

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
<u>Admin / Headquarters</u>	Administrative	20	Too much to re-learn. No need to change because of one incident.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	We should leave that policy as it currently reads. We have to be able to shoot at the driver of a vehicle who is driving on the sidewalk trying to kill people. Tennessee/Garner section needs to be retained.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	the de-escalation dismisses the danger suspects pose when armed with knives , clubs, etc. The supervisor mandate to respond is burdensome and the mantra over the radio is ridiculous
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	5. Moving Vehicles However if exigent circumstance exist, officers may discharge their firearm at the operator of a moving vehicle if a violent felony has been committed or attempted and the officer has reasonable cause to believe a substantial risk exist of death or serious bodily injury will occur if the apprehension is delayed, etc..
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	The new proposal seems to be repetitive to the current General Order. From what I understand, there is Case Law regarding pointing a firearm at someone as a reportable use of force. If that's the case, then I guess we have no choice but to adopt that policy. It seems ridiculous to have to tell someone a firearm was pointed at them if they never knew that was the case.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	again, not thorough enough. needs to be more specific
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	proposed GO does not give officers enough room to operate within policy to protect the Sanctity of Human Life. Being unable to defend oneself or others from the operators of a moving vehicle when said officer has no other means to defend oneself is ludicrous. Officers cannot be expected to be killed or seriously injured by a suspect(s) using the vehicle as a lethal weapon. An officer that does defend him/herself by the final mean of resorting to the use of the firearm can be found operating outside dept policy. Civil charges. Criminal charges. Loss of job and pension. These are all very real possibilities facing an officer who operates outside policy. Officers need policy to allow them to protect their lives and the lives of others. The Sanctity of Life for innocent victims needs to be a priority over the lives of a suspect/criminal intent on killing others. Difficult choices need to be made by cops every day. There will be moments where an officer will have to make that difficult choice of using lethal force on a suspect to save the lives of others.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	1) I do not believe that the section of de-escalation should be included in this order. The use of one's firearm is typically a last resort and de-escalation is already covered in 5.01. 2) Section I.B.3. is unreasonable. How is an officer supposed to feel when they tried to delay taking a subject into custody, and the already "in crisis" subject does something unpredictable- which they are known to do- and manages to harm another person by throwing that bat, or that brick, or that knife, or that improvised weapon? Requiring officers to delay in taking action really goes against the grain of our being as protectors. What makes the life of someone with the propensity to do harm more valuable than the people around him/her? 3) Officer Involved Shootings often happen in the blink of an eye and to add all of this wording and "fluffy stuff" clouds things. 4) The section regarding moving vehicles is too restrictive sets all officers up for violating policy when they are attempting to protect the lives of innocent people. This new

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			order does not address what we can do when the suspect is mowing down a crowd of people on purpose or if the suspect is purposefully aiming their vehicle at myself or another officer who has no place to run for cover. I will not let that suspect run down a crowd of people, fellow officers, or myself.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	There are no rules on the streets which govern desparate individuals who have nothing to lose. The law enforcement commuity cannot be ordered to hesitate in order to “assess”. We are trained to assess immediately, react immediately to save lives of citizens and others.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	The proposed General Order 5.02 should incorporate the following; In instances where the operator of the moving vehicle is threatening the officer with imminent danger of death or se-rious bodily injury by means of the vehicle, and the officer has no reasonable and apparent way to retreat or ,otherwise move to a place of safety, the officer should have the option of using deadly force in self-defense.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	The definition of De-Escalation and Proportionality are redundant in this DGO. It’s already listed in 5.01.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	When confronted with potentially deadly weapons (knife,bat,etc.)and unless the person is barricaded or there are no citizens within two blocks, I do not see how an officer can safely “mitigate” the immediacy of the threat when we are reacting to a suspects actions, which can be dangerous, uncertain, and rapidly evolving.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	11-15	Again written by someone with no law enforcement experience.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	6-10	This proposed order intimates that encountering subjects armed with a weapon other than a firearm are less dangerous to the public/officers based solely on the fact they are not armed with a firearm.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	20	It seems an attempt to ‘fix’ what is a non-problem born by a false narrative. Ultimately it will endanger the lives of those we serve and those who serve them, for a political end.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	11-15	“MOVING VEHICLES. An officer shall not discharge a firearm at the operator or occupant of a moving vehicle unless the operator or occupant poses an immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury to the public or an officer by means other than the vehicle. Officers shall not discharge a firearm from his or her moving vehicle.” this change does not allow us to shoot if the vehicle is the weapon...
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	11-15	As if we are children responding to incidents just hoping for a chance to shoot someone. “Re-mind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, main-tain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources” Writing this stuff tells the general public that we as the SFPD have been doing things wrong this whole time, which we have not. This will embolden the criminals further (who have no such rules of engagement when dealing with us) into pushing the envelope further or use that against us in an ambush type scenario. I hope to never have to shoot someone. I didn’t come into this department hoping that I would shoot someone. But

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			things such as these proposed changes to both 5.01 and 5.02 are making it so I don't feel that I would have the same ability to stay safe and go home to my loved ones.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	6-10	CHP Officer Sirenko's throat was slashed as he confronted a man with a knife in San Francisco ONLY THREE AND A HALF WEEKS AGO. Has our Admin forgotten?
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	6-10	I think this order and the other proposals castrate us as a department and are a knee-jerk reaction to political pressure. The squeaky wheel definitely got the oil in this instance. Let's not focus or be outraged that someone got shot and killed in broad daylight in front of northern station in front of dozens of witnesses, let's instead worry about de-escalation in the city with the most mentally unstable people minus New York's bellvue hospital
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	3-5	Way to many things to remember or notice when dealing with a combative subject.
Admin / Headquarters	Training Division	20	Once again, what exactly will be considered pointing? In regard to prohibited drawing, what about non-department-approved training or off-duty practice? Based on the limited intermediate and advanced firearms training offered by the department, officers should be encouraged and not prohibited (by policy) from practicing. The language at the beginning of the order, as in the proposed 5.01, seems to suggest that our officers have not been respectful of human life or have not practiced restraint in incidents involving potential force. Officers that I have spoken to said they felt insulted by the language of the proposed orders.
Admin / Headquarters	instructor	16-19	vague, rushed, stupid
Admin / Headquarters	Training	11-15	There are numerous issues with the proposed new 5.02 including but not limited to: "Moving vehicle" section changes are too restrictive. SHALL NOT fire at the operator prevents the officer from defending his live or that of another who will be run over etc. See: "Laurel Village Incident" Officers who SHALL not fire FROM their vehicle are prevented from defending self and others if they happen to be in a vehicle at the time of an attack etc. What if I am the passenger in a police car and we come under attack by gunfire? This prevents me from returning fire in defense of myself and partner. Ludicrous and dangerous
<u>Airport Bureau</u>	Investigative	20	Goes to far!
Airport Bureau	canine	20	Again this is contrived.
Airport Bureau	explosive detection k9	20	One word "PLEASE"!!!!!!
Airport Bureau	explosive detection k9	20	Proportionality. This language needs to be deleted. Most of the time, we do not know the offense the subject committed prior to our arrival.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	If I am in a moving vehicle and a person approaches me with a weapon to cause me harm I need to stop the threat.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	now we cant shoot from a moving vehicle. what if we are slowing to a stop and get ambushed? we cant fire back if the car is “moving”?
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It’s very foolish to try to determine why a subject is resisting arrest or non compliant. If an officer determines it is necessary to shoot a suspect to defend himself or herself or in the defense of another, then it must be done. If time is wasted trying to figure out why the suspect’s is behavior the way he/she is then the officer will be killed. Obviously, the department has no faith in a officer determination to shoot or don’t shoot. We are taught from day one in the academy that our level of force does not have to match the suspect’s level of force. Yet this new G.O. is telling us that we have to match the suspect’s level of force. That is the stupidest thing I ever heard of!
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It places officers at an disadvantage. It increases the chance that an officer will get injured or die.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	For my last 20+ years of service, I have never had to report pointing a firearm as a use of force AND have not had an OCC complaint for such approved conduct.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	1)no carotid restraint 2) it goes against the active shooter training
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Since when is a knife not a deadly weapon.?
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	pointing department firearm should not be a use of force entry.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Officers shall not discharge a firearm from his or her moving vehicle. So, it a person is shooting at me from their vehicle, I should stop my patrol car, put the car into park, to shoot back????
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	not good to use same level of force against the bad guy. maybe bigger and stronger.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	it works well too !
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Rushed with no street officers input!
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	During a critical situation, officers must be able to perform their job as trained. They do not need a supervisor yelling over the radio and micro manage while not on scene.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	If this goes into affect, pandora’s box will open allowing every realist to make changes in our policies. Law Enforcement will no longer have the ability to fight crime.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It will create hesitation by officers in dangerous situations, placing them in more danger.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Again, I take exception to the term “Proportionality.”
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Basically we are being told that if the person is a threat only to themselves or not actively a threat to others and has a weapon, we are only supposed to contain them. Even if they pose a passive threat, i.e. they are yelling and threatening to kill, and not complying with our orders, but not actively trying to harm others or us. This seems to contradict the job we were hired to do.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>Bayview Station</u>	Administrative	20	I think preventing officers to shoot at a vehicle that is using it's vehicle as a weapon will put officers at risk.
BBayview Station	Investigative	16-19	It should not add to EIS criteria.
Bayview Station	Plainclothes	11-15	Most of the time people that draft this kind of Orders and or Policy have never been involved in a critical incident. There's always going to be some kind of questions in regards as to the actions of the Officers. We are not robots, we are human beings, and regardless of whatever anybody says we are not perfect!
Bayview Station	Plainclothes	11-15	Somebody is going to hesitate and either get kill or hurt. Who's going to be responsible for it?
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Unnecessary language and restricitons
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Having my firearm out is like a tool that is a necessity at times and I should not be penalized for using it by pointing or just having it out of my holster.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Proportionality policy leads me to believe that we can only use our firearm when a suspect has a gun. this will get an officer injured.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Negatives: -If someone is firing at an officer from a vehicle should they turn and run? That is what this policy is proposing. -This policy jeopardizes public safety and officer safety -Proportionality is going to get an officer hurt or killed and the same goes for innocent civilians -Officers have to be expected to win. That is our duty. "Officers who proceed accordingly and delay taking a subject into custody, while keeping the public and officers safe, will not be found to have neglected their duty. They will be found to have fulfilled it." This statement leads me to believe that regardless of the offense committed the committee who came up with these want officers to turn everything into a critical incident. Every officer utilizes verbal persuasion and lesser levels of force on a daily basis. If they did not we would have thousands of reportable uses of force. This will give non-compliant subjects the upper hand. The entire GO is geared to protecting the criminals and not the officers or the public.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	We sometimes have less than a second to make life and death decisions. Im being asked to now consider what their motive is? If my life is in danger it should never matter what their motive is. And yet it something else the city is coming up with to endanger our lives. It is outrageous.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	This order requires a supervisor to tie up radio communications in instances which we know communication with other responding officers is the most critical. That is patently unsafe. This order states that intentionally pointing a firearm at somebody is a reportable use of force. It does not cover the "low ready" position and it does not address the eventual issue of when a firearm is displayed and an officer is captured on cell phone video with a firearm at the low ready but the media and public contend that it was pointed at somebody. The proportionality section of this order is contradicted by our training and the circumstances where we are allowed to discharge a firearm. We are allowed to discharge our firearm when we or another person are in imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury. But the proportionality paragraph says nothing about serious bodily injury it only makes mention of a threat to life. Since

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			5.01 & 5.02 are inextricably linked, it is obvious that in civil court and OCC that we will be held to the definition of proportionality in 5.01 if we discharge our firearm. I find it troubling that the 5.01 definition of proportionality deals with weapons other than a firearm but the 5.02 definition does not.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	See above. Pretty much the same thoughts. And I feel that all of the proposed General Order's are serving our current Chief's own ego, (he is pretty much a media whore), who probably dreams of attending an Officers line of duty funeral so he can network.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	As stated above, the proposed DGO 5.02 just released again seems like a knee-jerk reaction in need of far more input from the membership.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	criminals don't shoot at us twice and reassess
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	As officers we have split second decisions and sometimes we do not have the leisure of deescalate situations, although it sounds great in theory it is just not practical. It will endanger the public we are trying to protect. So many restrictions and proposals that promote de policing and it will endanger officers and citizens by playing political games.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Again, I do not understand why we are lowering our use of force to match that of the suspect. This is only going to get an officer hurt or killed.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Very lengthy and confusing. Obviously not written with the assistance of patrol officers/ POA.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Goes against previous training that can't be switched off. It does not take into account the fear and adrenaline an officer will experience in a shooting. We have to reassess after every shot. More nonsense.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	the problem isn't really in the proposed order but in the training and the BS on why we need to change it, makes it seem we've been wrong this entire time
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Officers will put themselves into dangerous situations and someone will eventually get hurt or killed. These policies are extremely counter intuitive, and place the life of dangerous criminals above those of the officers.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	As stated when responding to proposed General Order 5.01 de-escalation techniques are used on a daily basis, and therefore are not needed to be written demanding them in a General Order. Officers are not certified therapist or doctors, although the public seems to believe we are, and should not have to spend an extra split second attempting to determine whether or not the Suspect whom he feels is endangering his life of the life of others can comprehend the situation at hand based upon "medical condition; mental, physical, or hearing impairment; language barrier; drug interaction; or emotional crisis".

