

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
<u>Admin / Headquarters</u>	Administrative	20	most of it is what we already have.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	Reportable if suspect claims injury... Should be claims injury beyond application of force ... Sgt investigation for incident is too much. I couldn't find the Sgt form , could be in the general member investigation manual.. pointing of firearms & tasers is burdensome, and will lead to not pulling a gun when needed and a tidal wave of use of force reporting
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	Supervisory responsibilities should be increased.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	There are use of force reporting requirements already in place for officers and supervisors. Not to mention mandated investigations conducted by superiors, OCC, IAD, and the District Attorneys Office. For supervisors to be required to get on the air and remind officers to "create distance", etc seems like "over kill." Officers receive training at the Academy and in FTO. Officers are deemed competent to work on their own or with a partner. Cops don't need to be told over the air what to do by somebody who isn't at the scene. Plus I believe this ties up the air when officers may need to broadcast necessary information. I believe most supervisors know when it's necessary to respond out to the scene during or after the conclusion of the incident.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	we need to do more reporting, more paperwork will ensure transparency with the public
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	While we are at it, why don't we include our verbal commands as a reportable use of force considering neither pointing a CED or a firearm are actual physical controls. Verbal commands are utilized for the same reason the CED and firearm are utilized- to let someone know they are not free to leave.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	Rediculous. Overblown polictical response to a NON political situation. Equate it to Someone using the word "Routine" on traffic stops. It doesnt, and NEVER will exist. Police work is NOT cookie cutter templates of situations .
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	Fairly well worded.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	My main concern would be with how this will effect EIS "points system" and cause more early warning flags...
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	11-15	Whoever drafts these use of force policies should have a minimum of 10 years street experience in a busy district. We have to make split decisions in fractions of a second sometimes. Any officer worried about following the guidelines of this new proposed D.G.O. 5.01.1 will get themselves killed.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	11-15	It's very simple. When you aim a weapon at a subject, current policy is sufficient in explaining to a person after the situation is safe the reason for aiming a firearm at them. The proposed policy, requiring officers to report that as a reportable use of force, will not only spike our use of force, making it SEEM our department is all of a sudden using a lot more force than before AND also, again have officers hesitate pull their firearm when rightfully so, in order to avoid being an officer who "uses force" often, due to the early warning system. USE OF FORCE IS NEVER PRETTY. It is often necessary to effect an arrest of a violent subject who CHOSSES to

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			resist arrest. The suspect ALWAYS dictates the use of force used upon them. The office is NEVER the aggressor as defined by state law and laws of arrest give peace officers the authority to use whatever force is reasonable to effect an arrest. The public will not care the break down of the use of force when the numbers are reported to the public by the media. All they will see is the XX% increase in reportable use of force due to that ridiculous policy.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	6-10	The current policy regarding when and how to report use of force incidents is a true and tried method, which has never been called into doubt.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	6-10	Creates unnecessary work and is attempting to “fix what isn’t broken”
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	20	There is nothing that REQUIRES the Department to include the pointing of a firearm as a reportable use of force. POINTING a firearm is not likely to produce an injury. There is now massive confusion amongst even the Department Command Staff as to what is, and what is not, aiming, Low Ready or ‘exhibiting’ a firearm.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	11-15	Over reporting is ridiculous. We are swirling ourselves down the toilet. Imagine the next Jonah Lamb article on the thousands per cent increase of UOF in SF, because of all the nonsense decisions to over report. Pointing a gun at a subject...okay, maybe under circumstances where it is intended and known to the subject. But we moving cops further and further behind the reaction curve. Taser = OIS? BS!
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative		I have no problem with reporting the use of force. I think it prudent and necessary in our job. The proposed order requests a detailed account of the use of force, including what attempts were made at de-escalation. Do I put down that I struck John Doe x number of times? or between x and xx number of times? What happens when my recollection differs from someone elses recollection? Or a video? Whether my number was lower or higher than what appears on the video or is reported by a witness, am I now going to be in trouble of falsifying my report? Also, the section on Proportionality is ambiguous. If I go to arrest someone for a petty theft, and the subject is non compliant and I use a physical control, the subject continues to be squirrely and the force goes up to gain compliance. Then the subject gets injured. Is that considered in proportion for the crime committed?
Admin / Headquarters	RTO	20	Police Officers will hesitate to draw firearms when completely justified to do so, or when they should and don’t.
Admin / Headquarters	range firearms instructor	20	Making officers report intentional pointing of CED and firearms at a subject would and has caused officers not to deploy their weapons
Admin / Headquarters	Training Division	20	The order doesn’t define what is considered pointing and who will determine what was intentional or not. I have concerns that this order will deter officers from drawing their firearms when it would be safer and wiser to do so.
Admin / Headquarters	Evoc Instructor	20	Basically I feel like soon enough if you raise your voice it is going to be a use of force. Where does this end so cops hands aren’t tied. The command staff damn well knows we are good cops who do a great job. They also have to understand that the more provisions they put on us, the

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			less cops are apt to do. Lastly they need to remember that the less we do, the worse they look. Keep making us roving secretaries and that is soon what they will get.
Admin / Headquarters	Training	11-15	There are numerous issues with the proposed new 5.01.1 including but not limited to: Pointing of firearms should NOT be mandatorily reportable. There may be limited situations that the courts require it, but not every time. Same for CEDs
Admin / Headquarters	Instructor	6-10	-Intentionally pointing a firearm or CED at someone should not be reportable. Reporting those may not only be excessive and cumbersome, but may also discourage officers from drawing their firearms when appropriate, leading to officers and/or the public being injured.
Admin / Headquarters	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	takes to long to write
<u>Airport Bureau</u>	Administrative	16-19	Don't agree with having to write a report each time a gun is pulled out of your holster. I don't think that is a reportable use of force.
AAirport Bureau	K9 Handler/Sergeant	20	Same as above. Police work in its most basic function is dangerous, and we get called to quell violent situations. To overburden police officers and sergeants in making "everything" a use of force is a waste of time, and again will take needed resources of the street. Officers will be hesitant to use force, and then they will be the victims of force by a subject who adheres to no personal code of conduct.
Airport Bureau	canine	20	Again the wording seems contrived and intentionally ambiguous.
Airport Bureau	K9	20	Create time and distance, don't respond, or take your time getting there.
Airport Bureau	explosive detection k9	20	More paperwork, making officers 2nd guess every action.
Airport Bureau	explosive detection k9	20	Any report of pain should be reported and documented in an incident report.
AAirport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The new rule will have officers second guess at an incident and might get hurt.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	pointing a gun is not a use of force, no physical force was applied, no physical injury occurred
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I don't mind reporting use of force, but who are we giving the information to. I have nothing to hide.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The proposed G.O. 5.01.1 makes no sense at all. Pointing a firearm should not be a use of force since there is no force used on a suspect. Point a weapon is no different then telling a suspect verbally to "drop the weapon or I'll shoot." So If I draw my baton and raise to to prepare to strike the suspect a use of force also? Well technically it is. Just like if I drew my can of pepper spray and pointed or aimed it at the suspect. Why are to two not a use of force? Therefore this G.O. make no sense at all.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It reads as if everything an officer does is considered force.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	In this day of technology documentation is an absolute, but to document a fire arm at the low ready as a use of force is not acceptable.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Pointing a firearm is not a use of force.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Any experience officer will tell you that every situation is different. An officer at a volatile situation where a subject is armed with dangerous weapon, may not have the time or resources to be able to apply the tactics mentioned in the proposed order. We have to remember that there is a lot that goes thru an officers mind, not to mention the stress level, that may effect his decision making.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I disagree with any revision of the current G.O. There is nothing wrong with the current one.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Every time you point your firearm or conducted energy device at a subject, that's a use of force entry?
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	By requiring officer to document every time they take out their firearm may result in hesitation that could prove to be deadly.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	No I am not.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I have no problem reporting use of force.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The city is supposed to back up our Officers not tie their hands from helping the public. The public is going suffer more and more violent incidents due to this new weak policy change.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Rushed with no street officers input!
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Too many to name but a few examples: Q50 reminding officers about distance while en route to a weapons call. Officers trained to make decisions and to call for a supervisor when in doubt - no more carotid - proportionality - no more shooting from a moving vehicle...
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	See attached notes
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Pointing a weapon at someone is not a use of force. Pointing a device does not cause injury.
AAirport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	This will cause confusion and cops will second guess their own designs. The problem is the public's view of police work through the social media's eye. You can't have the cake and eat it too.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It will create hesitation by officers in dangerous situations, placing them in more danger.
AAirport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The department will see undoubtedly see an overwhelming number of its members be place on the early warning system.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The additional reporting requirements as to documenting attempts to de-escalate the situation will cause officers to second guess themselves during an incident. For the most part we do not go into a situation attempting to use force, it is a last course of action when talking has been exhausted or the situation calls for immediate action. The proposed additions to the the use

