION F. SUPERVISOR’S RESPONSIBILITY, situation rapidly evolve and it is not safe and or fair for officer’s emergency radio traffic to be halted by unnecessary radio traffic. In regards to Section III. FORCE OPTIONS and Prohibited use of control holds. Why limit force OPTIONS by taking away use of CAROTID RESTRAINT. The CAROTID restraint is only used occasionally but removing an OPTION could detract from department’s SANCTITY of HUMAN LIFE section of proposed use of force policy.</p>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>“Other options, not listed above, may be available to assist in de-escalating the situation.” This vague statement makes a few appearances and makes me feel that we will be held accountable for things not even listed. Section II(a) 5. [Officers are allowed to use force] “To prevent a person from injuring himself/herself, unless the person also poses an imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury to another life or officer.”- I hope this is a typo.</p>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	It is poorly written and sets up officers for failure.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The carotid restraint is a positive tool that was removed. That is one less option during a fight. I do not like that.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This proposed new use of force policy dramatically increases my chance of being killed on duty.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I think this proposed general order discourages us from using force when necessary.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>The proposed policy becomes so much a stand off approach to policing. When someone calls the police for help, they have reached a point where they can't handle it themselves. When we get a call for a violent offense, we act without second thought. Those actions are within the current policy but would not be under the proposed policy. Subjects under the influence rarely respond to verbal persuasion. the other options we have on our tool belt also have little to no effect. Peeper spray....useless. Baton....useless. Firearm.....not justified. The only ability we may have to subdue a violent offender under the influence of narcotics or alcohol is the proper application of the carotid restraint. The omission of this use of force is a knee jerk reaction to unfortunate events from across the country. Violence in this city is rising and amending a strict policy to become even more prohibitive is dangerous for everyone.</p>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>The new DGO 5.01 creates too many “what if?” scenarios that can not be answered within the proposed use of force policy. For example, in section 1. C #1, a subject is to be “isolated” and “contained” but does not make suggestions on how to do accomplish that without using force. If force is used to “contain” a subject, that would be counter-productive to the proposed DGO 5.01. Section D makes mention of “principles of proportionality” but does not make clear what that means. Section E I believe will get officers and public hurt. An Officer coming into the middle of a situation, may believe a subject is compliant, however, an officer already on scene may know other information that justifies their use of force. For example, a subject in a car may appear to be putting his hands up, however, an officer at a different view point may see that the subject is retrieving a firearm from the visor of the car. The first officer may believe that the pointing or shooting of the second officer’s firearm may be excessive and try to stop it, thus jeopardizing both officers lives as well as by standers. Section 2. A. is the exact opposite of Section 1. C. Section 2 A. says that force may be used to gain compliance with a lawful order. For example, a subject is refusing to stop and is walking away. Should the officer use force to stop them? or wait for other officers to attempt to “contain” them and attempt de-escalation? Section 2 B. is very confusing and seems to infer that if a subject is stopped for an open container, and attempts to walk away, that only verbal persuasion should be used as a force. This section forgets that when LEGAL force is used, it is the subject that escalated the situation, not the officer. An officer uses force when the subject has brought the interaction to the level of needing force. An illegal use of force is created when an officer begins to use force when a subject is compliant. Taking away the carotid restraint takes away a tool for officers and opens up the door for more use of impact and personal body weapons. A properly applied carotid restraint will have far fewer lasting effects than an impact or personal body weapon. There is no reason to limit chemical agent to an unarmed subject. By doing this, the proposed DGO 5.01 forces an officers hand to a higher level of force when dealing with an armed subject. Prohibited uses of an impact weapon is too vague and rigid. #1 states it can not be used to intimidate a subject, “such as...” but merely holding the impact weapon could be considered “intimidating”. Striking a handcuffed prisoner should be allowed in exigent circumstances such as a prisoner has moved their handcuffs to the front and is trying to disarm an officer. It may be necessary in some instances for an officer to raise the impact weapon of their head, while it should be avoided, outright prohibiting it is too restrictive.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	“Remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources.” ???
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	No need to take away an effective use of force, the carotid.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	potential of getting officers hurt is high
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Unrealistic
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	There are no positives. The proposed General order is going to have officers second guessing themselves because there is too much to learn and memorize when it comes to use of force.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	the proposed general order simply put our lives as peace officer in danger even more so. I personally feel the proposed general order is a way to appease the public.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Extremely disagree. Language of proposed G.O. would make me hesitate before taking lawful use of force options. Bottom line, officers will get hurt.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I do not particularly agree with the section about “proportionality of force” use by officers, as it means that officers will not have the upper hand against criminals when effecting arrest. This will definitely result in more officers getting injured while attempting to subdue a subject. This will also lead to less lawful arrest as officers will not want to put themselves in harms way to effect an arrest.
<u>Central Station</u>	Admin and Street	20	It will get us hurt, killed and sued. So called experts who do not do police work have written this to fit their political agenda. They have spoken and we will be forced to listen, but they will not like the consequences. I’m disgusted and have no faith in our City Government or those in the SFPD who are going along with it. I am actively advising family and friends to avoid applying with the SFPD specifically and LE in general. Please turn the lights off on the way out.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This policy was not mutually agreed upon by the chief and the POA. The Chief is practically ordering us to follow this policy before a meet and greet with the POA. It was haphazardly put together in a few days due to bad politics. And after 25years of police work (entirely on the patrol) I have never been on disability for any injury because of our current policy.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The new policy disregards federal law regarding Use of Force cases: Graham v. Connor and Tennessee v. Garner. It states that minimal force should be used. That is completely wrong, force used should be REASONABLE.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I question the wisdom of the pointing of a fire even being on the Use of Force continuum. Placing it just under the actual USE of the firearm is ridiculous. It lessens the City/Departments liability while putting it squarely on the backs of the individual officers on the street, in harms way, protecting the citizens they serve.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The overwhelming burden this puts on officers during a stressful situation is unreasonable and sets officers up for failure. This burden is going to get an officer hurt or killed because they are second guessing their actions. I don't like that the Carotid is no longer a tool for us.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I do not like the removal of the carotid restraint
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This proposed G.O. will directly put officer's in jeopardy. These changes, will in effect, make officer's second guess themselves in split second decisions.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	They prohibit the choke hold? We have never used a choke hold so why is it even in the new GO. The carotid restraint is a great tool and as long as I have been a Police officer, I can recall no case in which it led to the death of a person it was used on.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Ambiguous language - 'thoughtful', 'proportionate.' Clearly crafted with one type of incident in mind. Unreasonable expectations - the mandatory sgt. broadcast for armed subject calls is completely impractical and also pointless. Overall, a poorly thought out amateur attempt at a policy.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Why are they prohibiting the use of the Carotid Restraint? In grappling, the taking of a subjects neck is an easy way of handling compliance when other methods have not worked.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	THE PERPS GET MORE DOPED AND ANGRY AND WE HAVE TO GET NICER...BULL-SHIT! THIS ISN'T UNIQUE TO THIS COUNTRY. THIS IS A TREND THAT SUSPS ARE GETTING VIOLENT ALL OVER THE COUNTRY. PLUS, THE BLANKET STATEMENT BY THE CHIEF HAVE ALL THE PROPER TOOLS, SHIELDS ETC., IS B.S. JUST GO TO A STATION AND AN AUDIT.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It contradicts and compromises officer safety. Officers don't go out seeking UOF, let alone OIS's. This new proposal is another way Chief Suhr is playing to the community without thinking it through. He will get Officers seriously injured or killed with this mentality. and why take away the carotid? there is no factual argument for the SFPD to lose another (non lethal tool)
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	too restrictive and not well thought out or realistic. will get a cop hurt or killed.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The proposed orders try to dictate explicitly what order things will be done and tie the hands of patrol officers as Sergeants SHALL order officers to not take action, give distance and take command of the scene. New officers will hesitate, not wanting to violate orders, resulting in officer/public/suspect injuries or death.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Encourages officer hesitation. Will cause officers to be injured or killed. Use of force experts should write this policy, not the ACLU.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	There are too many ways to interpret the verbiage as it is written in the proposed version.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It seems the new proposed G.O. 5.01 overly emphasizes negotiation tactics. When Police Officers enter specific situations in calls for service, the given situation is handled in the manner

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			presented to us. We use trained Hostage Negotiator resources already when needed. Most incidents we're involved in consist of us 'de-escalating' a situation. We already have been trained in verbal persuasion as outlined in the current DGO 5.01. Giving Police Officers these additional responsibilities may cause us to give 'pause' and hesitate which could result in officer safety issues.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Negative: To give warnings before deploying Pepper Spray, etc
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	any further de-escalation of force will create unsafe practices for officers, especially those who are brand new to this job.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Removing the carotid is a huge mistake. The carotid is extremely useful and works very well. The de-escalation portion is an absolute joke, especially if dealing with a subject with a knife. a 15 foot gap can be closed before we would even draw our weapon. Having a sgt respond and take command of a scene with a weapon is ridiculous. This policy is going to get officers hurt or even killed.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Prohibiting the carotid should be eliminated. If you are in a fight on the ground the carotid presents itself it is a great tool.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I do not like this new use of force policy for multiple reasons. I feel that taking away the carotid restraint as a force option is unreasonable and will lead to more traumatic force being issued. If in an officer's duties to apprehend a violent subject the most appropriate option is to render the suspect unconscious, then the new policy will require the officer the do so with personal body weapons or impact weapons used in a lethal manner. The policy will require blunt force trauma to the head rather than a momentary prevention of blood flow to the brain. The concept of proportionality when using force obscure and provides too much power for interpretation by third party observers. The order reads that the usage of force should be proportional to offense committed, not just the level of resistance the offender committed. That concept intrinsically creates self doubt and delay of action. This will lead to officers getting injured. Who determines what is an offense in which personal body weapons can be used versus OC? Further, this allows OCC and IA to interpret that an officer acted in appropriately when then are forced to use force on a misdemeanor offense in which the suspect reacts with violence. The standard for judging force usage should be measured against an officer with similar experience and training. Further 835 PC does not require an officer to retreat due to proportionality of the offense committed. Furthermore, the order allows officers the ability to deflect a suspect with their vehicle, but officers receive no deflection training.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This steers far away from anything we have learned in the academy and it is going to make people hesitate and may result in serious injury to an officer or civilian.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The provision regarding tactical relocation puts an unnecessary burden on officers to accommodate a potentially violent, dangerous, noncompliant subject -- this places officers and the public at unnecessary risk, and demonstrates a lack of "sanctity" for the preservation of life of police officers and uninvolved, innocent citizens. Additionally, the provision regarding pro-

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>portionality goes far above and beyond applicable use of force standard articulated by the Supreme Court of the United States. There is no ethical, practical, tactical, or legal reason to enact more restrictive policies than those approved by SCOTUS. More restrictive, and more detailed, policies require officers to spend more time thinking through their use of force decisions and, potentially, react slower to defend themselves or the public. Furthermore, the section regarding supervisors responsibilities creates a vague and likely onerous requirement -- the requirement that supervisors notify responding officers to “protect life, isolate and contain...” et al. It does not specify if supervisors should remind officers of this daily in line up, once at the scene, or via radio. Should supervisors violate a code 33 radio restriction to read this wordy statement over the radio?</p>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	not being able to use the carotid restraint is insane
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	This proposal takes away the carotid restraint, which can be a very useful tool and can prevent a situation where a greater level of force would be require without that option.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	This proposal will make an officer question when he can and can't use force. We don't have time to think and question our instincts. With the old GO, it was simple and to the point, making it easy to use good judgment in the field.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	“minimal force” is not a good term. anyone can think less force would have been appropriate.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I feel people do not understand the extraordinary situations Officers can be put in where split second decisions have to be made. Every Officer I know just wants to go home at the end of the day with out incident. The new proposal emboldens those who are legally detained, especially after committing violent felonies, to challenge us and escalate matters. It would be nice if every suspect incident ended with the subject being compliant but unfortunately it does not always happen that way.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	it removes the carotid. Time and distance is not always the most practical situation. It puts other officers and the public at greater risk.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	OFFICER SAFETY CONCERNS W/ TIME AND DISTANCE
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	“ It is important that an officer’s level of force be proportional to the severity of the offense committed...” the times that i have used force was due to the fact that the subject became a resister and i had to use force to gain control of the subject, the wording on this to me, makes it appear that we can no longer use force if the subject becomes a resister when conducting SIA and use traffic violations as PC to detain.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	its ridiculous
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I like the it that a supervisor must respond to calls where subjects are armed. I think a lot of times officers are left out to dry by supervisors.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	to much gray area, I don't feel like I will ever be supported by the department for a use of force. The use of force could look “lawful but awful.”

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	We are already trained to create time and distance, however taking away certain force technique such as the Carotid will limit what we can use to do our job and possjble limit on how we can subdue larger subjects without using lethal force.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	No carotid restraint. As a petite female, you have now placed me at a disadvantage in a physical fight versus almost every subject I will come into contact with that becomes violent and physical. This is a technique that can save my life, and you have narrowed my options down to a fist fight or use of baton. If I can't get my baton out first, then I am stuck with a physical fight with limitations imposed upon me, but no limitations imposed upon that subject. I have been put in a chokehold, and body slammed, and kicked, and punched, yet I do not get to use a safe technique that is taught during the Academy, a technique I know how to safely apply to a subject to safely effect an arrest. This proposed General Order places me in harm. It should be a 1:1 ratio of lethal to less lethal officers on scene. It is stupid to have every officer scream out instructions after one officer does. One officer should be in charge and be the voice. I want a tazer too.
<u>Ingleside Station</u>	Administrative	20	Duty to intervene will get someone killed, its only a matter of time. One officer may see or hear something their partner missed. Supervisors responsibility to "Remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication" will also get someone killed, the air shall belong to the officer in danger. We need to keep the carotid - it works and nobody gets injured, those are just a few reasons....
Ingleside Station	Investigative	20	Is there a scientific definition of proportionality that we are using? I read proportional as equal.
Ingleside Station	Investigative	16-19	This is going to get an officer killed! Our current chief would have never had a full career under this policy. He would have been removed while working at Narcotics.
Ingleside Station	Investigative	16-19	Withdrawal of Carotid is very bad. Requiring patrol supervisor to remind about sanctity of life, etc. in middle of violent encounter is stupid and impractical, Maybe such a reminder in writing at station to be reviewed in line-up or similar. ECD language is bad should be allowed in non-armed confrontations as required by situation.
Ingleside Station	Investigative	11-15	Directly flies in the face of current penal code statutes regarding use of force. The proposed use of force not only endangers the lives of officers it also endangers the lives of the general public. The proposed plan would paralyze officers into taking no action. The idea that one must retreat or to be attacked first before resorting to using force is astonishing. The proposed policy also is treating the environment as static in nature and fail to see the dynamics of any situation in which force might be used. In a perfect world or testing situation there is the luxury of calling for and relying on those with more experience and an expertise. However, this is not the case

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Ingleside Station	Investigative	6-10	<p>and this is simply not possible. The proposed policy talks about space and distance. But it does not address how much space or how much distance, and when that space and distance is closed then what? Do you give five yards? Ten yards? and if the suspect has already shown a propensity for violence? The current policy has a line that states “when reasonably possible” but the proposed policy does not allow for any qualifiers for a grey area.</p> <p>I believe many tactics in the new proposal second guess what officers already do and create a public safety and officer safety issues. The GO suggests officers do not already employ de-escalation techniques. SFPD officers employ such techniques and try to determine what type of crisis a subject is having on a daily basis. If officers failed to do these simple first steps there would be hundreds if not thousands of reportable uses of force and injuries to the subject, the public, and the officers each year. The GO states that an officer’s level of force should be proportional to the severity of the offense committed or the threat posed to human life. How should an officer approach a violent robbery suspect proportionally? The GO also states it is critical officers apply the principles or proportionality when encountering a subject armed with an edged weapon. Is the GO suggesting I take on a subject armed with an edged weapon by utilizing my baton? Proportionality is going to get an officer seriously injured or killed. Another negative component is described under the supervisor’s responsibility section. The GO states supervisor’s shall remind officers to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, and the list goes on. Calls for service and self initiated activity can be very dynamic and dangerous situations. Radio airtime and brevity may be of the utmost importance whether the public or an officer is coming under attack or an ambulance needs to be summoned. These are just a few examples of why the radio needs to remain free for the officers on scene and those responding. I believe removing the officers’ ability to utilize the carotid restraint is a mistake. Officers should be equipped with as many tools as possible. The carotid restraint may be the only force option an officer is left with after trying to employ lesser levels of force or it may be the appropriate force option to begin with. Subjects practice hand-to-hand combat and grappling. The majority of subjects who I have encountered that have resisted arrest have resulted in wrestling on the ground. The carotid restraint is an effective tool that can save the life of all parties involved. I believe alerting subjects to the fact that they are going to be sprayed with a chemical agent or struck with a baton is not feasible in many situations. Again, situations are very dynamic and there may not be time to make such a statement. Officers who are trying to restrain a violent subject have a number of responsibilities including putting out their location on the radio, telling the subject to stop resisting, and determining which level of force is appropriate. Additionally, an officer may lose the element of surprise if they make such an announcement. Thus, placing themselves and the subject in greater danger as this may elevate the subject’s level of resistance.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	<p>unrealistic expectations. Supervisors will endanger officers on the street if they spend a lot of time on the air reminding them (like children) of all the things they should already know to do when confronting or deciding when to use force or not.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The new language introduces the unmeasurable element of an officer's use of persuasion and destroys the bright line tier between force options.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Too restrictive
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Very ambiguous and dangerous to the officers. Life on the street does not translate to this order and inputs officers lives at stake
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	the wording of proportionate to the crime is a huge mistake. most 148's take place from common take ons and shoplifters. PC 835a should be the standard nothing more or less. The restrictions on the Taser is asinine. The RCB will often cause more and permanent damage than a Taser by far. The taking away of the carotid is absurd !!
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The very beginning especially 1. Policy C. De-Escalation is almost insulting! All officers evaluate situations utilizing this set of criteria. We do this without it being memorialized on a DGO! A 7 page order is too wordy and this order is too ambiguous. I have had OCC sustain allegations on OCC's interpretation of ambiguous orders/case law. This order is going to be a field day for OCC!
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Question regarding 5.01 II A. The word UNLESS.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The new GO was not written to keep officers safe. It was written to be politically correct. It is also very unrealistic. As a supervisor, I am now ordered to ask a slew of questions while en-route to a call involving a weapon. This will not only delay my response, this puts officers at risk by me tying up the radio. Taking out the carotid? What for? Adding in head-butting... really?! Should this order be put in place, it is just a matter of time before an officer is seriously injured or killed.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	If this proposed ratification passes, I see many officers seriously hurt or killed because present officers will second guess themselves. Overall, a large increase of lawsuits from officers rather than Joe Citizen will spike.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Reducing the amount of options (ie: No Carotid restraint and "Tasers" for Tac/Specs only), WILL force Officers to use their firearms more often. . The opposite argument can also be made. Officers may refuse to use their firearm out fear of repercussions from the Department/ Media/Law suits etc..... This outcome WILL cause death or injuries to Officers. Which I know is not a concern of the Chief/Mayor/Board of Supes/Black Lives Matter etc.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement		After carefully reading the entire draft, we already do a lot of things proposed. The proposed changes will create an unsafe working environment and cause hesitation. Policy changes as a result of political grandstanding and to the catering of special interest groups should always be avoided. The carotid restraint should still be a tool in our use of force continuum.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I believe the proposed G.O. will create more dangerous situations for police officers. ex. I. C. (De-escalation): "Officers should consider the possible reasons why a subject may be non-compliant or resisting arrest." If a person is actively resisting you and your trying to control