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Highly restrictive. Still does not allow for pistol mounted flashlight. Supervisor responsibilities will tie up radio air during critical times. Considering the possible reason someone is non compliant or resisting arrest is a matter to be investigated after the public, my fellow officers, and I are all safe and subject is subdued.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Completely removing the ability to discharge a firearm from a moving vehicle is absurd. There are already few instances where this would be reasonable, but telling officers that they have to allow a suspect to shoot at them without being able to defend themselves does not make sense.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	There has been no thought to practical modern police work or with concern to officer safety and the day to day dangers and challenges police face when responding to calls.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	There is a strong likelihood that the proposed GO will put members in harm's way.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	FIREARM POINTING AS A REPORTABLE USE OF FORCE WILL LEAD SOME OFFICERS TO AVOID DRAWING THEIR WEAPONS AND WILL INEVITABLY RESULT IN OFFICER INJURY.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed order is waste of ink and paper.
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 "proportionality" section does not belong. According to that section, a "32-All" person, who owns a legal firearm, standing on the street corner holding the firearm has only committed misdemeanors. Even if the subject begins to walk toward a preschool with the gun, failing to follow officer's commands, the subject is still only committing misdemeanors. However, after the Sandyhook massacre, no one in their right mind would allow the subject to enter a preschool. An officer, using lethal force to stop the subject would be using deadly force against a subject who has only committed misdemeanors. Therefore, lethal force is not proportional to misdemeanor crimes. Prohibiting a officer from using a firearm against a driver of vehicle who is using the vehicle as a weapon does not make any sense. A vehicle is easily a deadly weapon and there are circumstances where an officer will need to discharge their firearm at a vehicle when the vehicle itself is the weapon.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	A moving vehicle continuously shooting toward citizens is a threat that should be addressed
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Proportionality clause makes it seem like we can never draw our firearm unless a firearm is presented against us
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	similar to the explanation given for proposed DGO 5.01

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>Central Station</u>	Admin and Street	20	A compete joke. Please let me know when the adults are ready to talk.
Central Station	keeper	20	C2 makes it sound as we may only draw our firearm if we are sure there may necessary use to ensure the safety of others. Sometimes when you just don't know what you have and the total-ity of the situation, neighborhood, time of day and experience may warrant a firearm to be out and in a low ready position as we approach.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This order was suddenly ordered by the chief based solely on politics not for the benefit of Officer safety. If the Officer is ever faced with a well armed suspect, the officer(Due to this proposed,complicated training)will second guess him/herself and will be killed or badly injured due to a delayed reaction. And if the Officer wins the gun fight, the suspect's lawyer will easily lambast the Officer(victim) in front of a jury to distort the truth. All because this proposed order is very complicated to understand.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The policies as written I believe are overwhelming for officers to think about in a dangerous and stressful situation. I believe these policies have set men and women of this Department up for failure.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Don't care for all the de-escalation stuff regarding subject armed with other then firearm.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It is ridiculous and beyond common sense.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It seems like we are just putting stuff in the GO to appease a very vocal minority of complain-ers. Have we forgotten that we have over 800,000 residence in San Francisco and we have to protect all of them jus not the small group that shows up to the Police Commission meetings.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Adds 'necessary' to justification. (not just reasonable.) See above regarding absurd and un-workable mandatory sergeant's broadcast.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	LIKE I SAID ABOVE, IT IS LUDICROUS, BANE AND STUPID!
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	There was nothing wrong with it before, all of a sudden the Chief is on the hot seat and he wants to change it? Grow a set
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	too restrictive.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Supervisor responsibility repending to the scene: remind officers....and a list of things? Take up valuable air time to tell the cops to protextct life etc? Insane. I refuse to do that . Taking the air away from the cop who needs it is absurd. Its potentially deadly. Who in God's name is writing this stuff. Certainly no one who has fought a parolee on the street, and listened while someone droned on about this or that on the radio while I need to call for help, or give updates. Pointing a weapon at someone is NOT a use of force. It may be a show of force, but then again, so is a big person standing there looking at someone. Unreal.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It reads like officers are to retreat if practical. This will enable the suspect in future encounters with law enforcement to challenge their authority further dramatically increasing the probability of physical or weapon based confrontation. Although stated, I believe that an officer and the public will be placed in greater danger if action is delayed by this order.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I strongly disagree with the idea of firing twice and reassessing the threat. If it is a true threat, that gives the suspect an opportunity to attack.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Negative: Using the firearm to de-escalate and prevent a subject from fleeing who could further cause harm to the public.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	De-escalation technique will get people killed.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Targeting specific target areas is a horrible idea. And P.O.S.T. should get involved because that is principal that is not taught. I agree with reassessing after shoots but that has to be when necessary and feasible.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	We give up the right to protect ourselves against a vehicle no matter what?
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I have two main issues with this proposed policy. First, I do not agree with placing the officers responsibility of de-escalation in the use of firearms portion of the DGO. If an officer needs to use a firearm, then they already need to take the highest level of responsibility for their actions. Placing the responsibility of officers "should attempt to de-escalate" ignores the fact that officers are only using their firearms in the most dangerous of circumstance. This requirement provides one more opportunity for officers to be second guessed, especially by non-police officers. Second, I disagree with the policy on the discharge of a firearm at moving vehicles. As the proposal reads, officers that cannot retreat and a suspect is attempting the kill them with a motor vehicle, must do nothing. Further, the proposal reads that a suspect actively attempting to harm people with a motor vehicle cannot be stopped with a firearm. Lastly, if a suspect is firing a gun from a moving vehicle and officers are in pursuit, the proposal reads that officers must not return fire from their vehicle. These are all absolutely ridiculous concepts. In each of these extremely dangerous situations, the officer duty and life are completely disregarded.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This is going to cause an officer to think to much and an officer is going to get hurt during that time frame.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	As noted above, the requirement that force be proportional (especially when confronted by a suspect armed with a lethal weapon other than a firearm) severely discourages officers from taking proactive action to take a violent suspect into custody -- essentially, it requires that officers allow wait until they (or a citizen) is attacked instead of taking decisive, proactive action to take a violent suspect into custody and protect the community. Again, this policy ignores widely accepted research and theories regarding the use of force (e.g., the OODA loop (observe-orient-decide-act) and the principle that action will always beat reaction -- an officers reacting to a suspect will always be at a disadvantage.)

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I believe the clause regarding deescalation creates an atmosphere where officers may second guess their decisions and it could end up getting a officer hurt or killed.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	As with the revised 5.01, this proposed GO is going to make officers question their judgment. There are numerous cases around the country where officers have been seriously injured or worse because of cautious decisions because of fear of repercussions.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Too many ideas to consider. An officer may become injured when trying to think of all the checklists when using lethal force instead of protecting themselves.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	statistics show that an officer involved shooting happen within seconds of the officer arriving on scene. Officers have no time to consider possible reasons why the subject is non compliant.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	It does not say anything about not judging officers that use deadly force with 20/20 hindsight. I would like a clear statement acknowledging the fact that command will review deadly force incidents in accordance with law (totality of the circumstances), and not Monday morning quarterback officers.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Oit doesnt factor the skill level of the subject and the type of weapon use. It will present major officer safety issues.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	a moving vehicle can kill me, and harm other people. Many people in this city are aware that police can not chase vehicles, and will leave scenes at high rates of speed, driving erratically, harming the public when we are not in pursuit.
<u>Ingleside Station</u>	Administrative	20	should v shall. Chief makes a distinction between the two words, but when an Officers career and assets are on the line, will the Dept be so generous as to admit that “should” was only a suggestion if safe to do so
Ingleside Station	Investigative	16-19	Again, this is going to get someone killed. Why can we not stick to a policy that is consistent with National standards. I’m fairly certain the courts, including the SCOTUS, has already weighed in on these issues.
Ingleside Station	Investigative	16-19	It needs to be re-thought out, and re-drafted, then submitted in a meet and confer. Use of force experts should be involved, and real life statistics drawn from our incidents and experiences at SFPD should be employed to drive a realistic policy. While PERF can be used to some extent, I don’t think that PERF should drive our policy solely.
Ingleside Station	Investigative	11-15	The idea of proportionality is the first step to removing the possibility of choosing the best level of force and beginning the makings of a force ladder in which each step must be satisfied before moving onto the next. I remember in the Academy we were taught that when you were in a fight you fight to win. This proposition appears that we would now be in a fight to draw.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Ingleside Station	Investigative	6-10	I addressed my concerns with de-escalation, proportionality, subjects armed with edged weapons, and supervisor's responsibilities in my response above. I believe the section describing moving vehicles is vague and dangerous in prohibiting officers from discharging their firearms at the operator of a vehicle who is threatening their life with the vehicle. An officer could only be so lucky to get out of the way of such a deadly weapon and in many circumstances such an opportunity does not present itself. This leaves the officer with two options. The officer can either utilize their firearm to try and save themselves and the public or they can be struck by the vehicle and probably killed. The latter should not be an option.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This policy will create confusion within officers and while they are thinking about all the un-necessary policy changes, they will be in danger and most likely end up in trouble no matter which way they decide to go. As usual the department is being extremely reactive and creating an extreme morale issue for all the members of the department.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This introduces an element to the use of force, deescalation, that is already incorporated by the simple phrase, "when other force options would be ineffective or inadequate." The new language places an officer at greater risk and prohibitively complicates the real time decision making process, not to mention creating an arbitrary standard by which any adversarial review may interpret prejudicially.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Exposes officers to danger and will make them hesitate...
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Will cause more unnecessary reports of use of force and EIS warnings. It's not based in reality like the other orders
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I have heard that officers are going to be trained to shoot only twice, pause & re-assess, and then if necessary shoot again. Is this going to be mandatory? I think that's dangerous to require in certain circumstances. If a suspect were actively shooting at an officer, it's ridiculous to require an officer to pause. If a suspect was pointing an assault rifle at an officer from a close distance, it's ridiculous to pause.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	This is going to cause hesitation in officer's actions and could lead to injury. Having to come over the radio to remind officers of 5.02 B 4 will take up radio time and should be unnecessary for the officers. Pointing a firearm at a suspect SHOULD NOT be considered a use of force since no force was used.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Too much political rhetoric. Unless the arm all of patrol with CEDs, what do they expect us to do when put in situations in which deadly force is necessary to protect life? I feel that our current 5.02 is tried and proven.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Again, officers will second guess themselves and get hurt because of touchy feely nonsense.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	We will be prohibited from firing a warning shot? Under no circumstances can we fire a warning shot? What about a worst case scenario? A cop by him/herself, surrounded by a violent crowd of dozens of people yelling things like, "Let's kill a cop. He can't take us all down. He might get a few of us, but if we all rush him we can kill him." SO instead of allowing an Officer