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
<u>Bayview Station</u>	Administrative	20	of force reporting is second guessing every action that an officer takes, and assumes that an officer is incorrectly using force .
Bayview Station	Investigative	6-10	pointing a firearm at a person is not force. I have no problem w/a policy that states every member must write a report when pointing a firearm, but to put it on the use of force log triggers EIS for just being safe.
Bayview Station	Investigative	6-10	I've already seen officers not drawing their guns on a felony stop. At Bayview, we have a lot of felony stops. We were and have been trained to draw our firearms during any and all felony stops and because this has become a reportable use of force, (cops don't like paper), less and less cops are drawing down. Even if it is our guns are at low ready, and the bad guy coming out of the vehicle has a gun and intends to shoot at us, we have mere hundredths of a second to shoot. Having our guns at low ready because of a bulletin we have to comply with, will can cost officers their lives.
Bayview Station	Plainclothes	11-15	doesn't matter when, we always report use of force....
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	As a Sergeant already go to calls where the potential to use force or force has been used, I know what my job is.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	We are charged with enforcing the law. The word is in the job title. Everything we do is force. When does the public have to submit to our authority? The minute someone says no, force is being applied, verbally or physically. We will never be on the street.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I think the current General Order is actually more detailed than the proposed General Order regarding reporting of force.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I think the current General Order is actually more detailed than the proposed General Order regarding reporting of force.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	As a supervisor, I don't mind having to fill out a form to show officers used the appropriate amount of force.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Irrelevant
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Having out of San Francisco uses of force entered into a log at DOC is ridiculous. Who is responsible for entering that, the officers supervisor? So they now have to drive to DOC and make an entry into that use of force log, that is an unnecessary burden on the supervisor. There is no reason not to allow the supervisor to make the entry at their own district station. This order section B. 3 also speaks of "uncertain situations" regarding the identification of witnesses. I do not know what an "uncertain situation" is.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The proposed DGO change seems like a knee-jerk reaction in need of far more input from the membership.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	how does this bridges communities and the police department
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing a gun is not a use of force; there is no injury as a result (unless you discharge that firearm, then its a different story). EIS cases are going to go through the roof...

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Unnecessary changes to a policy that works. Changes that endanger officers, the public and ultimately will go back to the department in some shape of form.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I think its again going to officers hurt or in trouble. It is going to cause people to hesitate and creates more work that bogs down hard working people. Instead of streamlining things this makes things harder for everyone and caters to public sensitivity.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	pointing a firearm at someone should not be a reportable use of force.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	i get the fact the courts made this ruling. but need to change EIS....
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing a gun at someone is not a use of force.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	5.01.1 seems to lead to the fact that if an Officer patrols an area, where Subjects are known to be uncooperative and commit dangerous crimes, and the Officer has to now use “reportable use of force” (i.e. pointing of firearm), that Officer will now be documented as one with “excessive” Use of force when compared to other districts or departments.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Why isn’t this included in 5.01?
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I noticed that section II.A.1.b., requires officers to explain how they attempted to de-escalate the situation prior to using force. This should include, “when feasible or practical.” There are numerous situations where this is problematic. One instance is when an officer’s use of force is solely comprised the pointing of a firearm at a suspect. There are generally no opportunities to utilize de-escalation techniques in this scenario. It is also out of industry standards to view the pointing of a taser at a suspect as a reportable use of force. In section, II.A.2.a., the phrase, “when practical or feasible” would be beneficial. There are numerous situations that the officer using force cannot fulfill those requirements.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Who wrote this, a group of college kids on an NPR group think?
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed GO is not in line with other law enforcement agencies in Northern CA.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	PROPOSED POLICY FAILURE DEFINITION OF INJURY. INJURY IS NOT CLEARLY DEFINED OFFICERS AND SUPERVISORS SHOULD HAVE A CLEAR DEFINITION OF INJURY. In regards to Section B. Use of Force Notification. It is not the duty of an officer to determine that another officer’s use of force was excessive and or unnecessary. In regards to Section C. Evaluation of Use of Force, from time to time officers have personality conflicts with supervisors. Certain situations supervisors respond to the scene in order to conduct use of force investigation. In the event that a personality conflict exists and a supervisor makes a determination of excessive force while not being on scene. What civil, administrative, and criminal remedies and or protections are available for officers in those situations?
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Reporting the use of pointing firearm may cloud an officer’s judgement. It should not be hesitated.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I think this proposed general order discourages us from using force when necessary.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed reporting of Use of Force is unreasonable. The mandated time offered after “warnings” have been given allow the subject ample time to develop a plan to thwart the force action.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Contradicting. Pointing a firearm at someone is a use of force however when you point a firearm that is painted orange (ERIW) it is somehow not. I do not agree that pointing a firearm should be a use of force in the first place. It is going to get someone hurt.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	In the line of duty as peace officers we are in situations where unprecedented events occur. making a report every time we draw our department issued firearm simply expresses to the public that we are actually using more force and not deescalation techniques.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	its understandable that force should be reported
<u>Central Station</u>	keeper	20	I am dissatisfied that a supervisor will have to go over the air and hog up air time to enroute to a weapons call and remind officers to protect life, use thoughtful communication, move to cover. This is ridiculous. I am also disturbed that the public wants us to use more less lethal things and carotid is now a prohibited control hold.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This proposed policy is dangerous to all officers. Officers will second guess themselves because of this policy and if the officer survives whatever incident he or she faces, they will be strongly criticized by the media, lawyers and or jurors.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It will negatively affect officers by subjecting them to needless use of force entries, i.e. pointing a firearm.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Reported use of forces will skyrocket along with EIS investigations.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This GO appears to be written as a way for OCC to sustain complaints. You must explain your complete reasoning and steps through out the report writing process. It places an unfair burden on officers during a stressful and dangerous situation.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	i do not like the evaluation of use of force
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	What’s next? If you raise your voice it’s a reportable use of force?
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Pointing a firearm at a suspect should not be a reportable use of force. This is a knee jerk reaction and does not help the department in anyway.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Report writing requirements contain an implicit assumption that de-escalation efforts are always required where in fact there are many situations where decisive and immediate action is safer and more appropriate for all involved. Mandates, yet another form, which we haven’t seen but based on past efforts is bound to be a mess. (Anyone remember the code-3 justification form?)