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>the subject in a split second decision, I don't think I would have the benefit of time to think about why this person is resisting and being non-compliant. My concern is my safety, and if the subject is not controlled then the outcome of that encounter can be potentially dangerous. Also (I. F.) Supervisor Responsibility. This is not practical to every incidents especially on an On View situation. (III. Force Options A. 1) "minimal" amount of force. I feel like we our going to be judged based on minimal amount of force available rather than the reasonable use of force. A. 3. Prohibited Use of Control Holds... I feel that having Carotid Restraint is an effective tool, it can stop a potential violent person without having a prolonged fight, and can be effectively used by a small officer on a bigger and stronger resistive/violent subject. Taking this tool out, I believe is a political one and a dangerous one. I feel that not having this tool will limit us to use other force that will prolong the violent encounter and endanger the safety of all involved. We don't have choke holds which is defined in our current G.O. already. (III. D. Extended Range Impact Weapon) 2 a. "there should be fewer lethal cover officers than the number of ERIWs deployed" I understand we are trying to limit the number of lethal covers, but are we going to be playing a numbers game all the time when there's an incident at hand. 4. b. So if other officers don't echo the warning, are they held in violation of this order? III. E. Vehicle Intervention. Deployment of spike strips and "Other" interventions resulting in the intentional contact with the non compliant suspect vehicle---is this a reportable use of force?... sorry Im confused...and What are considered "Other Interventions" and who decides what is considered "Other Interventions". This G.O. took out reasonable force section (I E 1.). I believe this to be important when using force. We are judged based on the reasonableness of the use of force.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>It is reactive and pandering to a radical group who is seeing to the destruction of police work. Police work is dangerous and serious business not a political pawn to be molded at whim.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>I don't believe that explaining the sanctity of human life, thoughtful communication, proportionality, de-escalation, and duty to intervene should be the entire first section of the Use of Force G.O. It's all very vague and really has little to do with use of force. All of those things are done prior to using force. I also don't understand proportionality. What are they saying? The only part of that that makes sense is the last line. Is proportional supposed to mean "even". Does it mean that we pull out a baton if they have a bat? It's confusing. What about the carotid? Why eliminate it?</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>Probably written with good intentions, but sadly the author(s) clearly have no knowledge/ understanding/ or expertise related to use of force. The vague and confusing/contradictory verbiage is a major issue. The draft order as written will be extremely difficult at best to work with based on what Officers deal with on a daily basis. The proportionality section is very troubling as it is not consistent with the law related to our ability/lawful right to use force, it overlooks situations Officers face on a daily basic with individual who choose to resist arrest. Officers level of force should be based on the actions of the subject the threat presented to the Officers or public, the size of the subject, fighting ability of suspect, suspects history if know (prior 221 148 245 etc) weapons or makeshift weapons available to the subject taking</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>into account the severity of the offense committed 245 187 types of violent crimes should be initially met with a higher level of force, but this listed verbiage implies that a low level offense should me met with low level of force, which is not necessarily true as a low level offender 602 who Officers see with a knife is much larger than the Officers should be met with a level of force disproportionate to the crime and proportionate to the threat the officers are facing at the time. The force used should be at least a step above the threat presented to us, we should always chose a level of force likely to end, not prolong the situation, and minimize the injury likely to Officers and the public. When we use equal force to that presented to use we are setting ourselves up for failure/injury. The CHP Officer who was nearly stabbed to death this month while dealing with a 602 is an example of what can happen in an instant where a very low level crime quickly turns to a lethal force situation. I agree that Officers should report to a supervisor what they believe to be excessive force; however, in chaotic scenes we all see from our vantage point only and do not have all the information present. If Officer #1 is forced into a deadly situation (sees a suspect in close proximity holding a gun or knife) and Officer #2 (based on vantage point or perception) does not realize what Officer #1 sees and Officer #2 physically intervenes both Officers and the public could be seriously injured or killed. Supervisors and Officers don't determine medical response, that is done by medical personnel, we have no ability to expedite the process, we can only request resources when safe to do so and provide the nature of the medical issue, this draft order appears to make us liable for the actions of medical personnel. The idea of Supervisors taking up radio traffic to say they are responding and remind Officers about how do deal with the situation, when those Officers are possibly fighting for there life and needing to broadcast pertinent information to responding Officers & Supervisors is is terrible idea and huge Officer safety issue. Unnecessarily tying up the radio when Officers are dealing with a potentially life threatening situation is absolutely wrong! Any time an Officer calls a Code 33/148/1025/406 that/those Officer(s) are the only ones that should be talking on the radio. No one should even be on the air saying they are 98. The Officers on scene need the air. If the incident is resolved and they are trying to give a code 4 SIC and can't due to unnecessary radio traffic if puts multiple Officers and the public a risk as Officers respond code 3. If Officers broadcast that the subject has a 221 or 222, location changes, additional suspect or vehicle information, safe avenue of approach, how to get to where the Officers are and that information is not heard it further endangers responding officers and the public. Each ERIW Officer should have a lethal cover as separation of lethal cover Officers/ or ERIW without lethal cover creates a situation where a ERIW Officers will not have lethal cover as they need that lethal cover close to them where they can communicate directly/move together/etc to immediately deal with deadly threats without delay. Trying to determine why a subject is non compliant is only possible in some very limited situations, likely impossible in many/most situations due to the nature of incident threat presented to Officers/Public at the time. At a minimum there should be acknowledgement that this is impractical/impossible at times and should not trump the Officer/Publics safety. Removal of the carotid restraint and an extremely limited use of Taser creates an even larger gap in our use of force spectrum likely increasing the likelihood that Officers will have their hands tied in this restrictive policy and</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>be forced to use a firearm, when a Taser or carotid, would have been a much more reasonable option and far less likely to cause death. Not being able to use a Taser on subjects without weapons or fleeing renders them practically useless. There have been many instances where Officers were severely hurt or beaten by individuals who had no weapon, but were physically stronger, larger, or possessed superior fighting skills than the officers, and there is no reason why Officers should not be able to use Tasers on people that present a threat to the Officer or public with or without a weapon. How about when the use of deadly force is necessary and justified, shouldn't there be verbiage that allows Officers to use any type of force when presented with a situation justifying the use of deadly force. A hand cuffed prisoner can still kick/throw elbows/head-butt/etc and seriously injure someone, and such a baton/impact weapon/Taser is very reasonable use of force on a handcuffed person in such situation. I think keeping our firearm/ERIW's distant from us on patrol (locked in the trunk) is a bad idea likely to create situations where Officers won't have time to get to the ERIW and will be forced to choose their handguns.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Negatives. The prohibited use of the carotid restraint.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>The proposed DGO takes away the option of the carotid hold but replaces it with the option of a Taser which is only available via Tactical Company. It does not create solution but creates a deficiency for the patrol officer.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>Proposed DGO as it stands is politically driven and exposes officer to unnecessary harm, and places politics and the life of suspects above those of officers and the general public.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>Where do i start. Thoughtful communication with someone AMS/under the influence? That's unrealistic and to put that language into policy is nothing short of delusional. The deescalation language implies that deescalation is always an alternative to use of force in every situation, also completely delusional. the "deescalation tactics" stated in the policy does not take into account terrain limitation (beyond our control) and the reality that the suspect's action (also beyond our control) is single largest factor in the outcome. "The principles of Proportionality" is introduced in the new policy. What is this? Who made this up? What is the legal basis for the "principles of proportionality"? What does it even mean? No where in both Graham v Connor and Tennessee v Gardner is the word "proportionality" used. The constitutional standard for use of force is "objectively reasonable", not proportional. This language is baseless in case law and is completely unacceptable. The policy references 835a PC to discuss objectively reasonable under totality of the circumstances, yet it conveniently omits the protections afforded us by the second half of 835a PC: an officer need not retreat or desist from making an arrest, shall not be deemed the aggressor, does not lose the right to self defense when using reasonable force. Supervisor's responsibility to remind responding officers of time and distance, communication etc etc. You want a supervisor to tie up the air with lengthy radio transmissions that provide no tactical advantage or information during a hot run? Huge officer safety issue. Unacceptable. Removing the carotid restraint is a mistake. It is an extremely effective technique that is the ultimate equalizer in hands on arrest situations. Compliance</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			can be gained regardless of size and strength of suspect with the carotid restraint. This is no doubt a knee jerk reaction to the in custody death of Eric Gardner in NY. I would suggest that everyone watch the video again, which clearly shows that Gardner was neither choked to death by strangulation nor by carotid restraint (officer's arm was under Gardner's armpit the whole time, physically impossible to "choke" or "carotid restraint" with that arm position". We have to fight to keep this.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	During stressful situations you revert to your training. The proposed use of force policy is going to get someone hurt or killed. Officer safety is always FIRST.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Negative: Created hesitation in Officers, especially less experienced ones. It has been documented nationwide that imposing too many rules on use of force created hesitation in Officers. Some cases, the Officer ended up losing their lives.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Why get rid of the corrotid restriant? It works, we need it and we are trained in proper application and revival techniques.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Why have us out there then? Basically we are giving the power to the bad guy. This new GO is completely ridiculous.The shields are absurd and there is no way in hell that myself or any of my fellow officers are getting close to a knife welding person without lethal force.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	There are no positives. Some one is going to get hurt. Taking away options (carotid restraint) is a bad idea. Every officer needs a taser.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Proportionality is ridiculous. Everyone should get a taser. TAC/SPECs are trained in using a higher level of force. They are not trained to de-escalate a situation other than overwhelming force. We have HNT for de-escalating. Being CIT trained means nothing for using a taser. We should be able to use a taser in all instances when force is REASONALE. The carotid should stay, its a humane way of settling a dangerous situation.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Since when is having to engage in thoughtful communication practical in dealing with people with mental disorders or simply attempting to do harm to another or not wanting to sign a traffic citation. Last week, an "A" priority 913 turned into a mentally unstable woman yelling on the bed that she wanted to kill herself. The young lady moved her leg and my partner saw a knife underneath her leg. Quick hands on control holds, spit mask, hobble and an ambulance with restraints later, the subject was diagnosed as 5150. Having to do things differently that night would have turned disastrous. Having to engage the this lady with no time limit, meanwhile she has a knife under her leg is allowing her to control the scene, moreover putting my life in danger more than it should be, with no control of the scene. Isolating and containing this subject in her bedroom, with multiple hiding places for weapons is also a waste of time and decreases my officer safety. This subjected needed to be given a sleep agent by medics for her erratic behavior. Every simple question throughout the entire incident, such as "Miss where's your purse", was answered by "Fuck you bitch. Fuck the police." Talking to this subject in a calm manner with fluffy voice intonations would not work. Stop putting my life in further danger by making General Orders made by people who do not patrol the street.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This order is filled with contradictory language that will not only endanger officers by encouraging them to hesitate when it is necessary for them to use force, but will set up officers and the department for unnecessary disciplinary action and lawsuits. The proposed standard of proportional force, as opposed to reasonable force, is equally troubling. Many offenses are minor crimes but have severe consequences to the community if left unchecked. This proposed standard not only breaks from the legal precedent of reasonableness, it hamstring officers by prohibiting them from taking reasonable but disproportionate action against offenders. Finally, the loss of the carotid restraint is particularly concerning, as we will lose the only tool that can safely and humanely restrain an aggressive person who is resistant or immune to pain compliance techniques. In addition, it will cause additional unnecessary legal action from the public who perceives that officers are using an “illegal choke hold” when they are in fact using other approved techniques that may resemble such a hold to the untrained observer. There are numerous other issues with the proposed policy that I could discuss at length.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The current SGO 5.01 is already restrictive to the point where Officers can second guess themselves on the issue of Officer Safety for fear of getting into trouble or getting on the EIS list. The proposed DGO 5.01 does not take into account the type of calls for service arising out of different Districts. Some Districts have Gang Stay Away areas, Gang Zones of Influence, Public Housing, or a higher incidence of violent crime. Other Districts are much larger, have traffic congestion or limited avenues of approach, or lighter Patrol staffing. Moreover, the proposed DGO does not take into account the timing or number of back up units available when watches are “light” as opposed to “fat.” Creating time, distance, and de-escalation are most feasible with “fat lineups, low calls for service, units not tied on “A” runs, multiple officers on scene, areas easy to cordon off, and low density of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The proposed DGO 5.01 does not take into account the practicality of its implementation nor the potential harmful effects it has on Officer Safety.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed General Order (5.01) is taking away a useful option (carotid) and does not allow me to make a safe decision for myself and others.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	neg- use of force matching the crime. the crime doesn't necessarily always dictate the use of force. sometimes it is the subjects actions and demeanor that determine the use of force.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I feel it tries to put more strict lines to follow in a job that has no two situations as being the exact same or no one guideline that would situate with every occurrence.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Absolutely not. The onus to perform in a proficient manner has always and will always rest upon the patrol officer. However, with this proposed version of the Use of Force Policy, there exists too many alterations, loopholes, grey areas; in too little time, to allow a patrol officer to retain a “working knowledge” of the policy.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Ties our hands when dealing with dangerous suspects. Gives us only a tool to deal with any given situation, (ie hand vs hand, baton vs knife). Situations are unpredictable, we need a wide range of tools to deal with the situations.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed policy is filled with fluff. Rather than having a simple and concise use of force policy which officers can understand, the administration has created an idyllic novel (for the public) for us to read that is so outrageous and opens us up to even more civil liability, OCC complaints and a violation of this policy could risk us losing our jobs.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The new policy adds many considerations which opens the department up to liability and officer up to liability.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I think it will make officers over think their decisions and hesitate on making decisions. When it comes to persons that are AMS, they will not be able to comprehend what is going on and it is often that officers should go hands on with them, in order to keep everyone safe.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I believe that sfpd officers already do most if not all of the new proposed guidelines. I believe that the new proposed guidelines will only put officers even further under the microscope and open to more civil liability.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The proposed DGO 5.01 is dangerous and will result in officer's second guessing any use of force. The proposed DGO 5.01 is unrealistic and allows criminals and individuals who do not follow lawful orders to dictate how the incident will unfold. This DGO will cause incident's to spiral out of control and cause harm to officer's on scene and other civilians.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	many of these new revisions are unrealistic and pose great officer safety risks. For example, new de-escalation tactics are not realistic and present a greater danger to officer. We need the carotid restraint as a necessary tool for self-defense and to prevent further injury to the subject. The vehicle intervention section is very vague. Pointing of a firearm should not be a use of force. With respect, it is not, just as our uniform is not a use of force. The new use of force policy is extremely vague with such substantial changes to our work conditions and with regard to officer safety.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	taser only when suspect wielding weapons is absurd. lapd can use taser on suspects who are unsafe to approach.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	provides subjects the ability to dictate or control the scene leaving officers and others vulnerable to injury, death, or danger
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Removing carotid and two shots and reassess seems unrealistic for stressful situations.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Assumes unrealistic scenarios. Appears to be dedicated solely to mental health crises that make up a tiny minority of use of force incidents. "Proportionality" section is unreasonable and, frankly, wrong. Use of force is not and should not be related to the offense. Rather, it always has been and continues to be related to the level of resistance met. Strong implication throughout DGO that non-firearm deadly weapons are not dangerous. Appears to disregard 835(a) PC. "Supervisor's responsibility" clause completely unrealistic, nobody should be getting on the air in an emergency situation that isn't at the scene, especially for the reasons listed. DGO states physical controls are not reportable uses of force unless the suspect complains of an injury, then says personal body weapons *are* reportable uses of force. These force options

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>are at the same level. This is not clear. The carotid restraint is one of the least harmful force options we have and there is no reason to remove it. It is also the best option for an officer in a ground fight with a suspect, where other force options are difficult or impossible to use. Blanket prohibitions should never be used (e.g. “officers shall not strike a handcuffed prisoner”) as extraordinary circumstances will always present situations that justify use of force when it would otherwise be unreasonable. Policy should contain some sort of “unless...” clause allowing for these situations. The ERIW is an impact weapon, and as such should be considered an equivalent level of force. There is no reason to prohibit its use to armed suspects. I have never seen the ERIW work to subdue a suspect. Not once. The department should re-evaluate its reliance on this tool. “De-escalation” clause is dangerous. These techniques are only useful in a minority of use-of-force situations. Requiring officers to consider this in every scenario will result in officers getting in trouble for acting lawfully or injured for not acting quickly enough. No “levels of force” section (a-la the Third Order of Performance) to clearly lay out officer’s options. Why is the hobble cord policy listed under the OC section (section B-5)? OVERALL, language throughout the DGO is very unclear.</p>
<u>Investigations Bureau</u>	Investigative	20	<p>What standard and who is deciding the definition of “proper voice intonation” and “provide advice to diffuse conflict”? It appears that this Department is now taking away potential life saving tools away from officers, instead of providing tools. Who is looking out for our officers?</p>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	<p>This is going to put the lives of the men and women of the SFPD in harms way.</p>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	<p>vehicle policy, carotid, reporting uses of force, supervisory responsibilities, language of appeasement vs arresting criminals</p>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	<p>It is not a use of force proposal - it is feel good language for a non-violent world</p>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	<p>Too many to mention but: “thoughtful communication” during a use of force situation is impossible to determine and who will decide if it was appropriate for the situation or a distraction of the task at hand? Who determines what exactly “thoughtful communication” is as apposed to clear commands? Also, the outright elimination/banning of the Carotid restraint (excepted and taught for at least 25 years in Law Enforcement) seems to be slipped in the order with no explanation or justification. And no caveat for when it can be used, i.e.,self defense etc.</p>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	<p>It is a recipe for disaster. It puts the officer in a reactive mode that could and would give a suspect every opportunity to hurt the officer or public</p>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	<p>It is poorly written (chokeholds?? really we don’t do those). It is clearly meant to be restrictive. It is not clear on what force can be used. If we go by this order we should wait after a suspect tries to kill someone. Then get a bunch of cops and respond to the scene. We should talk to the suspect (CIRT etc), when that doesnt work pepper spray, then ERIW, then bigger ERIW, then we he/she attempts to leave and possible 664/187 someone else we should use deadly force. --- Didn’t we do just do that?? This order is ambiguous while the old order was specific.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	THIS NEW PROPOSED ORDER IS GOING TO GET SOMEONE HURT. THE PROBLEM IS YOUR TEACHING THESE KIDS THE WRONG WAY TO ENCOUNTER PEOPLE. THEY'RE SCARED AND PROBABLY NOT BEEN IN HAND TO HAND ENCOUNTERS. IT'S A TRAINING FAILURE. NOT REFIGURING THE USE OF FORCE GENERAL ORDER.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	No need to add de-escalation language. We are all trained to de-escalate matters first. Doesn't verbal persuasion cover this?
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Taking away the carotid restraint is bad. It is a valuable tool which has not been abused at this department. Why are choke holds expressly forbidden? We where not able to do a "choke hold" anyway. This seems to be a political decision and something that is being taken away due to the fear of public perception, not protecting officers. The NYPD "Choke Hold" incident was overblown by the media and people with agendas. He did not die because of a choke hold anyway. I understand politics is part of this job, but do not make us unsafe. Please.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	POS: Only see a positive for non-compliant subject. Providing time and space for a non-compliant subject is dangerous to the officers as well as citizens. NEG: Removing carotid is a bad decision. We don't have many levels of force, and this removes another level. De-escalating an incident quickly is safe for officers. Creating space and time, gives a non-compliant subject time to plan and execute an assault and/or escape. It also creates time for public to intervene in a negative way.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	The proposed General Order 5.01 is poorly written and obviously written and approved by people who have not been on any type of street patrol for the past five years. First, the department will be making a huge mistake by removing the carotid restraint. This has been a technique that has been proven effective for years resulting in the safe apprehension and detention of violent suspects. The technique itself has not caused injury to the suspect nor the officer applying it.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	The carotid should be kept, the pointing of firearms should not be a reportable use of force. Proportionality is vague.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Negatives: loss of the carotid restraint Some of the deescalation portions
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Just give us tasers and options, don't be moved by rhetoric and politics
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	Negatives: In proposed DGO 5.01 the term "thoughtful communication" is very subjective. "Reasonable," verbal persuasion based on the actions of the subject, the terrain, and the training and experience of the Officer is more appropriate. Thoughtful communication is more appropriate for a locked down critical incident, where time and distance is not an issue, and the thoughtful communicator is trained in hostage negotiation or as a critical incident response team member.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	Negatives: Only some cops will carry tasers. ALL cops should carry tasers. They also took away the carotid which is a valuable tool, and was NEVER even an issue.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	This new proposal is too restrictive, and does not take into consideration the reality of dealing with rapidly escalating situations and situations that restrict our abilities to use the best force options available (at the time) in order to keep ourselves and other safe.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	This makes no sense. Our they going to take away our guns next?
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	How are you going to untrain me from using the Carotid Restraint during a dynamic incident? Why even reference a “choke hold,” which has NEVER been in our policy? The language is ambiguous regarding “no time limits” for de-escalation techniques. The policy is less a policy and sounds more like political pontification rather than a living, useable policy for Officers to follow.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	I feel the new DOG will put a lot of cops in danger. Last thing you want to do is made cops second guess themselves during a dangerous situation.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Extremely narrow use of force policy, and removes a tool (carotid) that has been very useful in the past. This new policy is going to get someone hurt or killed. Also, having Sergeants get on the air and recite time and distance, etc. is going to take up valuable air time and cause confusion. Let the cops on scene act.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	No positive changes noted Negative(s): The 1st paragraph is an opinion with a reference to the LE Code of Ethics. 835a of the CA PC is glaringly absent Are highest priority is to not only safeguard all human life (which includes our own), but to protect property and preserve the peace Thoughtful communication sound be replaced with Tactical communication because in every situation where the possibly of force exists, that is a tactical consideration in order to protect ourselves and citizens. The subject resisting has created a tactical consideration, not the officers. De-escalation is a tactic that officers are taught from the first day in the academy. Officers responding to a call for service or who have on-viewed a incident never want to use force, but are only forced to use it based on the actions of the subject. Designating an officer to engage in thoughtful communication will only endanger the lives of the other officers and citizens because the subject is the only one who knows how they are going to react. Re-positioning during attempts to communicate more thoughtfully with a subject (or subjects) will liking take an officer away from a position of cover, and thus exposing them to danger. The public and their safety is the paramount concern when dealing with an armed subject, and de-escalation will only allow the subject more time to escape or formulate a plan of attack. Proportionality needs to be rescinded entirely based on a number of reasons. The best example of a disproportionate situation is when an officers stops an individual for a minor traffic infraction, that subject evades officers and produces an edged weapon with the intent to harm or kill officers. Infraction to OIS is disproportionate when read this way. I will not defend myself against an armed subject as if we are engaged in pitched medieval battle The duty of a supervisor is to ensure all officers conform with the policies and procedures of the police department, however the responsibility of the supervisor to remind all officers who are responding to a weapons call or who have on-viewed one to essentially use their heads is absurd. The fact that a supervisor needs to rule if a U of F is appropriate by the end of their