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement		<p>in this most unlikely of scenarios, to fire “warning shots” into the grass or dirt that they are standing on and then hopefully escaping the situation, the Officer will be left with either not using their firearm and getting beaten/killed by the crowd or using their firearm and dealing with the repercussions of “shooting unarmed citizens”.... Another possible “worst case scenario”. I’m shot, bleeding out, in the middle of McLaren/Golden Gate park. My radio is shot up or lost, along with my flashlight and whistle. Other Officers are in the area, but don’t know my exact location..... And I’m prohibited from firing a warning/distress shot..... A “hunter” in a less life-threatening is legally allowed to fire 3 “warning shots” as a sign of distress.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>(I. B. 3.) “immediately disarming the subject and taking the subject into custody is a lower priority than preserving the sanctity of human life” ---I am totally confused, if someone is armed then preserving the sanctity of human life is jeopardized like an 801 scenario. (B 4.) Supervisor’s responsibility....This is not practical in every situation. (D. 5) use of firearms and lethal force at moving vehicles...(compared to our current G.O.) We lost the right to defend ourselves or others from someone trying to use their vehicle as a deadly weapon? I strongly disagree with this.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>Any improvised weapons or techniques should be allowed as reasonable when faced with life threatening situation, not limited as stated. All this talk about de-escalation, but what is its definition, is there a POST class what does it mean? We all have differing opinions about its meaning. When faced with a life threatening situation or potentially life threatening situation Officers should be focused on making sure they are safe and the public is safe, not wasting their time playing Dr and attempting to diagnose someone in an unsafe situation and making the situation even more dangerous. This is likely to create hesitancy and indecision in Officers that will result in the Officer/publics injury/death. Proportionality is an issue. The force used should be at least a step above the threat presented to us, we should always chose a level of force likely to end, not prolong the situation, and minimize the injury likely to Officers and the public. When we use equal force to that presented to use we are setting ourselves up for failure/injury. The use of force should be based on the law. The Supervisory requirement to get on the air to remind officers is terrible idea and huge Officer safety issue. Unnecessarily tying up the radio when Officers are dealing with a potentially life threatening situation is absolutely wrong! Any time an Officer calls a Code 33/148/1025/406 that/those Officer(s) are the only ones that should be talking on the radio. No one should even be on the air saying they are 98. The Officers on scene need the air. If the incident is resolved and they are trying to give a code 4 SIC and cant due to unnecessary radio traffic if puts multiple Officers and the public a risk as</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			Officers respond code 3. If Officers broadcast that the subject has a 221 or 222, location changes, additional suspect or vehicle information, safe avenue of approach, how to get to where the Officers are and that information is not heard it further endangers responding officers and the public. The reasonableness of our use of force should be based on the law and the reasonable officer standard, not public opinion after the fact. The moving vehicle portion is a problem. What about incidents like Popal running over pedestrians thought the city in 2006 or the lunatic in the stolen police car last year with access to firearms, both of those are examples on incidents where shooting at and from moving vehicle's are both very reasonable options to prevent the likelihood of death or serious bodily injury to the public and officers.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	De-escalation. Understanding a subjects situation? Criminal activity is criminal activity, period. This single proposed option will put Officers at risk for injury of death.
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. Maybe the chief forgot how it was like to be a street cop.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This bulletin is an Officer safety issue and it's going to make Officer's hesitate when they should be pulling out their firearm.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Officers shall not discharge firearms at moving vehicle unless there is a threat other than the vehicle. So Officer Josh Bryant who was pinned with his knee to his chest by a suspect vehicle on Mirabel St would have had to choose between violating policy and being murdered because he would not be allowed to shoot suspect trying to kill him. We also would not be able to shoot a driver that is purposely mowing people down with a car, like the guy from Fremont, like the 800 lady in DC that tried to run over people near the white house. COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE. A vehicle is a deadly weapon and should be treated as such.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	As I mentioned above, this policy will cause officers to hesitate, maybe because of EIS points, or maybe they just don't need the extra paper work. We have enough paper work as it is.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Negative: Creating too many rules for using firearms will create hesitation in Officers. As it stands, the current rules encourage Officer and public safety in the face of danger.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Again its dangerous and limiting
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I think a Sergeant should not get on the air and remind officers of their duties when engaging an armed subject. That's horrible radio edict and can only distract officers from the immediate threat at hand. Officers should still be able to shoot at an operator of a vehicle to prevent immediate injures or self and others.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I've been on the street for nearly three years. I see all levels (new/junior/senior) of officers not pulling out their firearm because they are second guessing the use of force by intentionally aiming at a subject with their firearm. There are videos of it on YouTube with armed subjects. It is shocking to me that pointing a firearm at someone, which during my time of employment

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			here, has gained 100% compliance without me going hands on (ie use of force) is considered now a reportable use of force. This entire portion of the proposed General Order is a joke, probably made by a person who doesnt use their firearm often.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The order is virtually unchanged, except for two major points. First, the addition of superfluous introductory language. Again, my concern with this is that it will cause officers to hesitate in situations where split seconds mean the difference between life and death. Granted, the overwhelming majority of situations can be handled with lower levels of force, but when an officer needs to use lethal force, the last thing that should be on their minds is whether they are going to get in trouble for failing to engage in “thoughtful dialogue.” Second, the stipulation that supervisors respond to the scene and, while en route, remind officers to do their jobs is completely absurd. It is insulting, counter productive, and completely dangerous. While dealing with an armed person, the last thing an officer needs is a person who is not there tying up the radio, asking for updates and reminding them to “engage in thoughtful dialogue,” or to “take cover.”
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Pointing a firearm at someone with intention is a use of force. There should be a clear “best practices” of when firearms are pointed that are “per se” acceptable. High Risk Felony Stops, Building Clearings, Reported but Unseen Firearms, Crimes where Firearms may be likely, Edged weapons in terrain where there is limited line of sight or close quarters.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I am not satisfied with the proposed General Order (5.02), which takes away some decision making and how many times I can shoot to stop the threat.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed order would have us disarm ourselves and the community of vital defense that we need everyday and would cause officers, new and old alike, to question previous training and put ourselves and community in danger.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Time and distance is an emphasis for the rapid changes that are being proposed. I take issue with this because it takes control of a tense situation away from the patrol officer and gives it to the suspect(s). Further, how does one gauge adequate time and distance? One persons interpretation will differ compared to others, and thus result in the patrol officer being reprimanded for performing their duties.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Isn't a vehicle considered deadly force? Also what happens if we miss with our first two shots?
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The firearms policy should not change. We should still be taught failure drills and shooting to end the threat. Assessing after firing two rounds in a gunfight will get officers or the general public hurt or killed.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	this policy further limits officers abilities and will lead to injuries.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	If a suspect has a gun and is a threat to me/partner/society, I am not going to be focused on why this suspect has a gun in his/her hand and why this person will not follow my commands (because of a medical condition, psychosis, etc). People in that state can still harm/kill people. Putting this type of thought process on officers will cause an officer to hesitate and this hesi-

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	tation could cause great bodily injury or death (the things officers are suppose to stop). I am not saying officers are not smart enough to have this though process but what is the difference between a person pointing a gun at someone and pulling the trigger vs a person in psychosis pulling the trigger. In that moment, there isn't a difference. I think this proposed GO, is thought out in a half-ass way and will lead to a lot of civilians and officers injured and killed.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I do not believe that the use of firearms general order should be changed in any way. If this order becomes any more restrictive i believe that it will only put officers more at risk for serious injury.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	pointing of a firearm should not be a use of force!!
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	discourages officers of using their firearm as means of self defense or defense of others
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	“Proportionality” section in unreasonable and, frankly, wrong. Use of force is not and should not be related to the offense. Rather, it always has been and continues to be related to the level of resistance met. Supervisors should not be tying up the radio saying “remember to preserve life!”. This is unsafe. Subjects armed with weapons other than firearms are still dangerous and potentially deadly to officers and the public. This policy suggests otherwise. Requiring a use of force report for mere pointing of a firearm is impractical under current use of force reporting procedures. “The above circumstances (D.1 a-e) apply to each and every discharge of a firearm or application of lethal force” - this sections worries me. We should not be attempting to count shots in a deadly force scenario. We shoot until the threat is over. I understand the intent behind this but it is not practical or safe to ask us to, for example, shoot twice then assess. “Moving Vehicles” section needs to contain the exceptions listed in the current DGO. These are very important and there is no reason to remove them.
<u>Investigations Bureau</u>	Investigative	20	Absolutely not. Again Officer's will be second guessing themselves and afraid of protecting themselves.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	Our job is to stop public safety threats
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	My fear is that it could put an officer in a situation that could have been avoided and is now life threatening.
IIInvestigations Bureau	Investigative	20	I wish SF did not have gangs, murders, criminals but it does. Will this policy almost all shooting would be out of policy. We don't live in Scotland or Europe where gun possession is prosecuted harshly. we live in SF where Gascon doesn't do shit.--print that please.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	AGAIN, YOUR PROPOSED CHANGES ARE GOING TO GET SOMEONE HURT. YOUR TRAINING TO THESE YOUNG OFFICERS NEEDS TO BE CORRECTED. NOT THE GENERAL ORDERS.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Again, The proposed 5.02 restricts officers from drawing firearms unless they're threatened by use of deadly force. Officers encounter dangerous individuals without any signs potential threats. Such proposed 5.02 language only delays officers from defending themselves or others.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Negative: Who decides the proportionality. How will the officer be judged? PROPORTIONALITY. It is important that an officer's level of force be proportional to the severity of the offense committed or the threat to human life for which the officer is taking. Officers may only use the degree of force that is reasonable and necessary to accomplish their lawful duties. Negative: This takes away a situation where deadly force could save me or another. This is bad. 5. MOVING VEHICLES. An officer shall not discharge a firearm at the operator or occupant of a moving vehicle unless the operator or occupant poses an immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury to the public or an officer by means other than the vehicle. Officers shall not discharge a firearm from his or her moving vehicle.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Explaining in detail to removal of firearm is ridiculous. I am trained in the academy to know when and when not to use my firearm. Obviously the upper staff doesn't trust the academy training. most agencies have a "check the box" on use of force with small explanation of what type of force. SFPD will have to write a detailed portion as to why, what and how? This again will have officers felling like they are being punished or have done something wrong. How about the non-compliant subject that refuses to obey orders?
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	This new policy will get an officer killed and it puts public lives at risk. What do you do when someone is shooting at an officer or public while they are driving a car?
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Proportionality is again vague and ambiguous. Many times these events occur very quickly and it does not take much effort to kill someone with a knife or edged weapon, even if the knife is small. It is not that difficult to slice vital areas.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Negatives: The pointing of firearms is a mandated report of force
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Someone...meaning an officer...is going to get hurt or killed....
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	Negatives: 1) Tying up the radio during a code 33 threatens the safety of Officers and the public. I believe that this order should suggest that if it is "reasonable" to do so a supervisor should remind Officers to use "time and distance" not shall. 2) The use of the phrase "principals of probability" should be replaced with the phrase, "the level of force shall be reasonable." Again the word "reasonable" is consistent with the language used by the courts to judge the actions of police officers. The language of this drafted policy leads me to believe that Officers are going to be asked to fend off an edged weapon attack by means other than a firearm. I have never been trained nor will I accept training that expects me to use a shield to fend off a knife attack. I will never turn my back and run from a knife attack directed at me or another person. Please view the video attached to SFPD case 160146310. This incident involves the stabbing of a tourist. Its a grim reminder of what a knife attack looks like.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	The proposed proportionality is deeply flawed. Any tenured officer can tell you, including the recent CHP officer who was attacked with a knife, that a knife is an extremely dangerous weapon. One stab wound can kill someone. I have seen it happen numerous times in my career. What is proportional then? Waiting until a suspect stabs us or someone else and then using force. Then it is too late. This idea of proportionality needs to be addressed. It is deeply flawed. We can not always control suspects with proportionality. Not being able to discharge your firearm when you are in a moving vehicle may prevent officers from carrying out their duties as a police officer. Not being able to shoot the driver of a vehicle who is on a rampage with that vehicle is not good. How would be stop that person then?
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	These changes do not add any benefits to the department or the tax paying citizens of this City. Officers in this Department have demonstrated time and time again the best use of de-escalation when available.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	Subsection 4 is a joke. How about we stay off the air?
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	Why use the phrase “all human life?” How about just “human life?” Additionally, how about making it a useable policy instead of a public relations tool? How can an Officer or Supervisor follow this policy during a dynamic situation? How is a Supervisor is going to remind responding Officers to “to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources” during a Code 33 situation? Presenting the policy with the disclaimer, “when safe and practical under the totality of circumstances...” and then enumerating a PR based policy in which the itemizations can only be applied in the best case scenario makes it this not only unreasonable, but impossible to follow. Who will dictate the “safe and practical” nature of the response?
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Creates further negative exposure for the officer.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	This policy is going to cause officers to hesitate to pull out their firearm, and second guess themselves when they don't have time to do so.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Regarding the word “legitimacy” in the opening paragraph, were we ever “illegitimate”? Containment of a subject should not be our main concern, it should be to stop the threat The statement states that officers have “fulfilled” their duty by delaying taking a subject into custody is a furtherance of cowardice and an opinion that has no place in an order as important as this one Constantly reassessing an situation where shots are fired will get an officer killed in a gunfight. Detrimental muscle memory leads to dire results: Newhall shooting Will the DA charge a cop if their first 4 shots are considered reasonable, but their 5th shot is not? Vehicles are weapons and the driver can pilot that weapon, there are obvious examples when shooting solely at the driver (who is unarmed) would be permissible under both state and federal law and U of F thresholds. Officers may have to shoot out of a moving vehicle, again, not all situations are the same. A bad guy or girl doesn't call time out for us to exit and stop our car to engage