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	POINTING A GUN AT A VIOLENT SUSP CAN BE A TIE BREAKER THAT PREVENTS A DANGEROUS SITUATION FROM UNFOLDING. SINCE WHEN IS POINTING A GUN AT SOMEONE AND NOT PULLING THE TRIGGER A USE OF FORCE? THAT'S AS STUPID AND LUDICROUS AS SAYING STANDING AT PORT ARMS AT A DEMO WITH YOUR BATON UNRINGED IS A USE OF FORCE. IDIOTIC!
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It will cause Officers to not want to go hands on or do anything, causing the general public to be in dangers now as well as police officers
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Reportable use of force: says we have to report sue of force when someone claims to be injured by use of CED, however the CED oder states that ALL CED deployments shall be documented and that the UOF be entered in to the UOF log?
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	This order is open to far too much interpretation. Pointing a firearm, one officer's low ready might be higher than another officer's. Who determines what "pointing" is? Is it the officer's intent? Perception of the suspect/citizen? Supervisor's belief?
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Negative: If you point your department issued firearm at a subject then it is reported as a use of force and not as a de-escalation.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	In my opinion, directing a firearm is not a reportable use of force.
CCentral Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I don't have any strong opinions on the proposal aside from the fact that the Early Intervention System (EIS) will now be completely useless unless they modify the amount of entries required for the system to be activated. Under the new proposal, all working officers should be on EIS based on the amount of times an average officer is forced to point their firearm at a suspect in the performance of their duties.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	In some areas of the city we have to draw our firearms anywhere from 1 to 3 times every shift and if this "G O" deters officers from drawing their firearm it could result in an injured officer or a violent felon getting away.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The requirement for reporting the pointing of firearms or CEDs is unnecessary. It creates hesitation in officers (who are concerned about adverse personnel decisions as a result of our EIS system) and does not account for tactical realities in which multiple officers are facing multiple suspects. Does two officers pointing firearms at four occupants of a felony vehicle create 8 separate uses of force? The four alone per officers would trigger an EIS alert -- for a single incident.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	This states that if an officer uses force they must include their efforts to deescalate the situation in their report. Deescalation is not always an option.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I don't see the point in listing the de-escalation procedures when we already list the reasons for why we used force in the first place.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Redundant. can be included in 5.01
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Uses of force will sky rocket and it will show an inaccurate and disproportionately high rate of use of force.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	“ efforts to de-escalate prior to the use of force” the incidents that i have used force, it was the subject began to resist during an attempt to detain the subject, there was no time to attempt to “de-escalate” the situation.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	This will create hesitation and officer safety problems to officers. Example, felony vehicle stops. How can we prove intent?
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	It is not a use of force to point your weapon at someone. You are only discouraging Officers from bringing their weapon out in times of need, and placing all Officers in danger. I have already been put in situations where I was less lethal, and my partner did not pull out his lethal for fear of having a use of force report. A lot of new people are now afraid to pull out their weapon in times of need. This policy has made it so new people are scared. Criminals have guns, and no rules.
<u>Ingleside Station</u>	Administrative	20	By all means keep records of use of force incidents so we can improve our training and tactics, but change the EIS to reflect the new documenting so Sgt’s are not constantly doing pointless paperwork
Ingleside Station	Investigative	16-19	I don’t think it’s bad to document the incident but it definitely should not count for E.I.S and be compared to other uses of force.
Ingleside Station	Investigative	16-19	An update of the Use of Force log is long overdue, however, classifying the pointing of a firearm or ECD, or laser aiming device, as a reportable use of force is bad. An officer is likely to start triggering the Early Intervention System repeatedly when it should not be activated. Sure reporting the pointing of a firearm can be required in an incident report might be OK, and even tracking the pointing might be good, with an eye toward determining if the threat of lethal force can actually de-escalate a situation might also be helpful. This requirement will result in an officer being injured or killed, because he/she did not prepare him/herself for a potentially lethal situation before the actual shooting starts.
Ingleside Station	Investigative	11-15	Seems a bit redundant to the current policy. I also note the creation of yet another form to fill out. One might argue that the pointing of a firearm (felony stop, etc.) is itself useful in de-escalation (the suspect sees that there is no escape, outnumbered, etc.)
Ingleside Station	Investigative	6-10	I believe creating a GO strictly for reporting the use of force is unnecessary. The GO repeats what steps are already employed.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Every officer already knows that you have to explain what the suspect did to make you use force. how much force you used and what kind of force and when the Sgt. was notified and did the Sgt. respond if not why.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The Supreme Court's decision has arbitrarily and unavoidably complicated "use of force." Persuasion generally, whether by virtue of "outreach communication" on the one hand or weapons deployment on the other might be better served by creating a its own orders for deployment and reporting altogether separate from an actual Use of Force. In any case, the issue requires a great deal more discussion before implementing a knee jerk reaction.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	not a use of force...unnecessary....will make officers be slower to defend themself
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Too ambiguous and not based on reality.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The EIS's will go through the roof. for what ?
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Positive: It is now codified where City wide units shall log the use of force. I've been assigned to the investigation bureau, the tactical unit, and to VRT. It was always ambiguous where the use of force should be logged, at the district station or the unit(s), when multiple officers from different units used force in the same incident. Negative: The amount of incidents where reportable use of force is being logged is greatly increasing with the inclusion of pointing a firearm as a reportable use of force. The amount of EIS points needs to be increased before a review is done, or all patrol will be on EIS.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Much is already done by officers. Supervisors having to stay undermines another supervisors coming on to shift.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I do not believe that we need an entire G.O. for use of force reporting. The part that stands out is that if I am the supervisor that conducted the investigation, I shall stay to approve the report. Utterly ridiculous and a waste of money to pay a supervisor OT should an officer get stuck on a late investigation in which he or she used force.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Good wording, somewhat common sense actions.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I have no strong opinion regarding the propsed DGO 5.01.01.... I do however believe that the E.I.S. needs to be amended. "Pointing of a firearm" during a "felony traffic stop", "building search (on an alarm or 459 call), while "searching to contact" (during an active shooter), and "covering a window/door/hallway" (during a search warrant), would all result in "Uses of Force" and would place numerous Officers on E.I.S. and require documentation/statements and take more cops off of the street.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I feel that having a list of Officer's Responsibility (II. A. 1) creates a situation where de-escalation seems more important rather than immediately using reasonable force to establish control over a subject when an opportunity arise. I understand the reasonableness of trying to de-escalate, but not every incident is going to have the luxury of time and distance. I feel that if such a requirement is in place, I will probably be in violation in the future of such policy. I have used physical control on an altered subject to prevent a potential violent confrontation. Having this policy in place would question my tactics and possibly put me in violation of this policy.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It is designed to get cops in trouble. A cop should have all advantages in a gun fight not worry is the Chief will have to apologize at a community meeting. that is what chiefs get paid for.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I don't think that the pointing of firearms should be considered a reportable use of force. As long as it's documented in a report and a supervisor is involved, I think that should suffice.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	What does the new form entail and why have we not been provided a copy of it? Shouldn't we also be including things related to the subjects size, fighting ability, demeanor, prior history of assault weapons possession, posture, access to improvised weapons and what types of force were not an option based on the situation?
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It lists pointing of a CED as a reportable use of force but pointing an ERIW is not. Both are considered less-lethal options, but are being treated differently.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Proposed DGO creates additional work and increased paper trail, and also will impact officers in a negative way by placing them in EIS for just drawing their handgun. This will cause officers to hesitate and second guess themselves.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing a firearm at someone should not be a reportable use of force. This will have the human engineering result of making officers not having their weapon ready when necessary.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing a firearm at someone should not be a reportable use of force. This will cause officers to hesitate, and could get them hurt or killed.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing a firearm should not be a reportable UOF. It can be a UOF, but lower on the list. I would think it could be down by verbal or baton strikes.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Its garbage
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Pointing a taser at someone is not and should not be a use of force. Its going to come to us warning someone that force may be used and calling that a reportable use of force.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Current option works well already.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	While I understand the necessity of tracking incidents where officers point their firearms or conductive energy devices at suspects, I think it is inappropriate to label this a "use of force." For one, it's a misnomer; no actual force is used when a weapon is pointed. For another, it's a waste of department resources and time. A relatively simple investigative detention report becomes a much larger investigation with a supervisor responding to the scene, additional notifications to be made and so on. And a high risk vehicle stop now takes multiple officers off the street to write statements.

<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 Use of Force reporting is contrary to the idea of color blind equal application of law enforcement. An Officer in the Taraval District will likely have a higher percentage of AM or AF Use of Force and E585. That is the nature of the population of that District. Officers in the Southern District will have a different gender and race metrics--with these numbers changing even according to shift. A Day watch Southern Officer may have a high percentage of WM and WF statistics. A Swing or Midnight watch Southern Officer may have a high percentage of BM, BF, HM, HF statistics in comparison simply due to the changing racial make-up of those who walk the streets at night as compared to daytime.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I feel the current policy is sufficient and the proposed additions would do nothing that would be a benefit to the work.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	It is a terrible idea. We should follow the examples set fourth by the supreme court with reasonbleness.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	our use of force is repoted in our incident reports. the log is redumdant. i do not know of any other department who uses a log.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I believe that uses of force absolutely need to be reported but if an officer needs to report every time he or she comes into physical contact with a citizen it will unnecessarily tie up much of that officers and that officers supervisors shift.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Once again it has to do with our new use of force policy. I believe that reporting part seems acceptable as long as the use of force options are revised.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	current policy is efficient and meets all requirements.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Personal body weapons should not be reportable uses of force is the suspect is not injured or does not complain of injury. Pointing of firearms and CED's should not be a reportable use of force under current policy. A streamlined use of force reporting system will be necessary if this is desired. It should be noted that use of force reporting for these categories is not required by law. All subjects of use of force claim it is excessive. We will run out of supervisors very quickly if we are required to notify for every allegation of excessive force. Current procedures adequately accommodate such complaints. "Efforts to de-escalate" should not be a requirement for the use-of-force report. De-escalation is not an option in most use-of-force incidents.
<u>Investigations Bureau</u>	Investigative	20	Again, this will place our Officer's in harms way.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	The current use of force of log is more than adequete and reduces frivolous suits.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	We should all stay at the station like firemen.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	SAME AS THE ANSWER ABOVE. YOUR POLICY FAILED THESE OFFICERS AS THEY WERE NOT TRAINED CORRECTLY.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	I don't believe pointing a firearm is a reportable use of force or should be. Rather, it should be memorialized in incident report for investigative detention. Should not count against officer for force used.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Reporting the pointing of firearms etc....silly. This has made me hesitate already. No reason for this.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	The Early Intervention System (EIS) is currently written to alert on any action done with this proposed general order. A newer officer will second guess his/her self and will be injured and/or jeopardize public safety.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	I am not happy with the new reporting policies. Use of Force reporting should be limited to the injuries sustained from the suspect. Merely pointing a firearm at a suspect is not causing injury and therefore does not need to be reported. These new reporting policies will have an officer think more, thus hesitate, about the liability than their own officer safety.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Negatives: The pointing of firearms is a mandated report of force
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	This order seems reasonable.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	Proportionality is flawed. It is deeply flawed and is not in line with best practices.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	It's misguided. Although the new use of force reporting will include data regarding age, race and sex. It should be noted that most often we point guns at people during high risk traffic stops and building searches prior to even being able to determine the person's age, race and sex.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	It takes away a force option, putting Officers at risk. The wording puts too many limitations on the Officers. "Shall" always give a warning?? That's not always reasonable.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	The fluff included in this policy will cause Officers to hesitate and then we will have dead Officers. This is a poorly written policy that truly reflects the fear of liability that has grossed this administration.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	The new reporting proposed policy puts the liability not only with the officers, but also with the supervisors in making immediate determinations on whether the use of force was acceptable or not. If OCC or another entity later rules that the use of force was not justified, then the sergeant or supervisor making the initial determination is at risk.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	The Carotid restraint is a good tool when needed. When used, it prevents the need for greater force and resultant injury to the subject and the officer.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Use of force is going to go up, EIS is going to go up, and we are going to look bad to the public.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	The transfer of liability, whether vicarious or actual, will save the Dept in a press conference, but will burn a cop or a supervisor. Again I beg the question, why are we doing this? All units should have a U of F log

