

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
<b><u>Admin / Headquarters</u></b>	Administrative	20	First line responders should be equipped first. Not specs or Tac. Way too many restrictions. Its a proven tool for the job.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	I agree with officers getting CEDs, but all of patrol should get the CEDs and the authorized circumstances need to be increased. Only using CEDs on armed suspects does officers no good. This would be the most restrictive policy in the country - and the only reason for that is to appease the vocal community - who are in the minority.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	we need to be able to use it on unarmed people. Unarmed people can be very violent and can cause serious injury using physical force. A violent resister or one threatening to resist, pose a threat. In SIT we had one punch cases turn into homicides. My most serious case , no weapons, just physical force, suspects pled to ten years
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	As I said earlier, I can't believe the department will not allow the use of a taser on an unarmed person. What would be the purpose of having them if you were prohibited from using them on an unarmed person? I also believe the mandatory IA investigation if used would put an unnecessary burden on IA. I also believe officers at the station should be allowed to carry them when first approved. I say this having been assigned as a Spec and at TAC. There are only so many Specs these days and TAC is not around 24/7. This new rule could hinder a patrol officer who might need that energy device to save themselves from injury or death.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	20	its kind of confusing to me
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	Considering I will not be carrying a CED due to not being on the Tactical or Specialist Teams, I do not have a strong opinion about the order. I do find issue with not being allowed to use the CED on an unarmed suspect. The use of a CED against an unarmed subject skilled in MMA or body building would be safer for the officers encountering this subject, but it has become very apparent that the safety of officers comes second to the subjects we have cause to encounter.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	“Contain the subject” - What equipment are we going to use to “contain” the subject. --- PROVIDE proper Equipment before ordering officers to do something that cannot be done. Identify With What .? This is COMPLETELY UNREALISTIC.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	Under the “Definitions Section” you should list the definition of CED first and then Activation, Deployment, etc. Just read the whole thing.....awfully wordy. Way to much content in that Unit Order. DGO 5.01 and 5.02 aren't even that long.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	16-19	Tac/specs, often, cannot respond fast enough to a scene with the device unless there are the first officer(s) on scene. The industry standard in other agencies does allow CEDs to be used an unarmed subject, in some cases. This would be a useless and unused tool if officers are only authorized to use it on armed subjects. If you have an armed subject, you have the potential for lethal force. I do not see a way around that in any circumstance even if you had the luxury of time to use or attempted to use, other force options.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	11-15	All officers need to be armed with a taser.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	11-15	In reference section F number 1 (unarmed subject) have the person/s who wrote this ever had to arrest someone on PCP? A taser in this situation would greatly reduce officers injuries.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	11-15	This weapon should be made available to ALL officers in the SFPD. This should not be tested out on certain divisions/bureaus/units etc. Furthermore, the use of ECD's should be consistent with standard/best practices in L.E. To only have Specialist/Tactical outfitted with ECD's is silly. They are spread thin throughout the department and the patrol officer responding to calls for service should all be equipped. We CANNOT afford to wait for an specialized officer/supervisor to respond to an incident requiring ECD. As we all know, incidents unfold within minutes and time can ;make a difference on whether someone is "tased" or shot with a handgun. Therefore it's imperative ALL officers be equipped. As with any new technology/tool/weapon, officers MUST be held liable for any inappropriate use of such devices. We have to show the public we need these devices, but also have the responsibility and training to use them appropriately. Not the "grab ass, let's tase each other" behavior. We only ruin it for ourselves.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	6-10	The policy states the officer SHOULD "display the electrical arc or laser" if possible prior to use, which requires the removal of the cartridge. The policy then prohibits the use of the CED in drive stun mode. But, the CED can ONLY be in drive stun mode with the cartridge removed. But requiring the "unloading" of the CED to brandish it obviously requires that it must later be loaded prior to use in an authorized manner. THIS GUARANTEES THAT OFFICER'S WILL EVENTUALLY BRANDISH THE "UNLOADED" CED AS DIRECTED, GET RUSHED BY A SUSPECT, AND BE REQUIRED TO "DRIVE STUN" THE SUSPECT AS THEIR ONLY OPTION. This policy is setting up Officer's to be FORCED INTO drive stunning and will eventually lead to injuries, escalation, and sustained complaints instead of the opposite. We are asking that officer's brandish an effectively unloaded weapon, since if they "display the arc" the CED must necessarily be "unloaded." We don't require that officer's unload their firearms when holding a subject at gunpoint, and then load it if they have to shoot. I also suggest that these policies be peer reviewed by outside Departments' of similar size. Having worked for a Taser equipped Department previously, I can confidently say they would be appalled by this policy, unless they are also cowed by public opinion instead of employing reasonable adult thinking. There is almost no instance of authorized use in this policy when compared with the prohibitions. Is a 5'3" female officer prohibited from using a CED against a 6'0" muscular parolee in a fighting stance? He's unarmed and it's therefore outside of policy to deploy the CED. Really? It's shameful for the Department to intentionally place their officer's in this position. The policy makers have clearly weighed the cost/benefit ratio of additional injured officers vs. satisfying the outspoken lunatic fringe, and deemed it acceptable. The policy simply creates so much doubt and gray area for ever using the device that it ceases to become a tool, and only becomes a liability.
Admin / Headquarters	Administrative	6-10	This policy states that officer's may not use a CED on an individual who is "unarmed." Creating a policy in which it is insinuated that the use of deadly force is preferred to the use of a CED is asinine.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
AAdmin / Headquarters	Investigative	20	Not a 'perfect' order, but at the very least, it would offer a possibility for the use of a lifesaving tool, that is a nation-wide, accepted industry standard for law enforcement.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	11-15	1. What happens when all TAC and SPECS are unavailable due to large events...IE Superbowl 2. What happens if the only SPEC working is on the other side of the city. 3. What happens in the exigent circumstance where the spec goes down but if allowed the patrol officer could have resolved the incident by using the CED.. There are too many shall do's added to the deployment and use of the CED
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	11-15	BS. Patrol needs it before anyone. Check the facts. Who gets into the OISes? Who uses force? Patrol has the interactions...they catch it, then TAC cleans it? By the time the can respond someone will be injured or dead. This won't do anything effective.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative		Does leaving TAC or the Specialists make one unworthy of deploying the CED? Why can I not use it on an unarmed person? Because that's one other tool that can help stop a huge knock down drag out fight that injures both parties.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	6-10	Are we that afraid to call it what it is....a Taser? I am a big proponent of the Taser. I was a Defensive Tactics and Taser Instructor at my former department. I've used the Taser during the scope of my duties and it proved to be an effective tool in situations. A Taser is an additional NON LETHAL tool or force option for Officers such as verbal skills, physical control techniques, O.C. and baton. With that said, I don't know why the CED(Taser) draft is twice the length of the firearms(LETHAL) draft?!
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	6-10	I touched on my disdain earlier stating that a resister without a weapon can't be tased. The deterrence alone of the threat of being tased could end many many altercations.
Admin / Headquarters	Investigative	3-5	Negative: Unable to use CED on unarmed subjects that resist. Way too many rules to consider when dealing with a combative subject.