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Here, “de-escalation” and “proportionality” appears again. Officers already know to “de-escalate” situations which they often times successfully do on a daily basis. These new terms will do nothing to increase the safety of the Officers or the safety of subjects. They serve to provide only an additional avenue of attack when second guessing an Officer’s decisions after an incident.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	This new general order panders to uneducated politicians who have never been involved in LE. It leaves the officer completely open and liable even if he/she did everything justified within the scope of federal and state law. If an officer performs his/her duties according to what the supreme court of the US has dictated he/she could still be found administratively liable under this nonsense of a GO. Frankly the idea tat officers need to “hesitate” during a critical incident is going to get SFPD officers killed.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	-Supervisors responsibility: Any time when the use of a firearm is potentially necessary, having a supervisor tying up the air is simply dangerous. -Same complaint regarding proportionality as with proposed 5.01.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	I believe the proposed General Order will cause police officers to hesitate using force when it is necessary, which will result in officers getting hurt or killed.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Confusing. Reads more like a mission/value statement instead of a policy
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	3-5	there is too much emphasis on de-escalation. situations are dynamic and change rapidly. too much focus on de-escalation will get an officer injured or someone in the public.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	3-5	- As previously stated, I disagree with the superfluous language regarding de-escalation, proportionality, unnecessary supervisory radio traffic. -I disagree with the proposed changed regarding discharge of a firearm at the operator/occupant of a vehicle who is intending to do harm. I believe that the totality of circumstances and reasonableness should determine the use of deadly force, including when such force is applied to a vehicle operator or occupant.
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Again, as stated above I understand updating and changes. I care about any person, good or bad and do not come to work wishing I can pull the trigger on my weapon, nor do I think any fine SFPD officer thinks that. It’s a horrible thing, no one wins, its the last resort. Again, Hesitation by the officer when faced with GBI or death. Why is there Proportionality even in this order? What would we do different if a purp points a weapon at us? I think all of us can go on and on about the issues...Again, WHY are we being rushed and maybe stuck for the next 20 years with a policy with issues?
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	How is “slowing” down our response to potentially deadly encounters considered appropriate? This is a slap in the face to common sense.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	same language as 5.01
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The issue of the felon driving/using their vehicle as a deadly weapon is a major concern. Every two years, while at AO/CPT, we discuss the Fremont man who ran over several innocent bystanders in San Francisco using his car as a deadly weapon. How exactly should a SFPD Officer handle that kind of incident if it should ever happen again.
<u>Mission Station</u>	Investigative	16-19	The word “proportionality” is extraordinarily problematic. Without further definition and clear examples, it is a word that creates argument rather than clarity. The word appears in subtly different ways. One is in 5.01 I d- “it is important that an officer’s level of force be proportional to the severity of the offense committed or the threat posed to human life...” The second is 5.02 I B 3- “It is critical officers apply the principles of proportionality when encountering a subject who is armed with a weapon other than a firearm...” These two statements can basically mean anything. What are the “principles of proportionality?” The GO implies more than one. The word proportionality is not defined in case law regarding use of force. The word “reasonable” is defined clearly. No one is guessing what it means in context. The Supreme Court has defined it. Lower courts have explained how it is applied. Police training has been refined by experience and court cases. Proportionality, on the other hand, has no such positive aspects. As a new concept, it will require a large amount of training to teach. However that training will have no court cases to follow, no experience to draw from, and ultimately, no idea what it means. Proportionality means whatever activists say it means. That is probably a feature and not a bug, but that word should be avoided at all costs.
Mission Station	Investigative	6-10	Again, the implied requirement for de-escalation, and proportionality add too many factors for the officer to consider when facing a life or death decision related to the use of force. This could cause an officer to hesitate and delay in using deadly force resulting in death or serious injury to the officer. A weapon other than a firearm that is considered a deadly weapon (a knife, a bat, etc) is still a deadly weapon and needs to be treated as such. It should not be treated any less than a firearm. Understandably other weapons will not necessarily have the range and be immediately useable in the manner in which a firearm is. This does not negate the danger posed by a knife or other weapon. Again the amount of information a supervisor is expected to broadcast as a reminder is too great and consumes too much air time that responding officers need, and the officers on scene need so as to broadcast vital information. If the supervisor is broadcasting all of the required information, an officer on scene would be unable to broadcast crucial updates, especially to broadcast an injury to an officer on scene. As far as isolation is concerned, unless a suspect is barricaded, we do not currently have any means of successfully isolating an armed suspect without exposing officers, or citizens for that matter, to unnecessary risk of injury. It is not feasible for public safety to continuously move with an armed suspect, essentially allowing the suspect unrestricted movement. This allows the suspect more time to make a decision to try and improve his tactical advantage, and adds the possibility of an unforeseen circumstance occurring, such as a citizen exiting their home or parked vehicle, or even rounding the corner to where a homeless person is camped out, potentially providing the armed suspect with a hostage and/or new victim and would thus be

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			contradictory to the reason the police were contacted about the suspect. Police are contacted for armed suspects to prevent injury to the public, not provided an armed police escort for the suspect to the next unsuspecting victim.
Mission Station	Investigative	6-10	I agree that shooting at or from a moving vehicle is a dicey proposition. But to completely take it off the table is foolhardy. The police were able to take out the two terrorists in San Bernardino by shooting at the suspects' moving vehicle from their own moving vehicle. I guess if that happened in our city, under this new general order, SFPD would have just had to absorb the bullets and hope the suspects eventually ran out of gas. In exigent circumstances, shooting at or from a moving vehicle should be an option.
Mission Station	Investigative	6-10	it would jeopardize officer safety and put our officer in danger
Mission Station	Investigative	3-5	We are removing our ability to properly defend the public and ourselves.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The language "sanctity of human life" which is plastered everywhere in these new orders is offensive. Working police officers already know this and function this way saving lives everyday. To have this language reiterated everywhere in the orders by civil rights and tort lawyers and anti-police advocates is to insinuate that police officers do not believe this and that only they do. The reverse would actually be closer to the truth.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	To wordy and ambiguous.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	After going thru A.O. recently and having this revised order in mind, I found myself hesitating in a lethal force situation. Had this been a true event, I would have been seriously injured or died as a result of not shooting at a threat with a knife. Two years ago in the scenario, I found I had no hesitation in the discharge of my firearm in the same scenario.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	De-escalation should not be mentioned in this GO. It holds officers to a standard that will be judged only after the fact, and to an unknown standard. Proportionality is open for interpretation and has no bearing on an officer's perception of danger. And trying to say that a knife, baseball bat, or brick can't kill you as fast as a firearm is ridiculous. The parties writing this proposed DGO needs to watch the training video of the guy with the "knife" cover twenty feet and "stab" the officer before he could even clear leather.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	For the reasons stated above, these policy changes are unnecessary and only serve the department, not its members or the public.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The Department wants officers to "consider" why people aren't complying? That considering will get officer killed or hurt because that means they are hesitating. If someone is pointing a gun at me, or trying to stab me, etc., I'm not going to take the time to consider why because I want to go home alive. We are already trained to watch out for public safety, etc. before we shoot. Expecting officers to try and "de-escalate" when reacting to a violent subject is an officer safety issue, which is what the Department is supposed to care about first and foremost right? It's employees? Not so much.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Again, this proposed order, if enacted, will increase the likelihood of injury to officers, the public, and the suspect. Order imposes a clear duty to delay and retreat from deadly force encounters.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It is not a workable proposal.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Officers will start to view having their Firearm out for necessary defense of their life, like those mentioned above as a “shall stop doing” and WILL ABSOLUTELY cause an OFFICER to be killed in the line of duty for no other reason then to placate the current group Politicians. This idea is unforgivable, and if passed OFFICERS LIVES will be placed directly in harms way for no other reason then Politics. Officers will stop being prepared to defend their life or the life of another Officer simply because they will be reluctant to have their name placed in the Use Of Force Log or more accurately so they wont have to write a statement in an incident. This proposed DGO Will get Officers killed..
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Though I have not attended the new qualification, from what I have been told I like some of the changes. I do not like the proposal for much of the previously statements above.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I have spoken to seasoned officers who have recently participated in the FATS program at advanced officer training and they have told me that they, along with other officers they observed, hesitated during the scenarios when a firearm could be been an option and changed their decisions from what they would have been the last time they were at AO. Some of the officers scenarios went bad as a result and in a real situation could have been hurt or a member of the public could have been hurt. If officers are second guessing themselves in a simulated situation, then obviously they will second guess themselves on the street and get themselves or the public hurt or killed.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Very politically driven and not to the best interest of the officers out on the streets.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	using firearm is a last resort and should not be limited in anyway.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The proposed firearm police focuses more on the safety of the bag guy than that of the general public and of the officers involved. I strongly believe that the proposed firearm policy is geared more towards public relations than towards helping officers enforce laws.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Is extremely ambiguous and poorly written. Leaves Officers potentially vulnerable to Departmental and Civil Liability for merely doing the fundamentals of their job.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Opens all actions to scrutiny and subjective interpretation. Opens all of us up to liability and second guessing. Requires us to guess why a person is not complying, as if we should handle no compliance based on the reason as opposed to the actual and immediate threat it poses. Regardless of the reason for non compliance, and the mixture of mental illness, drug use and emotional state, a threat remains a threat and in the worst case scenario, will end with either the officer or the suspect being injured or killed. This policy increases the likelihood of the officer being killed and the civil liability if by any chance he or she survives.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	“It is important that an officer’s level of force be proportional to the severity of the offense committed”- a 6’7” jaywalker refuses to comply with my order to stop and instead attacks the smaller officer. Will the officer be judged on the initial offense? Isolate and contain? How???
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Our current training and DGO already covers what the new DGO stating. The new DGO leaves officers open to second guessing their actions and additional legal issues by adding additional steps, which we are already implementing on the street.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I feel that the new General Order goes out of its way to state what Officers do everyday as far as assessing situations and attempting de-escalation. The problem with it being written out in our DGO’s is that it gives our detractors a lot to work with when they are scrutinizing us.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This proposed places officer safety as an after-thought.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	As with the use of force draft policy, the introduction of language about de-escalation and proportionality makes us (police officers) sound like thugs looking for any reason to shoot someone. Whether we have had CIT training or not, officers will try to de-escalate a situation and use proportional force. The purpose of a use of firearms policy should be to provide guidance on what to do when de-escalation fails. “Officers should consider the possible reasons why a subject may not be noncompliant or resisting arrest.” We do not always have the time to consider why a suspect is noncompliant. We are expected to arrive on scene and resolve a problem. If we can do so without using force we will. If we arrive on scene and the suspect immediately becomes combative, whether armed or unarmed, then we have to make a split second decision on how to keep our selves and the public safe. This language is poorly worded and does not seem to take those kind of split second decisions into account. The draft policy fails to mention the penal code definition for use of force, including that the use of force is determined lawful or not based on an officers perception of the situation at the time of the situation. This draft contains language regarding de-escalation and proportionality, but if an officer feels that their life or the life of another is in danger, then they are covered by the penal code to use force.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Trying to plan out and pre-arrange how and when an officer will use a firearm is ridiculous. This new policy WILL get an officer hurt.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	All the issues that I had with the proposed 5.01 order regarding de-escalation, proportionality, and supervisor radio duties are also here. Additionally: Much of the proposed policy is not consistent with state law regarding use of deadly force. The proposed policy forbids shooting from a moving vehicle without exception or at a person in a moving vehicle unless the person poses a serious injury threat by means other than the vehicle. So if my partner was just shot dead in the driver’s seat of our moving car by an active shooter suspect while I was in the passenger seat of the car and our car was still rolling, I would either have to get out of the rolling car into a more dangerous situation to return fire or wait for the car to stop to return fire, or violate policy to try and save my life. Situation #2: A deranged suspect got into a car and is plowing over civilians in the crowded Alemany Farmer’s Market. I run up to the car that is still