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>tour of duty only creates another layer of liability for them The carotid is absent Although an officer would never want to strike a handcuffed prisoner with an impact weapon, there are situations when that may be the only option available (size of subject resisting, number of subjects resisting, the subject has slipped their cuffs and it appears they have martial arts training) ERIWs may have to be stored in the trunk of a vehicle There should NEVER be more ERIWs than lethal cover officers This is a perfect example of “Monday Morning Quarterbacking” vs. “Saturday Night Quarterbacking” in that decisions are being made before officers know what they have. This opens up officers and supervisors to an increased liability because nothing is concrete and other options are not accounted for. Transfers liability - officers are agents of this city This is a great example of opinion vs. fact. The disconnect between command and street officers is offensive. No one wants to use force.....it is forced on us by the subject Proportionality will not control a threat, only burn an officer who has used proper force under the CA PC, but not our Dept. Is a 3rd party going to advise me on what type of force I can use in an evolving situation? This order will only expose officers to serious injury or death Why do police work anymore? We confront violent felons daily who know what they want to do before officers even contact them, the officer needs to make a split second decision to overcome their resistance. Time is never on our side Re: 835a PC.....we don't desist or retreat</p>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	<p>What are we using a cookie cutter boilerplate policy. Make thoughtful, balanced policy that is suited for the city we police and live in, not what some academics and out of touch brass have been paid to write up.</p>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	<p>There are numerous problems with the new order. Firstly, “Proportionality” is another avenue that can be used to attack an Officer’s decision that has been made in the field and most likely “in the heat of battle”. It is far too easy to say that an Officer’s response was disproportional to the subject’s actions. We do not operation on a proportional basis. We operate on a potential basis that evaluates threat POTENTIAL and is not solely based on reactionary proportions. If that were the case, we would never ask subjects to remove their hands from their pockets etc. The news, antipolice groups, the OCC, the Police Commission, and even our own IA will have a new tool called “Proportionality”. It will be used to further question a response made by an Officer and gives perception a heavier weight when evaluating such circumstances. I do not understand why the Carotid Restraint is being removed. It is a tool and an option that can be utilized to bring an physical altercation to an end, preserving both the safety of the subject AND the Officer. Removing such a tool further places all parties at risk. I have a strong suspicion that the reason for removal is because it’s application shocks the easily offended and the ignorant. Repeatedly, punching a subject in the face due to the removal of the Carotid looks a lot worse than a 30 second application of the Carotid.</p>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	<p>It is clearly written by people who have not been on the street in some time and are clearly lacking in public contact. The interaction with police and the public has significantly changed since the introduction of cameras and that needs to be taken into account when allowing officers the latitude in dealing with the public.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	-Much of it has nothing to do with actually using force, thoughtful communication should be its own policy if they really want it to be. -It is clearly defined in case law that officers are not required to retreat or give ground if they have a lawful reason to detain or arrest someone. For the department to order that we do so seems to be a violation of case law and possibly the penal code. I.(D): Proportionality. Every good cop knows that when you take someone on for jaywalking and they violently resist, it's probably not because they don't want a jaywalking ticket. You have to assume that something much more serious is going on but the new policy would make it seem that we would be out of policy if we use higher levels of force for a minor offense. Force should be used proportionally to the AMOUNT OF FORCE THE SUSPECT IS USING, eg Kenneth Harding.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	sec E, duty to Intervene. An officer's opinion about excessive should be made to a supervisor. The supervisor should determine if the force used was appropriate after gathering the facts of the totality of the incident. The officer who reasonably believes that excessive force is being used may not have knowledge of the events leading up to the use of force. The level of force used should be evaluated after the suspect is in custody and not have the officers intervene during the incident which may lead to injuries to all parties involved. Force Options sec A #3. The choke hold should be removed however, the carotid restraint should remain in the policy and is a useful and effective level of force.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	I believe the proposed General Order will cause police officers to hesitate using force when it is necessary, which will result in officers getting hurt or killed.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Not based on the law: minimal vs reasonable, force is never used in proportion to a crime, it is used based on a suspect's resistance/acts, carotid restraint is a valuable tool that prevents further uses of force, supervisor responsibilities effectively render a code-33 useless (supervisor shall get on the air and remind units about DGO)
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	3-5	proportionality of force in regard to crime locks us into a limited use of force options when we deal with dynamic situations. that can escalate rapidly if appropriate force is not applied. carotid is no longer an option??
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	3-5	- On de-escalation, the proposed language seems to assume that law enforcement contacts occur in a vacuum wherein time is always available for thought and discourse. This is not the case in practice. -On proportionality, the proposed language neglects that while a subject's initial offense may be proportionally "lesser" (i.e. an infraction), the subjects actions after their detention will be what dictates the force used. For example, a person may be detained for urinating in public, but when detention is attempted the subject may choose to attack the officer(s) to prevent arrest. -On supervisor's responsibility, the proposed language includes a lengthy paragraph of radio traffic that a supervisor SHALL remind responding officers of. This lengthy radio traffic poses a significant officer safety issue by tying up radio time.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Although I understand the need to update (since 1995) and seek best practices, have we really done that here? I don't believe PERF is the expert body of law enforcement, but suggestive. It is clear why this is being proposed, but if we are the world class dept, and we want to be the model, why are we not making sure that we have reached out and sought the best way? This of course would mean not pushing through this proposal, but taking time...6 months, a year, whatever it takes to put in place the policy that protects the public and our officers. What is Proportionality? Thoughtful Communication? Supervisors taking over the air on a potentially, fluid, situation to remind the officer about this? That is ridiculous, not to mention a huge officer safety. No officer comes to work thinking to him or herself, I can't wait for someone to resist me so I can use my baton. All officers want those to be arrested or detained, to simply comply. Of course we would love to see a situation go peaceful. Of course we think about time and distance and not escalating a situation, but this undermining officer and public safety by now making the officer hesitate. Also, when is the last time that the carotid restraint as seriously injured or killed someone? If im now in the fight for my life and can not get to my gun because the suspect has a hold on it, I can't use the carotid to save my life, of the life of the public? I have never used it, but I certainly don't want to have to worry about losing my house if I have to in a life or death situation. Why hasn't anyone from the dept come forward to explain this policy and the words? everyone seems to have a different meaning on the WORDS, such as proportionality and it's meaning. Because someone may read the term as something else, they may not understand its importance, or feel that the policy is not bad until its been signed and too late. Forgive me, I'm just typing thoughts as they enter my mind. How about we CREATE TIME and DISTANCE with this proposed policy and make sure we are doing the right thing before rushing in!!
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	How is removing the carotid restraint, which has proven to be highly effective tool, a positive for Law Enforcement. Tasers have caused physical harm than applying this technique has. How is utilizing the spike strips considered a Use of Force?
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	This is an outright attack on the rank and file. It's tone is one of threatening officers that are forced to use force. It is so vague and contradictory that it will cause harm to officers physically, legally, financially and emotionally.
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The new proposed DRAFT DGO is very dangerous to say the least. The proposed General Order places the safety of the criminal over the safety of the Officer. The new policy is a disturbing attack on the working cops of this department. I feel very badly for new police officers starting their careers with all of these new proposed rules. Can someone specifically explain/ articulate what thoughtful communication and de-escalation looks like with a combative suspect who is high on drugs? Rhetorically asked. Can someone train the department on the correct way to deal with a jaywalker who then runs from the Police when he is stopped for his infraction. Can someone demonstrate proportionality looks like when an individual with an open container turns violent on the Police? The proposed general order appears to be based on incidents that occur in fantasy land. I realize the media and the activist groups (however small) demand change. But the department should not accommodate every whim and wish

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>of the activists at the expense of our members. After all, our members are our greatest assets. Let's have a general order that shows our commitment to safety in the DGO. I will leave it at that. **** The radio traffic a supervisor shall broadcast for a person with weapon call is atrocious and absurd. Tying up the air in a potentially dangerous or deadly situation is not acceptable.</p> <p>This is an officer safety issue with using the air. This also makes sergeants open to various liability issues. Notify DEM, monitor radio communications, respond to the incident (e.g., "3X100, I'm monitoring the incident and responding."); 2. Remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources; 3. Upon arrival, assume command, and ensure appropriate resources are on-scene or are responding.</p>
<u>Mission Station</u>	Administrative	16-19	<p>i don't think the carotid restraint should be removed. D. PROPORTIONALITY. It is important that an officer's level of force be proportional to the severity of the offense E. DUTY TO INTERVENE. Officers shall intervene when they reasonably believe another officer is about to use, or is using, excessive force. Officers shall promptly report any use of excessive force and the efforts made to intervene to a supervisor Officers should not be forced to decide what another officer was thinking during the time of a use of force.</p>
Mission Station	Administrative	11-15	<p>The carotid restraint is a important defensive tactic technique when Officer's are attacked by physically aggressive subjects, which happens on any given day.</p>
Mission Station	Investigative	16-19	<p>Flowery, vague language. Lots of vague pronouncements with no concrete rules. Anything anywhere could be in our out of policy. One very positive aspect- the "Vehicle Interventions" section- properly described as a use of force. This section is excellent.</p>
Mission Station	Investigative	11-15	<p>Convuluted and pandering mess that lacks insight</p>
Mission Station	Investigative	6-10	<p>Carotid restraint has been removed. The manner in which thoughtful communication and de-escalation are listed under policy implies that it is required in every situation. This will likely cause officers to engage in conversations with a non-compliant suspect longer than they normally would, which provides the suspect with more time to plan their next move, and potentially give the suspect a chance to injure or kill an officer or an onlooker. Requiring an officer to intervene when excessive force is perceived is equally dangerous. It is entirely possible the officer using force has seen something other officers have not, causing the witnessing officer to use force, such as the suspect reaching for or possessing a weapon that other officers have not seen. Now there is potential for an officer not aware of this fact from stopping the initial officer and allowing the suspect to access and use the weapon. Equally likely is the possibility that a brand new recruit with no prior experience will intervene when another officer has been perceived to be using excessive force (as the recruit has no prior experience to base his/her assessment) and again potentially result in the injury or death of involved officers. The</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>amount of information the supervisor is required to remind responding officers of is extremely excessive and is not feasible to broadcast over the air, and takes too much air time away from officers on scene using force. Saying that force must be for a lawful purpose implies that force is used for unlawful purposes. The idea that force used must be proportional to the offense is too vague, and will likely lead to hesitation by officers to use appropriate force for the situation they are presented with. It implies that a suspect stopped for an infraction (such as jaywalking) who runs should not have force used against them as jaywalking is a minor offense. Would the officer be liable then for engaging in a foot pursuit of said suspect, if the suspect is injured after being tackled or having other physical force used?</p>
Mission Station	Investigative	6-10	<p>-Taking away the carotid restraint as an option will serve only to compromise officer safety. -Requiring a supervisor to say 7 distinct things on the radio when responding to an armed subject call is only going to unnecessarily tie up the air. No need for all that. Have some faith that the line cops will do their job. After all, they do it all the time.</p>
Mission Station	Investigative	6-10	<p>alot of OIS happens in spit second. We just react to the suspect action. We do not decide what will happen. The proposed DGO 5.01 would put officer in danger</p>
Mission Station	Investigative	3-5	<p>After reading the new order, it appears to have so many influences into it that it is no longer clearly written. One of the easiest ways for police officers to work within policy at all times is the clarity of the policy. While a lot of the options, including de-escalation, is very good for officers to do, there are so many more times in policy work where situations unfold so quickly that it is impossible to de-escalate. To make this a policy now makes police officers have to try to stall until the last possible moment before using any type of force. This puts officers, suspects, and witness lives in danger. Officers have to think one step ahead when using force because of all the outside factors we are responsible for. To make a policy where we have to wait even longer to use force means we will less likely to be able to properly use the force and more accidental strikes/sprays/kicks will end up hitting subjects in places they were not intended. Also, too many times and officer's first use of force is unsuccessful and they have to transition to an alternate force. This policy eliminates the amount of time an officer has to transaction to a new use of force and makes the officer stick with his first use of force option regardless of if it is his/her current best option.</p>
Mission Station	Investigative	3-5	<p>The proposed G.O. is further limiting beyond the scope of the law and will inhibit our ability to perform our duties. I believe the increased restrictions will result in further injury to the public, and officers, as well as a spike in violent crime activity.</p>
Mission Station	Platoon Comm. patrol/admin	20	<p>We need to keep the carotid restraint as an intermediate use of force. This proposed policy has the tone of valuing offender life and safety more then the members.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	<p>Too many gray area's in the proposed General Order and puts Officers safety in jeopardy. OIS's are usually split decisions, having more things for the Officer to think about during these stressful situations is dangerous.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It appears that this proposal was written by people who has no law enforcement experience. It would be ideal in a perfect world but we do not live in a perfect world. We live in a world that we have to react to other peoples action and it is those people who dictate what type of force is used. The authors do not realize that someone can be calm on second and the next second be totally out of control. I feel that the authors want to control how every incident is handled. For example, is suspect does "A" then officer needs to do "1,2,3". If suspect does "B" then officer does "8,9,10". It leaves us no discretion.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This policy is written very poorly and betrays a complete lack of familiarity with policing as it exists on the street and the nature of fast evolving, crisis situations where fractions of seconds count. The policy is wordy, cumbersome and most importantly will place officers' safety and the public's safety in jeopardy. The only winners of this proposed order appears to be 1) criminals not adhering to lawful commands and 2) Their lawyers. This policy is an insult to SFPD officers and the tax payers. I am both.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The proposed DGO, is too wordy, ambiguous, prohibitive and will have officers second guess themselves, increasing the chance of injury or death to the officer.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The removal of the carotid restraint is taking away a tool that has saved my life on many occasions.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It takes away our discretion and more prone to officer safety.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The proposed order lets the Officers know the Department does not trust their abilities. Constrains the officers, limited how and when they respond to possible dangerous persons. It creates more opportunity for complaints and liability. We also shouldn't have to tell police officers that criminal activity is illegal (II. C.) The removal of the Carotid is an example of perception and media over reality. The numbers do not warrant the removal of a very effective tool that has prevented untold injuries to suspects and officer s alike.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	by pointing your firearm at someone is now a reportable use of force, that will now drive up the statistics in uses of force by officers. If you have 11 officers pointing their weapon at 5 suspects in a suspected shooting vehicle, then that's 55 uses of force that needs to be reported. Also with a lot of suspects learning how to ground fight and some officers not being trained, taking away the carotid is just another defense taken away from the officers tool belt. The officer my be choked out themselves, injured and or killed. it would be hard to de escalate when you are being choked out!
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I see no positives to the proposed changes. The draft proposal on the conductive weapons is designed to prevent the use of such devices. TAC units are rarely on scene when such tools would be useful, and a full call-out makes it too late. Giving devices to field supervisors would make sense, but that is not in the draft. The removal of the carotid restraint, the addition of the firearm policies, and the general wording of the draft proposal make it abundantly apparent

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	that the department's sole concern is avoiding controversy and law suits by opening the DGOs when state and federal law indicates we are already operating under more restrictions than required by either of those bodies of law.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The proposed policy was written by someone with little to no experience being a proactive police officer. Spending your career walking on carpet and hiding behind a desk produces a policy that will only provide a work environment were officers are more at risk.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	<p>This new General Order is going to get officers killed. Too many officers are hesitating and putting their lives in danger because they are trying to talk to unstable, aggressive subjects in order to de-escalate situations, and are fearful of getting in trouble by the department for making the "wrong" decisions. The Department is throwing officers under the bus by Monday morning quarterbacking the life threatening situations they are being put in while they sit in their safe offices. SFPD has given us training that has worked for the last 18 years I have been in, and has not been getting officers killed. Officers should not be asked to engage in "thoughtful communication" with subjects because that is what will get us hurt. Officers are reactionary not the cause of these encounters, and we should not be treated as suspects who kill and injure people at will. Our Department has let us down. Officers have always articulated why we use force. The California Penal Code gives us the decision to make the appropriate level of force. The Department cannot look from an office at a situation when they are not in it. We have been trained and given the ability to react based on another's actions. The Department should believe in the officers and all the prior training they have provided, and back their officers. The new order is offensive now making officers sound like yahoos who just decide at will to go out and harm people. The Police Department has always been reactionary when it comes to Use of Force. We took this job to serve and PROTECT everyone, and with the new order now stating the Department is committed to the sanctity and preservation of all human life, human rights, and human dignity? As if we weren't before? We do not go around committing "malicious assaults and batteries" for "vengeance." Seriously? We are being accused of doing these things and that is offensive. The Department talks about not having a biased and hostile work environment, yet the Department is showing bias towards officers, and creating a hostile work environment by creating a policy which paints officers as criminals who go around killing people and beating them. I did not sign up to be part of a Department that paints me as a criminal, or a murderer. I did not become a Supervisor to enforce a policy which already tells the officers they are murderers and beat people for no reason when they are reacting to a situation that they were presented with at no fault of their own. The Chief should be ashamed of himself for trying to pass this policy. As far as I can recall, an "edged weapon," "baseball bat", "brick", "bottle," etc. are all DEADLY WEAPONS that can kill officers and citizens. If an officer shoots someone because they fear their life is endangered by one of the above, then that is a decision put in their hands by 835 PC. The Department should not be able to handcuff officers decisions that 835 PC has given us the right to make. Officers should not be expected to retreat, or let subjects walk away, or think twice about the decisions they instinctively would make because of a terrible policy. More officers will be killed or injured if this policy is enacted.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Proposed DGO does not follow state law, case law, or accepted police practices, and will increase the likelihood of injury to officers, the public, and suspects. The order also presumes that suspects armed with knives, bricks, and baseball bats do not represent a threat of death to officers or the public--an assertion I wholeheartedly disagree with.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I beleive the way it is currently written will endanger the general public and police Officers lives. I don't believe that it is a practical use of force policy.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The revised 5.01 will absolutely place Officer's lives in undue risk simply to apiece a small segment of society. Revised version will absolutely cause SFPD Officers to be seriously injured or killed and at the very least will create a surge of unjustified OCC complaints when a Officer needs to use force. Bystanders never understand the reality of an Officers job is reactive in nature and more often its the suspects actions that cause a violent encounter. If lawful verbal commands were "Always" followed, Use of Force would drop dramatically, but when Suspects refuse to follow commands and or react violently or aggressively towards Officers, we are often forced to utilize a force option out of necessary defense to our direct safety.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Though I like the terminology "sanctity of life" added to the proposed General Order, I do not believe the proposal is designed with the intent to keep officers safe. I believe it is worded as such to create many loop holes for citizens to complain about officers actions. I also believe it is written to appease a small percentage of citizens.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Officers are going to get hurt public will be at risk if we let them walk away officers are thinking too much instead of relying on training NO POSITIVES!
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This proposed draft is going to get officers on the street hurt. The carotid should still be utilized as a use of force option. When Officers are engaged with an active resisting subject, the fight often goes to the ground and the carotid is a great option if it presents itself. On many calls, we have to make split second decisions to protect ourselves and the public and this proposed draft is going to make many officer second guess themselves causing injury to themselves or the public. Giving in to the media is not the way to improve our relations with the public.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I don't feel the comfort zone from the city and county having my best interests in the matter. I feel that it is directed towards the politics and not our safety. As a result, I feel that officers will start to second guess a quick second decision which will cause officer safety issues. Also feel that supervisors will be put in a tougher situation which will cause the officers to second guess their supervisors abilities.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	does not keep us safe
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	the draft UOF policy mainly focuses on not using any force of the suspect. this drafted policies will cause Officers to hesitate placing Officers/public in danger.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The language in the proposed DGO focuses mainly on protecting bad guys and not the safety of victims, general public and officers involved. It is geared more towards public relations than actually enforcing laws. In my opinion the DGO will force us to act like security guards and not police officers. This puts officers and the general public in great danger.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The proposed changes only increase the dangers faced by Officers in an already dangerous profession.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This is a political statement, not a general order. It is overly restrictive, confusing, does not allow us to protect ourselves, establishes doubts in all situations and open each and every one of us to civil liability, if we do not get killed in the process of interpreting and following this order.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Officer Safety should be the number one concern and with this new policy it's written so that the public will be happy and not keep officers safe.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	1. No other agency has a similar policy. 2. The proposed policy, I believe, is a knee-jerk reaction to an incident which is being deemed "wrong" by a small, political, anti-police group. 3. I believe the proposed policy will result officers being injured or killed due to specific wording, ambiguity, and contradiction which will cause officers (especially new officers) to hesitate in situations where seconds count. 4. The carotid restraint is a use of force I have used and I believe is very effective, especially when dealing with large/strong resisters. 5. Throughout the policy, the word "reasonable" as it refers to the application of force has been supplemented with "necessary." I believe the word necessary is ambiguous and opens up a situation to severe "Monday morning quarterbacking."
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Are we placating politicians and bad guys?
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I am not happy with the religious reference (sanctity of life). The order is to confusing and relies on ideas that are not grounded in common sense policing. This will cause either officer hesitation on scenes or officer complacency to go to "hot" calls.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Carotid restraint should remain in the use of force. Carotid restraint has allowed officers to control combative subjects with minimal force and within a timely manner. ECDs should be given to all officers and not just specialized units. Specialized units are not always available or in close proximity to calls when ECDs would be in immediate need. ECDs should be allowed to be deployed when subjects are combative and not just with a weapon. ECDs can subdue subjects quickly and without having to unnecessarily endanger officers.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed use of force will take away my confidence in dealing with dangerous situations. The proposed General Order sounds like it would make for more dangerous work conditions and would put our communities at a greater risk for harm.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed policy fails to even mention the penal code definition for use of force. The language used in the first 3 pages makes it sound as if we (police officers) are nothing more than thugs with no regard for human life, and seek out any opportunity we can to use force.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>The language regarding de-escalation is something that isn't necessary for a use of force policy, because our training tells us to attempt to de-escalate a situation prior to using force. The purpose of a use of force policy is to guide officers in what to do when de-escalation fails and a situation is instead escalating. The new language about proportionality makes no sense and contradicts our training. The proposed language says, "It is critical officers apply the principles of proportionality when encountering a subject who is armed with a weapon other than a firearm, such as an edged weapon, improvised weapon, baseball bat, brick, bottle, or other object. Officers may only use the degree of force that is reasonable and necessary to accomplish their lawful duties." This language implies that an edged weapon, a bat, or the other items listed are not deadly weapons, and that the use of a firearm would not be proportional. While the use of an ERIW would be great, it isn't always going to be available. An edged weapons is easily concealable or a person may have a bat in their apartment, and officers may not be able to get back to their car to get the ERIW. In these situations the use of deadly force would be proportional. A subject with an edged weapon blinded by pepper spray may pose a bigger threat if they blindly wave the weapon around, and it's too dangerous to get in close enough for an impact weapon or personal body weapons to be used. The removal of the carotid restraint takes away a valuable tool that allows officers to subdue a suspect without using force that will injure the suspect. The carotid restraint is not a lethal tactic and there are no statistics that say otherwise.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>The proposed policy is very ambiguous and restrictive at the same time. After the reading the proposed policy I had more questions regarding all the levels of force. The proposed policy contradicts itself and opens officers and supervisors up to even more liability even when the policy is followed.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>The problem with this DGO is that officers on a daily basis are using de-escalation techniques, in fact in the Mario Woods incident, officers used de-escalation techniques SEVERAL times. The problem is not the officers, the problem is the aggressor. Remember, who dictates the fight? Who dictates the reactionary gap? We like to think we do, but we do not, the bad guy always controls that tempo. It's our jobs as officers to decide in split seconds what the best decision or ideally choose the most reasonable level of force. Here's another paradigm shift, what do officers do in an out of control situation? The Mario Woods incident was an out of control situation. No level of "control" holds or less lethal force were going to stop an individual who was determined to hurt officers or at least get away. This can be explained based on Woods' aggressiveness, speed, and proximity to the officers. Unfortunately, sometimes officers must use deadly force. It is not something officers want to do, but it is part of the job we have taken. Look at FORCE SCIENCE, they explain why the officers took the appropriate actions.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>This proposed order is terrible because reads as if all officers use too much force. This order is written as if we are trying to scold children for defecating on the kitchen floor.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>It is both ambiguous and overly detailed in that it tries to anticipate so many different situations that it leaves little room for an officer to just make a common sense decision based on his</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>training and experience. Instead an officer, in a possible life or death situation, would have to think about this order and second guess his decision to make sure he isn't in violation. The tone is one of "things you can't do" and ways you will get in trouble as opposed to the old order which was more neutral in it's language and just explained what is a reasonable use of force with certain fair and unambiguous prohibitions. The new order also comes off as condescending in that it tells us all these things we are already trained to do and normal life skills like "thoughtful communication" that we use every day as if we are robots that need to be told that it's probably best to try to talk to someone if you can before using force. This is general idea is already covered in the old policy with 'verbal persuasion' (without being condescending or ambiguous). And it is trained in the Academy and is just good common sense. Every single officer I know would rather talk someone into compliance than get into a physical altercation where their safety is at risk. Also, the section on proportionality is ambiguous and implies that I need to use force proportional to the force the subject is using on me. A lay person or lawyer reading that section would understand it to mean that if a guy is coming at me with a knife, anything more than a knife in response would be unreasonable. Also, the supervisor's duties (Section F. 2.) to remind me over the air of common sense actions I should be taking when dealing with a subject with a weapon will tie up the air unnecessarily. That is the time when the officer needs radio silence so that he can deal with the threat and put out important information to responding officers. If someone is coming at me with a knife or bat, I don't need my sergeant reminding me to protect life, find cover, and use thoughtful communication. I am not a robot. It's language like that which makes this proposed order both ambiguous and condescending, overly verbose, and a danger to officer safety. An officer or a civilian will get hurt because of language like this. In general, the proposed policy comes off as a threat of all the ways an officer can mess up as opposed to neutral guidelines to follow that allows for unanticipated situations and reasonable common sense interpretations. The proposed order as a whole would essentially make any officer's use of force assailable as a violation of policy by any competent lawyer. And this strategy of second guessing every action without any room or concern for an officer's split second decision making is not the approach we should take as a department because it will lead to more officer safety issues, more uneducated criticism of officer decisions, and a lower morale among officers. Also, for recruiting purposes, if we want the best people to want to work for the SFPD, we need to show that our policies are unambiguous, fair, and not politically motivated.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>I think the carotid restraint is a tool we can use to rapidly stop violent encounters without having to use a more lethal type of force. I also believe that it is unreasonable to continually move away from a suspect with an edged weapon due to the fact it could create larger problems and put more people in danger.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>I feel that this general order is not based on any data, case law, training or experience. There is no logical way to train officers, new and experienced, in the techniques delineated in this order.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>The section regarding proportionality is confusing. To have officers hesitate and think of</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	applying a degree of force proportion to the weapon used by a subject, other than a firearm, is extremely dangerous. The first arriving officer should be drawing his firearm against a subject armed with a knife or baseball bat, until there is sufficient units on scene for less-lethal options.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The draft stresses public opinion over the idea that police officers face radical circumstances and must make difficult decisions in the blink of an eye. The draft opens officers up to be criticized for their decisions by people who have never and will never know what it is like to make decisions we have to make.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Getting rid of the carotid is a terrible idea. Only giving tasers to TAC and Specialists is also not a good idea. Every member of the department who works on the streets should be trained and equipped with a taser. Also, tasers should be able to be deployed even if a suspect does not have a weapon.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The carotid restraint, when used appropriately and as trained, is an extremely useful option in cases of active and extremely physical resistance by a subject. When used correctly, it allows officers to place a subject into custody with MINIMAL threat of physical injury to both the subject and to the officers at the scene. Prohibiting the carotid restraint potentially places both subjects and officers in harms way, and I strongly disagree with this proposed change in addition to other changes made in this proposed General Order. Additionally, changes listed in proposed DGO 5.01.1 C5 (tactically reposition) and DGO 5.01.1 F (supervisor's responsibility) ignores the potential of a subject to unilaterally escalate a situation prior to a) a supervisor's arrival, and b) control being placed on the subject. More care needs to be made in the writing of these portions in regards to the speed at which an incident can escalate beyond control.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Officers and citizens will get hurt.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I don't see anything wrong with the current policy. It works, why change it for political purposes at the expense of the law-abiding public and the cops. Its language is often obscure. "Buffer Zone", "thoughtful communication", "principles of proportionality"? What do these mean?
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The general purpose and intention of the order is good. The problem with the order is the way it is written, in addition to the general message it sends. After reading the order, I am left with the idea that I am only allowed to use force after exhausting all possible attempts at "thoughtful communication." It states that communication should be used when practical. But before each and every topic of force, the issue of communication is revisited. The order also uses the phrase "communication with non-compliant subjects." With the exception of instantaneous fleeing or fighting, a subject does not establish non-compliance until communication has already been established. Requiring officers to continue to communicate with a subject that has already established non-compliance presents a hazard to everyone. The order does not state a purpose, and does not even acknowledge the necessity of force until paragraph II. Communication should be covered, and then move on. The guidelines and policies for the