Admin / Headquarters	RTO	20	I disagree based on the asinine name they have given the Tazer
Admin / Headquarters	Training Division	20	Why would only officers assigned to Tactical Company or the Specialist Team be the only officers to carry these devices? Are not most incidents of force involving first responders (patrol) ?? Regarding prohibited use, the fact that a subject is unarmed does not mean that they can't pose a threat to a person's safety. A fleeing subject can also present a threat if they have been engaged in violent activity, yet the order prohibits use on fleeing subjects. Also the "prohibited use" section doesn't address exigent circumstances. We all know that most police work does not occur as a clear "black & white" scenario, but is unpredictable and falls into the category of "grey area".
Admin / Headquarters	Evoc Instructor	20	Why have them if we have to use an abacus to figure out when to use them. We have to be psychologists, neurosurgeons, and humanitarians to figure out if we can shoot someone with a bean bag. No more are the days of you are a bad person who did a bad thing and you wont comply.....and we do what we have to do.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Admin / Headquarters	Instructor	6-10	CED's have proven effective on unarmed, but combative subjects. To prohibit the use on unarmed subjects will result in higher rates of injuries to both the officers and the suspect.
Admin / Headquarters	Training	11-15	There are numerous issues with the proposed new CED Order including but not limited to: Only for TAC/SPEC means you have to call for help if you need one. You don't have that kind of time in the real world. PROHIBITED use includes many scenarios the CED is designed for: what about Fleeing armed subjects? Suicidal subjects with a weapon? Unarmed subjects trained in combat or high on drugs and violent? If the chest is a non target area we WILL NOT get hits that is the only viable target in the real world when both cop and suspect are moving. If you can use the CED in "drive stun mode" then you cant defend yourself if you are out of CED cartridges? What about multiple subjects? Missed shots? Subjects who pull out the prongs? This policy is HORRIBLE and puts cops lives at risk not to mention legal issues
<b><u>Airport Bureau</u></b>	Investigative	20	Patrol officers should be issued them not just TAC & Specialists, but only if they are willing to go through the training similar to collapsible baton training and take on the added responsibility.
Airport Bureau	K9 Handler/Sergeant	20	The whole idea of "proportional" force is ridiculous. We have not been trained that way, and the California Penal Code says that we don't have to use that type of force to effect an arrest. 835a P.C. states, " Any peace officer who has reasonable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed a public offense may use reasonable force to effect the arrest, to prevent escape or to overcome resistance. A peace officer who makes or attempts to make an arrest need not retreat or desist from his efforts by reason of the resistance or threatened resistance of the person being arrested; nor shall such officer be deemed an aggressor or lose his right to self-defense by the use of reasonable force to effect the arrest or to prevent escape or to overcome resistance". It seems the "leadership" would rather the police officers let the subject get away, get beaten up, than have to answer questions defending officers on appropriate uses of force. How come nobody holds the individual accountable for the actions or inactions that forced the officer to use force? If a subject does not comply with the lawful orders of a police officer then they are putting themselves in that situation.
Airport Bureau	canine	20	Contrived and ambiguous.
Airport Bureau	K9	20	either we all have them or no one has them, how long will it take for the few people allowed them to get to the scene
Airport Bureau	explosive detection k9	20	I rather not carry one. I rather be a station keeper and handle reports. Thats all we have become.
Airport Bureau	explosive detection k9	20	All officers should be trained. Not just SWAT.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	the usage seems too limited for unarmed subjects only and only applies to tac and specs

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	how do I defend myself against a larger person or one who is on drugs but does not have a weapon?
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	can only be used on armed suspects? that does not make sense. issued only to tac and specs? we should all have them.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	new device could be helpful but TAC will be stretched thin and not likely available when needed unless TAC unit is expanded to cover all districts
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I do not agree with this order nor do I agree that only tactical officers or specialists are only allow to carry a taser. It is the year 2016. Every department in the bay area issues tasers to all their ALL their officers. Yet our department believes that only tac and specialists are smart enough to carry and deploy a taser. I'm really tired of the administration belittling all other non tac or specialists in the department. We went through this with the AR rifles were issued. Yet now non tac or specialists can carry an AR if they are trained. So what difference is it that I can carry an AR but not a taser??
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Every Officer should have a CED not just TAC/SWAT.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It is impractical.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I feel more officers than the proposed amount should be given the option to carry tasers.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Officers need the ability to use a taser on an un-armed combatant whom is non compliant and resisting arrest!
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Tazers are meant for use on unarmed combative subjects. Limiting them to armed subjects is useless.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I believe the policy will make it impossible for Ofc'. to deploy taser. I also disagree with only providing Tac with taser's . Tac will not be able to respond to incidents that meet Taser deployment even if policy is revised with less restrictions.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I don't know much about the proposed Order for Tasers.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	with so many AMS individuals, depending on the type of clothing they're wearing, CED devices may not work properly
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	we need tasers !! 86 the body cameras !
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Rushed with no street officers input!
AAirport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	No coverage
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The prohibition of use on "unarmed" suspects defeats the purpose of the CED. Is a 250 pound boxer unarmed? I'd say he is armed.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Again, too many restriction. It's like this was put in place to allow us to carry the device, but not to use it.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It will make Tasers completely impractical and virtually unusable.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	When dealing with the mentally ill, individuals who are in crisis or under the influence of alcohol or medications, the situation is very fluid. We only have one specialist on duty at the airport and he is currently assigned to the midnight watch. Wouldn't it be more practical to arm Sergeants with the CED so as to have it more readily available?
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It is my belief that all SFPD Officers should have access to conducted energy devices since the proposal now excludes the use of the carotid restraint.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Positives: typically non-lethal, and usually effective. Negatives: Dont always subdue suspect, and can still cause serious bodily injury or death.
Airport Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The level of restriction and number of officers who will be issued the CED's makes them impractical to deploy or use. Few officers will be issued them, and they will only be able to use them when there is an active threat. Again, we are being told to corral a subject and wait until that subject gets tired, or decides to act in an aggressive fashion. We are becoming a reactionary force, allowing the subject to dictate all of our actions, and taking away our ability to take the initiative.
<b><u>Bayview Station</u></b>	Administrative	16-19	Too limited in permitted circumstances
Bayview Station	Investigative	16-19	Too limited. Only for a subject with an edged weapon is insufficient. If you take away the carotid and limit the "conducted energy device" in this manner, a very large, strong or trained subject will force an officer to either get hurt or use their firearm.
Bayview Station	Investigative	6-10	negatives: only tac and specs get to carry it?
Bayview Station	Investigative	6-10	I have yet to see it
Bayview Station	Plainclothes	11-15	Everybody should get them. What are we going to do, with an active person stabbing other people citizens and or victims
Bayview Station	Plainclothes	11-15	Its a tool that should be available for every member. We cannot wait for Tac or Specs to respond. Its all about common sense.