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			slowly moving, but the doors are locked and I can't break the window quickly enough. The suspect is trying to get the vehicle into gear to run over more people. My options are to further risk my life and civilian lives by trying to break the window and someone pull the suspect out. Or violate policy and shoot the suspect. These situations are rare and will hopefully never happen, but it is absolute prohibition language like that which makes the proposed policy inflexible and makes it seem like it is designed to make an officer choose between violating policy or saving lives. There needs to be some understanding that exigent circumstances exist, not every contingency can be anticipated by policy, and officers are picked and trained and trusted to have enough common sense to deal with life or death situations that they face.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I believe proposed D.G.O 5.02 leaves officers vulnerable to getting hurt.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I do not agree with the revised policy regarding shooting into vehicles. Not allowing an officer to defend himself or the public when the driver intends to use the vehicle itself to cause GBI or death takes away from an officer's duty to preserve life in those situations.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed draft stresses an idea that the safety and life of an officer matters less than that of a potential suspect. The draft is written in response to current public opinion and not to protect officers in the line of duty.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This policy change appears to be geared specifically for CIT-related situations. It apparently ignores the other potential incidents caused by armed subjects that are not in a case of mental distress.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	evaluate after "each and every discharge of a firearm" What is the point of this specific language? If an officer fires 4 rounds in rapid succession, did they violate policy? It is impossible to conduct this evaluation between the pulls of a trigger in a high stress situation.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The core of the new 5.02 appears to be very similar to the old 5.02. However, the issue with the new 5.02 is the same as the new 5.01. The over focus and repetitive coverage on communication makes it unclear. The importance and expectations of communication was established in 5.01. The order clearly states that its purpose is to establish policies and procedures regarding use of firearms and lethal force. It does not stay focused on that topic. I find great danger in the fact the new 5.02 directly and exclusively prohibits the discharging of a firearm from his or her moving vehicle. While the discharging of a firearm from a moving vehicle is dangerous and should not be a first resort, it may become necessary. As the old order states, it should be based on the totality of circumstances. Officers are ambushed in their vehicles. It is possible, and highly likely in light of the number of officers ambushed recently, that an officer will be attacked in his or her vehicle and need to fight for his or her life.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	It is terrible and dangerous to tell officers that they should be thinking of reasons why a subject is not compliant while you have a gun pointed at them. The officers need to be focusing on the task at hand and not a million other things. It is not wise to advise the person why a gun is pointed at them until they are put under control and in handcuffs. The officers have a gun in their hands and can't be worrying about other things.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This is offensive. It does not need to be said that lethal force is only for the protection of life, and to amend the GO with endless mealy-mouthed feel-good pointless statements is ridiculous. The actual verbage about the usage of lethal force is fundamentally the same, but with lots of implicit qualifiers that will surely be exploited by people looking to profit from tragedy.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Sections I(4)(A) and I(4)(B) prevent the officer who is encountering/about to encounter an armed subject from transmitting critical information when it is most needed, potentially putting the lives of officers and the public needlessly at risk.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	-pointing? -no leeway in shooing at a vehicle or driver of a vehicle
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	As previously stated, I strongly disagree that officers have to go at par with a suspect who has already demonstrated a propensity for violence. For those who believe that an edge weapon is less lethal than a firearm I would suggest that they look at national statistics on firearm deaths versus edge weapon related deaths.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I feel that it doesn't help the officers and is not looking out for safety of the officers.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Vehicles, edged weapons, baseball bats, bricks, and bottles are all deadly weapons. This DGO attempts to cast them in another light. If the verbiage in D. 5. becomes policy, officers will not be allowed to protect lives when and if a suspect chooses to use a vehicle itself as a deadly weapon.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The language seems to be too subjective and leaves officers subject to lawsuits. It seems like a person who has never been an officer ever wrote this in the safety and comfort of their home.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Why would supervisor's need to remind us to use de-escalation techniques during hot calls? We know how to do our job. Let us do it without forcing supervisors to do things not even they want to do. How do we know if someone only presents a danger to him/herself? What if a person is holding a knife to their throat and starts to walk or run into a group of people or into a school or playground. Every incident depends on the situation. A situation like this MIGHT require deadly force, even though it appears the person is only a danger to themselves.
<u>Northern Station</u>	Administrative	20	since when are sharp objects not dangerous! This is crazy.
Northern Station	Administrative	11-15	As with most of the new policy drafts, the language included limits an officers responses to unpredictable situation. You CANNOT put every scenario into a policy, that is why the current policies were more practical. Although a bit vague in some parts, the vagueness allows for the hundreds of scenarios that officers face.
Northern Station	Investigative	20	Muscle memory training for experienced officers to be now untrained/retrained..... Ive fired three rounds and had no idea how many I fired.....
Northern Station	Investigative	0-2	See above regarding use of firearm use of force reporting.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	There are times when an officer needs to point his/her weapon at a subject, this should not be

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			a “Reportable Use of Force,” because now it becomes an indicating factor in regards to the EIS. An officer already in the EIS may hesitate, second-guess, as to not “activate” the EIS --- which may have either officer, or citizen safety ramifications.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Supervisor’s have too many notifications to broadcast to Officer’s at the scene. It is not practical an will create confusion and stress that is not needed.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Again, pointing of gun at criminal as a use of force is a terrible idea.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	see #10. Paragraph 4, section b has that same unnecessary radio directive that is too time consuming and illogical coming from someone who may not be anywhere near the scene.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	This new order will create “second guessing” by an officer that could end with less than desired results such as an officer or suspect getting hurt or killed. It will also raise more unnecessary doubt or scrutiny from the general public.
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	disagree with the section regarding subjects armed with weapons other than firearms. 99.9% of officers I work with already use de-escalation
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	4.b is naive, wasted use of radio time and officer responding should already know this. Not to mention you have a person giving orders to a situation that isn’t present and has first hand knowledge. c.2 advisement of why a gun is being pointed should happen after the event not during. If you have ever pointed a gun at a real possible shoot situation and attempt to do this you would understand why this is distracting/bad idea. What’s important, is making a good discussion and evaluating the threat not being distracted. Any seasoned officer knows this. 5. Moving vehicles; The use of the word Immediate should not be there. It should be imminent if a word is to be used. B.1 is far too wordy, and De-escalation should not be a requirement only an option. We are not psychologists, psych nurses, or doctors. Not to mention bad de-escalation tech can harm or escalate the situation. Which leads into more restrictions and requirements and as stated above citations like these are fluid, evolving, and dynamic. To thinks a set type of requirements should be implemented is ignorant and naive.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The new proposal is an over reaction to the media and small group of people that have always been in a confrontation with the Police at one time or another. If not them then someone in there immediate family has and they just don’t like what we do in order to keep the peace.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	See above - the proposed policy is confusing and exposes officers, the public, and subjects to a higher degree of danger than current policy.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Why is “the sanctity of human life must be protected” repeated over and over. Im insulted that whoever wrote this believes that the police officers within the SFPD don’t already believe that. The politicians seem that they would be more happy if a cop were killed rather than the criminal we sometimes have to eliminate. We contribute something of value to the community. We pay taxes and the kind of values most of us are made up of, help make the world a better place. But the politicians in my city, and the ones in the current White House, rather risk me and my