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Why do Supervisors need to remind officers via the radio to de-escalate, create distance, etc. If we train Officers let us allow them to do their jobs. The last thing they need in an already stressful situation is a Sgt in their ear distracting them from what they are already doing. Those distractions could compromise officers safety and the de-escalation process. These are grown adults not children.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	I do not understand why officers who are on the front line were not involved in any discussions regarding changes to the use of force DGO's. In a time when so much of our department's reaction to anything is based upon public perception, the command staff has given perception to the officers actually doing the job that their input is not viewed as relevant or necessary.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	I do not understand why an Officer has to articulate their de-escalation. Why does every potential resister have to be bargained with? Subjects in question are legally obligated to obey lawful orders. 835(a)PC does not state that Officers should "de-escalate" anything. Additionally, do not confuse this response with the advocacy of "quick force". I am merely stating that the California State law does not require the negotiation of surrender when effecting a detention or arrest, and it is confusing to me why our policy would. This order provides yet another avenue for the ignorant to question police arrests and detention. We are moving farther away from arresting the "bad guy" and are moving towards a police culture that has to pre articulate action and makes decisions more complex, thereby increasing the risk to Police Officers.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	It is clear that the policies are being written with a "monday-morning-quarterback" mind set. It is so limited that it does not take into account everything leading up to the incident where force is used. Trying to make a step by step process while not defining when de-escalation SHOULD and not SHALL be used, makes it incredibly difficult on the officers. Each situation is different, each subject is different, each officer is different. Trying to force officers to act uniformly in uses of force situation is not attainable.
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	3-5	SCOTUS decided that pointing of a firearm intentionally is a use of force, therefore I will abide by their decision and the decision of our Department to add language in this matter.
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I understand the change to writing a report, but I also think 9/10 a report was written. However, it being a reportable use of force will now cause hesitation and confusion. I drew my weapon, but did any part of my barrel sweep or point at, if for a second, any part, including the toe, of a person? When it doubt, it will be a use of force, or a sustained complaint..cellphone video or our own body cameras. Officers will hesitate! We are taught felony car stops, to point your weapon...everyone uses of force....but wait, if its just a felony want vehicle, is that proportional to me drawing my weapon? (another section, I know)
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The lack of Carotid Restraint means there is one less tool an Officer can use to protect him or herself during a dangerous confrontation. Other than that, 5.01.1 is fine.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>Mission Station</u>	Administrative	16-19	Officers should not be forced to decide what another officer was thinking during the time of a use of force.
Mission Station	Investigative	16-19	The changes add paperwork to supervisors duties.
Mission Station	Investigative	6-10	A sergeant now has to respond to all uses of force, even if no medical aid is needed? That creates an undue burden.
Mission Station	Investigative	6-10	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
Mission Station	Investigative	3-5	This makes the officer go into further detail about what he/she did not do than what he/she did do.
Mission Station	Investigative	3-5	I have no problem providing the information requested regarding a use of force incident.
Mission Station	Platoon Comm patrol/admin	20	Pointing a firearm at somebody is not a use of force and by making it suck, could imply that we are overusing our firearms when we are just being safe. Having supervisory make a speech on the air reminding officer to de-escalate takes up too much time and is unnecessary as cops are already trained. We are not reminding them to double knot their shoe laces.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Based on this proposal, every working police officer will be on the early warning system within 6 months.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	We do not need to start a new DGO numbering scheme with subsidiary e.g. 5.01.1. Put the reporting requirements in the 5.01 order as it currently exists. The current reporting requirements are satisfactory. Reporting should not be one officer for every one subject as if there are six officers at a felony vehicle stop and four suspects in the car --- you do the math. ridiculous.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Too wordy, to much time will be spent reviewing the DGO to ensure every bit of minutia is documented in the report. They are talking about using a form that has yet to be developed and vetted by the "stake holders".
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	We should not be questioned about taking our firearm out to the threat that is presented to us.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Spread Sergeants thinner and give them more paperwork, doesn't sound like very much actual supervision or mentoring will be going on.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The proposed draft requiring the pointing of firearms to become a use of force entry will de facto require officers to be placed on the watch list for participating in felony stops with more than one individual in the car.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The implication that Supervisors will have to do Use of Force Evaluations on officers is ridiculous. This makes it sound like officers have done something wrong when they haven't. Also, we don't have conducted energy devices and this should not be added into the order until every SFPD officer has one, and has been trained to use it.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Creates additional and unnecessary paperwork for supervisors as well confusion as to who is responsible for completing the paperwork and timeframe for completion.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I don't think the proposed order will track genuine and accurate use of forces. Ex: It is a significant difference between hitting someone with a baton compared to pointing a firearm at someone during a building search.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Proposed DGO reduces Use Of Force to almost blaming the Officer because of the actions of the suspect. More often than not, verbal persuasion is effective but not always. Officers are placed in violent situations without time to simply being able to "hug it out". This proposed DGO is going to place members lives directly in harms way.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Making pointing a firearm a reportable use of force is a bit much. I understand doing a statement for it, but do we really need to list it in the log? There was a felony traffic stop last week and I think the only reason everyone pointed their guns was because I was there and I have been pushing the fact in lineup to continue doing felony stops the way you were trained. Because there were so many occupants in the vehicle, 60 use of force entries had to be made! I have never cared about EIS, but it worries officers who have never been on it. One felony stop can easily put them on it, which again is making officer deviate from being safe. There will be more EIS investigations, which again I know is part of the job. But the way it is going, supervisors are going to be forced to be inside doing investigations instead of out on the streets supervising. Not to mention Sgts. Have to respond to all of the dangerous mental health calls. I just see big problems developing all around from the change in the policy. And we all know if it changes, there is no going back. Civilians/Supervisors/Board Members don't understand our job and the risks, but yet they are the ones pushing to make us unsafe. And if we let that 800 with a knife walk away so that the police don't hurt him, and then that subject hurts someone else, they will still blame us even though that is the NEW policy.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing our firearm at a suspect should not be a reportable use of force.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	nothing major appears to have been changed.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing of firearms and energy devices are not reportable use of force because it causes no injuries to anybody. In my opinion, you should 849b and complete a detention report if you detain somebody at gunpoint, but it should not be a reportable use of force.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Not only the pointing of firearm reporting requirement is ridiculous, but the information required to be documented in the police report is absurd ... what de-escalation techniques do we use before pointing a firearm at the occupants of a vehicle during a high risk stop? What type of warning do we give someone prior to reacting to a threat and protecting our self an others? Once again, these practices are not reasonable but even more ... they are unsafe!
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing a firearm at a person is making officers question their own safety and safety of fellow officers because they are concerned with a use of force documentation being done on them.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			Officer's responsibility for reports is outrageous. Having the verbiage SHALL makes it not an option for certain areas to be written. Every situation is different and does not allow for the steps to be taken. Officers should NEVER have to why a supervisor is or isn't doing there job in a police report. Doing this will have issues where a SGT leaves because they are off and the next SGT would read the report and won't know if the statements are true and accurate.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	How do I de-escalate a fist coming directly at me?
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	What is an excessive use of force? One where the person complains they are hurt so to avoid jail? What happens to the officer who is accused of excessive force?
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I do not agree with having to report pointing a ECD at a person. ECD is not a firearm and should not be an automatic use of force for pointing a ECD. Allegation of use of force should not be reported. Majority of subjects complain of use of force is not warranted when force is applied to them. I should not have to question my supervisor if they do not respond to the scene. Especially if I deem it necessary to point my department issued forearm at a subject. Sgt.'s should not have to respond to all use of force situations.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I only looked at the changes that would effect me as a patrol officer and those seem fine. I am unsure about the changes for supervisors and that is why I put neither agree/disagree.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I do not agree with pointing firearms should be reported use of force. It is as if subject's feelings is a reportable use of force.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I came from the Oakland Police Dept, where the exact same policies were enforced. Do you know what this created? No one was enforcing the streets or doing anything proactive because officers and sergeants were deluged with paperwork. We spent more time documenting meaningless things that no one was out on the street doing anything. Moreover, morale was crushed, and everyone felt like the dept was out to get them. There was no TRUST within the department (a huge component in leadership) and therefore no one did anything. We already document these UOF's, through our police reports. Also, we will eventually get CAMERAS, what more needs to be documented!?. If anything occurs that is suspicious, review it on the camera. You don't need to document it several times, it's just a time killer. We already are performing mindless time killers (we document things in our report narratives as well as the boxes such as "Notified CWB." Have you ever thought why is this relevant? It's not, and no judge cares. Why are we documented meaningless things. A Sgt needs to supervise and lead his team. With policies like this, he/she will not, they will just be in the office doing inane drivel.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I believe it leaves officers open to both getting hurt, and being punished by the department for acting reasonably in violent situations.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	5.01.1 should clarify whether firearms/CEDs being held at the low-ready position in the presence of a subject (not pointed) is or is not reportable use of force (as it was in the department bulletin).