Bayview Station	Plain Clothes	6-10	It is too limited in who should carry it. Why only spec's and tac? Tac is rarely on the street and rarely on the scene in cases when a CED would be used. There are too few spec's and they are not frequently around when needed. We are limiting ourselves for no reason. Additionally, by stating it can only be deployed when someone has a weapon in his/her hand we are also limiting ourselves and opening ourselves up for detailed scrutiny by OCC, etc. The language should say something about deploying based on threat posed by the subject.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	CED use does not apply to me

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It should be available to every one not just TAC or the Specs because they are not always working when the shit hits the fan and contrary to popular belief, we don't always have time to wait it out, actions happen swiftly.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	makes the use of a ced equivalent to use of a firearm renders it useless and dangerous for officers
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I am sorry, but all field Officers should have this tool. It saves lives. The only ones who shouldn't have them are people who are not on the street such as those who are in Admin assignments, and our command staff, (since they are not in patrol). I also think the Airport bureau should have them.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	So many restrictions, why even have it?
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	to many restrictions.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I know we will never get tasers. But if we did, limiting the use to tac and specs will be useless. There are not enough TAC and Specs officers to respond to specific incidents. They should be given to CIT trained officers, Sergeants and above.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	All officers should be equipped with CED's and should be able to utilize such a device in situations that call for such a level of force. Restricting officers to only using such a device when they encounter a subject with an edged weapon will limit its effectiveness and endanger all involved. Officers do not have minutes in many dangerous situations. Why not equip all officers with CED's so they have another option before discharging their firearm. This could save many lives.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	As a patrol officer I don't have the time to wait for a specialist or Tac to come with a taser. I am as qualified to carry a taser as anyone from those specialized units. If anything patrol should have tasers before the specialized units. seems like another CYA tactic and again screws patrol over.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	This policy is probably the most restrictive CED policy in the country. This order precludes us from using a CED to save a suicidal persons' life. That is not inferred from the order it is spelled out in it. The officers who will be authorized to carry CEDs is a glaring ignorance of our officer involved shooting history. In the early 2000's Southern Station officers got into an OIS with a subject armed with a knife in a movie theater. Only select members of the department at the time had been authorized to carry ERIWs. After this OIS the whole department was then trained and equipped with ERIWs. CEDs should be issued to every officer in the department with a policy in step with general law enforcement practices. This order is shameful. The irony here is that opponents of CEDs are so against the implementations of this equipment that they are still opposing even this policy. Chief Suhr withdrew the request for CEDs when he said that the policy that would govern the issuance of them would place an undue burden on officers in the department. That was the right decision for the well-being of every officer in the department. Obviously, his and the command staffs concern for us has

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			been diminished since the last time the Chief tried to obtain CEDs. If this is going to be the policy for these devices then I do not want one.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Why only SOG? Why would these devices be used on armed individuals only? Can we please see some other major department with a similar policy so we can know the proposed bureau order isn't dangerously insane, as it currently reads? Or does such a document not exist?
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Too many restrictions for deployment. HNT and CIT should also have CED's
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	the guidelines are so narrow that the Officer will hesitate/delay the use of Taser potentially endangering him self and opening himself up to Civil Liability.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	- Too restrictive, to the point that utilizing it would not be a preferred method
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	What's the point of having a great tool that we can not use in situations where they should be used? It won't prevent another Mario woods event. It will be the same result but with even more outrage since this time we will have the tool to prevent it and yet we can not use. Why restricted to the point of not being able to use it??
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The basis of the order is a good starting block. However with the limitations of the officers who can carry the device, why bother having them. As a likely scenario, it's 3:30 am, your at of a person with a knife. The officer has determined they need an officer with a CED. There are NO specs or tact working that night. Then what??
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	with the way it is written i would not want to carry one. it would not be a tool just a liability.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	TAC the last unit to respond will be issued CED makes a lot of sense.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Giving tasers to special units and not the officers that are the ones responding to the call is crazy. The frontline officers need all the tools.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I don't know what that is.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	too many limitations. giving that tool to tact is worthless, they r not 24/7 or in the right place at the right time. It'll be like the ERIW's, are we gonna wait until they show up? limiting the deployment of the taser in the way its written, you might as well as keep it in the box next to the shield at the stations.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I fail to understand why we need someone from TAC or Specs to carry a device that patrol officers use all across the country. TAC is not normally responding to 911 calls like officers assigned to patrol. Then they're expected to use a taser on someone carrying a weapon exclusively? Again, unnecessarily dangerous and it opens them up to all kinds of legal second guessing.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	As stated above, the proposed order appears to want Officers to further endanger themselves prior to using tools available to quickly and effectively take a Suspect into custody, further preventing any other incidents.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The only way this could possibly be any more different from every CED policy I'm aware of is if it were written in wingdings

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This proposed order is ridiculously out of sync with industry standards and the best practices of our profession. There are far too many problems to point out and I simply cannot justify wasting that much of my time writing a response to it. This department seems nearly completely indifferent when considering my safety. They constantly attempt to persuade officers not to use their firearms but refuse to give us the reasonable tools necessary to accomplish that goal.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The plan is to arm only a handful of people who may never be in a position to use them when needed. Is the distrust of Q2s and their judgment about what is appropriate so great within the top ranks that they don't trust a patrol officer to use a less lethal device but will arm them with rifles and shotguns, most of whom would not hit a target beyond 15 yards under stress. This is a joke.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I had a CED at my prior agency it is a much more effective than a baton and/or pepper spray.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	UNARMED SUBJECTS ARE STILL DANGEROUS
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This policy was designed so that if we ever use a firearm instead of a taser, our decision can be used against us.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The limitations on the use of CED is pathetic. We are going down the same path of previous proposals. Split second decisions that can determine life or death(use of firearm) should not be limited. CED's are less lethal devices that should be defined in proposed DGO/Bureau Order. Clear scientific and data base definitions should be included in order to prevent the Board of Supervisors, NAACP, and ACLU from proposing garbage verbiage in our DGO. The CED should not be limited to TAC and Specialists. If CED are going to be an option ALL MEMBERS SHALL BE ISSUED CED's
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	PROHIBITED USE. Officer are prohibited from using the CED: 1. On an unarmed subject This is an issue. Officer's should be able to use the CED in situations where the use of a baton is justified. (Example: Individuals who are physically fighting with officers to resist arrest / lawful detention).
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Too few officers can carry the CED. It can only be used on armed suspects other than a firearm. What about violent felons not armed with a weapon who is 148?
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	All SFPD units should carry these. TAC & SPECS may not arrive in time to have them as an option.
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	Why provide a tool for use when the use of that tool is on par with the discharge of a firearm. The lack of CEDs that would be issued is far too few to be effective. Only providing the devices to TAC and specialists is insane. As anyone who has worked in patrol knows, Tac response time (through no fault of their own) is marginal at best. Often they are detailed to special events, assigned to search warrants, or on patrol in a different district. Response times for

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			specialists could also be slower when certain districts do not have them on staff.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	too restrictive. why is shooting a fleeing person under certain circumstance ok, but using a conducted energy device not ok?
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	An unarmed suspect may need the deployment of Conducted Energy Device. All units should be equipped with a CED
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	It makes no sense to taze an individual when the person has a weapon. The Police commission should look to other agencies in the area or similar larger departments that have conducted energy device policies for guidance.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Makes absolutely no sense.
Bayview Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement		The device is only used as a defesive weapon with too many restrictions.
<b><u>Central Station</u></b>	Admin and Street	20	After reading it, YOU CAN KEEP IT. TAC and Specialists? What about officers who are actually on scene? Use only on armed suspects without a firearm? We need it to contain large resisters to minimize injury to the suspects and officers. (Are the special interest groups going to show us how to apprehend 300 pound drug addicts? No, I didn't think so either.) Just keep them and lets move on. You can't have it both ways. The commission is responsible for all of this and for what is to come.