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>coworkers life by making us second guess in situations where sometimes we have fractions of a second to make a life or death decision! If these type of politicians had to do our job, just one day, they would cry and run away. Even the most hardened, mean, jaded cop would not want to have to shoot or hurt someone due to all of the paperwork! The paperwork is enough of a deterrent !</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>My comments above cover this proposed area of the D.G.O. as well...</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>The first section in this draft is de-escalation. Why? An Officer should take into account and “consider the possible reasons why a subject may not be noncompliant or resisting arrest. A subject may not be capable of understanding the situation because of a medical condition, mental, physical or hearing impairment”. Given that this is the use of firearms policy, Officers in theory would not have time to consider this as their lives or the lives of others are at stake. Given this wording in the policy, Officers would have a lot of explaining to do given the discharge of a firearm. This is unfortunate. “Immediately disarming the subject and taking the subject into custody is a lower priority than preserving the sanctity of human life.” What does that mean? “Officers, who proceed accordingly and delay taking a subject into custody, while keeping the public and Officers safe, will not be found to have neglected their duty. They will be found to have fulfilled it”. This sentence goes against the oath I was sworn to protect. So basically why should an Officer respond to a 222 or a 419 call for service? What happens when someone is hurt then what? Am I neglecting duty then? Seems like I’m praised more for doing nothing and letting a suspect get away than for reacting.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>This will endanger Officers and the law abiding citizens they/we protect and serve. Space and distance will not make people more safe, it will endanger more people from the few that terrorize their communities.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>Politics verses science and statistics seem to be bringing a dangerous hesitation gap that will endanger the Police. i.e. Texas Deputy who did not draw his firearm, where he was disarmed and firearm was used against him -- afterwards, he felt he would get in trouble for drawing his firearm, which is why he failed to defend himself.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>Section 4 states three items as a SHALL for supervisor’s responsibility. Tying up valuable radio transmission time to “remind responding officers, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint.” Your pretty much telling the officers on scene to run and hide. This info is a shall. Directions given from someone not a scene undermines the ability of the officer on scene.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>I am extremely frustrated with this proposed policy. It is so convoluted and filled with bureaucratic language that it is difficult to understand and apply. I whole heartedly believe that it will lead to officers hesitating and being injured. I have read it multiple times and still have difficulty remembering all of the additions. This policy seems like it was written by someone who does not understand the idea of the split second decisions that need to be made, are completely disillusioned by the dangers of a knife and think that by being a police officer, it means that we have a duty to die.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
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	A knife or edged weapon is a deadly weapon and you should never use anything other than a firearm or Taser in that situation.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	officers will no longer take their firearms out of their holsters or hesitate to when their is a clear need because they will have conditioned themselves that they will have to report a use of force write a report and then have to deal with OCC.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Shooting at a moving vehicle is sometimes necessary. I agree that additional training to limit “sympathetic gunfire” is a good thing. Policy does not need to change for that to happen.
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	The limitation about using firearm from our patrol vehicles seems kind of counter intuitive with all the officer ambushes going on in the country.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Pointing a firearm at an individual should not be a reportable use of force. This proposal creates many officer safety issues. In a stressful situation, considering factors as to what is causing an individual and creating time endangers an officers safety. The officer needs to focus on the threat presented and how to/ overcome it. Pointing a firearm as a reportable use of force creates an unsafe deterrent to officers as they may not point it because they are deterred because it mandates a reported use of force. Officers in the country have lost their lives because they were scared of media attention and/or paperwork.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Officers point guns at people everyday and rightfully so. Our streets are becoming more and more dangerous. Now you are creating hesitation that will cost lives.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	this will cause injuries to officers and the public they will hesitate to use their firearms when appropriate
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	If a subject is waving a knife at a Police Officer, I’m pretty sure there’s a high chance that de-escalation isn’t going to work. A mentally unstable person makes things MORE dangerous. They’re unpredictable. Now that we can no longer draw our weapons and point it at someone without reporting it, Officers will now think twice to draw their weapon. This will create a greater danger to the public. It’s not even so much Officers in general, it’s for the older Officers who are trained and have it engraved in their memory the older techniques. It’s not like suspects getting shot is an new thing. The department is trying to make itself look good, playing politics...Again, I get it. But you’re handcuffing you’re department.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I believe pointing a firearm at a suspect should not be a use of force. Police Officers have to point their firearms at subjects in given circumstances because it is for their safety and the safety of others. When a firearm is pointed at someone they do not get injured unless the gun is fired, therefore it should not be a use of force to merely point your firearm at a suspect. If it is going to be a use of force, pointing a firearm should not be taken into consideration for E.I.S.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			Officers will become worried about being on E.I.S. for pointing their firearm at suspects which may lead to Officers becoming timid and not having their firearm out when needed. This is a huge Officer safety issue.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed draft creates too much liability for Officers who may be forced to use deadly force in extreme circumstances not contemplated by the Order. In particular, prohibiting Officers from discharging a firearm at a moving vehicle in ANY circumstance is moronic. We have now had two extreme cases within the past 6 years of deadly felons armed with vehicles which were being used as the suspects' primary weapon. Although it's not favorable to shoot at a moving vehicle, the risk to Officer/Civilian life safety far outweighs any rigid adherence to policy.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Like explained before in an ideal world these ideas would work. This city has some of the most strung out, crazy and unstable people. If you actually worked as a police officer in this city you would know and understand how unique and crazy this place can be. What I am most concerned with is that by passing this proposed General Order is the safety of our officers. I feel like this is a knee jerk reaction to a terrible event where a young man lost his life. That incident should not dictate where we go as a department. That man was shot because he stabbed someone and failed to comply with police demands. So what your leading me to believe is that by passing this proposed DGO the subject high or altered is now all of the sudden going to comply. Am I crazy or did the Officers on scene that day in December not try to deescalate the situation. Didn't they order him multiple times to drop the weapon? Didn't they use verbal warnings? didn't they use reasonable care for the public? didn't they use less than lethal options before deploying there firearms? Sure you could argue that 4 people shooting is a lot. Sure 20 rounds fired at 1 subject is more than needed but like I said in the beginning of this we don't live in a perfect world. I would just hate to see this department pass or allow something into our DGO's that would jeopardize the safety of our Officers over the safety of a fleeing armed felon who is a known gang member and has already shown that he is violent. I am sorry but when did this country value the life of a felon a bad guy over the lives of the men and woman who serve this city.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The wording and overall feel of the new DGO is confusing and makes it hard to understand when it is authorized.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The main disadvantage in the draft is pointing a firearm at somebody is now a use of force. Officers will be more hesitant to draw their firearm, and it will only be a matter of time before somebody gets hurt. The other night there was a shooting on Polk St and officer's drew their weapons and pointed it at the suspect. Half of the night half the watch was at a computer writing supplementals about their "use of force" while crime was happening out on the streets.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The revised version of DGO 5.02 states that supervisors are to remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources. Officers will not be able to transmit on their radios during this supervisor reminder. Bad idea

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	and very dangerous for responding Officers. I do not like the moving vehicle section of this new revised DGO. Can an Officer shoot at a suspect that is driving a vehicle at a high rate of speed towards pedestrians on the sidewalk? It is not clear.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I believe this new use of firearms GO will backfire on the city. Once again, as I explained before, it creates an environment in which members will hesitate at crucial moments which can save lives. Take Oakland for example, approx 66,000 stops to 14,000 stops in one year. It has created an environment that is rampant with violent crime and a police force that is powerless to stop it. We cannot let this happen in San Francisco.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Sacrifices officer safety
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	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	Drawing and pointing a firearm should not be a reportable use of force. A firearm is could be used numerous times depending on the calls for service that an officer faces. Having to add more reporting requirement and use of force logs would bog down a officer and prevent them from accomplishing their duties.
<u>Park Station</u>	Administrative	20	A politically motivated piece of garbage developed by activists and politicians, not by professional law enforcement trainers and experts. It will get officers in the SFPD hurt or killed. What a disgusting joke.
Park Station	Investigative	20	Cops will second guess themselves when it matters most. Whereas the current policy reflects reasonable actions, this new proposal is bureaucratic doublespeak for retreat and do nothing.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This DGO should be combined with 5.01. It says all the same things and it has many of the same problems. Supervisory Responsibility - The communication issues in section I.B.4. - See the comments made on 5.01. As I stated in my comments on DB15-255, making pointing a firearm at someone a UOF does not make sense. Section I.D.1.b. They have added "or use lethal force against" - this is the firearm DGO. That reference was added and should be removed. This is done again in same section under 2. Section I.D.5 - The draft has removed a large section outlining Moving Vehicles. There are situations when using firearms should be an option but they have been removed in the draft. I was part of the rewrite group on DGO

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			5.02 in 2011. The City Attorney needed this info in the DGO to defend officers in civil court. Section 6.b “Other Lethal Force” - why is this in the Firearm DGO?
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	So a suspect who runs into a car you cant shoot at even though they just killed someone? The suspect as happened a few years ago is driving around rowing down people using his vehicle as a deadly weapon. We cant shoot him? The suspect dictates our response..verbal warning are great..communication is good...but there is not effective method to disarm a person with a weapon if they do not wish to be free of it.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Again, the de-escalation is almost time consuming given the fact that the suspect will take matters in their own hands long before additional resources arrives.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	too confusing, its open to second guessing.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Pointing a firearm at a subject should not be considered a use of force.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	new language adopted -- Proportionality
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	it fckn sucks, and going to get some one killed, period. It just won't be the pencil neck who wrote it.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	If the subject has an edged weapon, baseball bat, improvised weapon etc.. I'm drawing my weapon! Take a poll of officers and see who would not? What about the sanctity of officers life and safety? Proportionality? What happened to 'Every officer shall go home safely at the end of their shift'?
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Limits officers, and will cause a lag time on thought to action, especially for members who have trained this way for years if they have to reconcile old training to new training. Does not cover officers in exigent circumstance. limits ability to protect themselves.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It should not be recommended to delay taking a subject into custody. Officers will now allow dangerous subjects to walk away and have the potential to injure the public. Under Moving Vehicles - I believe that Officers may shoot from moving vehicles if the subject poses a threat other than from their vehicle (If I am in a pursuit and the subject is shooting at me, I am not allowed to shoot from my vehicle, so what am I to do? Continue to follow and observe/report direction?)
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I am not comfortable with the word “delay” under the de-escalation. How much delay is acceptable before taking further action? To me, delay runs counter to taking action to protect the public.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	5.02 (03/11) version seems sufficient enough.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	More and more Officers are being injured by edged weapons each and every year. Also you want a supervisor to trample over the air who is not on scene to recite some policy. It is a complete joke and could get Officers hurt.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Whether the subject is in an altered mental state or if the subject has a mental condition is irrelevant when the subject has a gun or other deadly weapon and is posing an imminent threat to officers or the public. The wording of this proposed DGO is insulting and pedantic. The requirement for supervisors to recite a laundry-list of platitudes over the air while officers are engaging an armed subject is ridiculous and dangerous.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I don't like the use of force for pointing a firearm at a person. Why cant we use a firearm against a person who is using their vehicle as a weapon?
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Overall, it is a knee jerk reaction to public pressure and does not significantly address the day to day interactions and dangerous situations many Officers face
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The constant repetition of a phrase regarding the sanctity of life is political pandering. I came into this job and I put myself on the line every night for my city BECAUSE I believe in the sanctity of life and I believe that is true for most officers. We de-escalate almost every day - its called talking to people, and we do it constantly. This policy seems more like political posturing than actual change.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I do not feel like the action of pointing my firearm at a potentially dangerous subject should be a reported use of force, there was no injury if the firearm was not discharged and could be no complaint of pain besides hurt feelings. I feel like this new general order will deter officers from using their firearm as a tool to prevent a situation from escalating into a deadly force incident and will force us to be reactionary rather than prepared for a potentially dangerous situation.
<u>Richmond Station</u>	Investigative	20	A supervisor's responsibility to remind officers of what they need to do will tie up valuable emergency radio traffic.
Richmond Station	Investigative	11-15	pointing firearm should not be reported use of force
Richmond Station	Investigative	6-10	I. B. 1. De-escalation- Officers should consider the possible reason why a subject may not be compliant or resisting. I feel this is the objective of every officer always. This verbiage takes away from faith in the discretion and judgment of the officers and their training. Officers responding to dangerous incidents on a daily basis where the 'proportion' of these incidents that result in a use of force is much lower than the number of incidents that are neutralized without any force or minimal force. This proposed change comes as if it is never an officers intention to respond to a scene and neutralize the situation rather than it result in a shooting. Maybe because it was not in written form it is assumed by the people demanding these policy changes that it Shall be in our policy. I do feel it opens officers up to discipline and litigation in every instance they cannot de-escalate. This may cause hesitation on the officers part out of fear and lead to injury or death of an officer who is being stripped of his ability to make a split second decision and know that he is protected by our policy.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Without complete studies and research, I know that the new proposed de escalation techniques, and the shoot...assess the threat....etc, will get officers hurt or worse. Second guessing gives criminals the advantage. Prop 47 started the spike in criminal activity, with little to no recourse. Spineless jellyfish-like leaders folding, and caving to political pressure demoralizes patrol, the spine of all police departments, and the glue that holds society together, balancing between lawless animals, and civilized societies.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	B:2 Again, Proportionality needs to be explained better or omitted as I stated above. B:3 Proportionality again, (meaning balanced). We need to continue having the wording of reasonable force to overcome resistance.. Not proportional. Also, how can officers contain a subject with a knife? or bat? who will be the first officer to stand in front of him? and if he does, and the subject continues to walk toward him? now what? be proportional and use his baton?. These policies are put for the perfect situation with the perfect suspect, who will comply. NOT reality. 4: I listed my objections above on question 10.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Since when did pointing a firearm at someone caused injury? All the other use of force options cause injury. Officers including myself will be confused and not draw their firearms, again losing the advantage. Again the rise on more attacks on police officers will cause officers to hesitate to draw or be at a ready. Many officers will ensure be on the EIS. So does that mean they get transferred because there is a pattern? Where do they go?
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	You cannot rewrite a policy and undue 20 years of training and muscle memory. The Department is asking for law suites.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Negatives, extraneous radio traffic when the air should be clear for the officer calling the emergency.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Why are they duplicating De-Escalation, Proportionality etc.?
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Again drawing a firearm is not a use of force. No “force” or injury is delivered to a subject by having a firearm pointed at them. Furthermore, it is very vague in description and does not address specific situations like covering a building line with a firearm, or accidental “muzzling” of fleeing citizens from a crime scene, or if an officer is pointing a firearm at a car full of people but no one individual in specific.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I think the Police Commission and the Chief seems like they don’t ever want you to take out your firearm again no matter what situation an Officer finds himself or herself in.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I think intentional pointing of firearm should be defined as pointing of the firearm, directly at the person, that if the situation escalates, it would result in a shooting.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	same disagreement as proposed use of force - proportionality and de-escalation language should not be written into general order.
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.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I disagree with the section mandating a report when a firearm is drawn. this may lead to more injuries to and deaths.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Training creates muscle memory. If we get in a shootout and we have to stop and assess the situation after two rounds, we may do that every time. This can be witnessed in the CHP shootout in which the two slain officers were found with casings in their pocket. They reverted to their training in a time of high stress. This proposed General Order can cost us our life.
<u>Southern Station</u>	Investigative	11-15	Again too vague and open to interpretation. Every OIS could result in policy failure, depending on who interprets the policy.
Southern Station	Investigative	11-15	Again, de-escalation is made more important than officer safety. If an officer pulls out a firearm, there is usually good reason, officer safety or public safety. I'm not saying all communication is done. The officer can still attempt to de-escalate while having a firearm out, but again, there must be a reason why the firearm is present. the order make is seem like the subject armed with a knife or a brick is not a major danger. Knives are far more dangerous than gun. Knives do not need to be reloaded. Someone educated in close quarters combat can do serious damage with a knife. Look at what happen to the CHP officer a few months ago. Tell him knives are a danger. Time and distance will not always be available. Again the order tells supervisor to take up radio air and remind officer to preserve life. Why does this need to be reminded? This is what we train for. How can a supervisor make decisions when they are not present. Allow officer to make the calls until a supervisor is on scene.
Southern Station	Investigative	6-10	-Supervisors are to "remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources." How can a supervisor do that if he/she is not on scene yet, and therefore doesn't understand totality of the circumstance?
Southern Station	DOC Light Duty	11-15	Having a paragraph about de-escalation in the firearms policy is verbal masturbation. As well as telling Officers it's ok to let armed bad guys go to preserve human life.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Again, placing ourselves in harms way is no way top protect the public and carry out the performances of our duties.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I think this new proposed DGO is ridiculous especially the added portion that a supervisor shall remind officers about de-escalation techniques. This is going to get someone hurt or worse, killed because they will hesitate, worrying about whether or not they are doing the right thing.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Pointing a gun is a use of force? No way and again this administration should stop bowing down to the Board of Supervisors.
SSouthern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	- 2 shots and reassess is an officer safety issue. The issue is the stop the threat. Having a policy where only 2 shots are allowed at a time will allow suspects who are not stopped by the first 2