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>actual uses of force are unclear as a result of the over focus on communication in every section. The language “shall, if practical” is ambiguous. The omission of 835(a) PC is detrimental. The entire order lacks value of the officer’s life, despite claiming to have the highest priority for the sanctity for ALL human life. Among many examples, the fact that a section of 149 PC is quoted and 835(a) PC is merely mentioned strongly COMMUNICATES a disregard for the sanctity of Officer’s lives. In fact, 835(a) PC is improperly referenced as requirement of reasonable force. 835(a) PC is in regards to an officer’s right to use force and in what circumstances. There is no mention in the order of not restricting the officer’s use of sufficient force until the very end. Instead, the order continually stresses the use of “minimal force” and “proportionality” which are both contradictory to 835(a) PC. Regarding ERIW’s, there is a requirement for a lethal cover officer with the ERIW. There is also a “should be” calling for fewer lethal cover officer’s than ERIW’s. In addition to the fact that this is not logistically practical to require both, it is hazardous. The purpose of the lethal cover officer is in case of the ERIW failing to subdue an aggressive suspect (which the order also does not state). If the ERIW fails, having more ERIW’s will not ensure success, and lethal cover is necessary. Having less lethal cover is not logically or tactically sound.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>Thoughtful communication gets used a lot in this. What exactly does this mean because I may have a different idea of what this means than most. It sounds like trying to talk about someone’s feelings and emotions to get them to listen to you. Or it could mean, “Stop what you are fucking doing asshole!” We try communicating with people anyway and if people are not compliant they don’t listen so why keep doing something that doesn’t work. Now we have to call a supervisor out for even more so why am I an officer? So we are going to centralize everything when it is well known that de-centralized command is usually the most efficient way to function as we do and in the military. This policy takes even more away from us and from 835a PC which is what we are legally allowed to do. Now we must “tactically re-position” which means retreat and depending on the situation makes you lose ground. We replace the carotid with thoughtful communication. Whoever wrote this realizes that bad guys or the type of people we deal with don’t play by rules right? This policy appears to say its okay to put Officers at risk and this policy just will breed hesitation for everyone which will cost lives and more Officers will get injured. Everyone is going to second guess their every move. And with regards to some de escalation it should happen before but we are not doctors or can’t read people’s minds.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>It puts cops and citizens in more danger.</p>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>It’s filled with qualifiers that cannot be dealt with practically in the field at all times. All the recommended ideas are already incorporated whenever possible. Also, I STRONGLY recommend not removing the carotid restraint. My partner was attached and pinned in a tight area while having his neck bitten. The carotid restraint was the only way within policy to arrest the subject. The amount of liability due to immeasurable metrics is staggering. Lastly, and most importantly, this expects irrational people to react rationally. None of the recent OIS in SF involved people who were rational in any way.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The carotid is a great use of force option to be able to use. I've put a few people in the carotid during a 148 and because of that my partner and I were able to gain control of the suspect. I don't understand the reasoning of taking it away when SFPD has done nothing wrong with applying it. Just because another agency misused it shouldn't mean that we have to lose it. The carotid is the ONLY use of force besides using your firearm that totally allows you to control your subject in order to overcome resistance.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	There is a lot of ambiguous language in the proposed order that will leave officers second and third guessing split second decisions that need to be made. I do not want to be put in a use of force situation and have to hesitate on making a decision because this ambiguity. It will lead to more injured Officers and is a huge safety issue. I also do not think eliminating the use of the carotid restraint should be in there. The carotid is a great tool to use when you have to incapacitate a suspect in close quarters where a baton or pepper spray would be useless, plus, if you are in a situation where you are wrestling with a suspect, it is not practical to transition to a weapon if the persons positioning allows you to easily apply the carotid (which can be used from many angles).
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Much of the new language is unclear and confusing. The new language under the heading "Duty To Intervene" puts officers and the public in danger by asking them to second guess what other officers are doing. The perceptions of the intervening officer will always be different than the perceptions of the officer they believe is using "excessive" force. The officer using the force might be reacting to a weapon the intervening officer did not see or a threat the intervening officer did not hear. The language under II(A)(5) is confusing. It says "Officers may use reasonable force . . . [t]o prevent a person from injuring himself/herself unless the person also poses an imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury to another life or officer." Does that mean an officer CANNOT use reasonable force when a person is a threat to himself/herself and officers as the language plainly suggests? The required reminders under section II(F)(1) and II(F)(2) prevent the officer who is encountering/about to encounter an armed subject from transmitting critical information when it is most needed, potentially putting the lives of officers and the public needlessly at risk. Section III(A)(3)(a) inexplicably removes a very effective less lethal option.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	-no carotid -no leeway in using force against a person in cuffs -no leeway in raising baton over head -supervisors needlessly chewing up the radio when going to a 222,221,419 call -seems like policy was written by people who had an opinion but no legal knowledge of the courts and no knowledge of what officers encounter each shift. poor officer safety. -i feel I will be legally justified in my use of forces BUT i will be outside of policy and the department will make good with the public by firing me for doing my job under legal standards
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Proposed General Order 5.01 places more emphasis on subject rather than the safety of the officer, public, and property.
Mission Station	Patrol Officer	0-2	It does not consider what, why, and how officers need to use force to actually combat a situation to get their point across. Force is something that is subjective and this new order is trying to define force as objective.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The new general order isn't cut and dry. It has a lot of gray areas in which other people who aren't police officer's nor worked in this type of work environment voice their concerns and doesn't know the reality of each situation. We are taught and trained to do one thing, and the new proposed order teaches us to do things differently. Doing things differently can get someone hurt or killed. If our General order isn't broke why revise the whole order.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	As a former member of the United Nations, I am a strong advocate of measures and steps that safeguard human life and the use of lethal force as a last resort. I, however, want to go home at the end of the day. A policy that makes me risk my life everyday by making me go at par with dangerous armed criminals after less lethal options have been attempted is a policy that does not take into consideration my life. To me and my family, my life matters.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	This version of the DGO appears to be more of a political manuever than one designed to help officers. The wording and convoluted steps seem to be designed to help the Department's admin distance themselves from any officer that may use force that the public deems "excessive." This DGO will put me and fellow officers in harms way. I fear that an officer will have to be gravely injured while following this DGO in order for the admin to understand this.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Negatives: A focus on de-escalation without time constraints. Proportionality - If a subject is in violation of an infraction, an officer has minimal options in order to do their job.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The proposed GO(5.01) completely ignores case law, primarily Graham v Conner, that has been established and since 1989 and taught to generations of cops. This standard of "reasonableness" has been widely accepted by LE and by the country! This proposed GO is completely disconnected with the reality of use of force situations, primarily how the situation (and that the US Supreme Court has defined it) are a violent, quickly evolving, dynamic situation. Officers must make split second decsions and this proposed GO will make cops stutter step and in return will be injured (however slight) or worse, killed. THIS PROPOSED GO DOES NOTHING TO BUILD CONFIDENCE IN THE OFFICER NOR THE COMMUNITY!!!!
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	This policy is dangerous and leaves officers no options between baton and firearm. The carotid restraint has proven safe success in the past and without it officers are subject to less appropriate measures
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Awful policy, no other metropolitan police department has a policy that is being proposed.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I think the draft General Order was rushed and contains alarming requirements; the seven things supervisors are required to remind responding officers are common sense and redundant to trained officers. Broadcasting these seven reminders would tie up the air to no small degree, (likely during Code 33s,) and therefore subject officers, suspects, and the public to undue risk. Additionally, the carotid restraint has the potential to prevent serious injuries to both officers and suspects as well as prevent the need to resort to deadly force. I'm confused as to why this technique would not be allowed if the draft General Order is approved.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I believe that getting rid of the carotid restraint is a huge mistake. Bringing the use of Tazers into the department will not be good for the future of SFPD.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I believe this proposed GO is a reaction made with haste in response to ONE very tough situation in the Bayview. Though I believe this is a good topic of discussion I do not believe it is a good idea to hastily implement a new foundation for the work that we do. IF this were to be implemented as proposed BEFORE it went into effect the entire department would need to undergo extensive training to re learn the job so that we are not guinea pigs testing out the kinks on the street. I believe this would be a great disservice to the community that we work hard to protect. This GO will for sure lead to more hesitation amongst members of our department. In other professions hesitation might be a good thing, in ours hesitation often times either leads to personal injury or unnecessary injury to another. This new GO is not clear in its language and from what I have observed so far nobody is clear as to what exactly it looks like in the real world. I hope a serious look is taken and practical studies done before implementing these changes. I fear without the above our members will be put in unnecessary danger due to uncertainty of what is allowed and what is not.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I don't see any positives. Can we just be police officer's without there being so many new rules implemented by people that have never done this job? If I'm in a situation where I need to use the carotid restraint and there's no other way for me to get out of it, I'm going to use the carotid restraint. Why would I not be in policy to do something that could possibly save my life or a fellow officers life and/or prevent serious injury? It doesn't make sense. They're also trying to get rid of something that is seldom used.
<u>Northern Station</u>	Administrative	20	way too convoluted
Northern Station	Administrative	20	I don't even know where to begin. Officer safety is a main concern. Not realistic for supervisors to get on the radio (interrupt a code-33) and start reading this stuff to the responding officers.
Northern Station	Administrative	11-15	The sanctity of human life and de-escalation techniques are already used by 99.9% of officers of these types of situations. I have no problem with putting that into writing. Some issues: a) Thoughtful communication - although it can work "SOMETIMES", other times a more forceful tone must be used. This wording makes it sound as if we are customer service reps on at a remote location. Supervisors responsibility of "reminding officers to protect life, isolate, etc." is impractical at best. Whoever wrote that never has never tried to use the radio when multiple units are speaking, multiple stations are on the air, etc. Carotid restraint removed for what reason? It is still used by agencies all over the country. Batons - prohibited use of impact weapon "above" the head eliminates the small % of times when it might be necessary;
Northern Station	Investigative	20	coratid keeps injuries to officer and suspect to a minimum if resisit is prolonged
Northern Station	Investigative	0-2	*The supervisors' requirement of having to admonish the officers responding to or on-viewing a knife/weapon call would clog up important radio time. The officers that are dealing with the subject would need the radio traffic cleared as what a code 33 is supposed to do. The purpose of a code 33 is so the officers can broadcast pertinent information about the call. The supposed admonishment is unnecessary and clog up the radio. *"Thoughtful" communication

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			only works for a few seconds. Subjects often do not submit to officers' orders as it is. Subjects not submitting to officers are already resisting officers' duties. Communicating thoughtfully in this situation is a waste of time. *Creating time and distance - If this section is adopted, you will find a lot of officers creating enough "time" and "distance" and taking their time to respond to calls *We were never taught the choke hold.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	In Section II, F. "Supervisor's Responsibility:" if an officer "on views" an individual with a weapon, a supervisor should not be on the air occupying valuable airspace giving out common sense directives that even a probationary officer should know... especially if a Code 33 is requested. During those tense moments, the officer should have they air, along with Dispatch, and other units identifying themselves as back-up. This unnecessary supervisory advisement could have officer safety consequences. And I am writing this as a supervisor. Additionally, it appears the Carotid Restraint has been removed as a Use of Force option. This option is not overly used in our Department, but when it has, it has proven effective; and has certainly helped me in the past (twice) back in my patrol officer days.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The current proposal creates too much doubt in the Officer's mind / too much thought of violating a rule and getting in trouble. The proposal is going to get an Officer hurt and or killed in the line of duty.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	total garbage
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	We are led by a person who is only thinking of his future political aspirations, not about us. We need someone to think clearly in any proposed changes.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This new version of 5.01 is going to get Cops hurt or killed. Maybe Greg and the rest of his command staff would like to come out and hit the street under his new version of 5.01. Maybe they would like to deal with some 800 AMS nut job and try to talk them down. I know that Greg did not deal with violent gang member in his day like he wants newer cops to do. What a hypocrite ..
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Taking away carotid, including taser (which we do not have), mandating Sgts remind Officers ON THE AIR of de-escalation, using vague language i.e. "principles of proportionality", spike strips as a use of force are all horrible ideas.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The proposed policy is written in a very ambiguous fashion and like the Bible is open to interpretation by each individual that reads it. The Carotid Restraint is no longer allowed taking away a very effective use of force option. In addition it is clear that the safety of the officer is at of least importance to the author(s) of this proposal. The policy contradicts itself and is confusing. The paragraph that "shall" be read by supervisors to officers responding to calls of armed suspects is ludicrous. The proportionality section seems to require officers to have a "crystal ball" in order to know "the severity of the offense committed ..." by the suspect prior to police contact.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	F. Supervisors Responsibility, section (2): this section is impractical and unnecessary to tie up

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	radio traffic with such a broadcast, esp considering the officers would already know to do this. When I read this policy it makes sense to me. My responsibilities, duties and limitations are explained with reasonableness and good judgment to guide officers.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Verbose, confusing, over reaching. This new order creates too many “what if” situations. This order has obviously been hastily thrown together as a knee jerk reaction to a society that sensationalizes police action (lawful or unlawful) with the idea that the police are the ones who created the situation and are wrong for its the less that desired outcome. Also it is too drastic of a change that should be implemented over time if at all.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	What the Police Commission, Chief, Mayor and are looking to do is reinvent the wheel. The policy in place works. The problem we are running into is not so much a policy issues, but societal issues. The issue of a single mother or single father attempting to raise a family alone is an all too often picture we as a society face. The two parent household is becoming a thing of the past. More so in areas in which families of color have only one parent. As a result there is not the balance a child growing up needs. Many children grow up resenting the lack of or missing parent. The anger and frustration grows as they grow. So when law enforcement becomes the surrogate parent for a lot of these children and adults, there is great resistance because there was never a true family nucleus to start. So rather than point the finger at those who decided to drop out of high school and not finish an education, and instead focus on the adult pleasures of life but not have the life skills to manage an adult life, we as a society are left with picking up the pieces. This cycle will continue to be this way until those who really care about their family unit and culture, decide to take accountability for their actions. It would be nice if the POA had an opportunity for a meet and confer.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	ambiguous why is pointing a firearm at someone a reportable use of force. Force defined from dictionary.com, “strength, power exerted upon an object (person), physical coercion, violence”.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The thought that a human being can take a vehicle and decide to run over numerous citizens of San Francisco and a police officer is not allowed to shoot the the suspect to stop the threat is asinine. We are law enforcement officers we are the last line out there of people committing heinous crimes and it take this tool away is a complete utter joke. On top of this to take away the carotid restraint which is a fantastic tool and actually saves lives is another joke. Whoever thought of considering pointing a firearm at a suspect and considerate use of force is a joke. To issue tasers and then not be allowed to use it on a completely combative 148 or a suspect running away is a joke. I think San Francisco should just issue San Francisco police officers a blue rubber gun
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	At this point more degrees of use of force does not make it more effective. The current policy is fine and should be the standard across the state.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	First let me be clear: I am FOR de-escalation. I am FOR creating time and distance. I am FOR thoughtful dialogue. I am FOR reviewing and modernizing our department’s use of force

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>policy to maintain the trust the people of San Francisco have in the SFPD – I truly believe that the use of force policies must evolve. However, this proposed policy appears to be a result of reaction rather than a thoughtful process involving all stakeholders; it is cobbled together from think-tank recommendations, blue ribbon panels, and academic papers with no input from the police officers who will have to apply it on the streets of the real world. As a result the proposed policy is confusing and exposes officers, the public, and even subjects to a higher risk of danger. - REACTIVE vs PROACTIVE. This policy is NOT the result of a thoughtful process it is a reaction. A proactive policy process would include ALL stakeholders and would not be rushed by outside influences. As a result this proposed policy has not included the input of police officers. The fact that the Police Administration refuses to sit down and discuss this with the POA undermines the legitimacy of the policy with the rank and file. This is not an academic exercise: this is a working document that my fellow officers and I will have to apply in the middle of the night in a crisis situation. I am NOT comfortable with a policy that includes input from every stakeholder except for the ones who have to make it work – working police officers. - CONFUSING. The proposed policy is flat out confusing for officers and the public and that could expose them to a higher risk of danger. With all the repetitive “shoulds,” and the supervisor’s requirement to repetitive remind officers of things they already know this proposed policy appears to create a de-facto “duty to retreat” which is not only confusing but creates a substantial danger for police, the public, and even subjects. The policy should be clarified so that officers and the public are aware that (a) no policy can anticipate every situation, and (b) officers have NO DUTY TO RETREAT. By not specifically addressing these issues this proposed policy also creates false expectations in the minds of the public that SFPD will NEVER use force – the public does not know the difference between “should” and “shall.” - PRUDENT RISK. The proposed policy asks officers to accept a greater degree of risk to themselves, to the public, and even to subjects than in the past without giving them guidelines for assessing risk. Any proposed policy should include a “balance test” between danger to officers/public/subject and the need for immediate apprehension as a guideline for officers to determine and accept “prudent risk.” For example a balance test is routinely used by SFPD officers to determine Emergency or Code-3 responses; there should be a way to develop a similar balance test that can help officers in a high stakes, high stress situation make good decisions about accepting prudent risk. -WHERE IS MY CHIEF? Last I have to say that I am extremely disappointed that the Chief has not chosen to discuss this with not only the POA, but more importantly with me and my fellow patrol officers. We are the ones working mid-nights, humping radio cars in the rain, answering the man with the knife call. We will be the ones who have to make any proposed policy work as we apply it in dark alleys, at a store, and on some apartment balcony. Why hasn’t the Chief taken the time to come to each station and talk with us directly about what is happening? To address the rumors (which are out of control)? To make his argument as to why these proposed changes are needed and the right way to go? I am more than willing to listen, I am more than willing to change – we MUST change the way we do our jobs to maintain our legitimacy – but I cannot support change I had no say in.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	All of section I is garbage! First of all most officers do use de-escalation techniques already just out of common sense and instinct. A lot of officers use “thoughtful communication” too but to have it written down that we SHALL perform our duties this way is dangerous and will get officers killed! Doing police work is dirty and dangerous. It is not a garden party! Everyone, and I seriously mean everyone, is on drugs in San Francisco, whether it be prescription, illegal, or both. Every patrol unit has, at least twice during their shift, a call with a person running around naked in a busy street, etc. in some kind of altered mental state. These people do not respond to “thoughtful communication”. Whoever wrote this has never done police work at least not on the street. If a cop wrote this they were likely being forced to comply with the ignorant/naive politicians who seem to forget that they would not survive very long walking down the streets of San Francisco without law enforcement protecting them!
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Cannot find any....It may cause confusion and an officer to hesitate and that might have dire repercussions...
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The wording in the revised general order is too vague. The General Order protects the department and not the members who would have to use force. In any criminal investigation or federal lawsuit an Officer would be ‘hung out’ to dry given the current language on the first page of the general order. Time, Distance and Descalation for all runs maybe important but not always feasible. In the ‘new’ general order there is no wording protecting an officer from re-acting and coming on scene. In all the uses of force the first categories are that warnings need to be provided but once again is not always feasible. My fear is that given the wording of the general order an Officer would have to go thru painstaking measures to explain themselves in depositions and in law suits to the city. Furthermore, no member has ever been trained in a ‘choke hold’ and the carotid restraint being taken away from the members is unnecessary. From present memory, I do not recall a time when a suspect has passed away or been gravely injured by the carotid restraint. The carotid restraint is a great tool and a necessary tool to combat subjects who are AMS. Also, we are no longer allowed to strike a handcuffed suspect? What if the suspect is very flexible and agile and moves the handcuffs from his back to his front and attacks a Officer? This policy does not consider the suspects size and ability compared to the Officers.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Reaction time is not on our side to cater to career criminals or persons with mental disorders and/or an altered mental state due to unsafe street drugs.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The proposed policy was written because of the current political climate and not for officer safety purposes. It will lead to officers second-guessing their actions and thus leading to more officers getting hurt or worse.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It’s well beyond current case law and a knee jerk reaction to one event, that is controlled by a small part of the community.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It is clear that these proposals have been made as a result of politics that favor the interests of those “Communities” that harbor felons and unfairly make villain of Police Officers. These proposals will put Police Officer lives in danger more than they already are.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Positive: Policy reiterates what I and SFPD have been practicing, which is We believe in our community and the Sanctity of Life. Negative: It appears the proposed policy changes are implemented with little science or statistics and such policy is being formulated by political groups. ie. when the Carotid Restraint has been used hundreds of times successfully without permanent injury to subject. Additionally, implementation of plastic shields; ie. I already see police officers getting GBI while the subject slices high or low when confronting a shield, so the DEPT SHOULD BE PUT ON NOTICE FOR IMPLEMENTING DANGEROUS PRACTICES THAT PUT LAW ABIDING COMMUNITY MEMBERS AND MEMBERS AT DANGER.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The way the proposed general order is written it seems as though they put de-escalation in front of every use of force option. I feel officer will have to explain more about what de-escalation techniques they used or didn't use before choosing to use force. This would have some officers second guessing themselves and hesitating in a life and death situation. The carotid restraint hold is an extremely valuable tool to have in our use of force options. I myself I have used the carotid restraint hold on a person high on PCP to overcome his resistance and render aid to the person he was standing in front of. I was able to quickly and effectively use the carotid restraint on the subject and detain him in handcuffs with out anyone getting hurt.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The new DGO is convoluted and confusing. It is difficult to apply without taking time to consider. This is time we do not have on the street. In addition, the removal of the carotid is a mistake. As a female in this department I can say that I have been in drag out fights where the suspect was OC'd, batoned, had his nose broken, and still was actively attacking officers. If I had not utilized the tool of the carotid restraint, myself and the other officers involved would have suffered more than the bloody lips and bruises that we ended up with. This DGO is a poorly thought out mistake that will make officers second guess themselves and put us in harms way.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The department should of met and conferred with the POA prior to making any proposed changes.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It is a huge Officer safety issue and puts Officers at risk. We have trained a certain way our entire career now you want us to change. That's doesn't work. Mussel memory will kick in. It is awful to propose an order that will put us at risk.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This order appears to be a knee-jerk reaction to a political issue, which pays little regard to public safety, and even less regard to officer safety. The order is unclear, unrealistic, and filled with rhetoric. Implementing this policy would create hesitation and undue self-doubt in officers, particularly new officers, who are in dangerous and life-threatening situations that require immediate action. Additionally, the carotid restraint is a necessary force option and should not be banned.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	appears to me to contain language that can be very open to being interrupted to the needs of the department and can leave an officer who has done everything correct out of policy if the department is getting pressure from special interest groups