Central Station	keeper	20	Besides Tactical and Specialist all supervisors should also have CED. it should be able to be used on a fleeing subject if the event warrants it. We can shoot a fleeing subject if we believe his escape will possible injure someone else If he posses an immediate threat. So if we have any cover with a armed subject then we cant deploy. that doesn't make sense. Immediate means now. so do we just continue to talk to them? The target areas should not be lower body. It will be very difficult for both prongs to make contact with two separate legs and avoid the groin. F1 On an unarmed subject. (this should read that is posing no physical harm or threats to another person or officer)
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	ALL OFFICERS MUST BE ARMED WITH TAZERS!!!
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Every officer, not just specialized units, should have the Taser. The Taser restrictions in the policy are ludicrous and need to be rewritten.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I am patrol and will not be issued one so I don't care about this policy.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Having plain clothes officers wear body cameras? Isn't the whole idea of plain clothes is so you don't look like a police officer?
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	IT'S A START..A PISS POOR ONE BUT A START. WE ALL KNOW SPECS RESPOND TO EVERY RUN AND NEVER GET TIED UP ON A CALL OUT WHEN YOU NEED 'EM.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	it should go the patrol, not TAC or specialists.....unless they are all out patrolling at each dis-

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	<p>trict station, what good is it to have the arrive with a taser if the threat is already handled with other means? suspect has a weapon and officers are to wait for a taser and while the guy is injuring or killing someone? when a taser immediately could have neutralized the threat? or would the chief rather have some Jack Handy thoughtful words with the suspect in the interim waiting for a taser to show up like some secret weapon?</p> <p>Prohibited use: against an unarmed subject? Ridiculous. There may come a time when I as a person assigned to carry the CED has to protect another person, or myself. The fact that the subject is unarmed should never be a consideration in whether or not to deploy it. Think of a possible situation. The subject displays a fighting stance, or trained fighting ability. I have the ability to negate that without injuriy using the CED and instead you'd prefer I use a truncheon or fists to overcome that possible resistance. Unbelievable, and not logical. Against a suicidal person? Again, I have the ability to interrupt the electrical system of a person and have them not harm themselves. The ability to SAVE a life, and this policy denies that? I hope we don't see that situation but I know I will. You're giving these CED's to Tac and Specs, and expect us to not save someone's life even though we will have the tools that can do it. I hope to God you change that. Becuase you will have no idea how horrible it will be to watch a person kill themselves knowing I could have stopped it but your policy has signed their death warrant. Under 14 yrs old? Have you never seen a person under 14 with a weapon? I know plenty of "children" under 14 who have killed, and killed efficiently. On a fleeing subject? So a subject could attck with a weapon, turn to go? As it is right now, knowing they are a danger to others unless apprehention is immediate, and I have the right to shoot that person in the back with a firearm but not with a CED. seems insane to me. and lastly, by manually placing the electrodes on the skin? So I can Arc the CED to "show it off" but can't actually stun with it? wrestling with a subject, and I have to run away so that I can shoot with the wires? WOW! Documentation states: that officers shall document all laser activations? and it states that everyday, officers shall make sure the CED is properly functioning? So If I activate the laser to ensure its working I'd have to document that ? Every supervisor whall notify his Lt to have IAD notified as part of a OIS? Please tell me you're kidding? So a guy gets tased, and it's an OIS? Non target areas? You do realize that the CED works by having an electrical current between the two probes. Aiming at a smaller, and more maneuvrable area like the legs makes that more difficult. Even Taser's own manual shows a picture of the taser being used at the chest. and this is a non target area for SFPD? Please don't give them to us if this is the case? It's ridiculous. Youre going to get a cop hurt or worse dead. They are going to attempt to use it to subdue someone, and either miss because they're aiming for zone 2 or have to compute the enormous restrictions and get hurt anyhow. Order says nothing about use of CED's against animals</p>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	<p>What is a "conducted energy device?" It has never been brought to my attention what this is all about.</p>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	<p>The entire department should have this option not just TAC and Specialists. Also see previous objections to proposed Use of Force and Reportable Use of Force.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Puts too many restrictions on officers.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I feel that the current wording will make a new Officer too nervous to use this device.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Negative: The CED should be available to all officers, especially those in patrol who deal with the public more.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Contain the subject in an area and then call for TAC to respond? Is this a joke?
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	What they want are psychologist with a police uniform. It should not be limited to persons with weapons other than firearms. What about the suspects size vs the officers...under the influence of meth or other drugs...fleeing felon. There are many other situations were a CED would help with the capture of a suspect.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I have no opinion on a tool and force option I have received no training or exposure. The proposal seems like a situation of putting the cart before the horse.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	All officers must be armed with a taser.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	CEDs are proven to save lives and reduce injuries for both officers and suspects. However, CEDs only work if a) the policy allows officers to use the devices in a wide variety of circumstances in lieu of more damaging force options, and b) if criminals know that the CED will be deployed without hesitation to effect an arrest. Anecdotally, I used to work at an agency with a very liberal Taser policy. Suspects would usually comply immediately when confronted with a Taser, as they knew the officer would not hesitate to deploy it. If confronted by a baton or firearm, suspects usually ran or fought, knowing the officer either a) he could defeat the baton's effectiveness by aggressively attacking or running 26" away from the officer or b) because they knew the firearm presentation was preemptive and that they had not yet actually given the officer cause to fire.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I believe that the CED would be a very useful tool for all officer, not just officers assigned to Tactical Company/the Specialist Team. Also, there are situations where it may be necessary to use the CED on an unarmed subject where other force options have failed, especially if the carotid restraint is no longer an option.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I think of some officers are going to be provided with CEDs then all should be provided or at least trained with them.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	This order seems rushed and not having all patrol officers obtain and trained to use one right away can be problematic.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	i believe patrol officers should be issued the CED due to the likelihood to encounter a subject with weapon. I would like to be able to use the CED to gain control of a violent subject whether or not the subject is carrying a weapon. Subjects and officers are likely to get injured during the fight. If the CED is available to use to gain control, the subject, as well as the officer are less likely to get injured during an altercation.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	CEDs should be issued to more than just TAC and Specialists. Two or three people in each District on each shift should have a device. The officers should be well trained and have an exceptions knowledge of UOF policy and law. I would say at 10% of patrol officers should have them.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	tac never responds to my call, and specs are hard to find.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I think all officers should be trained to carry CED.
Central Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Too many rules placed on when and how you can use a tazer by people who have no idea what it is like to be placed in these types of situations, or how to be a police officer.
<b><u>Ingleside Station</u></b>	Administrative	20	If you dont want us to use them then dont give them to us
Ingleside Station	Investigative	20	Way too much verbage
Ingleside Station	Investigative	16-19	If only TAC and Specialists are going to have them, we are in trouble. That group of officers is not always accessible, especially on the midnight shifts. Every supervisor, on every watch should have them as well.
Ingleside Station	Investigative	16-19	It is a new policy, it should also be submitted for a meet and confer, it should be examined by our use of force experts, and it should be available to all who can qualify in the department not just a subset of the department.