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			shots, the time to attack the officer. This is particularly the case if the shots miss, graze or hit the suspect in an extremity or the suspect is on narcotics that prevent them from feeling pain.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	no positives. This whole deal about reminding us to de-escalate is absurd. We know what to do.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Training officers to only shoot a threat two times, and then reassess maybe putting the officer's life in danger.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	places too many conditions and restrictions on UOF. UOF are dynamic and fluid situations. requiring "2 shots then reassess" is an unreasonable condition and sets the stage for liability. In 25 years of law enforcement, firearms training has ALWAYS emphasized constant assessment during any UOF. Why quantify it with impractical conditions now? It sets up members for failure and liability.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This department is far too young to be instituting regulations that ALREADY have officers second guessing even drawing their weapons in situations where it is 1000% justified. The current reporting rules and proposed 5.02 will cause further second guessing, not the intended "moment of pause" or "thoughtfulness". It causes paralysis via analysis which will get someone hurt or killed
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Again changing the policy over one local incident and a few nation incidents is ridiculous.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Officers are going to second guess themselves and hesitate to draw their weapons. This new GO is going to get someone seriously hurt or killed.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	After reading through the proposed DGO, I don't believe it will be beneficial to implement this DGO. I think officers who are learning this DGO in the academy will take it as if they have to go through a checklist to make sure they are able to draw their fire arm. Even at that I believe this DGO will have officers' second guessing themselves when they are put in a situation where their life and the publics life is at risk. I think this needs to be addressed now before an incident occurs in which someone's life is put at risk.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Requiring a supervisor to advise officers while en route to "protect life, isolate and contain the subject...etc." will tie up radio traffic unnecessarily during what is potentially a dangerous incident.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Let's not be pussies please.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I agree with the current one, I do not see why we have to add all these unnecessary steps, that only put my life in danger more than the other person.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I do not agree with the policy of pointing a firearms as a reportable use of force. Based on that logic any time I threaten to us my baton, pepper spray or even raise my voice that too should be a reportable 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	This proposal will eventually end up getting Officers hurt. “Proportionality,” how can you sleep at night. Anyone who has spent any time working can tell you this is nonsense. I have nothing further to say. I fear for lives of Officers and Citizens who will be wronged when this all falls apart.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This GO is going to get Officer’s hurt or killed. It now gives suspects the ability to get in a car and run us over and takes away our ability to protect ourselves and the public.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Policy is too restrictive. It is upsetting that the people who wrote this proposed policy don’t realize that you cannot have a policy for everything single situation. There will always be different variables, such as people who are on meth and refuse to listen, people who do not want to go to jail, and people who have have a disregard for human life. The sanctity of life line only needs to be written once, not more. I personally don’t believe it’s necessary because I don’t believe there is a single cop that wakes up wanting to discharge their firearm. It would be a lot easier if the bad guys followed instructions, but they don’t. The section on moving vehicles from the current DGO should be inserted verbatim into the new DGO.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	officers are going to be afraid to pull their guns out when their lives are in danger.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Once again, de-escalation is a tactic we use on a daily/nightly basis. The use of firearm is a result of the subject not complying with usually verbal and sometimes physical control. We use our firearm in self-defense of ourselves or another when there is imminent danger of death or bodily injury. Proportional use of force throws that out the window.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Insanity to consider pointing a firearm as a reportable use of force.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	How can you train police officers to shoot somebody two times then assess. As a combat veteran I know for a fact that the minimal training that SFPD does with firearms will not ingrain muscle memory. Not only that, but if you have to engage somebody, and you shoot them two times in the gut, they will probably not go down. If they have a firearm as well, they will still be able to use it. Officers will get hurt.
<u>Special Operations</u>	Administrative	20	Again it handcuffs the officers from making decisions during a dangerous and fluid situation. Officers are going to get killed.
Special Operations Group	Administrative	20	Have not seen proposals
Special Operations Group	Administrative	11-15	I understand that our firearm policy is changing due to recent court rulings; while we must adapt to the legal environment I still believe it is a step in the wrong direction.
Special Operations Group	Canine Handler	20	De-escalation has always been at the for front in resolving situations. In regards to lethal force paragraph, I.B.1 concentrates on why a subject is non-compliant. Most often we do not have the time to contimplate “why” nor does it really matter as long as the suspect is willingly posing a serious threat. The why really doesn’t matter. explaining to a subject why you point a gun at them is also useless. Most likely they know why and even if you spend the time to

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Special Operations Group	TAC	3-5	<p>explain it to them they won't respond rationally nor be able to understand the reason from the officers perspective. I.D.5. Moving Vehicles- This says you can't shoot the driver of the vehicle who is trying to kill you with the vehicle. That is insane! you may be in a place where there is no cover and can't safely get away. (ie large empty parking lot)</p> <p>1-MOVING VEHICLES. An officer shall not discharge a firearm at the operator or occupant of a moving vehicle unless the operator or occupant poses an immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury to the public or an officer by means other than the vehicle. Officers shall not discharge a firearm from his or her moving vehicle. So if a vehicle is driving directly at me and I have no means of escaping that path I am not allowed to shoot? The wording is very particular and narrowly focused leaving no room for a variety of situations that could present themselves and make it necessary for an Officer to either discharge their firearm at the operator/occupant or shoot from a moving vehicle. This wording tells me the department does not care for our safety or the very difficult decisions we have to make under stress and extreme time constraints; nor do they wish to back those decisions.</p>
Special Operations Group	Mayors Detail	6-10	The proposed policy severely limits an officers effective usage of the firearm. Which unfortunately is more of a necessity today then ever before.
Special Operations Group	High risk warrant	11-15	Its going to get officers hurt. It makes officers think too much instead of concentrating on eliminating the threat to keep themselves and the public safe.
Special Operations Group	Tactical Unit	16-19	This will jeopardize officer safety like in other agencies. Officers are not drawing their firearms in other agencies during dangerous situations because of the reporting procedures. They are keeping their hands on the firearm, in the holster. This is creating a huge training scare and this will get an officer killed.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	<p>Again as stated in DGO 5.01 critique, I feel that a Supervisor having to go on the radio and to remind officers to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance, find cover, engage in thoughtful dialogue...etc is trying up valuable air time, The requirement should be a SHOULD instead of a SHALL and should be applied when practical to do so. In the real world to hold a supervisor accountable to this policy would expose that supervisor to policy failure because they can realistically apply this requirement. We all know that in a code 3 response we are suppose to advise dispatch of our response, and our location of response , but the reality is we seldom do and reserve the air traffic for the officer at the scene. This requirement, though thoughtful is not realistic. D.5. Moving vehicle's. I understand the ramifications of firing at a moving vehicle, however there can be circumstances where this action is necessary. To not identify the vehicle as a weapon is a mistake, because it is. If an officer, through no action of their own, becomes threatened by the movement of a motor vehicle, they should be able to fire at the driver of the vehicle to stop of deter the threat. I have been in this very situation, and the reality is.. it happened and criminal will know that a vehicle is means to escape and will do nothing short of running over and officer to avoid capture.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Instructing a Sgt. to go over the air reminding officer to create distance etc. will only tie up the air and could complicate relaying important information from the officer.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	See above re: Sgts required to put all of that unnecessary info on the air while responding. Taking up valuable air time stating what officers already know (like “protect life”) is insulting and ridiculous. Also, the overall message of the order is to further risk the officer’s safety for the benefit of protecting the suspect who is forcing the situation, not the officers.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	i cant even believe they have come up with this crap. this is as unbelievable to me as what obama is doing to our country and how he doesn’t support our law enforcement. if we have done somwthing wrong we correct it , in our case we have done nothing wrong .
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	To restrictive
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Section I.B.4.b is completely unsafe, impractical and causes more difficulty for responding of-ficers and any back up officers. It is narrow minded to think supervisors need to say all of this over the radio for each call; that each call requiring a response will allow such time to make such “reminders”; that the officers actions 2-10 minutes after such a :reminder” will change what they are TRAINED to do in such situations.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It is ridiculous, juvenile, and unecessary that a supervisor would have to remind me of the sanctity of life while responding to the scene. I take offense to that and well know the sanctity of life. That is why I took this job, to preserve and protect life! I disagree with the pointing of a firearm as a use of force. When I display my baton or pepper spray is that also a use of force? If I knuckle up, is that a use of force? Furthermore, I do not like the statement about how moving vehicles cannot be fired upon unless the threat of death of an officer or the public is threatened by means other than the vehicle. As if a vehicle is not a weapon. What if a vehicle is speeding towards a civilian, should I not fire to stop it? It’s to restraining, and every situa-tion is different. Again the policy is full of fluff and feel good, yet unpractical policies.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	eliminates any possibility of officers thinking for themselves
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Proposed General Order 5.02 introduces the same language of “sanctity of life,” “proportion-ality,” and “de-escalation.” The order places officers in harm’s way, as they have to sacrifice their personal safety to appease the current political environment. A knife, brick, and bat are equally as dangerous as firearms. Based on FBI studies, knives have killed more individuals in the United States, than firearms. It is ridiculous to think that an officer is limited in their force options, if the dangerous weapon is not a firearm.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I feel that this new order will put officers lives and the publics lives at risk of death or serious bodliy injury. Officers will second guess them selves and it will result in several officer deaths and deaths of the citizens of San Francsico. I don’t see how this is a realistic type of “Guide-line”. All of the OIS’ that have occurred have been an extreme last resort. Our members are not out shooting people like its the wild west. None of us get to work and say “hey you what would make my day, let me go shoot someone today”. This new order is a knee jerk reaction by the