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Someone is going to get very hurt. Carotid is very effective and relatively safe. Taser policy is so restrictive, a firearm could be used. Tasers are effective when readily available. I can't remember the last time I even saw a Tactical unit on midnights. Time and distance is a good thing, but requiring supervisors to tie up the air will get someone hurt eventually.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Makes the entire encounter with an armed suspect more dangerous. Ties up the air with supervisor mandates when emergency traffic from the officer involved should be priority. Officers in the field already know how to respond appropriately and use every attempt to de-escalate and resolve situations with the minimum force required. I strongly disagree with the removal of the carotid restraint from the use of force continuum.....
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Some of the negatives are we loss the carotid restraint as a force option, requirements for sergeants is unrealistic, opens officers and the city to liability and the way "time and distance" is being presented feels like it goes against the oath that we took when we were sworn in. Losing the carotid will impact patrol officer that are in close quarters with a suspect where other force options are not feasible to overcome resistance, prevent escape, and effect an arrest for someone who does not want to submit to our authority. The requirements for what the sergeant has to broadcast is unrealistic for the real world. Part of being a patrol officer is the ability to consider everything outlined in the proposed DGO 5.01 already, situations are fluid and every changing. The new proposal DGO 5.01 opens officers and the city to extensive liability because the argument will be the officer did not use time and distance with their client. The way "time and distance" has been presented seems to be against our duty as police officers to protect life. It just does not feel right and I feel that this will cause harm to the innocent people of San Francisco because we will creating time and distance while the suspects is attacking people. The positive is that we will get tasers as a force option albeit limited.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Removing and altering uses of force creates liability dangers to officers who are trained on existing methods. Officers in stressful situations rely on training they have received already which is "muscle memory"
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The new policy is not practical and more of a political move with language that puts officers in grave danger.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	the proposed restrictions will inhibit us from preventing injuries to ourselves or others
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	As a CIT trained person, I have personally felt that de-escalation techniques can in some instances be useful. However, a majority of the time, de-escalation does not work. When someone is in a mental health crisis, common reason DOES NOT work. In most instances, I've had to become physical with a subject. Often times, fellow officers and myself have gotten injured in an attempt to subdue a flailing subject. With the PROPOSED General Order, I would need to think twice and no longer act on my training. I would be forced to second guess myself, fearing that I might be out of policy for missing a check box on bureaucratic checklist. In turn, jeopardizing public safety, safety of fellow Officers, myself and potentially the subject. The "Unlawful Purposes" section is insulting. Before I go on, I do understand why this section

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>is in there. But if there are Officers that do this, they should be fired. At the same time, we should be looking at the hiring process. Maybe there should be more stringent requirements? I understand the department has to play its role in politics...but to risk the lives of the people who serve this city is outrageous. It would seem that the very people that are suppose to help and back officers are leading us to the slaughterhouse by basically unarming us with the proper tools we need. SFPD is becoming, if not already, a joke. I have numerous friends from various other agencies ask me what is wrong with this department. I just shrug and try to defend our department...but it's a losing uphill battle.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>The proposed General Order 5.01 reads very much like it was not written by a Police Officer. Every Officer uses some form of de-escalation technique before going hands on. This proposed General Order has far too much emphasis on trying to “thoughtfully” talk to someone. Every Officer attempts to talk their suspects down before the Officer’s hand is forced, by the suspect, to go hands on and use force. I believe one of the most critical amendments in the proposed General Order is the elimination of the use of the carotid restraint. Our department used the carotid restraint somewhere around 50+ times last year and applied it correctly every time. There were no deaths incident to using the carotid restraint. The carotid restraint is a tool that many Officers, including myself, need. Many of us Officers are smaller in stature than our suspects and when a suspect who is larger in stature is actively fighting, the carotid restraint can be a huge equalizer, especially if the Officer engaged with the suspect is a SAM unit. Without the carotid restraint, many Officers now have to go to using their batons or their “personal body weapons” more often which will cause more sustainable injuries to suspects. Another problem with the proposed General Order is announcing that you are going to use O.C. spray to the suspect before you use it. This will only give the suspect time to shield their eyes, making the O.C. spray ineffective. Spike strips should not be considered a use of force. The spike strips are deployed to pop tires, not to cause physical harm. If the suspect crashes his/her vehicle after spike strips are deployed, they should be held accountable for not stopping their vehicle, not the SFPD Officer for doing their job.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>The draft includes language that compromises safe radio tactics. Banning the carotid restraint is an emotionally-driven as well uneducated, ignorant decision. The new restrictions will place Officers in substantial danger if followed or place irrational liability on them if violated, even if for life safety. In essence, much of the new “shall” guidelines must be revised to “encouraged to” with allotments for some action to be taken in dire, explainable circumstances that the Order does not already contemplate. The draft comes across as being written to be appealing to civilian readers, instead of being built around life safety and protecting Officers from irrational liability. Spike strip deployment is not a use of force. Causing damage to property is not a use of force. Otherwise there is no distinction between the crimes of vandalism and assault. A fleeing vehicle may present dangers unto itself and occupants while being inhibited by spike strips, but those factors are the directly created by the suspect’s actions leading up to successful deployment, not the Officers’ actions. Officers have no control over the vehicle’s speed, physical factor/limitations and the manner in which the vehicle is driven. Therefore, any factors result-</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>ing in occupant injury due to a collision of any kind, should be treated solely as consequences of the driver's actions. This revision is inherently awful.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>I can understand the Sanctity Of Human Life part which is important and already exists in our police department. We are all humans we understand that life is valuable and the sanctity of life should be our highest priority. The thoughtful communication part is great for the class room but unfortunately can't always be achieved on the street level. So what your asking me to do is try and ask someone who is under custodial arrest or lawfully detained thoughtful meaning questions while they are actively resisting me is crazy, dangerous and should not be tolerated. So I as a police officer now have to ask someone sir why are you punching me? why cant we talk? would you like to stop punching me? why cant we be friends? Who in there right mind would agree to something like that 835a of the of the CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE states that "a peace officer who makes or attempts to make an arrest need not retreat or desist from his/her efforts by reason of resistance of threatened resistance of the person being arrested; nor shall such officer be deemed the aggressor or lose his/her right to self defense by the use of reasonable force to effect the arrest, or to prevent escape, or to overcome resistance." In a candy cane and lollipop world I would be able to talk people down and we could hug it out and I could place them under arrest but I live in the real world. A world where I do try and talk people down I do try to use thoughtful meaning full communications I am not an animal that blindly attacks when I feel threatened. The whole proportionality issue is not needed period.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>Page 1, Line 1: "sanctity of all human life"- Well it sure doesn't seem that the people who wrote this care too much about the sanctity of my life. Page 1, #2: I don't understand what situation this would realistically be reasonable in, with the exception of a possible 801 jumper or hostage stand-off. Page 1 #5: The first part of the sentence contradicts the second part. We also have a DGO stating that we don't need to retreat. Page 2. II #5: I don't understand it Page 3. Several bosses already don't understand the importance of brevity on the radio in general and particularly on a hot call. And now when I on-view a subject armed with a gun, you want my Sergeant to recite a 24 word statement while my personal safety and that of the public safety is in danger? Page 5 #2, Top Line: Why should I give someone an opportunity to shield their eyes and make the use of force ineffective? This may or probably would create more problems and safety issues. Page 7. Why is a spike strip deployment a use of force?</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>It takes all decision making out of the equation, there is always a "grey area" where "Monday morning quarterbacking" will take place with a "I would have done... they shouldn't have done..." and unless you are in that moment with that specific officers training and expertise, you cant not see what they see or feel. The new DGO makes people who are not on scene make the decisions and makes it unsafe for all officers.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>Way too many gray areas, and a whole lot to think about in a split second while an officer's and innocent civilians life's are at risk. The man with a knife may not be a threat one second, but will be the next second. I don't want another officer's blood on my hands, are an innocent civilians. Normal people don't yield weapons in the streets. I'll have trouble if these changes go</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			through, and I've been out of the Academy for only a few months. I can only imagine an officer who's been out on the streets for ten years dealing with these change. I have not been trained this way, and neither have 98% of the Department. It just seems like we can do no right with this proposed draft.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The DGO seems to value the lives of violent criminals over law abiding citizens and officers attempting to protect those law abiding citizens.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The apparent emphasis on lack of confrontation is sending the wrong message. It is conducive to creating an environment where officers hesitate rather than protect themselves or others. This type of trained or muscle memory behavior is likely to result in serious injury or death for one of our members, or quite possibly the public. It is important that we do not allow political pressure dictate the officer safety measures that have been tried and tested in the field. SFPD members have not been found out of compliance for use of force in recent incidents. We must protect our ability to protect ourselves and the public from harm. It is unfortunate that members of the BOS are more interested in furthering their political career than creating a safer city. I take great pride in the city of San Francisco and I find it appalling that we are considering discarding several proven defensive tactic measures in an effort to please a political minority. It is our moral and legal responsibility to create and maintain a better San Francisco for the people who live and visit. By creating a UOF policy that creates an environment where officers are more concerned with career survival rather than preservation of life is in direct opposition to the oath I proudly took to protect and serve our city.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The new use of force policy is a SLAP in the FACE to all SFPD members. It shows that there is no trust in the decisions we make while on duty. It also makes me second guess what I can and cannot do based on the worry that I will not be supported by the San Francisco Police Department. When I first entered, I felt as if San Francisco cared about it members and wanted everyone to "go home at night to out families." Now I feel as if we are being MICRO MANAGED and the department cares more about those that WE are dealing with every night. This new use of force policy was written because hierarchy dose not want issues with the community or the public. I am all for community policing, however we are a group of approximately 2000 members in a little city that nearly has 1,000,000 people. Continue to make policies that have officers second guess if they will have support, we will lose our city because it will make officer afraid to do their jobs.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Sacrifices officer safety.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Our tools are being taken away to defend the public's safety and our own lives because of bleeding hearts trying to save face because of recent events
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The new proposed DGO will make every officer second guess themselves when a use of force situation presents itself. An officer second guessing themselves when being approached by someone who is armed is how officers get KILLED. Also, the provisions added for supervisors are unrealistic. Armed suspect calls are high adrenaline and high stress situations. We

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			need officers who are ready and willing to take action against someone who is willfully threatening the public with violence. If officers practice “time and distance”, I believe we will see more innocent people get hurt and more people questioning why the police did not intervene. It is unfortunate that there is not a simple or easy answer when it comes to taking a violent or weapon wielding suspect into custody. Being an officer isn’t an easy job, and taking someone’s freedom away will never be fun, but it is necessary. Adding more rules and hoping that suspects will respect the, “time and distance” approach is ridiculous.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	These changes are an emotional response to recent incident and are not rooted in sound, unbiased judgement.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	For starters this department does not use “Choke holds” we use the carotid restraint, which are two entirely different holds, if whoever drafted this policy cared to consider. The choke hold requires pressure on the throat/ windpipe, hence the word “choke”. The goal being to cut off a person’s air supply by applying pressure to their throat/ windpipe. SFPD uses, and has to my knowledge always successfully and without incident used the carotid restraint hold. The goal being to apply pressure to a subject’s carotid artery slowing the flow of blood to their head, making them pass out. These technique’s, although similar are completely different from each other. Also, the carotid restraint is probably the best technique to level the playing field for any officer. I’m 6’1” 200 lbs. and I would still have trouble subduing people bigger than me, or people who have been using drugs/ alcohol in certain cases. I don’t know if whoever wrote this policy has ever had to fight someone who is on methamphetamine, heroin, crack/ cocaine, or even under the influence of alcohol, but their completely altered and are not at all easy to deal with. Taking away this use of force would greatly diminish officer safety in my personal opinion. A majority of the suggestions in this “proposed” policy lack any sense of common sense.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	These orders are too long, too complicated, and completely detached from the realities of using force on the street. Rules should be short and concise and emphasize officer safety first. The banning of the carotid restraint is particularly disturbing.
<u>Park Station</u>	Administrative	20	This proposed general order 5.01 may get officers hurt. We are rushing to put this into place.
Park Station	Administrative	20	Politically motivated GO designed by activists and politicians but not professional law enforcement trainers and experts to keep criminals and violent people from harm but will lead to more officers injuries and or deaths. Most of the political language has no business in a use of force GO and is childish since we practice some of those type of things on a daily in just about every situation. In a use of force situation we only need the rules that are set forth by case law and other professional law enforcement experts not armature activists and politicians who have no idea what we do. It’s insulting, juvenile and sad.
Park Station	Investigative	20	Knee jerk political response to a lawful shooting within our current policy
Park Station	Investigative	20	Why would we take away the carotid restraint?

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	There are many areas of concern: - It seems to be written in such a way that if you end up using force you have violated the policy - guilty until proven innocent. There is so much ambiguity that it could always be said you should have tried a little harder at thoughtful communication, or providing distance. There is too much room for an officer to second guess how they will be evaluated later that officers will be hurt. - What the heck is thoughtful communication? - Section II.F "Supervisor Responsibility" states that supervisors shall respond to any call "with a weapon" and "remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources." This section is completely unrealistic. This would suggest that a supervisor respond to every call and that each time a call comes out a supervisor recite over the air what an officer is already aware of, if this draft becomes permanent. It also takes trust away from officers and crowds the air so valuable info cannot be broadcasted. Its ridiculous. - Prohibition of the Carotid Restraint - I am a 5'4" female that has rarely used force in my 28 years of law enforcement; however, in the moments where I have been attacked the Carotid Restraint has saved my life. It has saved my life 3 times because the person that attacked me was huge and extremely violent. The carotid restraint was applied correctly (due to training), was perfectly effective, and caused no damage to the suspect. It is a tool that can be effectively used by all officers - small/large/male/female - to safely manage a violent suspect. Also, taking the carotid restraint away will mean how to correctly use it will no longer be trained, and in dangerous situations where 'anything goes' it will be used incorrectly. - Prohibited to strike a handcuffed prisoner with an impact weapon: There is no exception listed. - ERIW: mico managing the deployment of officers and the amount of officers. - CED: Should be given to patrol, not restricted to specialized units.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	will lead to officers & public getting hurt
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Not very thought out, officer safety issues. It is a Knee jerk reaction to political pressure. This will result in even less police work being done by officers.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Wording is horrible. Cant use force against a person who is only a danger to himself? How are we suppose to subdue this person? Cant shoot at a person in a vehicle only if they are using a weapon and that weapon cant be the car. No carotid? Wording is just vague and confusing with no data to back up policy changes.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It is almost close to impossible to obtain additional resources in quick response time that only a suspect/subject can cause harm to others in a split second. Sure we can attempt to use de-escalation techniques, but more often than not, most suspects will "not" wait for the resources and end up either hurting themselves or others in much less time and eventually claim liability against us.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Too many unknowns involved in the new order. Too narrow in scope to be able to deal with the changing environment that police work is.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	language not so clear - Thoughtful communication is different for everyone which has a snow-ball effect on the de-escalation.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It fckn sucks, and going to get some one killed, period. It just won't be the pencil neck who wrote it.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The language is awful, ie thoughtful communication? Whats a buffer zone? This is going to make the Academy train pansies and the recruits will be hesitant to act. Deployment of spike strips is not use of force!! According to this G.O., Woods' OIS was still in policy.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Puts officers in positions where their lives will be in jeopardy by limiting their options, and having to chose between their livelihood, and the lives of others and themselves.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Cops are at an all time low in terms of morale. They need to feel supported, and not like their safety is secondary. extra training is always good, but these modifications need to be clear and not vague.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It is a mistake to remove Carotid Restraint from DGO 5.01. This is a necessary tool that can be used to quickly and easily overcome resistance against a larger or better trained opponent.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Why did we lose the Carotid Restraint?
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	removal of carotid restraint
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The emphasis on de-escalation prioritizes the levels of de-escalation above all other levels of force. Additionally, there is no guideline specifying the length of time an officer should engage in de-escalation techniques before making a decision to employ other levels of force.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I do not agree with prohibiting use of carotid restraint to subdue a suspect. I do not agree with de-escalation efforts when dealing with a violent felon who has displayed violent behavior towards others.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The new DGO could get Officers gravely injured if not killed. A new form of hesitation will most certainly occur especially with new recruits to adhere to this new proposed policy. We shall not attempt to satisfy the general publics views of force options. Being that our main goal is to protect life and property, an Officer should be able to use what force he or she believes is necessary and not have to worry if they exhausted all force options. It is very saddening what direction the department is going and I strongly believe that Officers will get hurt if such policy is approved.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed General Order contains many provisions that are unrealistic and several that are dangerous, like the requirement for supervisors to tie up the air with ridiculous admonitions while officers are responding to, or engaged in handling an armed subject. This proposed General Order is clearly pandering to people who have no idea of how police procedures work, and is a dangerous departure from our previous General Order.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This proposed version makes it seem as though officers have no right to use force, and that we must wait until force is used against us before we can go hands on or use our tools. That is contradictory to what the law states. We are not to be deemed the aggressor, and we do not have to retreat just because someone is resisting arrest. De-escalation works in some cases, and we already always try to de-escalate situations without using force. But there are times when force is necessary, when a suspect is not going to comply, and force must be used. This proposed order seems to attack/shame officers for using force even in those situations. There are also times when for our safety, it is not practical to try to use words or de-escalation, and this new proposal ignores that. There seems to be a big disconnect between what the new proposal would allow us to do, and what the law allows us to do.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Why get rid of the carotid? Why mention that choke holds aren't allowed if they weren't allowed to begin with. I don't understand at what point we are supposed to go hands on with a suspect if they don't want to be arrested.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The new General Order puts Law Enforcement Officers' lives at risk. Additionally, it places the life of an Officer in significant jeopardy when responding to a critical incident.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Elimination of the carotid restraint, a technique which is effective and has not resulted in any serious injuries here in SF makes no sense. Further, the new rule urges us to consider the "proportionality" of a crime if someone presents with a weapon other than a firearm - a knife, however, is a deadly weapon. Does this mean if the crime is an infraction or misdemeanor and the subject pulls a knife (a deadly threat) we should not respond with the corresponding force (firearm) simply because the underlying crime is not serious enough? If so, does this mean anyone who sufficiently escalates the potential violence level on an otherwise lesser crime has to be let go? If a subject pulls a knife on me, whether I am detaining them for a violent felony or jaywalking, I should be able to respond by drawing my weapon and defending myself, regardless of the underlying core transaction.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	This proposed policy relies strongly on the theory that the people we encounter on a daily basis are calm, cool, collected and rational thinkers and based on personal experience this is not the case.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The new 5.01 will lead to a(n) officer(s) getting hurt or worse, killed. The incident in the Southern earlier in Feb is a perfect example, the only reason why an officer is not hurt is because the suspect did not actively use the edged weapon. Going hands on with a suspect with a knife is not something that would have happened prior to the mario woods incident; it is causing officers to hesitate.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The lack of clarity would put me a greater risk of harm, as well as risk of violating the DGO