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	There is no need to change the current policy.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I think the proposed use of force reporting is terrible. Having to report every time an officer points their department issued firearm at a subject is bad. In just the last month, I've had several reportable uses of force regarding pointing my firearm at criminals. Recently, I have also noticed many officers reluctant to draw their firearms in cases where it is imperative to do so. Many officers are now practicing poor officer safety because they are afraid to have to document pointing their firearm and they are concerned with being put on EIS. Lastly, with the new proposed use of force reporting, it would be reportable when using verbal persuasion, which is insane.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This policy change apparently ignores the numerous potential circumstances under which uses of force may be enacted by officers, and how such force may be reported.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The order is effective and provides clear instructions.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	It's more writing than is needed, but isn't wrong and won't get people killed.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	II(A)(1)(h) requires officers to explain in their incident reports why their supervisor did not take a specified action. Must an officer question their supervisor as to their reasons? This is unrealistic and antithetical to the officer/supervisor relationship.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	-pointing causes no injury -all of uses of force either cause injury or complaint of pain -im now required to report if i hurt someones feelings
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Reporting the Use of Force needs to be detailed and thorough.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I believe we shall report the use of force. But it is ridiculous to report "a use of force" if we draw our weapon. What force is being used? If I pull my baton out the ring is that a reportable use of force? If I'm on fix post at a demo and I have my 36' baton ring at port arms is that a use of force? I don't think it is. No Force was used. reporting these little things is taking away from the job.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Allegations of excessive use of force can be made by anyone in any circumstances because the term is so ambiguous. This will certainly limit officers in carrying out their duties in fear of reprisal by their accusers.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Comparing SF's policies currently in place and this ridiculous proposed policy not only related to UoF reporting, to my other two Bay Area agencies, both policies take away critical thinking skills of the individual officers.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I do not see an issue with the reporting proposal unless it is coupled with the new UOF proposed policy. Under the new policy UOF with increase dramatically which is not good for the community and the department.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	It's too much reporting for doing things that really aren't force. I don't see how pointing a firearm is a use of force. No one was hurt. Also, all this de-escalation stuff they added in is good

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			in theory, but to say that we as officer's need to deescalate situations before resorting to force is asinine. I don't understand what they think we've been doing since police have been around. In certain situations de-escalation works. In others, talking calmly and trying to baby the person into stopping whatever they're doing, again is foolish.
<u>Northern Station</u>	Administrative	20	We have completely lost our way. This is so ridiculous.
Northern Station	Investigative	20	To much to be responsible for under stress..... we will then be deemed as liars or not cooperating
Northern Station	Investigative	0-2	*What happens when we conduct a felony traffic stop and there are four people on board? Usually, when a felony traffic is conducted, multiple units will arrive on scene as back up. Is it really necessary for everyone to be in the use of force log?? I have already found myself not pulling my firearm out during a call because I did not want to deal with the administrative burden of reporting this said use of force. I guarantee there will be many other officers who have already or will be in this same situation in the future, jeopardizing officer safety.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The reporting of "any" use of force whether force was used or alleged is not practical. Again, It's the Officer who feels that they are the ones that did something wrong. The proposed reporting policy will force Officer's to just do nothing, rather than attempt to effect an arrest. Policing is often a physical job. Common sense on reporting the use of force has worked just fine.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Don't let pant shitters decide our future!
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	As stated above, gun being pointed and spike strips as use of force are idiotic.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Section B. Legally, Only a "competent court" can determine whether an Officer committed excessive force. Language like "suspects to have been committed" appears more investigative in nature and would not make a Sgt complicit in finding an Officers guilt long before due process
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I am worried that this new order will be used against an officer if they somehow don't cover every aspect or forget to explain something to some critics disliking.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	See answer to #9. It would be nice if the POA had an opportunity for a meet and confer.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I agree the old policy needs to be updated, circa 1995, but we shouldn't be doing it in a hasty manner, without input from the officers themselves or POA.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I explained it above pointing a firearm at somebody is not a use of force this has to be the stupidest most pointless asinine idea ever
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The mere fact that pulling your weapon and pointing it at a subject/suspect should not be a use of force mandate. At times pulling your department issued firearm is the safest way to effectively control a suspect.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I cannot be comfortable with a policy change in which I had no input.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Honestly, I cannot find any...It does play into the hand of politics and causes officers, senior and new alike to question the department and attempt to discern the exact direction that the department is going in...
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Once again, an Officer would have to explain what efforts he/she took to de-escalate the Use of Force. This is not always feasible as sometimes Officers have to react. For instance, Officers respond to a domestic violence incident and the husband is actively beating his wife. An Officer would not have time to de-escalate the call and the Officer would have to immediately react given the circumstances. But given the way the policy is written the Officer would be in violation of not providing time and distance when a citizens life is at risk. Reporting a UOF is fine but the wording is incorrect in this proposed GO. Once again, the department would be protected but not the members.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I disagree that pointing your firearm at a potential threat should be a reportable use of force. Pointing a firearm can be a very helpful de-escalation technique.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It opens too many holes for placing the officer and the city to absurd risk management.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	These proposals are excessive. Officers will be more hesitant to take a firearm out in a potentially dangerous situation as they will not want to list the precautionary move as a reportable use of force. Taking a firearm out of it's holster IS NOT A USE OF FORCE.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Again, it appears emotions and politics verses statistics and science are dictating reformation.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The requirement for only the most senior sergeant to conduct the investigation is unreasonable. Across a watch we need to be able to share the work load. The requirement for the use of force log to be completed for the pointing of a firearm and the pointing of a conducted energy device is unreasonable with the current system. As a Sgt. in this department I can say that even on a normal felony vehicle stop with multiple occupants, it results in dozens of entries. If this requirement stays, I hope that some degree of practicality will be considered. I have already observed officers, especially recruits entering our department, endangering themselves by keeping their firearms at the low ready instead of on a dangerous suspect. When questioned the reason for this potentially deadly hesitation is ALWAYS the new use of force reporting requirements and their impression that the low ready is what is preferred in our department.
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	Pointing your firearm at another person should be documented in a police report and that's all.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I believe the ratio of officers encountering suspects and using force is going to go up under this new policy and this is only going to be used against the officers

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing a firearm should not be “reportable force”. Reporting high risk car stops in the use of force log, with multiple suspects and multiple officers, creates a paperwork mess that does not serve any purpose.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I believe officers are going to get hurt because of it.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Seems relatively reasonable reporting requirements. The negative is kind of reads like every use of force is an automatic IA investigation, that the officer is somehow wrong for using force.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Pointing a firearm is not a use of force. Every officer that works the streets will be on EIS. Not to mention officers will be writing reports everyday instead of fighting crime. We shouldn’t have to explain that we want to go home to our families alive.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	this will prevent officers from protecting themselves in order to prevent early intervention
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I personally don’t mind reporting all my actions and I know most all other Officers don’t mind as well. However, due to the long extraneous bureaucratic checklist that this PROPOSED General Order proposes, Officers could/will unintentionally risk public safety as well as the safety of other Officers. They may hesitate in fear that they may accidentally do something wrong and thus create a greater danger.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	What’s wrong with current General Order? what has made it out of date and why the need all of the sudden to make these changes. I think we deserve the explanation.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	A.: The people who wrote this don’t understand what “Jailitis” is. They also don’t understand how custodies abuse the system and use bookings to get every test available at SFGH, while someone who pays for their own medical insurance has to wait months for something like an MRI.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The revised version of DGO 5.01.1 is very confusing. If an officer conducts a high risk felony traffic stop and points his firearm at a vehicle with multiple suspects inside, is this considered multiple reportable uses of force?
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The proposed use of force reporting I strongly disagree with.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Sacrifices officer safety.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	We are trained in the academy to point our weapons during a felony vehicle stop. I have recovered two occupied stolen vehicles and am in risk of going on the use of force watch list because of this.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I have no issues with reporting use of force. Every officer is to be held accountable for his or her actions. My issue with the proposed reporting DOG is what needs to be included in the incident report. I feel the guidelines are what should be included in the incident report are unnecessary.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Pointing a handgun at a potential violent/aggressive subject typically results in compliance. If officers are reluctant to point their handgun at these individuals, its yet another tactic of

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	non-physically violent deescalation method removed from us. The addition of reporting pointing your gun at someone any time you do so makes me feel as though the person (s) who drafted this policy has never been a patrol officer. First of all, if it is that serious it is probably a report anyways. Second, we already had a clause stating that we shall inform a person that we pointed a fire arm at why we did so. Certain people do not listen to or respect our commands, not even when we repeat ourselves over and over and say pretty please. If I am pointing my fire arm at someone, then they are someone I am afraid is an extreme danger to myself, my fellow officers, or citizens in the immediate area. We don't just point a firearm for no reason, this isn't a movie its real life. People get hurt and die in this profession and second guessing whether or not to pull my fire arm on someone is a huge officer safety risk, which this addition creates.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Every suspect upon whom force is used will complain of "excessive force" regardless of the force used. Using force against someone will never be pretty and the officer in the field should be the person who determines what is necessary or not.
<u>Park Station</u>	Administrative	20	I think it's good that we finally put reporting in one policy instead of multiple bulletins and a GO. I a police report I fail to understand why a document that is used in court to document criminal activity and probable cause, reasonable suspicion and the legality of an arrest in court why you would need to put in your de-escalation tactics. This has nothing to do with proving weather or not a criminal has committed the offence that he is accused of and weather the officer was justified in the arrest. It's juvenile and ridiculous to cater to amateurs who know nothing of what we do. A supervisors investigation should not be included in the incident report IE witnesses to the force unless it is protonate to the criminal case. It can/should be included in the supervisors use of force report.
Park Station	Investigative	20	Proposal is typical of a knee jerk response. Our current system has a proven record of functioning correctly.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Section II.A.c - Officers are being asked to report what they didn't do and why. Reports are for reporting what happened and why. - The section stating "In the event that an officer cannot document his/her use of force due to exceptional circumstances, another officer shall document this use of force in an incident report supplemental incident report or statement form at the direction of a supervisor." - This seems problematic as another officer is being asked to document another officer's use of force which will be used in a UOF investigation. Section II.B.1 - Why the senior supervisor? It should be a supervisor shall be designated. Section II.B.5 - Is this stating that supervisors must remain until the report is completed? This (again) is micro managing. I would like to see what the Supervisory Use of Force Evaluation form looks like, where it will be maintained, who has access to it, who reviews it... lots of questions.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It is to late in the game we lost everything .
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Use of force should be reported but pointing a firearm at someone is not a use of force anymore then the officer ordering someone to stop. And if it is to be listed as a use of force then just list