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	chief and his people to save their jobs and to look good to a small minority of people who are anarchists.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Puts officers at a disadvantage when confronted with an armed suspect. I believe that the proposed General Order 5.02 makes officers second guess themselves. It also makes supervisors second guess and overly micro manage their officers. This will put officers in situations where they second guess themselves or are overly hesitant to use their firearms when it would be absolutely necessary and appropriate.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Again this seems like window dressing to impress Politicians and aspects of the public who view ANYTHING we do as wrong. No matter what we will be wrong and on the hook. Work with us, use the input of our leadership. Police officers who are working daily to make this city a safer place. Officers who have unfortunately had OISs. Back us up.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	not practical to real life situations. “Except where circumstances make it reasonable for an officer to take action to protect human life or prevent serious bodily injury, immediately disarming the subject and taking the subject into custody is a lower priority than preserving the sanctity of human life. Officers who proceed accordingly and delay taking a subject into custody, while keeping the public and officers safe, will not be found to have neglected their duty. They will be found to have fulfilled it.” = joke “Officers should consider the possible reasons why a subject may not be noncompliant or resisting arrest. A subject may not be capable of understanding the situation because of a medical condition; mental, physical, or hearing impairment; language barrier; drug interaction; or emotional crisis, and have no criminal intent. These situations may not make the subject any less dangerous, but understanding a subject’s situation may enable officers to use de-escalation techniques while maintaining public safety and officer safety.” = joke
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Attempting to “isolate and contain” and subject with a deadly weapon is almost impossible, in order to do so, and officer must put themselves in harms way, and thus force the issue.
<u>Taraval Station</u>	Investigative	20	section B4 is nonsense. Is the sgt supposed to read that long admonition over the air while air time is probably precious. The section regarding de escalation will get officers hurt. In an OIS, seconds are precious. If an officer is considering why the suspect is not complying, it will delay his reaction. If someone is actively stabbing victims, are we supposed to maintain distance and establish “meaningful dialogue” with the suspect ?
Taraval Station	Investigative	11-15	Every cop with be on EIS. why even bother
Taraval Station	Investigative	6-10	Again the wording and added content it will only lead to less officer safety and cause officers to get injured or death. The whole proportionality section is extremely vague. Whats reasonable and necessary? Yes one officer shooting someone 37 could be excessive, but if there are 11 police officers on scene and everyone shoots approx 3 times is that excessive? The suspect got shot the same amount of times. We’ve been trained to stop the threat and are we no going to be trained. When you are fearing for your life and the life of another you can shoot to stop the threat, but make sure it does not appear excessive. This does not take into account accuracy,

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	training/unfamiliar-ness with other officers at the scene, stress, adrenaline, tunneling in, the suspects behavior, etc. Again i could go on more about the DGO.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I don't like the shoot twice and reassess. Suspect is charging at me or my officers with a weapon and their supposed to stop shooting to assess of the bad guy is still charging at them with a knife, bat, machete and if he is, hope I have enough time to shoot two more times?? And no more shooting Center Mass? Its hard enough hitting center mass much less trying to shot weapons out of their hands!
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I do not like the language that says supervisors have to remind officers over the radio about how to do their jobs while encountering an armed suspect. PRoposes too many limitations causing officers to hesitate. The proposed changes will further deter criminals from complying with the police. It's to the point that officers feel that the proposal is asking us to leave our firearms at the station and to do our job without the proper tools to protect ourselves.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	"Officers who delay taking a subject into custody, while keeping the public safe and officers safe...." following a man with a knife through a busy City is not safe for the public or officers. If they want to have us allow for time and distance then citizen need to be aware they may not be safe even if the police are present and we should not be held accountable for suspects actions when allowing for time and distance. / Pointing firearm- if a citizen watching an incident says I pointed my firearm at the suspect but I pointed at the ground is that a reportable use of force??? unclear language regarding - Section 5- shooting at a moving vehicle- an officer in an narrow alley is going to be run over by a suspect in a vehicle can't shoot??? because the vehicle is the only threat???
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Like for answer "9" I have an issue with the revision marked "B.4". Supervisors Responsibility" which relates to Suspects with weapons. I agree that a Supervisor should respond to the location to take charge but requiring a supervisors to list the entire second section: "Remind responding officers, while en route, to protect life, isolate and contain the subject, maintain distance., find cover, engage in thoughtful communication without time constraint, and call for appropriate resources." My first fear is this requirement will delay officers responding to weapons calls and endanger the public. We will be delayed and unable to hear relevant information while a supervisor reads this admonishment over the air.Does the public understand the volume of armed suspects we detain peaceably? Does the public realize that each of us is already trained to do this section and a lot of us has had multiple experiences dealing with armed Suspects? By reading this revision, I don't believe the author understands what we are doing daily. Again this is why I believe it would be good to have police officers sitting in with any discussions on any revisions. Again the people who this section is endangering is the public of San Francisco, which are also my family and friends. I believe a lot of this order should be reserved for a general training of the Department and not when responding officers are required to make split second decisions to protect the public.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	See above! The issues around use of force and firearms use are already cloudy and confusing. Further restrictions and training contrary to historical norms will open the officers and department to liability. Additionally, the department is setting officers up for failure. Having been trained in one way for generations, it seems wholly inappropriate to expect immediate change on such a drastic level.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Proportionality does not sound good. I am not trained in western or eastern martial arts in regards to knife fighting or swordsmanship or fencing at the SF Police Academy, so I cannot be in proportion when I engage an aggressive knife wielding subject charging at me within the 21 feet rule.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It is well written. I believe it is important to keep the public and the Officers safe. Sometimes the Verbal Warnings do not work, when there is either a language barrier or AMS. Containment and isolation are capitol ideas.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	As a former Specialist, it would be close to impossible too un train what I have trained to do in case of an OIS.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	This DGO is going to put a lot of Officers in the EIS just for conducting obvious Officer safety procedures such as: - felony traffic stops - building searches of a hot prowl or burglary - search warrants
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Very restrictive and penalizing.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	This proposal sounds like it had been written by someone who never even been in a playground fight as a child, let alone anyone that has been in and knows Law Enforcement.
TTaraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	“MOVING VEHICLES. An officer shall not discharge a firearm at the operator or occupant of a moving vehicle unless the operator or occupant poses an immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury to the public or an officer by means other than the vehicle. Officers shall not discharge a firearm from his or her moving vehicle.” -So if a suspect is trying to run over me with a vehicle and I have no chance of escape (because I can’t outrun a car), I’m just supposed to let it run me over? Again, where is the reasonableness?
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	With regard to moving vehicles, the proposed policy is potentially disastrous for officers who find themselves being pinned by a vehicle or who may encounter the need to fire their weapons from a moving vehicle.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Changes should not be made just because of Political pressure, as I stated above.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	You will cause officers to second guess their selves, which may cause them or others their lives.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Time, Distance and De-escalation are all important but when it means that a life or death decision needs to be made immediately because of risk to public and officer safety, I believe that thinking about the suspect’s current status whether he is capable or incapable or what proportional level of force should be used towards him should not be the first thing an officer should be asking himself. An officer who is in this very difficult situation should not be placed in a

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			position where he needs to question his actions thus jeopardizing the officer and the public's safety.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	A moving vehicle is a weapon that can cause death or injury if the driver of the vehicle is using the vehicle as a weapon. The need to end the threat is very important.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	New order implies too many shalls that would cause an officer to second guess there own actions and not stop a threat. They should be general guidelines like the current order that follows state law requirements and case law.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Addition of section for :firearms with regard to subjects armed w/ weapons other than fire-arms.” Discharging firearm at vehicles section appears more restrictive regardless of situation on case by case basis.
<u>Tenderloin Station</u>	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	A supervisor tying up the air with directions of thoughtful communication is an extreme officer safety violation. Keep the air clear!
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	what is meant by actively resisting? I would say Mario woods was resisting yet as we all can see most of the supervisors do not agree.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Again, all officers know the value of de-escalation and it does not need to be codified into a General Order. It is common sense. If putting this into the GO, you may want to add a section on when it may be appropriate to use a police radio to call for help or communication(again-common sense)
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Not very clear on what it proposes and feel it will once again put officers in harms way.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	this isn't even POST approved
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The throw away statement at eh end in which officers are allowed to defend themselves is insulting. Plain and simple.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Terrible.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	seems more restrictive than CA penal code
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It is putting 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	The new policy and new training will lead to more injuries or death. Sanctity of life is important but all these new policies take away the sanctity of the officers life. The officer is put in the impossible position of trying to make sure they do not violate the many many new rules while trying to defend their life.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I do not agree with pointing department issued firearm being a reportable use of force.

<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	The proportionality clause is designed to burn officers. Only the officer on scene, in the moment, can accurately assess what is proportional.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed order creates too many steps between using your firearm. Something that will mean the difference between life and death of innocent lives. Using a firearm is a terrible thing that unfortunately is necessary at times. The proposed order is just another effort to be "politically correct" at the cost Officer's lives and lives of civilians.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	There shouldn't be a bullet point to de escalate the situation before either discharging your firearm or pulling your firearm. We are police officers and are well trained. We as police officer try to de escalate every situation we encounter.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	There has already been numerous incidents where officers who would have drawn their firearm in situations where they feel their life or the life of another is in danger, for fear of the ramifications of the actions. if the new DGO is put into effect this shift in officers actions will change in priority to protecting their safety and the safety of others, to second guessing their decisions, leading to hesitation which will in turn undoubtedly lead to an escalation in these situations, specifically danger to the officers, rather than a de-escalation.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I disagree with making pointing a firearm a reportable use of force. The true purpose for recording the action as a use of force seems to be more of an attempt to collect antagonistic statistics against officers and in now way truly promotes safer interactions between the police and the community.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	In the arena of deadly force, the officer must be trained to react quickly and decisively in order to save their or another's life. By laboring the issue of proportionality, taking time to think of reasons why someone may not be complying - during a deadly force confrontation - is again, downright dangerous. This wording and emphasis on these concepts has incredible potential to cause officers to hesitate and not act appropriately at the moment when they, or another, most desperately need them to.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
<u>Traffic Division</u>	Administrative	20	The first paragraph are redundant from proposed 5.01 and the General paragraph. It is a distraction. Is it necessary to have both? De-escalation- We do this already. That's why we don't have more OIS incidents. As far as I know, there have not been any unjustified OIS incidents. By putting it in writing, it gives the haters more rope to hang us. "Proportionality" does not take into account if the suspect escalates the situation from a bus fare evasion (Kenneth Harding 2011) to a violent resistor. It does not address overcoming resistance. Also, an edged weapon is a deadly weapon therefore a proportional response would be lethal force if necessary, right? Its not clear. "Supervisors Responsibility" item 2 is unreasonable. It is a very long rope to hang supervisors with if it is not complied with for whatever reasonable and legitimate reason. It does not allow for practicality.
Traffic Division	Investigative	20	not needed political grandstanding.
Traffic Division	Traffic Enforcement	11-15	time is of the essence
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I have yet to attend the new firearms training. But the language seems unreasonable and poses officer safety issues. What are the policies of other large agencies with similar issues and crime rates?
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	There are times you need to be allowed to shoot if the vehicle is the only weapon.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Cant shoot at a vehicle? are we supposed to watch someone mow down people which has happened or sit there and be ran over ourselves and be prohibited from using a firearm?
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Proposed GO 5.02 is filled with confusing/vague terminology of "de-escalation", "proportionality" and "thoughtful communication". The interpretation of above terms seems open and creates confusion by officers guessing at a scene. Reporting of pointing of firearms will be judged under the same standards as firing the firearm (must be reasonable under facts/circumstances) creates a large doubt in officers mind. Pointing a firearm is raised to the same level as using it (in regards to reporting it). This might have an impact on officer safety; officers might choose to keep their firearms holstered and place themselves in a more dangerous situation.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Section I.B.3. places too many restrictions on members having to hesitate (or de-escalate) while deciding if the non-firearm weapon poses a "risk to serious bodily injury" to the member or the public. This is a dangerous precedent not supported by case law.
	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Pointing a firearm should not be a use of force.