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
<u>Richmond Station</u>	Investigative	20	I do not agree with the elimination of the carotid restraint. I do not agree with the much talked about “de-escalation” mandate. In 1993, a movie called “Demolition Man”, clearly portrays the failure of de-escalation by uniformed officers. Here is the scene from the movie and you can see for yourself what I am referring to: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9bO-QitInC84
Richmond Station	Investigative	11-15	carotid should not be eliminated, not enough tasers to field officers, pointing firearm should not be use of force
Richmond Station	Investigative	6-10	Proportionality- Does this refer to PC to stop? Example being, “ 917 ped stop for jay-walking, suspect runs, officer chases, suspect reaches into waistband and officer points gun and gives commands, suspect complies, then its determined suspect has a weapon, or warrant or search condition. Will it be deemed unreasonable to have gave chase or pointed your firearm at a suspect who “jay-walked”? Example 2: Call for service, 917/852 caser. Officer arrives, sees suspect matching description, attempts to detain, leads to foot pursuit, 148. Its a property crime. Most take-on’s don’t start out as A priority situations and the suspect is always in charge of how the contact will go. A simple traffic stop for a stop sign violation can lead to a homicide warrant arrest. When Officers make a stop the bad guy knows what he has done and when fighting or fleeing is his choice its usually due to something greater than the take-on. Tasers would save officers from injury and possible disarm suspects with edged weapons by means other than a firearm.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Removal of carotid and the continuous requirement to state what is going to be your next non lethal option(s). The delay could create an unplanned counter attack by the suspect.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It figures that desk jockeys would write nonsensical BS to appease a loud minority of the population, placing officer safety at risk, as a knee jerk reaction to political climate.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The proposed 5.01 is very narrow and lists policies for us to perform in almost impossible situations. We are to walk such a fine line and expected to perform ideal. Following all these policies listed will simply be impossible to remember and perform in a high stress and life threatening environment. i.e C: 2: Utilizing cover to avoid creating a threat?? sometimes, there is no immediate cover, OR why would I use cover with someone with a melee weapon? This was horribly written, (if I don’t take cover and the subject assaults me with his weapon then I am to blame??) Ridiculous, and the list goes on... C;1 contradicts C:2 as it states to containing the subject. How can this be performed when officers are taking cover and have their “buffer” zone?? C;4 will occur with multiple officers there, no one should be designated. D. Proportionality, another badly written policy. Proportional (meaning balanced by definition) is making this policy sound as if the subject is using a melee weapon, then so do we. Sounds as if we are faced with a subject with a baseball bat, that we can only use our baton which is proportionate. It was always taught that officer shall be at one level higher to over come resistance. NOT be proportional! This needs to be omitted.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Taking away the carotid is a mistake. Taking away a tool in order to protect self and others is horrible. What is the supplement during a ground fight? Also to give several orders by a Sergeant to officers at a scene ties up the air during an emergency. De-escalate or “tactical re-locate” is only good if overpowered. You take “real estate” in order to gain advantage. Moving away while trying to keep your eyes on a subject can cause injury, like walking into traffic, tripping, losing the terrain and now the subject has an open field or run into a populated area or school. None of the proposals thought of the numerous years of scientific study done in order to capture the suspect or put an end to the situation. That is what the police are there for and the person placed themselves in that situation causing a forced hand to the next level. Are the new orders at all street proven to save the lives of the public or officers? Also a 10 hour class does not fix the problem of 15 plus years of LE. The new orders follow what sounds good, but does not address how officers must do it safely. The training and the orders only made me hesitate which scientifically proves death or serious bodily injury. If we are to adapt to the new orders, then we shall train every week in order to change years and years of self defense training and even those who just graduated from the academy.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	We attack the threat to ensure safety for officer and the public. The de-escalation thing is bad for officer and public safety when it becomes mandatory.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Negatives; Proportionality is vague, the general public more than likely will never understand why we need to use force in general. Carotid restraint is taken from us with no explanation. No positives.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I found it confusing. I don’t want to be second-guessing myself when my or another officer’s safety is at risk. The entire De-Escalation section is ridiculous, how am I supposed to “isolate and contain” a non-compliant subject without using force? And “Proportionality”? Because edged weapons and baseball bats can’t kill people?
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Taking the the use of carotid away is a safety issue for current sworn personnel as they have been activity trained and retrained on the technique. Furthermore the technique will most likely still be used by members who will be in the situation to use it as they are re-actively trained to use it when a certain set of circumstances is presented to them. The proposed taser policy is un acceptable, if they are implemented in our department, all members should have fair use and training.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This DGO basically does not trust Police Officers to make sound decisions when it comes to use of force situations. Many of the new parts of this policy are un realistic and shows the complete disconnect between working officers and those who are attempting to change this policy. Police Officers are going to get hurt, because of politics \.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I don’t really care about losing the carotid restraint. It is rarely used. I do want as a replacement, CED’s, and I believe they should be issues to street Sergeants who will be responding to these calls for service anyway.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I will do what I can to protect the public or myself if there is a threat. I will not step back and think about how the person is feeling
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Proportionality??? Incorporating de-escalation in general orders would allow the department to find members at fault should they fail to properly de-escalate a situation. de-escalation should be a training block, if anything, not written in general orders.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Positive: Preservation of life is the goal. Negative: Preservation of life, if the life in question is not an Officer's life, is the goal.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I believe it ignores the safety and well-being of officers. I feel like I will have less control over a dangerous situation, and my life will be in greater jeopardy. I believe it will disproportionately report "use of force" incidents because the threshold in the new proposed policy ignores complaint of pain reported by a suspect, and goes off of an officer merely gaining compliance. Besides, gaining compliance and apprehending a suspect without causing him or her harm is de-escalating a dangerous situation successfully, right? My concern is that this new policy will inaccurately depict the SFPD as "aggressive" or "brutes," because of the low threshold for what would be considered reportable "use-of-force." This will directly contribute to greater misunderstandings, furthering the divide between officers and the community.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I strongly disagree with proposed de-escalation section. it basically states what we do on a daily basis on patrol when we talk to criminal subjects in the street. We are normally able to tell in the first 10 seconds of contact who is likely to be compliant and who is not. Whenever any verbal persuasion fails, we should move to the best de-escalation device which would be the taser gun, or firearm in case the subject is armed with a firearm also. There is nothing wrong with the current DGOs apart from the fact that it does not include the use of CED. Police officers should be police officers when dealing with the most dangerous social elements. The new DGO is making us meek nurses with police stars.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Taking away the carotid restraint limits our use of force. The way they will teach us to shoot and assess the situation is a liability to officer's lives. It gives the criminals the upper hand to try and harm us.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I would like to see the Carotid restraint in our levels of use of force. I have not personally used this technique but have heard positive results from others that have used it in the field.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	the proposed policy encourages officers to not use our current tools to keep each other safe or the public. the proposed policy actually discourages officers to use our tools and creates unnecessary work and documentation for all officers and sgts involved in incidents.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
<u>Southern Station</u>	Investigative	11-15	Too subjective! Obviously not written by anyone who puts any kind of priority on the safety of officers! Sanctity of human life, de-escalation, thoughtful communication are all examples of what good officers do on a daily basis. By putting it, you now leave it open to interpretation. Who gets to decide what is thoughtful communication? Supervisor responsibilities are unrealistic. Tie up too much air time, when the most important person on scene (primary officer) would need it.
Southern Station	Investigative	11-15	Seems like de-escalation has become more important than officer safety. I agree officers should preserve life, but officer safety should come first. This will create hesitations in officers' decision making, which could cause injury or death Also, a supervisor should not have to remind officers to get time and distance, while en-route to a call. This takes away communication on the radio. Plus, How can a supervisor make suggestions to an incident they are not present at. They should only acknowledge, respond, then take over when on scene. Allow for officers to make the decisions when the supervisor is not on scene. This is why we train. I disagree with the carotid restraint being taken away. Why? It is not a choke hold. It works. It is not lethal and it is safe, as long as it is applied properly. How else are we going to control a subject in close quarters, when the officer can not get time and distance. Would one rather see a person rendered unconscious in less violent way or have the officer strike the person several times in the face with closed fists. It just doesn't make any sense. It's not uncommon for one supervisor to be supervising an entire watch. What if the supervisor is tied up on another run or just can't make it because of another incident? Are we holding supervisors accountable when it's not in their control?
Southern Station	Investigative	6-10	"Proportionality" puts the members' safety, the public's safety, and the subjects' safety in jeopardy. As that section reads right now, it is too vague and needs to be clarified. -Why is the carotid restraint being eliminated as a use of force option? Again, that is putting members' safety in jeopardy, and possibly the public's and subjects' safety as well. Currently, the Department is proposing to equip a LIMITED number of officers with an additional force option (tasers), but is taking away a force option from EVERYONE. That makes absolutely no sense and one of us is going to get seriously injured or killed as a result.
Southern Station	DOC Light Duty	11-15	Taking away the carotid restraint is a big mistake! Not allowing Officers to use tasers against a suspect unless they are armed with a weapon is a big mistake! Not allowing Officers to use force against an 801 unless they attack an Officer is a big mistake. All of these new proposals are going to lead towards Officers being injured or killed.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This proposed policy, in my opinion, will create situations where Officers and/or persons in the public will be placed in harm's way.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	You're going to get cops hurt or killed. I've been on patrol my whole career and I've encountered many dangerous situations. I don't want to have to think about this proposed use of force whether I'm violated by creating distance. That thought process will make me hesitate and cost me my life.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Taking away tools we have been trained in only hinders us from being able to do our job safely.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The proposed use of force policy places unreasonable limitations on the officers, and creates an environment where officers will be hesitant in using justifiable force to protect themselves and others. The deescalation guidelines are what is most puzzling. Officers are advised to isolate, contain, while simultaneously seeking cover, and negotiating with a suspect. Attempting to accomplish all three simultaneous actions, while trying to protect the public is almost an impossible task to accomplish. Seeking cover, would realistically, prevent the officer from containing a suspect. Removal of the carotid restraint should not even be considered. The carotid restraint is a great tool in controlling a larger violent suspect.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Negatives: 1. The order is far too subjective in regards to some of the new terminologies proposed. (I.E Sanctity of Life and Thoughtful Communication) A person reading the new order would assume that, prior to this order being written, the officers within the SFPD did not value those principles. That is simply not true. Many of the terminologies used(I.E Proportionality) have the reader assuming that all situations are the same. Use of force options are determined by the officer based on the actions of the suspect and other information known at the time of the incident. There is not always a direct correlation between the amount of physical resistance/assaultive behavior given by a suspect and the severity of the crime. I think this is an inappropriate connection to make. The new terminologies are far too subjective(I.E Thoughtful communication). Any third party(I.E OCC) will routinely make claims against officers that will be subjective in nature because of the way the order is written. This will open the officers up to unfair discipline practices because OCC will deem that an officer didn't use "Thoughtful Communication or Proportionality" That conclusion will be drawn based on the subjectivity of an opinion rather than factual information. Lastly, the order appears to go far beyond the legal standards put forth in the Supreme Court ruling of Graham V.S Connor. That is a mistake given this ruling is the legal basis from which all police officers throughout the country use as an evaluation of what actions "reasonable" in a use of force situation. The Supreme Court ruling is not subjective. Its based on a clear set of straight forward standards and criteria that are used to determine the reasonableness of the actions taken by any officer. The language of the proposed policy will open up the flood gates of more frivolous lawsuits against officers and the department.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Vague, can easily be used to frame the officer in violation. Complex, not clear path for the officer while under stress. Theoretical, assumes perfect world conditions without clear definitions.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	"Supervisor shall...remind officers,while enroute..." that portion is unrealistic, unsafe (clog airway) and pointless. "It is important that an officers level of force be proportional to the severity of the crime" Huh? who's criteria do we use? If suspects resist we stop using force to effect arrest because crime is not severe??? That is a disservice to victims of lower level crimes.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The carotid restraint is the only non-pain compliance tactic available. All others require the subject to coherent enough to perceive pain and comply or to listen to verbal instructions.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	<p>The new order mentions De Escalation “Create time and distance from the subject by establishing a buffer zone (“reaction gap”) and utilizing cover to avoid creating an immediate threat that may require the use of force;” This is very vague as it give no indication of what a safe distance would deemed appropriate. This also seems to make it appear the officers are hiding or not willing to gain control of an erratic person. Clear definitions need to be given to all the new verbiage in the order for example what is thoughtful communications etc. as this is new verbiage and will be immediately attacked by defense attorneys with their own definitions. The idea of PROPORTIONALITY needs to be explained that officers are not trained to match a subject on an even plane more with a level that will successful effect an arrest or overcome resistance within a reasonable officer standard. E. DUTY TO PROVIDE MEDICAL ASSESSMENT. All medical decisions will be at th direction of the medics on scene, officers shall not transport suspects in need of medical evaluation F. SUPERVISOR’S RESPONSIBILITY. “2. Remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources;” creates a officer safety issue with radio traffic and exposes Supervisor is the transmission is not broadcast. B. CHEMICAL AGENTS. 3. MANDATORY FIRST AID. At the scene or as soon as possible, officers shall administer first aid by: “b. Flushing his/her eyes out with clean water and ventilate with fresh air.” This should not be a shall more if available flush with water. Officers are not equipped with water on patrol. This term “b. Give the subject a reasonable opportunity to voluntarily comply,” is very vague and be better described as give a warning if practical and access. 3. PROHIBITED USES. Officers shall not: “b. Strike a handcuffed prisoner with an impact weapon.” there may be an occasion that requires a handcuffed prisoner to be struck. cuffs are moved to front, subject demonstrates fighting ability kicks etc other efforts prove ineffective. ERIW “b. All other officers at scene to acknowledge imminent deployment of ERIW by echoing, “Red Light! Less Lethal! Less Lethal!” This may lead to to confusion with all officers calling out at same time.</p>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	<p>The prohibiting of the carotid restraint will limit officers’ ability to stop physical attacks against them by larger individuals. This was the only technique that allowed officers to avoid using impact weapons to stop attackers and causing injury to the suspect. We have NEVER been taught a “choke hold”. The carotid restraint is not a choke hold. The chief should have explained this to the media a LONG time ago to clarify the difference and that we do not choke anyone. Again an officer will get hurt with the change to policy.</p>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>The proposed General Order is extremely verbose and difficult to follow. I think it places unreasonable expectations on officers and supervisors by attempting to hold us to an unreasonable standard rather than the supreme court recognized reasonable standard. The amount of supervisors on duty would need to triple to carry out the order as proposed and the requirements would tie up critical radio traffic during intense/ possible life threatening situations. I think this order opens us to even more second guessing (monday morning quarterbacking) than we already receive. We should not be expressly taking away effective force options such as the carotid restraint. All of this is based on perception and not the lawfulness/effectiveness of policy.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	it takes away the carotid restraint which is a good option to have if needed. We have already been trained on how to handle force now we will need to relearn it and the hesitation will get somebody hurt.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I have personally used the carotid restraint several times and effectively made an arrest where I would have been completely justified in using my department issued firearm. All this language about de-escalating is absurd. We de-escalate situations on a day in and day out and they don't escalate to officer involved shootings unless the subject makes the officer use force. Having supervisors waste valuable air time reminding us to use our de-escalation techniques during an emergency is a waste of time and an officer safety issue
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The new policy is based on the theory that subjects are all basically nice people and will eventually go along with police commands if they are coddled and treated like little lambs. Unfortunately, this is not reality. Police deal with all the stuff the rest of the world doesn't want to deal with. There is a reason for that. Officers have taken an oath to protect and serve. If officers are not able to protect themselves, and others, they simply will stay in their cars and show up when the danger is over to write a report. The public is doing themselves a disservice by handcuffing the police. By taking away a force option (carotid) and not replacing it with another option (taser) is limiting officers. This lack of options will cause officers to resort to their firearm when faced with a difficult situation.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I believe the new proposed policy will place officers in more dangerous positions that would cause them or fellow officers to get hurt or worse, killed while on duty
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	We need to keep the carotid restraint.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Descalation seems like a good addition. The elimination of the carotid restraint seems unreasonable if the whole idea is regarding the sanctity of human life. Taking away non lethal UOF options doesn't seem right.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	No need to script a new policy over one incident related to Mario Woods
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The new proposed Use of Force GO is unrealistic for what actually happens on the streets and does not protect Officers. Things happen so fast on the streets and the new GO is going to get someone hurt or killed.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I strongly disagree with the omission of the carotid restraint in the use of force options. It is a very valuable and essential option for members dealing with a combative subject. If you omit the carotid restraint, you are forcing members of the SFPD to increase their use of force that could lead to great bodily injury where the carotid restraint can detain an individual and de-escalate a situation safely.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	After viewing the proposed DGO, I believe that this will negatively impact the way officers police the streets of SF. I find it hard to believe that the officer's safety was taken into consideration when drafting this proposed DGO.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Removal of the carotid restraint is insane. Officers need as many tools as possible to control violent suspects. If they do want to get rid of the carotid EVERYONE on patrol needs to be issued a Taser. There is also a lot of confusing language in the new general order that needs review and editing.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Many of the terms are not defined. In I, Section C, what is “actively” endangering safety. Is that the same as posing an imminent threat? The idea of proportionality leaves officers open to scrutiny at different times of the use of force incident. Officers should be allowed to use the most appropriate level of force in order to quickly control the incident preventing the chance for worse injury to the suspect and officer. The Carotid Restraint should be allowed. It has proven to be an excellent tool when used correctly in the appropriate situation. The fact that it is compared to a “Choke hold” in the general order is ridiculous. A choke hold causes injury. A Carotid restraint performed correctly causes no injury and incapacitates even the biggest strongest suspects. The idea of issuing a warning before using force puts the officer at a severe disadvantage. It gives the suspect a chance to prepare for the officer and tells the suspect which type of force the officer is going to use.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I do not agree with the change in the proposed policy.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	DRAFT 5.01 In addition to the points contained in the letter from the POA to the Police Commission: The draft order is poorly written and poorly organized. The draft order is unnecessarily verbose and makes redundant statements on the use of “thoughtful communication”, de-escalation, etc. The draft order is clearly written to appease the un-trained, public reader, rather than to provide much needed guidance and clarity to a police officer trained in the appropriate and effective use of force. 5.01 - Section IC: The statement, “understanding a subject’s situation may enable officers to use de-escalation techniques.” The statement, “understanding a subject’s situation,” is ambiguous and is a far cry from the precise legal verbiage of the current order 5.01. Rather than ‘situation’, a better term may be ‘state of mind’, ‘mental state’, etc. This line makes the use of force policy read as if it were written by some online blogger with no working knowledge of use-of-force policies, the importance of precise legal terminology, and the gravity of every statement contained in a use-of-force policy. 5.01 - Section IC - De-escalation subsection 2: “Create time and distance from the subject by establishing a buffer zone, and utilizing cover to AVOID CREATING AN IMMEDIATE THREAT that may require a use of force”. I would argue that our very presence on-scene creates an immediate threat to most subject. Regardless of the current threat to bystanders when we arrive on scene, most circumstances require that we arrive on scene and ensure that a subject is at least minimally contained and their freedom of movement restricted so they cannot flee the scene into an area where they may represent a greater risk to bystanders. This means we are EXPECTED to place ourselves in at least minimally threatening positions and to effectively corner a subject to restrict routes of escape. This action is especially necessary to successfully contain subjects that may be mentally disturbed, intoxicated, violent, etc, but would be discouraged by this policy. Even the videos brought up immediately following the Woods OIS that show UK police subduing subjects armed with knives, showed them placing themselves in positions that corner

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			a subject and create 'immediate threats'. 5.01 - Section E - Duty to intervene: Under what circumstances will or will we not be subject to disciplinary action regarding this section?
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed use of force will get officers killed and injured.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The changes are just ridiculous. Why are we succumbing to the demands of a select few who's views are covered by the biased media? In the almost 4 years I've been a police officer, I've never seen or done anything that has violated this DGO or the law. If you were to approve this new DGO, you would really hamstring and create a training scar in all officers. Since all this anti-police rhetoric has happened lately, I've noticed a lot more verbal abuse from subjects and more attempts on their part to resist us doing our jobs. If you were to approve this, you would create a police department in San Francisco that would be hesitant to do their jobs and you would be emboldening these subject's will to fight back against us. That would be a punishment to the silent MAJORITY of San Franciscans who appreciate what SFPD does and the dangers that we face everyday in doing this job.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Doesn't appear to have my safety as a concern at all, just wants to make the public happy with using positive words and not using force. I don't deal with the average joe, I deal with people who are yelling, screaming, mentally unstable, and people who want to hurt me. I do not want to sit and have a conversation with them, I want to keep myself and others safe- if that means using force at times, then I should be ok.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	It is Unrealistic and takes away useful tools.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The current polices already force Officers to take unnecessary risks and the new polices only seems to focus on taking away proven effective options versus giving Officers additional proven tactics. The proposal along with its authors appears to be more concerned with public perception than Officer safety.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	We are losing a great tool Carotid Control (CC), and prohibited from choking or use of CC. We are possibly gaining tasers, but are very limited in there use. I feel as we are loosing force option, which will result in more officers resorting to firearm use, at a department that doesn't support us in that use. Also we are being told to continually reassess during shootings, which WILL result in officers injury and death because of hesitation
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Taking away a less lethal force option like the carotid restraint without outfitting all officers with CED's is not feasible. This will only lead to more lethal force situations.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The new general order uses language that is contradictory, open to interpretation, and confusing. I could see instances where Officers are justified in their use of force yet out of policy and open to discipline or civil liability. The new GO, as currently written, is not best practices, and will put Officers, and the public, at increased risk of injury or death.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This proposed order makes it seem that we always use force and never try to de-escalate a situation. I have not been in too long, but from what I've seen, SF Police Officers are already very good at de-escalating situations. The problem is that some people are on drugs (a lot of