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			the incident not each officer on each suspect...5 officers 3 suspects ...15 entries. As a supervisor ..to be asked to get on the air and recite a statement regarding maintain distance, communicate is just stupid...it clogs the radio with unnecessary junk when an officer needs it the most. Doesn't Code 33 mean CLEAR THE AIR!!!. The officer calling that needs the air for a reason. Maybe while the supervisor is giving his mandated advisement the officer says that the scene is ok and everyone is safe...But officers never hear that and are responding code 3 and instead of shutting down their response they crash and injure themselves or others. It's bad enough a supervisor has to get on the air to acknowledge code 3 response...not add that advisement.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Thoughtful communication?
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I still have an issue where the mere fact of pointing a firearm or conducted energy device is considered use of force. I also see it as an officer's right to point the firearm and/or conducted energy device as an officer's right to defend ourselves against a quick-thinking suspect that can do more harm. The current use of force reporting is satisfactory.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	it fckn sucks, and going to get someone killed, period. It just won't be the pencil neck who wrote it.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I understand that OPD reports UOF when drawing their handgun. This is going to throw the EIS out of whack and OCC will have a field day, thus showing the public that their existence is necessary!
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	positive: expanding the reporting criteria, and data collection will enhance the ability to link an after action report to possible training needs in a more efficient manner. Disagree: Pointing a gun at someone is an inherent use of force, but the only use of force that can't, by itself, result in injury. It is inane to consider it reportable when a person can verbally yell at someone with the threat to injure in order to take a suspect into custody, with the exact same result, especially if the suspect/(s) is/are larger than the officer/(s) attempting the detention. When there is no physical injury, how should one try to relate that to an actual use of force where there is a complaint of pain or injury? The two seem at cross purposes, as the original purpose was to track injuries to detainees and force uses by officers in order to make sure that excess was not involved in a single incident, or that there was not a pattern of force used by officers in excess of what might be used normally. In fact, one could say that pointing a weapon in some cases might de-escalate a situation, as "pepper spray" is caustic, and merely the threat of "pepper spray" use can cause suspects to be compliant as long as there is also time to use verbal persuasion in concert, as a de-escalation tool.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	seems reasonable, but good hard-working cops may choose to be less proactive to avoid being tracked
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	No comment here.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I do not agree with warning the suspect of my intended use of force to give the suspect an opportunity to defend/deflect the use of force.

<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 General Order is superfluous to the reporting requirements section of the existing DGO 5.01. There are already provisions setting forth how uses of force are to be documented and reported. Also, the idea that the officers have to spend time explaining what de-escalation methods were used and why warnings were/were not given is unnecessary. Explaining the subject's actions, the threat presented, and the action taken to eliminate the threat should be sufficient.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	It would just open more officers to allegations, and lawsuits. Many of this "Use of Force" reporting is general day to day work an Officer has to perform.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I do not agree that the pointing of a firearm or the deployment of spike strips should be a reported use of force. It stands to reason that I should have to report verbal commands as a use of force if the subjects feelings are hurt.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	our use of force statistics are going to skyrocket with reporting every time our firearm is drawn & pointed at someone. Hopefully that won't be used later by politicians to handicap us even more.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	In the past 12 months, I have not used OC or my baton. I have pointed my weapon many times during felony auto stops, burglary alarm calls and detentions of suspects in dark areas who do not show their hands.
<u>Richmond Station</u>	Investigative	6-10	I don't see a problem with reporting pointing a firearm in incident reports. But for it to be deemed a use of force, I am concerned that the EIS will give an inaccurate depiction of "force used" in high crime areas and give weight to the outcry that excessive force is being used in minority communities who are demanding these changes to police policy, rather that it merely being due to these officer working in high crime areas.
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	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This involves way too much paperwork and involvement. Pointing a gun should be mentioned in the police report and the circumstances making this the most viable option. If it has to be logged into the Use of Force Log it should not count against an officer if the circumstances were reasonable. Why even have us carry a gun if we have to now start considering all of these conditions to determine if we should/should not draw our weapons in what could be a life or death situation. This is too reactionary. What other agency the size of our department has a DGO similar to this proposed one? And hoe effective or ineffective has it been since its inception?
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	B:5 Force should be proportional should be omitted as I stated above. The size and build of suspect should be included in this list, it's self explanatory. C: needs to list that intentional assaults and kicks by officers for self defense (fight for our lives) is deemed within policy. D. needs to list that performing 1st aid for subjects who are restrained or who are complying and

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			not posing any further threat or violence. F: should have DEM notify a SGT. when officers are dispatched. Some sgt's may not monitor the air consistently like officers because of meetings, admin work, etc. DEM should make them aware and confirm their response. F:2 will not be practical most of the time due to code 33 and the need for the air to be free so Sgt.'s can monitor and the necessity of updating dispatch of the unfolding event.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	What is a "personal body weapon"? If you mean, hands, feet or head, then say so.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This will create an unnecessary increase in work load for supervisors, EIS, cause extra stress for Officers, and lead Officers to second guess.
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	0-2	Drawing a firearm should not be a use of force. It makes officers not want to draw out there weapon which can be hazardous to our safety in case a suspect is armed.
<u>Southern Station</u>	Investigative	11-15	Not much is changed. It is common practice to articulate the what you did to avoid the needed use of force. (de-escalation and warnings)
Southern Station	Investigative	11-15	Why does an officer have to explain efforts to de-escalate if that was not an option? The officer's actions are a result of the subject's actions, which would be self explanatory. Again, we are too focused on de-escalation and not officer safety or the safety of the public. What is a supervisor evaluation form? Supervisor already evaluate all use of forces. If the force used was unacceptable, then the supervisors will take the appropriate action. we also have the use of force log, which is handled by a supervisor. More forms, just make thing more confusing and give fuel for more complains.
Southern Station	DOC Light Duty	11-15	Having an Officer worrying about "efforts to de-escalate" or worrying about a supervisor finding their use of force "unnecessary" is going to lead to newer cops hesitating and getting hurt.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This proposed policy, in my opinion, will also create situations where Officers and/or persons in the public will be placed in harms way.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This is just adding more paperwork for supervisors. You are now telling officers that a super-

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	visor will be the judge on whether or not the force used was appropriate. We are all adults trained in the same manner and shouldn't need the added layer of supervision.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I think politics is why we are getting all these revisions which is bad The use of force reporting contradicts itself. With the strict use of taser guideline, why would an officer want one issued to them? A simple activation of the taser is considered similar to a firearm discharge? I do understand that certain city officials were vehemently against the police department being issued taser. But, based on PERF's recommendations, and the chief wanting the tasers, the compromise reached in the restricted use of the tasers is comical. It is better not to have them issued to officers; I don't even know why a member from specs of swat would want one issued to them.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	One example is when an officer that is equipped with ECD device that officer will absorb a significant amount of use of force entries. It is a clear way of tracking encounters with persons of color which will become a lighting storm to those with a political bent.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	See above regarding "supervisors shall remind officers..."
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	- adding the first three sections is a good addition to not only the use of force, but general considerations for police work in general. If our missing can be accomplished without either officers or suspects being injured, it is better for everyone. - If officers have called a code 33 and are dealing with a dangerous situation, having a Sergeant using the radio air time to remind officers to de-escalate, make space, etc. would be both distracting to officers on scene and could prevent critical information from being broadcast by those officers on scene. - Proportionality: while I understand what is being said here, the weapons listed may be as deadly to the officer as a firearm. This paragraph implies that the officer would be less injured by a knife, baseball bat, etc. It does not take into consideration, the size, age or strength of the subject as compared to the officer. It does not take into consideration the skill of the subject as compared to the officer. Instead it is only stating the proportionality is dependent on the type of weapon. - although I have never used it, I have seen the carotid hold used effectively. This has not been a controversial technique in San Francisco. It should not be removed. - Duty to Intervene. Again, I do not object to the concept of preventing unreasonable force, but the way this is written, " .. when they reasonably believe that an officer is about to use ..." This requires officers to predict the actions of others which is not possible. This could also become a safety issue if an officer prevents another officer from applying force attempting to comply with this section and the suspect uses this interval to assault the officers.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	A. REPORTABLE USES OF FORCE. "Officers shall report any use of force involving vehicle interventions" Spike strips reportable use of force? against a vehicle? A. USE OF FORCE LOG. The following units shall maintain a Use of Force Log: 1. District Stations 2. Airport Bureau 3. Department Operations Center Investigation Bureaus GTF, SVU,HOM, PBTF, NARC shall maintain their own use of force log as they do now and their supervisor shall be responsible of the investigation of force. "1. Any use of force occurring outside the city