Ingleside Station	Investigative	11-15	I do not have another example to compare the proposed policy against. The policy does limit the number of people who may deploy the CED thus making it limited in its use. Again adding a devise for all officers provides one more tool to help quell the situation in the safest manner for all involved.
Ingleside Station	Investigative	6-10	I believe only assigning Tactical Company or Specialist Team officers to carry the CED is a mistake. Tactical Co. officers are very rarely the first officers on scene and Specialist Team of-ficers are not on every watch at every station. This not only jeopardizes the officers' safety but it jeopardizes public safety and the safety of the actual subject in question. Without equipping every officer with a CED you are asking that officers either become severely injured or killed, or that an officer's only option is to utilize their firearm. An officer armed with a CED will help to not only protect their life but the lives of others.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	There is no guarantee that there will be a spec/tac member working everyday, yet there is a guarantee that a Sgt. or above will be. These devices should be readily available and the super- visors make more sense then a unit they does not work at all on Mondays.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The device must be available to any trained patrol officer and not the exclusive province of specialized units.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Too many restrictions....Officers will be too busy questioning themselves on taking action to be effective or safe.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	There are too many limitations on the use of the taser and would hurt the officers because they will hesitate its use and possibly put them in more danger injury or death.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The restrictions on the Taser is asinine. The RCB will often cause more and permanent damage than a Taser by far.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The requirement that a suspect be armed with a weapon for an officer to use a taser is ridiculous. If an officer is fighting for his life with a trained larger suspect, should the officer bypass a taser and go straight to a firearm, if a taser would also temporarily incapacitate a suspect so that he could be safely cuffed. This is the primary scenario where a taser is helpful and justified!
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I need to learn more about this order.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	This order states that only Tac and Specs will have CEDs. Once again, the Dept is ignoring the fact that most officers first on scene are neither. Yes, Specs are on patrol; however there are very few at Ingleside and many times they are detailed.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	As with the Metreon shooting, specialists/SWAT were not present at the time of the shooting. As with ERIW's, conducted enery devices should be standard issue for PATROL.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Very much needed in our arsenal.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Again, limiting "force options" for patrol officers will be a disservice to the Officers/the Department/and citizens of this city. We need MORE options in of use of force, not less.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement		Too many restrictions. Working as a beat officer or solo may put yourself in a situation where the Taser will be the only tool left to use - other than a firearm to effect an arrest or keep the suspect away from my gun.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I am confused as to why CED would be Prohibited from use (III F 2. a.) towards a subject armed with a weapon other than a firearm...who is only a danger to him/herself???? I was present during a critical incident in the Richmond District where a subject held a knife to his neck barricaded in his car. This subject started to cut his neck...Do we not have a responsibility to try to save this subject? Why would it be not reasonable to use this option on a subject who is doing this in public if we have the opportunity to use another tool like CED to disarm this subject...especially if ERIW is ineffective? **Rather than limiting our options, can the policy makers at least provide a solution to situations when the use of ERIW, baton, and OC are found to be ineffective on a subject who is actively cutting his neck (like the Mission District Incident).
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	tasers for all or scrap the whole plan.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Having only Specs and Tac carry Tasers is wrong. If you trust cops with a gun, trust them with a Taser. There's no time for finding someone with a Taser. Why can it not be used on an unarmed subject? What if an officer is rolling on the ground with a subject and another

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>officer arrives and can help end the situation by using a Taser? This should be ok. I also think that you should be able to use it on a fleeing subject. If a suspect runs from you, how do I stop them? Is it ok to tackle them and get injured while doing it? The suspect makes the decision to run. We should give them fair warning and deploy the taser if they do not comply. A suspect should not be able to make the decision of how he is stopped by an officer once one he decides to resist arrest. (if you run from SFPD, they can't taze you.)</p> <p>The scope for Taser use is far too narrow and accompanied with the removal of the carotid creates an even larger void or hole in our use of force options, which I believe will unnecessarily expose Officers and the public to danger and tie Officers hand such that they may be forced to use their firearms at times when the Carotid or Taser could have been a much more reasonable option if it were available. The issue of proportionality again is a problem especially when it comes to edged weapons/improvised deadly weapons (baseball bat, 2x4, hammer, large rock, etc) as written in the draft order. Officers force should be based on the threat presented to them at the time (deadly in these instances and the crime is essentially irrelevant). Officers level of force should be based on the actions of the subject the threat presented to the Officers or public, the size of the subject, fighting ability of suspect, suspects history if know (prior 221 148 245 etc) weapons or makeshift weapons available to the subject taking into account the severity of the offense committed 245 187 types of violent crimes should be initially met with a higher level of force, but this listed verbiage implies that a low level offense should me met with low level of force, which is not necessarily true as a low level offender 602 who Officers see with a knife is much larger than the Officers should be met with a level of force disproportionate to the crime and proportionate to the threat the officers are facing at the time. The force used should be at least a step above the threat presented to us, we should always chose a level of force likely to end, not prolong the situation, and minimize the injury likely to Officers and the public. When we use equal force to that presented to use we are setting ourselves up for failure/ injury. How can we use a Taser on a subject armed with a knife if letting a subject with a knife get within 21' of us is a potentially life threatening situation? Trying to get 2 prongs with a Taser on a subject rapidly approaching us, when we can't deploy toward the chest and center mass is a loser... Why have them at all with such restriction? Prohibiting Taser use on an unarmed subject is ridiculous. Under the proposed draft a violent combative unarmed subject much larger than an Officer can't be addressed with the Taser and the Carotid is gone, so this forces the firearm to be the only allowable option for the Officers. It creates situations where Officers will be forced to use their firearm. Having only Tac or Specs with the Taser makes it a practically useless tool to patrol... There are currently less than 100 full duty Officers assigned to Tac &amp; Spec's. Taking into consideration the multiple shifts worked and lack of availability the likelihood that a Taser is readily available when immediately needed in patrol is slim to none. The restrictive policy and lack of personnel available to use the Taser under the proposed draft it seems like the draft was created solely to have the taser used on individuals with weapons once they have been contained and isolated and not a realistic tool for those in patrol. Prohibiting its use on a fleeing subject; So now a fleeing subject much larger than an Officer can't be addressed with the Taser and the Carotid is gone, so this may force the firearm to be</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>the only allowable option for the Officers. This restrictive Taser policy and removal of carotid creates an even larger void in use of force options and creates situations where Officers will be forced to use their firearm. Handcuffed subjects can head butt, elbow, and kick, why should we be forced to go hands on in such a situation when the Taser seems like a reasonable option? The target area is too small. Minimizing the size of the target areas minimizes the usefulness and likelihood of the device even working or being effective. There are issues with EIS points as stated that each use is additional use of force even in a single incident. There is multiple ambiguous verbiage and conflicting statements in the draft and confusing terminology: one line states someone Tasered can refuse medical assessment and another states they have to be evaluated.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>In many situations, members of the Tactical Company or the Specialist Team are not always available to respond to scenes. When they do respond, it is often with a timely delay.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>As previously mentioned, the proposed Order only allows CEDs to be used by members of Tactical Company. It is the regular patrol officer who is more likely to contact an individual where the use of a CED would benefit the subjects safety and that of the Officer's.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>All officers working in the street should be issued a conductive energy device. Patrol is the tip of the spear in the department and more often than not the first responders on scene and will come in contact with the suspect in an incident. Special units such as tactical are not always available to respond in a moment's notice and when someone's life is at risk seconds matter. Officers often have split second time to decide on an action such as using force, and by denying patrol such a valuable tool it defeats the purpose of wanting officers to have more options other than their firearm.