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>good meth going around right now) and others don't want to go to jail. People call us to do something about AMS individuals and criminals and expect something to be done. I get the impression that the department wants us to be hands off and if a person refuses we should just retreat and go 10-8. The verbiage under section 835a should be in the proposal word for word. The "Circumstances Justifying the Use of Force" from the current order should be included instead of "Use of force must be reasonable." If we have a legal detention or arrest, the subject needs to comply regardless. I think the first aid section is unnecessary. We are police officers, not doctors. Medics are usually pretty quick to arrive on scene. Are supervisors going to micromanage every incident where someone may have a weapon. If I call a code 33 or a 148, I want the air clear in case I need to broadcast something, if I don't come up, it means I'm still fighting and engaging the suspect. Having the supervisor on the air would be ineffective because from my prior 148s I know I do not hear the radio because I am busy dealing with the suspect. When I call a 148 or code 33, I already know that help is coming Code 3. One of the great things about this job is our freedom to handle our call for the most part by ourselves, and not being micromanaged by a supervisor. We are adults, not 5 year old kids. It is unrealistic and unpractical for a supervisor to respond everytime a person may have a weapon, which is a common occurrence downtown. The carotid needs to be an option. By removing it, we will have to resort to a greater amount of force to subdue a subject, which may lead to greater injury. We go over the carotid for two hours at AO. For some smaller officers, the carotid is a great tool to have because they can do subdue a bigger subject quickly. From training I know that people with smaller arms, are very good at applying the carotid and it works. Don't fix something that isn't broken. In the current order, we are allowed to use our baton on a handcuffed prisoner if necessary under section 1,C. The new policy prohibits it and there is no leeway. Section 1, B and C in the current DGO should be included in the new DGO, because they help address the uncertainty that we may encounter on the streets. Don't really know why the sanctity of life lines are added in multiple times. We all passed the civil service test and can read. They only need to be written once. I do not believe that the order addresses force for a sam unit officer compared to a two man unit. It should be understood that a sam officer will use greater force to accomplish custody if he/she is by him/her-self, as compared to two officers.</p>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>9. I don't understand the idea of proportionality. What happened to using a level of force greater than that of which the subject is using against us? Proportionality is insinuating that officers must not use a force that is greater than that of which the subject is showing and instead officers should match them. The idea of placing myself in such close proximity to someone with a stick or an edged weapon in an attempt to match force with them is mind boggling. I, along with every other officer that I have spoken with, do not like the idea of attempting to go hands on with an armed subject or attempt to disarm a subject with an edged weapon while using my baton. This idea is going to put the lives of every officer in danger. The thought that we can just create time and distance and attempt to reason with a good percentage of subjects with said weapons is not reality either.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I strongly disagree with the section of proportionality and the prohibiting of the carotid restraint. The phrasing of proportionality makes it sound as if I must use an equal level of force I am faced with. I do not want to risk my own safety to fight on an equal level with a suspect. I want to have the upper hand on the suspect and take him into custody without endangering myself. As a smaller officer, I would not be able to take a highly combative large suspect into custody on my own without using the carotid restraint. Physical control is not enough to effectively take a large suspect into custody. The carotid restraint is an extremely safe and effective tool when done with the proper technique. I also believe it is impractical for a supervisor to respond to all calls regarding an armed suspect. We respond to so many calls of an armed suspect, it is unreasonable for a supervisor to start a response to all of them and then give a reminder on the air for Section F.2. The reminder would also tie up radio traffic.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I do not agree with how we are given less tools to use.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Officers may get hurt trying to avoid getting into trouble.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	the proposed new use of force guidelines will prevent us from effectively protecting the community by limiting our force options. By limiting our options, we don't only put the public's safety at risk but we put our own lives in further danger. No officer should be expected to do something that their commanding officer would not do themselves.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The proposed 'Proportionality' concept is shortsighted and direct counteraction to the Mario Woods incident. It completely disregards law enforcement safety and should be removed from this policy. We are expected to make sound split second decisions when our life or our partner's life is on the line. This proposal makes me think twice of what is reasonable and what is not. Thinking twice could easily result in loss of life of an officer.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	This proposed General Order 5.01 not only puts officers in greater and unnecessary danger, but the tone throughout the order implies that officers are prone to abusive force. This proposed General Order leaves no room for an officer's discretion or experience, and creates a cookie-cutter policy for all incidents (when we know two incidents are never the same). The proposed General Order also makes it very apparent that a criminal's life more important to the Department brass than an officer's life. There are various new procedures in this proposed General Order that make it blatantly obvious the Department is careless in regards to officer safety, willfully ignoring state law, and caving to political pressure from a squeaky wheel. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Officers should consider the possible reasons why a subject may be noncompliant or resisting arrest. A subject may not be capable of understanding the situation because of a medical condition; mental, physical, or hearing impairment; language barrier; drug interaction; or emotional crisis, and have no criminal intent... etc." The entire paragraph is a paradox! If a subject is resisting due to a lack of understanding the situation, for any of the various reasons they stated, how in the world is an officer supposed to "de-escalate" when the subject clearly does not understand?! That is the equivalent of the "chicken or the egg" conundrum. • "Create time and distance from the subject by establishing a buffer zone ("reaction gap") and utilizing cover to avoid creating an immediate threat that may

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>require the use of force. This procedure completely ignores state law, coincidentally reflected in the current General Order, where it explicitly states that an officer “need not retreat or desist from his efforts...nor shall such officer be deemed an aggressor or lose his right to self-defense...” (PC 835). An officer therefore is never creating the “immediate threat” as suggested above, but attempting to perform his or her duty as required by law. Implying that the officer is creating the confrontation is the equivalent of blaming a victim of a crime. • It is critical officers apply the principles of proportionality when encountering a subject who is armed with a weapon other than a firearm, such as an edged weapon, improvised weapon, baseball bat, brick, bottle, or other object. This little tidbit implies that these “other weapons” are less deadly than a firearm and therefore a firearm is not an acceptable option. All officers know this is not true. A knife, a brick, a bat, etc., can be just as deadly as a firearm, if not more so. Maybe the author of this proposed General Order would like to talk to the CHP officer who was just attacked? He is extremely lucky to be alive! • DUTY TO INTERVENE. Officers shall intervene when they reasonably believe another officer is about to use, or is using, excessive force. Officers shall promptly report any use of excessive force and the efforts made to intervene to a supervisor. This new policy assumes that all officers on scene see the exact same thing, which is inherently false. It also assumes that officers willfully ignore excessive force used by other officers. Even ignoring a proven scientific reaction called “tunnel vision,” the legal phrase “totality of the circumstances” is in place because officers see different things during a high stress situation. The law acknowledges this discrepancy between what officers see on scene. If an officer points a firearm at a subject, it is not the time or the place for another officer to intervene. The first officer may have seen a threat the second officer did not. The same applies to someone resisting arrest. Officers see different things, and in the middle of a stressful and dangerous situation is not the place to have officers arguing over what constitutes excessive force. Excessive uses of force that are crystal clear and painfully obvious, should definitely be stopped and reported, but making it a requirement causes second guessing in the middle of an incident will cause officers to get hurt. • 4. Availability of additional officers or resources to de-escalate the situation; 5. Any force should be proportional to the severity of the offense committed for which the officer is taking action; 7. Severity of the crime(s) at issue; 8. Whether the subject is attempting to evade arrest by flight or is actively resisting, and the degree of that resistance; It should not matter what the nature of the crime was but what the level of resistance is by the subject. A subject who jaywalked, but is violently resisting detention/arrest, should still be held just as accountable for his or her actions as a violent crime suspect. The crime should not be the sole determination of the level of force the office can use. The level of resistance is what an officer determines his or her level of force. Also, the order should not require officers to try each of the force options before escalating to the next. As per the current General Order, good judgment and the circumstances of each situation will dictate the level at which an officer will start. • PROHIBITED USE OF CONTROL HOLDS: Carotid Restraint Why take a way a legal and effective force option that has not had any issues? Public impression? All SFPD officers know the difference between a “choke hold” and the carotid. Police should not have a force option taken away because “it looks bad.” All uses of force look bad. That is not the fault</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>of police, but of the subject resisting detention or arrest. • Officers shall provide a warning prior to deploying a chemical agent, if practical. Announce a warning to the subject and other officers of the intent to deploy the chemical agent if the subject does not comply with officer commands. The most successful uses of OC is when the subject is taken by surprise. Why would you provide a warning that OC is about to be deployed, causing the subject to block the stream of OC? For most instances, a subject has already had multiple chances to comply with orders of the officer. Forcing officers to announce the deployment of OC specifically would prevent the effectiveness.</p>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I feel the new DGO will put officers more in harms way.
<u>Special Ops Group</u>	Administrative	20	Too dangerous, handcuffs cops trying to make decisions regarding a situation that is fluid. A lot of these changes can cause an officer to lose their life.
Special Operations Group	Administrative	20	Have not seen it yet
Special Operations Group	Administrative	16-19	The concept of proportionality is poorly written and I feel will result in officers being injured.
Special Operations Group	Administrative	11-15	The new general order is a political ploy that could get Officers hurt or worse. It also panders into creating an environment where if something happens the Department will be ridiculed based on not de-escalating enough to prevent all Use of Force.
Special Operations Group	Investigative	11-15	This proposed policy is join to setting a police officer to get hurt/killed. The wording of deescalation/space sounds good on paper but if you have not been on the street in awhile you should know that suspects are going to take advantage of this and with flee or attack an officer.
Special Operations Group	K9 Handler and Supervisor	20	Too many loose ends. Liability for all parties. Severe safety concerns.
Special Operations Group	SWAT	20	It is my belief that this proposed general order will get officers injured or killed. It is taking away force options (the carotid) that could possibly prevent a lethal force option.
Special Operations Group	Canine Handler	20	<p>I don't like how we are being reminded that we should be valuing life in this policy! I'm a police officer and swore to protect life the day I graduated the academy. It doesn't need to be repeated in every DGO like I'm a crazed homicidal maniac. I prefer the use of the word "dignity" as apposed to "sanctity." I can see there being a paragrapgh about using de-escalating tactics, but the new policy seems to be way overboard on this. As cops we have been using de-escalation for years, and it works 90% of the time, but the other 10% requires some kind of force to resolve a situation. This policy makes it sound like "de-escalation" is the magical tactic that has been ignored for years and now will solve every situation. I don't like the use of the term "proportional." It can easily be misinterpreted for "equal" amount of force. When it should be "enough to overcome resistance." In "I.D.Proportionality" I don't like how it implies "edged weapons" are less dangerous than guns. I would say that a baseball bat, intact bottle, or brick pose less of an immediate risk, but that is not the case with an edged weapon that can be thrown, plunged, or swung at an officer causing immediate and serious injuries.</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			Omitted in the new policy is paragraph I.E. ,clarificatoin of reasonable force and how we are not required to engage in hand to hand combat or how we can be first to use force to safely resolve the situation. That I feel is a huge change that should be added back in. Also, why are “roadblocks” and “spike strips” a reportable use of force. Neither are done to a person, but rather the vehicle. Requiring Sgt’s to tie up valuable air time reminding on scene personnel to isolate, contain, maintain distance, yada yada yada is rediculous and poses a huge officer safety risk. Almost as bad as the policy about saying you are driving code 3 and where from.
Special Operations Group	Stable attendant	20	The proposed GO 5.01 would have officers second guessing and possibly give too much time in a possible life threatening situation for both police and public.
pecial Operations Group	Tactical Unit	16-19	extremely restrictive to the point where it will jeopardize officer safety and put the community at risk. Police work has become so restrictive to the point where officers are responding from the station instead of patrolling and being proactive. I am disappointed in our Chief on how much he has sold us out and believing that the criminals lives are more important than ours. Once we lose or change something as far as contract negotiations or general order policies, we will never get it back.
Special Operations Group	TAC	3-5	1-”Officers who proceed accordingly and delay taking a subject into custody, while keeping the public and officers safe, will not be found to have neglected their duty. They will be found to have fulfilled it.” The wording of this statement leads me to believe we are expected to back down to a suspect and let them dictate our tactics, attempting to do little as possible. 2-”F. Supervisor’s Responsibilities” Why are we asking supervisors to reiterate what Officers should already know and be implementing (over the air). This mind set breeds Officer’s that are not critical thinkers. 3-ERIW should not be in the shotgun rack of the vehicle- a lethal shotgun should be. This takes away the ability of the Officer to properly defend themselves if he/she were to engage a subject with superior firepower... which this day in age is a very real possibility.
Special Operations Group	Mayors Detail	6-10	Way to much emphasis on de escalation and the order appears to be less hands on or less use of force in general.
Special Operations Group	Homeland Security	6-10	Removes the carotid restraint. Reduces option for dealing with person who is only threat to him/herself. There is no protection for officers when determining the best response to dealing with non-compliant subjects.
Special Operations Group	High risk warrant	11-15	Its going to get officers hurt. It puts officers in a bad situation to second guess their safety.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	parts of the proposed order are vague and seem difficult to follow while engaged in a stressful use of force situation.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It’s completely unrealistic and will make it virtually impossible for officers to do their jobs. It also drastically increases the officers ability to safe guard their own lives while attempting to enforce the law.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	will endanger myself and lives of others...

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Though I agree with the overall purpose of these changes, I feel that some of the language too strict. Example 1 - 1.C.2 - Create time distance... (the utilization of cover should include the words if available and practical) Example 2 -II F.2 - Remind responding officers... This is a very unrealistic step and the word SHALL in the preceding title should replace by SHOULD. Radio traffic in an emergency is limited and reserved for emergency communication for the officer at the scene. If a supervisor is tying up the radio and stating the obvious, responding officers cannot acknowledge their response, the engaging officers cannot separate their attention to listen, To require a supervisor to say these things is unnecessary. In a best case scenario it would be idea to mention some of these actions but not in the form presented. It's too long and too time consuming. Example 3. III.A.3.a. Elimination of the Carotid Restraint is a mistake. In close quarters, such as a Tenderloin hallway or room, sometimes the Carotid Restrain is the only option available. In a situation where your battling with a subject in the ground many times the carotid restraint is the most available and practical technique to deploy. Why are we eliminating it anyway?? Is there a problem with the technique and its application. Why throw out a tool that has been successful and effective for decades?
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I have not read it I have only heard about it.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It places patrol at greater risk of death and injury, removing the carotid restraint is a mistake! I've used it several times without incident removing this technique will only increase more baton strikes.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	We should still have option of carotid restraint. It is impractical for Sgts to have to put all of that information on the air during response. Reminding officers of value of life is insulting. We are not Neanderthals.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	no positives . it takes all of our self defense rights away from us which has worked well for many years.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	New GO would take away options and provide new alternatives that are not always available to Field Ops personnel immediately.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This entire Go was thrown out and numerous items altered or removed to quell the community. Total BS
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The supervisors role to use valuable radio traffic to responding units to advise them how to deal with an armed subject isn't practical and shows distrust about the officers abilities and experience.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Section I.E opens every other officer on a scene up to discipline or at least investigation, if the investigating supervisor, OCC, MCD or anyone else EVER determines that excessive force was used during an incident. Section 2.F.2 is ridiculous and dangerous (see below answer to question 12) We are no longer using the carotid????? This technique, while not used personally, has proved very successful for other members smaller than their aggressive suspects, and relieved them of needing to resort to higher levels of force. Incredibly short sided action!

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It is full of fluff and nonsense. It is almost half about what we should do and what a situation should be in a perfect world. It states things we already know and use, such as deescalation, which has no bearings on force itself. As you know the courts deemed we do not have to retreat, and I feel we should not. It would be to the detriment of the public if we did so. I am very disappointed that the carotid restraint is to be no longer in the use of force policy. It is a tool that is proven effective without harming the unlawful subjects it is applied to. Scientifically and factually it rarely if ever does harm. Thousands of people are training everyday in the use of the carotid restraint, multiple times a day in gyms across the world. It is a safe and proven technique that can be used in a small area with little room to maneuver or against a larger suspect, or against a violent subject that is on top of a victim harming them. I do not understand why an effective tool would be taken away from us. It is taking a step back. I also do not understand how spike strips are a use of force. Can you use force against a vehicle, and does it count as multiple uses of force if there are multiple passengers? Overall I think the new policies will cause officers to hesitate and get themselves hurt, as well as taking more tools and options away from our ability to do the job.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement		I do not like the section regarding the Proportionality. This section should be same as one written in 5.02 Firearms
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The proposed document was put together with haste and lack of forethought, it is almost as if the author has no law enforcement experience. Anybody who has ever worked one night at a busy station realizes that the supervisory “shalls” are an absolute joke. To go over the radio and hog it with all the nonsense that the DGO implies while on an “A” call is ridiculous. I was always trained to keep the radio clear on a hot call so the responding officers can speak and put out pertinent information. To follow this DGO would be the absolute opposite of what every good cop would do. Unfortunately, a lot of this DGO is like this, 180 degrees away from common sense. When was the last time a suspect was injured during a carotid? That's right, never. Why would you take this usefull tool out of our tool belt? Would you rather have me punch the suspect repeatedly in the face while engaged in a ground fight, or simply apply a carotid? The Carotid is a humane way to take a person into custody. The options you are leaving me with are not
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Unnecessarily adds very subjective, irrefutable terms such as “thoughtful communication” and “proportionality.” The proposed draft seems too complicated and narrowly constructed to practically take into account an officer’s split second decision check downs in real time at the time of the occurrence. Very likely the language in the proposed draft will leave officers exposed to “Monday morning quarterback” opinions in court.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	: Eliminates the carotid, which is an appropriate tool and has never in my recollection caused serious injury or death. The “proportionality” clause for use of force. I do not, with my current understanding of Use of Force laws, need to exchange blows with a suspect merely because he is unarmed. If I have other force options such as OC/Carotid/or Baton, then I will employ