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			limits, except at the San Francisco International Airport, shall be recorded in the Department Operations Center’s Use of Force Log” Why wouldn’t this use of force be reported at the Unit or station responsible for the out of city contact? The concerns will be with so many things deemed reportable use of force the EIS numbers will go off the roof unless some other balances are in place to indicate the use of force and categorize it accordingly.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Officers will get hurt with this policy. Officers will not draw their firearms/CED in fear having a documented use of force and be placed on the EIS. That split second that it takes to draw a weapon that would have normally been out before this policy will cost an officer his LIFE.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	the affects it will have on officers warning system
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Pointing a firearm and considering it a higher level of force than a baton strike is ridiculous. One is a carried out tactic and the other is a defensive precaution in a warranted situation. During an active shooter scenario officers would be using reported force on school children fleeing a gunman? There is no logic behind this. It will only further stagnate us with paperwork UOF Logs, EIS activations, Etc. The department claims that the “courts determined”...I’m pretty sure no court required mandatory reporting of pointing a firearm. Requiring an 849b if practical and report would be more reasonable.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I have heard that having our firearm at low ready is a use of force which it shouldn’t be.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	We all know when to report force and that our supervisors need to conduct use of force investigations. The part where another officer is required to report another officers excessive force is something that would already be done under our current force reporting requirements. 5.01.1- what is this some sort of update for a cell phone system. lol
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Pointing one’s firearm should not be a reportable use of force.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I believe the action of pointing a firearm at a suspect is not a use of force. For the short time I have been in the department, this was never an issue and believe that pointing our firearm at suspects (when necessary) is not a use of force
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	No need to waist all that time behind a computer.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The old/current Use of Force reporting system worked fine. The proposed GO 5.01.1 is going to make it seem like the SFPD are a bunch of boot strapped thugs. The numbers of use of force are going to shoot through the roof because almost everything we do to gain legal compliance is a use of force.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I strongly disagree that pointing your department issued firearm at an individual is required to be reported as a use of force. When performing a traffic stop involving a occupied stolen vehicle, you are taught to point your department issued firearm at every occupant of the vehicle until they are in police custody. I agree that it should be noted in the police incident report but should not be reported as a use of force.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	If pointing your firearm is a reportable use of force, it will cause some officers to hesitate pointing their firearms which puts officers' lives at risk. Like it or not, some officers will be concerned that because it is a reportable use of force, they will not want to write a police report or be subject to EIS due to numerous uses of force.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Unless we want to cower and hide in our cars, or hide in the station, I suggest we lace up our boot straps and bury ALL of the proposed changes.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Once again, seems like they want to make the public happy with having us do more paper-work.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I think there should be more trust in Officers when it comes to efforts of avoiding a use of force. I understand that need to properly record any incidents but its just seems to be overkill in the effort to obtain information.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Every officer will be on EIS, which is a punishment no matter how you word it. The idea of pointing a taser or arching a taser being a use of force is ridiculous, as these cause no harm at all. this is even more ridiculous then reporting pointing my firearm.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Initiating IA investigations for a less lethal force option like a CED will waste department resources and cause scrutiny against officers who used a force option with no permanent injury.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	They are forcing us to document Use of Force where no force is used. This is will allow those who manipulate statistics to show we are using more force than ever. It will place most, if not every Officer on EIS when they are simply doing their jobs.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This section seems a little redundant. All use of force reporting is covered in current sections 5.01 and 5.02 (minus the firearm DB). Is the use of force evaluation a new form. I do not recall seeing this form mentioned in 5.01. I thought supervisors only conduct a use of force investigation if the force used may be excessive.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	10. I don't think that pointing your firearm or CED at someone should be a reportable use of force. The simple act of pointing your firearm at someone is not a use of force by any means. If pointing my firearm at someone brings compliance and I'm able to safely take that subject into custody without any further incident then how is that a use of force. There is no complaint of pain, no visible injury, and I didn't physically contact the subject with said weapon. I think this policy is going to make officers hesitate to draw their firearms or the CED because they're going to be afraid of having a reportable use of force. I think this will place officers in unnecessary danger and will lead to officers getting injured or killed. A split second of hesitation with an armed subject can prove deadly.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	We have to write more paperwork to explain how we are ensuring how we get home safe at the end of watch.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I used the carotid restraint on a violent suspect two weeks ago. After he resisted arrest and was attempting to assault myself and two other officers, I was able to bring the suspect to submis-

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			sion with just the threat of using the restraint. After 1 minute of him fighting I was able to lock the carotid restraint in and I told him that he would be put to sleep if he continued to resist. The suspect instantly stopped fighting and I did not have to put him to sleep.
<u>Special Operations</u>	Administrative	20	Have not seen it yet
Special Operations Group	Administrative	11-15	Let's face it, making everything a reportable use of force will only dissuade Officers from using any force; or under reacting which will see a rise in Officer injury, suspect injury, and a general reluctance to use required necessary force in line with our job and legal function.
Special Operations Group	Investigative	11-15	Officers are going to hesitate to pull their firearms out because of the mandatory reporting. This will cause officers to get hurt or killed.
Special Operations Group	K9 Handler and Supervisor	20	Tons of contradictions.
Special Operations Group	Canine Handler	20	I think reporting the pointing of a firearm and CED as a use of force is idiotic, but if it is mandated by case law than so be it.
Special Operations Group	Stable attendant	20	keeping in mind the current rhetoric of the police forces around the nation and the proposed use of force reporting for SF, officers might not be well prepared in entering deadly situations by keeping their firearms holstered because of fears that they might be entered into the EWS.
Special Operations Group	Mayors Detail	6-10	The current order as it stands I feel is efficient in terms of the reporting methods and documentation of the use of force.
Special Operations Group	Homeland Security	6-10	May cause officers to second-guess drawing a firearm, leading to potentially dangerous situations.
Special Operations Group	High risk warrant	11-15	Its very unsafe and unrealistic to do.
Special Operations Group	Tactical Unit	16-19	With the amount of paperwork we currently do, this will be another barrier keeping officers off the street. As busy as this city is already, I can see a lot of our time during a shift at the station doing paperwork.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	seems to be vague and not clear enough.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	will not allow officers to be on the streets....
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I feel that requiring an officer to report the intentional pointing of a firearm and/or conductive energy device at a subject will weaken the purpose of the EIS and subject the officer to undue early warning scrutiny. Will these types of force be separated from the other more serious applications of force as previously reported? Will it impact an officers career if they find themselves on the list? Will this encourage officers to not apply the necessary force level in lieu of being reported, thus jeopardizing their safety?
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This will only cause officers to be flagged on the early warning policy.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Pointing our firearm at somebody is already required to be explained in a police report per another DGO.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Reporting will be too restrictive
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The people who use the force should be consulted not Chiefs living in a glass tower and have not fought anyone in 20 years
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It's too long and addresses things that should be trained not outlined in a policy. We all know like if precious, we don't need to be told while responding because it can cause officers to second guess a decision that can get someone hurt.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	You have made police officers question taking their firearms out. Do you not see the implications of this?
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Section D. "Excessive Use of Force" seems vague to the point of being extraneous. It accomplishes nothing and should be removed.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The proposed use of force regarding the pointing of firearms is absolutely ridiculous. Although we understand that pointing a firearm at an individual constitutes a use of force; it does not constitute a reportable use of force. Unless a firearm is discharged, there can be "no complaint of injury," as a result of having a firearm pointing at someone. Additionally, having the carotid taken away is a major blow to use of force options, as it is one less tool that is available, and one less tool before the firearm is used. Rather than providing officers with options, we have limited officers.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I can understand that every officer should attempt to gain control of any situation with care, however we don't live in a perfect little society. We live in a society where people don't listen to anyone let alone the police or fire department.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This seems like we are having to unfairly justify each thing we do. As referenced above I believe in saving human life etc, but these things unfold are often made in the blink of an eye. THERE IS NOT A COP ON THE SFPD who wants to willfully hurt people. That is ridiculous; work with us and not against us.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Reportable use of force for pointing firearm or "taser." = joke.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	How are we supposed to be on patrol with the additional report writing requirements? It's impractical to require so much added work and for the primary job to still get done.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Pointing of a firearm is not a Use of Force. You will now have officers pointing their firearms at the ground because 1) they're too lazy to write a statement; 2) have "too many" uses of Force and are now on EIS this pointing of the firearm or unwillingness to draw their weapon will get an officer KILLED or HURT Soon enough we will see officers pointing ERIW's during a felony stop or a 221 call to prevent having to write a statement
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The negatives are that pointing a firearm and a CED are not uses of force and will deter officers from doing their jobs and keeping themselves safe