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>Only giving CEDs to Tac and Specs completely defeats the point of a CED (I'm a spec). The CED should be treated as a force option for all officers, NOT as a specialized piece of equipment. By the time a Tac or Spec unit gets to a scene the window of opportunity to use a CED to resolve a situation without deadly force may have already passed. Not being able to use a CED on unarmed or fleeing suspects. Suspects with AMS or under the influence that possess super human strength are situations where a CED can prevent serious injury or death to both suspect and officers. Instead of setting all these prohibitive parameters, just set the objective reasonable constitutional standard and let officers on scene make the call.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>We should be able to use tasers when someone resists arrest. It would cut down on officers getting injured due to fighting with suspects. Every other major city in the U.S has tasers and can use them on fleeing or resisting suspects. It is also safer for the suspect. Striking suspects with a baton is more damaging than being tased. What is wrong with these idiots.</p>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	<p>Positive: It would be a viable use of force option. Negative: There are too many restrictions proposed. If there are so many instances we can't use it, most Officer would probably chose not to carry them.</p>

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Every Officer in the department should be allowed to carry it if they want to. Not just TAC and SPEC's. Also it should be able to be used in any case the Officer deems necessary.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I have carried the taser in the military for over 8 years now and I have deployed it a few times. I have also been tased as part of the training. The taser is a tool that it is ranked at the same level as pepper spray. Just because it is 50,000 volts, it doesn't kill people. The amps on a wall electric outlet it is more powerful than the taser.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Every one should have tasers. The limits put on the uses is very narrow.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	All officer need CED's. its imperative. Take a look at all agencies across the country that use them. They work, well. I am CIT trained and I do not believe you need the training in order to use a CED. We also should be able to use them against passive resisters, they too still pose a danger to us and the public. CED's can and will end a dangerous situation without deadly force.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Already have enough gear on my person. Dont need something that I will never use weighing me down. Tasers will have guidelines which will further the current attitude of officers second guessing themselves and decreasing their safety.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	There is no reason that regular patrol officers should not have access to conductive energy devices. They are standard equipment in nearly every other city in the US. Further, the stipulation that officers must be CIT trained is absurd, bordering on insulting. Every officer-- even those who are not CIT trained-- is equipped with a firearm, which has much greater risk of harm to the public than a Taser. In addition, the prohibition against using conductive energy devices against unarmed persons is absurd. Any other force multiplier can be used against unarmed persons, provided the use of force is reasonable. Tasers are extremely safe for offenders and officers, especially when compared to other pain compliance options, such as batons. The fact is that unarmed people frequently pose a very real danger to officers, the public and themselves. Officers have a greater chance of ending a violent or potentially violent incident, without injury to the officer or the offender, when officers have more use of force options.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	At some point, there is a diminishing return to how much an individual can carry and still be effective. Our current gun belts are already over laden with equipment: 221, handcuffs, keys, baton, flashlights, ammunition, radio etc. Smaller Officers do not have any more physical room for more gear on their waists. If the proposed Bureau Order finally extends from Tactical or Specialized units to Patrol, then changes to how we can equipment MUST be made. Officers should be allowed to choose different "classes" of force, but not to carry an entire arsenal. For example, Officers can carry a lethal (221), a less lethal ranged tool (choose OC or Conducted Energy), and an impact device (Choose Baton, Yawara stick, Sap, or Flashlight).
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I strongly disagree with section F, line 8 in regards to using the CED in drive stun. If a suspect is actively resisting and we fire the cartridge at close proximity, there is a possibility the distance between probes will not be enough to subdue the suspect.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Street officers should be the ones to have this use of force option to try and stop resistance before it begins.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	At this time, there are too many exceptions and exclusions to allow for the effective deployment of Conducted Energy Devices.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	We need them, however everyone needs them.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Every officer should be issued a taser. A suspect should not have to have a weapon in order for a taser to be used.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	the bureau order is inadequate. the comon practice at other agencies does not limit officers abilities to to only using taser when the suspect is armed. common policy limits the use of ECD to considering age and possibility that the person may be AMS.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I do not believe that giving only a certain number of officers Conducted Energy Devices will make any difference.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	negatives: prohibited use section 2f, and 3. Bad idea. and off-duty considerations. As officers we are always on duty.
IIngleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	To me it makes more sense for patrol officers to be outfitted with CED's, as well as tac and specs.
Ingleside Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	CEDs should be available to all patrol officers, as is standard practice throughout the country. It is ridiculous to ask CEDs only be used on armed suspects. Armed suspects require the use of deadly force. In some circumstances, CEDs can be effectively used on armed suspects if time, cover, and lethal backup are available. CEDs are primarily useful as a minimally damaging means to subdue an unarmed suspect. This Bureau Order disregards that. "Proportionality" section is unreasonable and, frankly, wrong. Use of force is not and should not be related to the offense. Rather, it always has been and continues to be related to the level of resistance met. Passive resisters and fleeing suspects are prime targets for CED deployment. Other force techniques that may be used on these targets have the potential for greater harm. We should not be restricted from using the CED in these situations. Drive stun mode is an important feature of the CED. It is very difficult or impossible to properly deploy the CED from a close proximity, unless in drive stun mode. Unarmed, active resisters that officers may get into a ground fight with are the best targets for this. This policy prohibits this. Reporting requirements should not include suspect's medical condition. This will not be known by the officer in most situations.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b><u>Investigations Bureau</u></b>	Investigative	20	I'm in the middle on this issue. I believe everyone should have the Taser as a means of pain compliance.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	Why bother...too limited to use to few to matter
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	The order states to avoid using on "Subjects who may be under the influence of drugs/alcohol or exhibiting symptoms of altered mental state (e.g., nudity, profuse sweating, irrational behavior, extraordinary strength beyond physical characteristics or impervious to pain)" -This seems to be the scenario best suited to use the device in order to avoid a more injuring use of force to take a suspect into custody. Also Section F Prohibited use "4. To psychologically torment, punish or inflict undue pain on an subject; 5. For interrogation purposes or to elicit statements; I'm offended that we have that even written in the order. Over all, the order is so restrictive the devise will have limited application.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	Its a joke. Every officer in every other agency has them. So give them to all Officers. I was at TAC and a former Spec-- they/I was not always at every scene-- and not there first. The department's wait and hide until we get a bunch of cops and everyone will give up policy is a joke and will get citizens and officers hurt.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	20	WE NEEDED TASERS 10 YEARS AGO. MAKING OFFICER'S RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR ACTIONS IF THEY MISUSE THEM IS THE WAY TO GO.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	Why not issue to all officers? You give all officers firearms? It will be the officer on midnights not on any of the teams who will need this. This weapon is common throughout the country. Lets get with the times.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	As explained above. Don't make us go through a 7 month academy, then make us second guess ourselves, because some officers that never worked the street their entire time, feel that we could have dome something different.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	WE as a department have been asking for CEDs for years. It is ridiculous that we are one of the few agencies that does not carry them. I blame the supervisors who have not supported this need. Yet they pander to the public and the "needs" of the public.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	16-19	What is passive resistance? Does that mean just standing there and not submitting to be handcuffed or taking into custody?