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>them to effect the arrest quickly and humanely without a prolonged boxing match. The Sergeant's responsibilities: If I am responding to a person with a weapon, or am in a 148, I do not want nor need to hear a Sergeant taking up precious airtime (which is a privilege to even have if you are on channel 2 or 4) broadcasting reminders about "protecting life, isolate and contain the suspect, maintaining distance, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources." I know from being a COP that I need to do all those things, and that I should effect an arrest or get a subject mental health care with the minimal amount of force needed, and that I should make every effort to do so without harming the subject.</p>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>The proposed General Order 5.01 is a vague and never truly defines what proportionality, de-escalation and sanctity of life is. Furthermore, it places a huge liability on any police officer taking police action and having to use the reasonable amount of force. The proposed General Order 5.01 is a huge disservice to the citizens of San Francisco, as it will force cops to take less action, even when appropriate. The language of proportionality forces officers to give up their personal safety and the safety of the public in attempt to appease the current political climate. It's also important to note that the highest priority of the SFPD is not the sanctity of human life; it is the protection of human life. Unfortunately, in our line of business, although all police officers value life, we know that taking life is part of the job, as it may be necessary to do so to save the lives of innocent people.</p>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>I think it is horrible. Police Officers are supposed to be impartial and only gather facts and evidence. We are required by law to apprehend any person who breaks the law. I feel that this revised order will put officers lives at risk as well as the general public because officers will second guess themselves and get hurt. Or worse yet let a violent person go so they don't get into trouble and an innocent person will be hurt or killed in the process.</p>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>Puts officers at a disadvantage when confronted with a hostile suspect. I believe that the proposed General Order 5.01 makes officers second guess themselves. This will cause officers and supervisors to put themselves in a potentially lethal situation. Furthermore, if an officer is confronted with a larger or better trained suspect, the lack of the carotid restraint or taser use means that cops will get hurt, or will have to engage in a prolonged fistfight or prolonged baton usage, both of which will look significantly worse in the public eye.</p>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>I'm worried that officers will be second guessed to death. There seems to be too much emphasis on what appears to be a pervasive culture of "lawful but awful" type verbiage and how we appear rather than protecting officers placed in dangerous situations. I get time, distance and shielding. I get trying to communicate with a person armed with a weapon other than a firearm. What I fear is an officer being hurt or killed while trying to apply the items to the letter in the prosed GO 5.01. As a member of the specialist team I think too that ALL SFPD OFFICERS should be trained and equipped with CED's and 40 MM's. Let us stop the window dressing. Let's implement true changes that will resolve incidents with the highest probability of saving human life but protecting SFPD officers as well.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	leaves out reasonable standard, to many “shall” in a dynamic life threatening situation “shall” will become dangerous to all parties. “PROHIBITED USE OF CONTROL HOLDS. Officers are prohibited from using the following control holds: a. Carotid restraint; and b. Choke hold.” = joke
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	During a potential ground fight a member that is unable to subdue a subject by utilizing a carotid restraint might have to resort to firearm because they are “prohibited” from attempting a restraint move. Why would the department limit the use of techniques that could be utilized prior to a firearm? This policy is a scare tactic to prevent Officers from getting out of the car and making arrests. It is far too limiting and doesn’t take into account that every situation is different. what happened to the reasonableness standard ?
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Takes away non-lethal options, ties up the air with the supervisors broadcasting information that we are all aware of. Not sure how spike strips is a use of force when you are damaging personal property.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Deescalation is a given and we are taught from day one to use it, it doesn’t need to be the primary focus when encountering a subject. There isn’t time to add so many additional steps, its not practical and is apparent that non-law enforcement wrote the proposed DGO. If this DGO is implemented it’s only a matter of time until the delay caused by the additional steps gets a suspect, citizen or officer injured or killed.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Questions the ability of the officer does not put officer safety first will ONLY DISCOURAGE POLICE WORK Officers will reduce all types of public interaction with suspects. you will have an armed report taking/writing police department due to fear of making mistakes as outlined in the proposed 5.01 Officers will get HURT or KILLED because of doubt built in from the new proposed DGO
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Taking away the carotid restraint is limiting what and options officers have to subdue a suspect. This opens the door to more officers being injured and potential injuries to suspects.
<u>Taraval Station</u>	Investigative	20	taking away the carotid for no apparent reason does not make sense. Thoughtful communication..what is the proper voice intonation? I have a problem with the proportionality section... so if a jaywalker refuses to comply and resists arrest are we no longer able to use whatever force necessary to overcome his resistance?
Taraval Station	Investigative	11-15	Taking the carotid away is terrible, its a very useful technique. The language of the type of offense should dictate our use of force is horrible and will lead to no SIA.
Taraval Station	Investigative	6-10	limits even further, less then lethal “tools,” instead of giving us more. It lowers Officer safety by treating dangerous situations like barricaded suspects when most situations are totally different. I feel like a lot of stuff has been added that will confuse officers, add seconds that delay them in making split second decisions that are being Monday morning quarterbacked or make them hesitate when the meat of the DGO is mostly the same. You use force for your safety, the safety of others, etc.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Taraval Station	Plainclothes	11-15	I believe that the carotid restraint is an important tool in our current force options and should remain.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	<p>The language in the proposed policy is very confusing and vague. It appears to open officers up to civil and possibly criminal liability. The UOF policy should be straight forward and clear to all officers. This policy is filled with a lot of “touchy/fealy” language that is irrelevant and confusing. According to the proposed policy, we are required to be therapists/psychiatrists, mind readers. The department seems to be hanging their hats on CIT trained officers. Many of the proposals are unrealistic for example calling in Crisis/Hostage Negotiators and CED officers as a de-escalation tactic. First of all HNT will not respond to a call of a person with a weapon without TAC also responding (I know this from experience) so are we going to have a critical incident every time someone has a knife? Is that GO going to be changed also? it is proposed that CED’s only be given to Tac and specialists. We have no specialists on duty at most times in the Taraval. We also do not have the staffing on hand to make every weapons call a critical incident as proposed in the new UOF. San Francisco is very densely populated and I do not believe in, most cases, we will be able to allow suspects roam around with their weapon while we step back and give them space without endangering the citizens. “Duty to Intervene”-first I’m not a mind reader and don’t know when a fellow officer is “about to use excessive force”. If officers do not believe another officer used excessive force but a complaint is later sustained by OCC will the other officers on scene also get a sustained added allegation for not reporting the “excessive”UOF or intervening? Supervisors Responsibility (when officers are dispatched to a subject with a weapon)-supervisors would be required to tie up the air reminding officers of a whole list of things including protecting life and thoughtful communication??? is this a joke?? Officers are responding to a dangerous situation and the air should remain clear so that the officers responding could actually get helpful information such as updates from dispatch regarding the situation. Prohibiting the use of the Carotid is ridiculous. Why are they taking away a non-lethal option for officers when we have never abused this nor has there ever been an issue (that I’m aware of) with a SFPD officer using this. I could actually go on and on with the problems that I have with this proposed policy. I know that in todays climate, we are perceived as the “bad guys” to some people but there has got to be a better way of dealing with their perception of us. This proposed policy is going to put the citizens and the officers in more danger. The officers, especially the younger less experienced ones, are going to hesitate and as a result someone is going to get hurt.</p>
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	<p>It’s burdensome, it puts Officers and Sergeants in harms way, both physically and administratively by leaving them vulnerable to punitive actions by the administration. I understand ‘time’ and ‘distance’ but that isn’t always practical when the Suspect isn’t in an area where he/she can be contained. Are my officers out of policy if they just grab the suspect so the suspect doesn’t get away rather than just contain? The Policy doesn’t make that clear. What if the Suspect is armed with a bat, pipe, knife anything that could hurt my officers that isn’t a gun are my officers not allowed to shoot the suspect if all other means fail just because it will be ‘perceived’ as unjustifiable?? Are they supposed to shoot at his hands rather than center mass</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	as trained?? Are they to risk injury or death by tackling the armed suspect because that would be 'perceived' better?? I as a Sergeant won't put my people in harms way just for the sake of perception! And the Taser Policy is a joke! If I read that correctly, if the suspect walks away from me I can't tase him?? I can shoot him but not tase him?
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Proposed policy requires Sergeants to review a list of precautions that tie up the air. In addition, this could backfire on officers and be used against officers.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Taking away options like the carotid limits officers choices especially with an unarmed violent resister.Proportionality??? Not clearly defined and contrary to safety and training.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	<p>1. Why would does the new Order ban us from using the carotid restraint? I have witnessed the carotid used multiple times and I have never seen the Suspect receive serious injuries. Most of the time I didn't see them even get minor injuries. The times I have seen it used, other lesser force options were ineffective. I fear if the carotid restraint is taken away from us the only options for detaining a Suspect, when lesser force options are ineffective, would be baton or other strikes/punches. I believe these levels of force would cause more serious injuries and look much worse to the public. I don't believe this is what the public wants. Also, I don't think the ERIW is as effective as the carotid restraint. I've seen the ERIW deployed at Suspects with no affect. But each hit produces serious injures compared to the carotid. If we keep the ERIW I think the carotid should also be an option.</p> <p>2. The revision marked "F. Supervisors Responsibility" which relates to Suspects with weapons. I agree that a Supervisor should respond to the location to take charge at these type of incidents but I don't agree with the requirement that a supervisors to inform responding officers this entire second section: "Remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance., find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources." My first fear is this requirement will delay officers responding to weapons calls and endanger the public while listening to the above admonishment. We will also be delayed and unable to hear relevant information while a supervisor reads this admonishment over the air or meets with units prior to responding to a call for service. It doesn't seem like the public understands the volume of armed suspect incidents that we currently respond to multiple times a day. Does the public realize that the majority of those end when we detain the Suspect peacefully or that each of us is already trained to deescalate a situation and a lot of us has had multiple experiences dealing with armed Suspects? By reading this revision, I don't believe the author understands what we are doing daily. Again this is why I believe it would be beneficial to have police officers sitting in with any discussions on any revisions. Unintentionally, I think the people who wrote this section are endangering the public of San Francisco, many of them are also my family and friends and I fear for there safety. I believe a lot of the changes in this order should be reserved for a general training of the Department and not a GO for responding officers that are required to make split second decisions to protect the public.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	This further proposed limiting of resources endangers the officers working patrol and limits the abilities those officers have in addressing issues facing the residents of the City of San Francisco. Creating time and distance looks fine on paper but fails to consider that this is not the officer's decision. Suspects determine where and when we act and react. In a vacuum, this policy makes sense. In reality, rarely have I had the luxury of creating time or distance (except when running away and I'm not going to do that to the people I serve!).
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The carotid restraint when used correctly can save lives. When an officer is engaged in a ground fight with an aggressive attacking suspect, and there is an option to use a carotid restraint to subdue the aggressive attacking suspect during ground fighting, it should not be prohibited. An officer in defense of themselves may get hurt or killed if that option is prohibited, or hesitate in fear of possible future indictments which may result in the officer succumbing to GBI or death. The cartotid restraint if applied correctly will save the life of the aggressive combative subject from other higher levels of force or other lives as well.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	De-escalation is an awareness technique all should have acquired in training.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Negatives: 1.Carotid restraint removal. 2.Restrictions on proposed Taser usage and deployment only to tactical and specialists. 3.Use of force entry for drawing firearm.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	You cannot un train people of things that are second nature, such as the carotid restrain. Unrealistic that you would have to fire your weapon twice and then evaluate. Criminals will exploit the new DGO and officers might hesitate when in danger. There will always be scenarios that you cannot plan for, such as a take on where the suspect goes sideways. The new DGO relies on planning for known situations, such as armed subjects etc.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I could see with how cumbersome this proposed GO is, there is almost no use of force where OCC or an attorney could find us at fault for failing to follow anyone of the dozens of "Shall's" listed.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	This new DGO draft took away too many tools (carotid restraint) for us Officers to use that keeps the subject/suspect and the public safe.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I find it to be very restrictive and unreasonable. It is great for a controlled environment, say a court room, but in real life things are fluid and often, unfortunately, violent.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Will there be a class on thoughtful communication? You CANNOT expect officers to give advice without any type of structure or guidance and the CIT class won't cut it as a class where officers are taught thoughtful communication. What happens when the officers' give advice that isn't helpful and something bad comes out of it? What happens if there are NO officers that can engage in "thoughtful communication"? Are you willing to take full responsibility for EVERYTHING an officer says when they are trying to engage in "thoughtful communication"? "Supervisors are to remind officers to protect life, isolate and contain subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication, and call for resources." Anything else we should do? Is this a joke? I believe that anyone that has taken the oath (whatever oath

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			that is up to date and we are forced to take) KNOWS that we are supposed to protect life. I bet you can ask any of the officers involved in ANY officer involved shooting that they were trying to protect life, whether it is theirs or the publics, and THAT is why they shot and STOPPED the threat. This is just insulting. Duty to intervene? What if one officer sees something that another officer doesn't see and the first officer utilizes the appropriate level of force, BUT the other officer thinks that it is too high of level and intervenes? Then what? They both get hurt or killed? Don't get rid of the carotid. It is NOT a choke hold and it is taught PROPERLY and CORRECTLY at the academy. The level of force should be proportionate to overcoming resistance and effecting the arrest, NOT to the level of crime.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Very vague. What does proportional use of force mean?
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I disagree with the removal of the carotid.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	“Any force should be proportional to the severity of the offense committed for which the officer is taking action” This is ridiculous. If a person is a 148, the last thing an officer should be thinking about is the reason they came in contact with that person. We all get that it is sometimes possible to avoid 148's by way of communication, but not always. We are still Police Officers, and if we give a lawful command, a person must comply. If they don't, we make them. If verbal persuasion is reasonable first, then we try that, but eventually they are going to comply, voluntarily or not. The fact that an officer initially contacted them for a low level offense does not mean the Officer should hesitate or hold back in overcoming resistance or effecting an arrest. That would place the Officer in danger. Secondly, banning the carotid restraint is a huge mistake. It is a hugely effective tool and has been used on numerous occasions to end what would have otherwise been prolonged and dangerous fights. Without the carotid restraint, a much greater chance exists for the suspect, and the Officer, to get injured in a fight. Banning it seems like nothing more than a panic move spurred by an incident from 3000 miles away that had nothing to do with the SFPD. Thirdly, well... When officers are dispatched to or on-view a subject with a weapon, a supervisor shall immediately: -Remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources.” Asinine. That would take way too much time on the radio and is simply unrealistic.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	One of the main downsides is that the carotid restraint is eliminated. Supervisors are required to broadcast too much information while en route to an armed subject incident. This is not practical and ties up the air during critical moments.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	We are losing tools like the Carotid. The new GO seems like a more involved and slower process that may endanger officer in quick dynamic life threatening situations.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I do not believe Officers have acted in a way that would cause a necessary change in our current Use of Force Policies. Considering how many calls for service Officers respond to on a daily basis, it is extremely unreasonable to change our tactics strictly as a result of political pressure.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It took away the carotid restraint, which is a very handy tool when trying to control a 800 subject who is actively resisting and will not risk further injuries to the officers and/or the subject
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Losing the Carotid restraint hold is going to place Officers in jeopardy when a subject is violently resisting arrest and trying to hurt or kill an Officer. Having “pointing of firearm” as a reportable use of force is going to cause Officers to pause, hesitate, and second guess their actions during times where seconds are vital.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Why take away a tool, corroded, when it is a technique that works and has never been misused.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I believe that the proposed changes has been politically motivated. The whole section regarding “proportionality” contradicts state law as it is stated in 835 PC (which was removed from the proposed 5.01) which clearly states “A peace officer who makes or attempts to make an arrest need not retreat or desist from his efforts by reason of the resistance or threatened resistance of the person being arrested; nor shall such officer be deemed an aggressor or lose his right to self-defense by the use of reasonable force to effect the arrest or to prevent escape or to overcome resistance.”
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	No carotid, and eriw elderly and child is vague. 65 year olds can pose a threat that needed to be subdued by eriw as well as 13+
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Any alterations to the Current Use of Force Policy would be made for political reasons, which would make an officer’s already difficult job more dangerous.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I understand what the new order is attempting to achieve. However, no one situation is the same and the new order is being pushed when it has no real world application. Time an distance is common sense, when it is applicable. It is not a one size fits all option.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The carotid restraint is a useful non-lethal tool the officer has with dealing with an unruly subject while in a position of advantage. It’s especially useful for officers dealing with unruly subjects that are much larger than them. What’s even worse than removing the carotid restraint is have the “pointing of a firearm” as a reportable use of force. This proposal will get officers hurt, or even killed. We are living in a different political climate where criminals, murderers, rapists, thieves, and thugs do not fear law enforcement.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Negative: Removal/prohibition of carotid restraint regardless if member has been properly trained in it’s use for field operations.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The carotid restraint is a valuable technique that prevents higher levels of force from needing to be used. If it is removed, we only have firearms and batons to resort to, which aren’t always practical.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I think the proposed DGO complicates things for officers when a use of force situation is already a stressful situation.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Making sweeping changes based on the apparent legitimate and legal actions by officers in a recent OIS confuses me. The mere act of changing the use of force policy so soon after a shooting places a blanket of suspicion over the SFPD when the investigation is still on going.
<u>Tenderloin Station</u>	Investigative	16-19	Confusing terms, paints officers in a corner. Why are we loosing the carotid restraint. Where is the dialogue from the front line users, the cops on the street who will be guinea pigs finding out the hard way (EIS, OCC, IAD) the constraints an shortcomings of a poorly written UOF policy.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The carotid is a very effective under utilized technique that can quell a situation. I have used it several times on suspects who were larger than me without any problem. Why was it removed from the UOF options? By the way to hear Police Commissioner Dejesus refer to this technique as the “choky thing” on TV is embarrassing. Mandatory Medical Assessment for ERIW is not consistent with Dept. Bull 15-234. Which way do they want it?
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	this has been rushed through due to the Mario woods shooting. it is based on public comments and has very little to do with real life encounters
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It is complicated and verbose compared to current order, eliminating carotid is problematic. Any officer knows that using a lesser degree of force is desirable, and knows the value of de-escalation, and the definition of each type of force is unnecessary in the order. It seems more like a sales pitch for each use of force or an attempt to educate those unfamiliar with the levels of force in which SFPD officers are trained.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I have not read into it enough, as its very long, vague, and too much language. It needs to be more concise in how it is written, and will require much reading and memorization for officers to remember. At this time it is of my opinion when officers over think they will get hurt, and this currently proposed DGO may lead to this.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	running away and hiding will get an officer killed
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Who among the writers of this proposed order has any actual street level, police experience withing the last 12 months? Again, those making policy have little or no practical experience performing the tasks they expect the rank and file to perform.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It is written by a bunch of pandering pussies who don't work the streets.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It is horribly written and contradicts the stated orders. It leaves all the blame on the officer using force. If you use force you are wrong. The need to back off is bullshit. If the department passes this new order it will get what it wants. Report takers.....no more pro-active police work.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Disgusting piece of political nonsense. Following PERF will get Officers injured. Seems to be more about appeasing the vocal political anti-police types, then an actual G.O.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	it is wide open for interpitiation and leaves the officer open for unwarranted IA investigations and lawsuits
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Removal of caratoid restraint. Caratoid restraint is a very useful tool and I have used it effectively.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	too many changes in the language. the language is too broad and opens the officers to potential discipline.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	seems more restrictive than CA penal code
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Plainly, it's a crazy proposal. It does not take into account the safety of the general public or reflect reality in the field.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The negatives are so great it is difficult to list all of them. The limitations on who and when to use CED's. Prohibiting strikes to areas at all times without taking into consideration that these strikes could be the only options. The Sgts reading over the radio that would chew up air time when units may have emergancy trafic. Having the constant language to de-escalate using verbal judo will cause officers to hesitate and possibly drop their gaurd that could and will cause injury to officers not prepared for a suspect that can suddenly fly off the handle. Having it be a reportable use of force for pulling out your baton, threat to use CDE, or drawing your service weapon will make officers constanly have reportable uses of force opening them up to being perm on the early warning system.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It puts our lives and the citizens lives in danger.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It's going to get an officer seriously injured or killed
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This policy will cause many injuries and possibly death to our members. It expressly prohibits numerous previously allowed uses of force and takes tools away from street cops. It is also confusing in multiple parts and takes our policy away from both state and case law. A major step in the wrong direction.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I feel that the proposed general order 5.01 will endanger officers and the public.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I think the proposed changes will compromise our safety and get officer hurt. The new changes will compromise public safety
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	the reasonableness standard was developed over years by our supreme court. For a department to not use the reasonableness standard and decide that they know better than the supreme court is ridiculous. The loss of the carotid restraint with no replacement force option for the general patrol function of the city (ie conducted energy devices) ultimately reduces our force options and increases the likely hood that lethal force will be used.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Proportionality-the level of force should never be proportional. A fair fight is a fight that can get someone killed or hurt. It's important that Officers know they should always use a level

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>of force higher than what the suspect is. That’s what prevents the most injury and prolonging fights. The duty to intervene paragraph is designed to implicate and assassinate the character of other Officers on scene for a use of force that is appropriate, but creates political unrest. This is an unnecessary addition that further demonstrates the separation of command staff from street patrol, and the bedfellow they’ve become to political movements hostile to the safety of law enforcement officers in the performance of their duties. I don’t mind that there isn’t a duty to provide medical assessment for complaints of pain within the use of physical control holds. Supervisors Responsibility-- Reminding responding officers of their duty to protect life is foolish, condescending, and encourages a waste of radio space necessary for the first of-ficers on scene. Removing the carotid restraint is an ABSOLUTELY FOOLISH decision. It is the safest option to subdue suspects who are unable to feel pain. It’s easy to employ by any size officer, quick, and effective. Whoever suggested and approved such an idea is obviously a slug and a coward. Know that by removing the carotid restraint, officers are being instructed by the department to continue hitting until the subject is unconscious for subjects on PCP or other extremes. This creates a incredibly dangerous precedence for officers and suspects.</p>
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>The proposed general order is a GREAT danger to Officers, as well as The Public we serve. THE proposed order on use of force spends more time on not using force that will cause Officers to rethink their trained and conditioned reactions. The proposed order tries to dress up using of force in an effort to be “politically correct” and as a result puts Officers lives in jeopardy. The proposed order is not consistent with California Penal code putting Officers in a position where they can legally have a justified use of force, but not be in compliance with department policy leaving the Officer to be sold out by their department for doing the right thing. Using force is something that Officers have to do when dealing with violent criminals, we can not stop what we are doing to rethink the sanctity of life on people who will not extend the same courtesy to you. Also getting rid of the carotid restraint eliminates a good non lethal use of force option that I have seen save an Officer and suspect from serious injury.</p>
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>Some uses of force and proposed uses of force were taken away and implemented in a way that is dangerous for the officer.</p>
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>In short: Unfortunately I think this proposed policy is a weak show of sympathy from our spineless leaders who do not speak for our department. I hope I do not have to attend a police funeral because someone hesitates in result of this ridiculous policy.</p>
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>I completely disagree about the proposed General Orders for the mere fact that it is dangerous for officers on the street. We were trained a certain way, which is a way to keep us safe and in the end, go home to our families. With this new proposal, officers may hesitate in certain close counter situations and end up getting severely injured.</p>
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>CAROTID RESTRAINT SHOULD NOT BE PROHIBITED! This is one of the best, safest, and most effective tools we have. The proportionality section needs to be clearer showing that force can be used if the subject escalates. ie: 585 or shoplifting wouldn’t normally warrant much force unless the subject resisted which would allow an escalation of force therefor being</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			proportionate to the offense of 148 not just the initial offense. Giving a “warning” call before the use of a weapon: in an already escalated situation (which would warrant the weapon) how does an officer warn a subject without sounding threatening? the public already thinks police are too aggressive so if we have to announce the use of a weapon first they might see that as even more scary than then telling the person to stop resisting and asking for compliance. Supervisor responsibilities: Requiring a supervisor to take up air time reminding officers of the laundry list required during an incident is unrealistic.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I believe the revised DGO will without question cause hesitation and even inaction by officers in dangerous situations. This will exponentially increase the dangers already faced by officers and result in an increase in officers injured in the line of duty.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I am not against an update on our use of force policy. However, these proposed policies are outrages and without due regard for officer safety. It is clearly a reactionary response meant to appease a small group of individuals (that do not represent the majority of the SF community), who are part of an anti-police hate group. An appropriate update to the use of force General Order 5.01 should take into consideration officer safety, reasonable and well rounded approaches that have been evaluated by subject matter experts (i.e. The members of this POA, the City’s Attorney Office that represents us and additional experts with actual law enforcement experience).
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Taking the carotid restraint out of the list of options only leaves a larger gap between lesser levels of force and deadly force. I understand the concept of proportionality, but its wording and placement in the DGO is downright dangerous.
<u>Traffic Division</u>	Administrative	20	Bad: “Proportionality” does not take into account if the suspect escalates the situation from a bus fare evasion (Kenneth Harding 2011) to a violent resistor. It does not address overcoming resistance. Also, an edged weapon is a deadly weapon therefore a proportional response would be lethal force if necessary, right? Its not clear. “Duty to Intervene” will have overreaching consequences. It will be used against officers who happen to be at a scene and anything “unbecoming,” no matter how minor, will be used against officers all officers on-scene. Officers will become named instead of just witnesses. “Supervisors Responsibility” item 2 is unreasonable. It is a very long rope to hang supervisors with if it is not complied with for whatever reasonable and legitimate reason. It does not allow for practicality. Carotid restraint is highly effective and no one has died from its use. Why take away an effective and humane tool?!!!! Rather us use injuring force?!!! This is a poor decision. Good: “Duty to Provide Medical Assessment” seems to allow for officers to transport to hospital if medical response is excessively delayed (Mark Garcia, 1996)
Traffic Division	Investigative	20	political B.S. We should not fold to political pressure and loud mouthed malcontents. we were hired to restore order. we are the guardians of the city against chaos
Traffic Division	Investigative	11-15	It ties our hands and sets us up for failure.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Traffic Division	traffic enforcement	16-19	not practical
Traffic Division	Traffic Enforcement	11-15	I feel it is a major officer safety issue, officers will be second guessing their actions in life and death situations that could possibly get them killed, if they hesitate.
Traffic Division	Traffic Enforcement	6-10	The current G.O 5.01 is fine the way it's currently written
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	There are no Positives to this Policy Change. The Only groups that will be negatively affected here will be the Officers of the SFPD and The Citizens were Sworn to Protect.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	the proposed GO impacts an officers ability to make a split second decision when encountering a subject.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Its vague, misleading and too much guess work for officers when quick actions are required to make split second decisions on proper use of force. Officers trying to determine a suspects mental condition/motive plus using space and distance (retreating) during every serious encounter {second guessing and hesitation} will more than likely have a negative impact on the officers survival/safety.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The terms "necessary" and "practical" need to be replaced with the current proper wording, objectively reasonable. Why are we losing the carotid? If we lose the carotid, higher levels of force will probably increase. The carotid is a very effective and safe technique. We should not be told to retreat. Case law and the penal code says we do not have to retreat.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	to many steps to protect ourselves
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	No carotid will put officers in danger and take out an effective tool Its a mess cops are not gonna know which way to turn these incidents happen in a split second I know from experience we do a fantastic job dealing with them Politics have no place in setting guidelines and this is not gonna appease the people who don't like the police. Unfortunaely there are some very dangerous people out there there will be more shootings this new policy is gonna paralyse the cops on the street and whoever came up with some of this stuff is out of touch with what really happens out there
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	complete garbage!!!! tasers only tac and spec!!! only to be deployed with an armed subject, garbage! No more carotid restraint? why not? very useful. why must we fight when we have use of force options that would keep us safe.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Extremely vague terms not defined (ex. what constitutes "isolating and containing the subject", no examples of "proportionality"). Terms such as "de-escalation" leaves a lot to interpretation.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The draft is very restrictive and creates an environment where members will be placed in harms way. The draft proposes restrictions that are contrary to well established case laws (Graham v. Connor). Example, Section I.D. (Proportionality). I have yet to find a court case that tells an officer to use "proportionality" when applying force. Does this mean, if the suspect has a knife, the officer should use a knife as well?

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Creating a buffer zone is not always effective or available without proper tools. Officer should not have to retreat.
	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Removes the carotid.
		6-10	