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
<u>Taraval Station</u>	Investigative	6-10	Who determines what an allegation of excessive force (I, D: Excessive Use of Force)? The suspect? A third party?
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	What are we supposed to do if an officer is trapped with no way out and a suspect is driving a vehicle toward him/her? What if a suspect is running down innocent civilians on a sidewalk with a vehicle (as did happen here not too long ago)?? According to the proposed use of firearms GO we can not shoot the suspect. So what would they like us to do if that is our only option and they have taken it away from us??? (this answer should actually be under #12)
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Seems unnecessarily lengthy. What is wrong with the current Use Of Force Reporting? I don't like that supervisors have to fill out a form now every time a prisoner complains that the handcuffs are too tight.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I have already seen officers reluctant to draw their firearm to avoid a "use of force" incident. Officers feel this type of reporting can be held against them in their career.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The duty to intervene makes any reportable use of force that OCC deems excessive a sustained complaint for all officers at the scene because they failed to intervene even if they did not believe the force was excessive.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	We should be included in the process of revising the order.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	While I have no issue redefining use of force, the current proposal does not adequately answer specifics and leaves the officers and supervisors open to liability issues as written.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The language is more current.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It makes sense.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Use of force entry for drawing firearm.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The need to list how we de-escalate on every UOF is stupid. Looks great for the Mayor & Chief but we know the realities of it. On many UOF there is no time to "De-Escalate". If there is no time to de-escalate or we are unable to de-escalate for some reason, are we in violation of this order?
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Pointing a firearm at a suspect should not be a use of force
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I believe this proposal is geared to slow down an officers response but it will ultimately cost a patrol person his/her life due to an indecision to act.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Intentional pointing of a firearm is not and should not be considered an use of force incident.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Too conditional, excess verbiage, not in favor of officer's decision making with like training and experience, not practical and leaves officer's open to getting hurt or killed.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Intentionally pointing a firearm or a CED at somebody is not a use of force. It is an action used in hope to PREVENT a use of force.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	the Use of force reporting policy for intentionally pointing a firearm or taser at someone ambiguous and unnecessary.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The new policy seems like it was created to appease a someone's political agenda.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I do not believe there should be a change in our current Use of Force Policy. We have done nothing wrong.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	As stated Officers are going to hesitate and second guess their actions when it comes to pointing their firearms. Suspects will get the upper hand on Officers and the blood will be on the hands of the department.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The current reporting policies under 5.01 and the proposed 5.01.1 are almost similar that I don't see the need to create a separate general order for something that was already specified in the current G.O. unless there was something totally different.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I don't think an officer should have to report a use of force every time he/she pulls out a gun.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	a use of force incident may not provide the options that this order is requiring. Articulation for use of force is what is important, just like the old order already stresses.
<u>Tenderloin Station</u>	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This may help officers if supervisors actually document that their findings show the officers acted within policy. The supervisor who the use of force is reported to should not have to approve the report. The same supervisor should be allowed to complete the use of force evaluation at a later time.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	so if I take my baton out and tell some one to get on the ground its a reportable use of force because it intimidated someone? crazy. Pointing a weapon at someone is a reportable use of force, crazy. might as well add in raising your voice at someone.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	If going to the effort of implementing a new order, it should be clear as to whether low ready for firearm is a reportable use of force.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I believe that properly reporting the use of force benefits all, the suspects and officers, as it leads to transparency and it supports our actions in the field in that its often the suspects that cause a use of force incident, not the other way around due to their lack of compliance, tendency for violence, or they refused to be arrested for their criminal behaviors.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	we need to keep our original policy it works
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Reporting shall include... "Efforts to de-escalate prior to the use of force" You mean like when we ask them to stop committing the crime they are committing at the time we intervened? Supervisors shall respond to the scene of every officer who points his forearm at a subject?

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			Why? is the sworn officer whom you certified incapable of determining when he needs to defend himself, the life of another, or effect an arrest of a violent (or likely to continue to be) fleeing suspect?
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	We are bending over backward for 400 idiots protesting a justified police shooting.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	If they want to call something a use of force, by all means do it. A two line report justifying it is fine by me. We just can not allow a little paper from getting us killed.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	More political nonsense. The pointing of firearms or TASERS is NOT a use of force.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Does not explain what this “supervisor form” that supervisors are mandated to fill out. Only a one line mention in this order.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	seems more restrictive than CA penal code
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It puts our lives and 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	Parts of it update the current use of force reporting. However, most seem to add numerous hurdles to trying to report force, and provides no way to explain what will be the explosion in use of force reporting due to the pointing of firearms.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Under Section I. B. it states that an officer shall notify his/her supervisor of “any allegations of excessive force.” Based on my own experience, almost every incident involving a subject that is not completely cooperative has at least one bystander who makes allegations of excessive force or improper conduct. These are allegations thrown out by bystanders who display little to no understanding of our use of force policies, let alone the California Penal Code. It is bad enough that peace officers must endure the hostile verbal berating and physical encroachment by the friends/family/supporters of subjects under arrest. To effectively state that officers must now self-report allegations of excessive force by associates and supporters of alleged criminals in proposed DGO 5.01.1 is ridiculous. It may not be the intention of proposed DGO 5.01.1 to do so, but the language in it is indicative of self-incrimination by peace officers. Under Section II. A. 1. C. it states that officers shall document whether, “Any warning given and if not, why not.” I find this language to be vague, as the parameters for a warning are not given. Is this requiring us to attempt to give a clear verbal warning about an imminent use of force or would our stated reason(s) for the use of force in a report suffice as an explanation? The huge emphasis on de-escalation in the proposed DGO’s, both in practice and in report writing, is understandable given the current times. What needs to still be included though, is a peace officer’s lawful right to not retreat or desist when taking on a subject. I understand that de-escalation does not necessarily mean peace officers must retreat/desist in order to prevent lawful but awful incidents, but there needs to be language included in the DGO’s that also defends a peace officer’s lawful duty to stand his/her ground when he/she deems it the best course of action given the circumstances.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The new proposed DGO is contradictory and will lead to more officer's being injured or even killed.
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	Reactionary policy.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I am not satisfied with reporting every firearm, or CED's, pointing a firearm is something an Officer will do because at the time they feel they are in danger. That reaction is not to be second guessed with thoughts of paperwork. I feel it is just an effort to track demographics on who we pull our guns on.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Reporting pointing our department issued firearm at a suspect is not only additional paper work, EIS paperwork, its a liability for us officer who have to work with new incoming officers who will be taught this while they are in the academy. Coming out of the academy most if not all are hesitant to get a use of force because they are new. Also when coming out of the academy if you are trained to not want to pull your firearm or have five things you should try before you draw your firearm you will hesitate. Hesitation will kill us and in further kill other people who we swear to protect.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Writing a report and logging a use of force for pointing a firearm, with the end result being compliance, is counter-intuitive. For the officers that work in high crime places or specialized units that deal with violent subjects more often than other officers, they are put in an unfair advantage if they are flagged for "force" for doing their job the way they were trained. It should only be necessary in shootings or if the officer was not able to convey to the subject at the scene why the firearm was pointed in order.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The public announcement of the revised DGO has already tacitly implied to the public that our current use of force reporting is inadequate, when in fact this is far from the truth. The implementation of the new DGO will serve no additional material benefit, while at the same time reflect an increase in use of force incidents in the Departments annual reports (due to the addition of new criteria). However this information is presented to the public, it will undoubtedly reflect poorly on the Department and its officers, who without bias I can say are some of the most honest, conscientious, and caring individuals I have ever encountered.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The document is not being written and constructed with the impute it requires from the members of this POA and equally as important the City Attorney's Office. These proposed policies are being written and devised with solely political motives in mind and not for the purpose of implementing policies and procedures that best protect not only the community in which we protect, but with the officers who protect that community in mind as well.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	It is unnecessarily lengthy and wordy.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>Traffic Division</u>	Administrative	20	What is an “uncertain situation?”
Traffic Division	Investigative	20	no changes are needed
Traffic Division	Investigative	11-15	The chief, the mayor, and the police commission just want to be able to walk away from involved officers if a situation becomes controversial in the media.
Traffic Division	Traffic enforcement	20	
Traffic Division	traffic enforcement	16-19	could get officers hurt or killed
Traffic Division	Traffic Enforcement	11-15	We make split second decisions with little or no time. ie Traffic stops where driver exits vehicle unexpectedly. As previous history shows, Oakland motor officers shot during traffic stop.
Traffic Division	Traffic Enforcement	6-10	
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Once again, another thing to make the Officer hesitate in his or her decision making process. It will just get people hurt or killed.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	this is a knee jerk reaction GO.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Officers use of force entries will highly increase witch may cause officers to second guess themselves during a confrontation.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	pointing of a firearm is a waste of a reportable use of force. sergeants monitoring and requiring a play by play during an incident is a waste of resources, especially when you have sergeants with 3 years experience working the streets
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I disagree with firearm and energy device pointing counted as a use of force. Extremely debilitating to count a method that does no physical harm to a subject against the officer. What’s next, giving a lawful verbal order to “Stop!” counts as Use of Force? Poor precedent.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	As written, the DGO appears reasonable. However, I see it being interpreted by members as excessive in the amount of situations that require UOF reporting. I feel this will lead to members being reluctant to use force when warranted.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing of gun should not count as use of force. Creates waste of time, more bureaucracy and jeopardizes officer safety.