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	ECDs won't help if you don't have one available. Consider; the patrol rifle was issued to specialized units, however they were needed by patrol units. Patrol units now have that tool. Who needs ECD now, patrol. Why not train and issue so we might have the opportunity to preserve life.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	Negatives: Under the proposed Department Order for CED's the only Officers allowed to use these devices are assigned to the Specialist or tactical team. I do not understand this. CED's are the standard for Law Enforcement nationwide. It seems unreasonable to only allow a limited

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			group of people a tool that can potentially protect the the general public, combative suspects and Officers. The Department Order for CED's prohibits the use of CED's on a subject who is only a danger to themselves. This means that if a suicidal person is actively harming themselves with a dangerous weapon that an Officer would be prohibited from using a CED to save them. This is a violation of our "commitment to the sanctity of human life."
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	We need taser guns. We need other less lethal options as well (i.e. pepper ball guns, other taser devices etc). We do not need shields and 36" batons to deal with suspects with knives and baseball bats. That is crazy. This is not what we do. That will end up in officer injury and death.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	I think all uniformed officers need to be able to carry a taser. Too many limitations in the proposed policy.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	Too many limitations. Carrying an AED device? What about bike officers and foot beats??
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	11-15	The Order is again overly vague. What exactly is, "all other required Department-approved CED training?" Isn't the point of an Order or Policy to state exactly what the requirements are? Why would it NOT be deployed on a fleeing Suspect? Why NOT use it in drive mode? Why NOT for an actively resisting, "restrained" Suspect? The policy is overly restrictive for real world use.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Anytime the possibility exists that force may be used is exigent Where would the AED be "reasonably accessible"? Would another force option have to be used (firearm) if it is unavailable? No CED if no AED? A CED has to be able to be used on an unarmed subject if the situation dictates A CED has to be able to be used on a fleeing subject if the situation dictates that. You can shoot a violent fleeing felon, but not use a CED? Danger to others? There may be circumstances when a CED may have to be used on a handcuffed subject Each CED application is a U of F. 1 officer can use the same force twice on the same person? Is each personal body weapon strike a separate U of F Pointing a CED at a subject is a U of F? Where does it end (or begin). Does a baton at port arms constitute a U of F? No Does every activation re: a IAD call out and full Homicide response? Does the Commanding Officer handle or 5H. Will DAI and ADAs be involved? Where does it stop?
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Th reporting requirements are impossible. To have officers report duration of deployment, number of cycles and length of times between deployments is asking for trouble and lawsuits. This is more than we ask for in an OIS. These are stressful moments where our bodies cope by slowing down or speeding up time, among other things. The information being asked for here should be available via the CED unit itself, by downloading the information. If offers have that information available then they should be able to review it prior to making a statement. If not we will be called liars and allegations of a cover up will be bolstered by statements that don't and should be expected to match perfectly. Plus it gives Gascon more ammunition for his blue ribbon panel and re election campaign. To only allow officers in the TAC to use these is ridiculous. Why do we continue to make these same mistakes. Just like with the long rifles get them to the boots on the ground where they are needed most. Limiting the reason for

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			deployment to when a subject has a weapon is also dangerous. What we see as a weapon and what the public views as a weapon are two different things. Also not allowing officers to use drive stun mode is a waste of a useful tool. If a subject is fighting with an officer and attempting to take the CED why can we not use it like we would a gun against the suspect. If someone was trying to take my gun I would shoot them. If someone is trying to take my CED and it is reasonable and feasible why can I not drive stun them if we are at close range. Otherwise I would go straight for my gun. The public will be outraged over this.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Providing CEDs to 1% of the department and giving them .01% of a circumstance to use them is an incredibly impotent decision. If CEDs were approved for the entire department, I would want SOPs that mirror other large metropolitan departments in their deployment, use and reporting. Either get them and use them like every other city in the US or just leave them out. Providing CEDs and then not trusting an Officer's judgment to use them is a slap in the face and does not support us as Officers.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Patrol should have them
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	While I think the device is incredibly useful, I can see where it can has the potential to be mis-used. When I say mis-used, I do not mean abuse in any way. I can see the potential for officers to go immediately to it, rather than attempting other types of force (hand to hand, baton, etc.) I can see the OC being replaced because of the effects it can have on surrounding people. The conducted energy devices are much more precise.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	Sec B #8. Foot beat officers cannot carry AED with them on foot beats. Does this mean they are not able to carry CED's? Sec F #1. Prohibited on an unarmed subject. If subject takes a fighting stance or martial arts stance indicating they have martial arts training, the CED should be authorized to deploy. Sec F #8 and #9 should be removed or language should be added that if an officer's safety or the public's safety is compromised, the CED may be used to eliminate that threat.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	I believe that if CED's are issued they should be able issued to every patrol officer. Not giving every patrol officer CED's decrease their options and will cause them to use higher levels of force.
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	6-10	There are other circumstances when a taser can be used to minimize force (i.e. suspect possesses skills in martial/fighting arts....use allowed only when suspects have a weapon other than a firearm is extremely limiting)
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	3-5	by giving only spec and TAC tasers we are setting ourselves up for failure. Will those officers be responding to day to day calls for service? it's too hard to predict which calls or contacts with the public may require the deployment of a taser. there will be an OIS where a taser may have been helpful, but since its not available to patrol, our department will take another political hit. if only certain units have the taser, my opinion is we should then not have them in the department, so we don't set ourselves up for failure.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Investigations Bureau	Investigative	3-5	-A “pilot program” which only provides CED’s to TAC and Specs seems useless to me. Provide CED’s to all Officers. -The standard set by many other large agencies which use CED’s is that they may be discharged to overcome active resistance. I would like to see this language added. -This proposed Order does not address plain clothes units requirements for CED’s. If a Spec is assigned to a full time plain clothes assignment, will they be required to carry the CED? How will they carry it (bearing in mind that a CED will “print” under clothing considerably)?
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	To be honest, It does not affect me, I’m not a spec or TAC, but i’m glad I wont be giving one. You point it at someone and its a UOF? or all of the other provisions? And even though I wouldnt get one, I guess in another view, I wish we all had them. Our last shooting, think of how that outcome could have been different. Giving them to a select few is window dressing. What are the odds of TAC being on scene first? Or even a SPEC working. This only works for time...what if we don’t have that?
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	So restrictive as to make CEDs useless.
Investigations Bureau	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	It is completely silly. I am trying to provide a serious answer but it is difficult. Scenario: An obviously pregnant woman, who has an edged weapon who charges at the Police with the weapon could not be ECD’d under the Bureau Order as it is a prohibited use. However, an Officer could use deadly force on that same person. Go figure... There are few circumstances in which an Officer could ever use an ECD. It is pathetic that it is limited to SOG.
<b><u>Mission Station</u></b>	Administrative	16-19	all officers should have the option to carry the CED.
Mission Station	Investigative	6-10	Every officer, not just Tactical units should carry a CED and be trained in its use. Tactical units are not always available and there is potential for delay in response from a Tactical unit with a CED, especially if the only Tac unit is downtown, and a Park or Taraval unit needs a CED. Furthermore, CED’s should not be limited to only armed suspects. A CED would likely be useful for an officer encountering a violent suspect who may be of larger stature than the officer encountering the suspect. The CED could potentially eliminate the need for the officer to engage in physical confrontation with the suspect, thus preventing substantial injury to the officer and suspect. Using the CED in “drive stun mode” should not be prohibited. This method of use could be beneficial to an officer who is assaulted by a suspect, and actively struggling with the suspect on the ground-especially if the officer is alone. In this situation it may not be possible to deploy the probes. Using the drive stun mode could potentially save the officer from further injury at the hands of the suspect, and allow the suspect to be taken into custody safely.
Mission Station	Investigative	3-5	I believe this order will result in a hesitancy to use the proper tool at the proper time. We will create bad habits that will result in higher officer casualties.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Platoon Comm patrol/admin	20	Every member tasked with doing enforcement should be equipped with a taser because if involved in an OIS, that's the first thing the Federal prosecutor will ask is what else did you try prior to shooting. As for waiting for Tac or Specs endangers members.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The proposal for the Conducted Energy Devices is too restrictive. The use of this device is to limit the amount of injury to both officers and suspect.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	It totally sucks! So, if a 6' 5" 270 pound, highly trained killer is kicking my ass (preparing to take my gun and kill me and others) I can not use the taser because he is unarmed?! Again, refer to the ignoramuses who are writing these orders.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	To prohibitive.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I have not seen the Bureau order regarding tasers, however, if the dept adopts them , they should be issued to ALL patrol officers, not just specialized units who are never on scene.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Patrol, every patrol officer, needs the CED, not TACT. This tool should have less restrictions than the use of a baton.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The draft proposal on the conductive weapons is designed to prevent the use of such devices. TAC units are rarely on scene when such tools would be useful and a full call-out makes it too late. Giving devices to field supervisors would make sense, but that is not in the draft.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It is ridiculous that only Tac and Specialists will be issued these devices. They are not on regular patrol dealing with 800 subjects every hour of every day. The Department will not be giving these to officers who actually work and are making contact with hundreds of people each day.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	The order makes it clear that the Department may want certain members to HAVE Tasers, but they do not want those members to actually USE their Tasers.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The order is to restrictive and difficult to understand as written.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	What's the point of having only certain Officers trained and armed with TASERS?, especially the OFFICER'S that are always detailed to other aspects of Police Work and fairly unavailable when an immediate response is vital. Calling out a SPEC or a TAC Officer while a suspects stabs/slashes or attacks another citizen in some other Violent or savage way while Patrol officer's are unequipped, seems to me to be ridiculous not to mention clearly setting the department and its members up for failure.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Though I believe CED's would be an outstanding tool for law enforcement, I do not agree with basic patrolmen giving up a use of force option (carotid), while not having a replacement.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Many times subjects who are Altered do not react to pain (ERIW, Baton, OC, Control holds). The only thing that can actually be 100% effective in immobilizing a subject are CEDs. Yes there is a small risk of being fatal, but there is a much higher fatality rate if a firearm is used, which will be the only option left if the above listed do not work. CEDs allow for a faster in custody time, which means less chance of officers/public being injured. It also allows for

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			officers to maintain a safe distance and not being forced to go hands on. If the carotid is removed, I strongly believe it should be replaced by the CEDs. But, I think we should be able to carry them anyway. I know the proposal is for TAC and SPECS to have them, but patrol is always the first on scene. TAC will take too long to get there, and most SPECS or at the busier stations, not the slower ones like Richmond, Park, Taraval. Because of this, I think Sgts should be implemented into this as well. After all, Sgts are to respond to all of the calls where there is a 800 with a weapon.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The fact that they will only be issued to specialized units makes no sense to me. Many times in some districts, there are not any specialized units available and it would take far too long for any to respond to the situation at hand. Again, causing people to hesitate and causing officers and the public to possibly be hurt or killed.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	every Officer should be issued the equipment. the use of CED should not only be limited to subject with weapons (suspect resisting)
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The CED policy basically makes CED non existent in our department. Why issue CED only specialized units making response time for CED equipped unit greater. In addition, the policy is so restrictive that it makes using the CED more of a liability than an asset.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I feel that every member of this Department should be trained in, and be able to carry, a Conducted Energy Device. Also, the allowable uses for such a device, as written in the proposed Bureau Order, make potential deployment of such a device almost impossible.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Could we make it any more complicated and maybe add some additional requirements prior to deployment? This is a great tool, if we are allowed to used it as needed, with clear and simple guidelines. Looking at the order as written, it requires excessive steps prior to deployment and limits the likelihood of deployment and effectiveness of this tool.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	An unarmed person can be as lethal as a armed person based on sized related to the officer/ officers involved.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	1. Patrol officer should have the priority and receive CEDs first. 2. the order contradicts the idea of using the least amount of force to subdue a subject. Because the order prohibits use on an unarmed person, an officer is forced to go hands on (often resulting in injuries to both parties) or use his baton, which can easily cause injuries. I would rather gain compliance by tazing someone, than striking someone with an RCB baton multiple times, breaking bones in his body.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Again none of this is practical on the street level of policing.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Cannot use on an active resister? Does not make sense.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	SWAT takes too long to respond. CED needs to be available to patrol so situations can be resolved sooner.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	All officers should be given a ECD, since we are all officers and will be properly trained how to

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			utilize this tool if given to us. Specialized units are not always available in all situations, which may need immediate ECDs to be utilized. ECDs should be allowed to be utilized on combative subjects who are unarmed to protect officers, the subject and others for undue injury or risk of injury.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I only perused the section as it will not effect me, but it seems very restrictive.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Everyone should carry one or no one.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The idea that only officers assigned to the Specialist Team or Tactical Company will be issued the CED is absurd. This draft policy again is filled with language about de-escalation and proportionality, but fails to take into account the reality of working on the street. Not every situation is going to allow the time necessary for a Specialist Team or Tactical Company officer to arrive. Some situations are going to escalate regardless of the de-escalation techniques used by responding officers, and the CED is a tool to resolve the situation without using force that could injure the officer or the suspect. By not giving this tool to patrol officers, patrol officers will be put into more situations that could jeopardize their safety, the safety of the public, and situations that will require them to use other force options increasing the risk of injury to the suspect. The draft policy prohibits the use of the CED on an unarmed person. If the unarmed person is combative and actively attacking an officer, then officers will have to use another force option that is likely to injure the unarmed person, which will also increase the risk of injury to the officer. The draft policy prohibits the use of the CED on a fleeing suspect armed with a weapon other than a firearm. In our current use of firearms policy there is a narrowly defined situation when an officer can discharge a firearm at a fleeing suspect who poses a threat of death or GBI. Wouldn't this narrowly defined exception also apply to the CED? The draft policy prohibits the use of the CED on a person armed with any weapon other than a firearm who is only a danger to themselves. While this would be the ideal situation to use a CIT trained officer or some kind of de-escalation technique, wouldn't the use of a CED (a less lethal force option) be a tool to use if other techniques don't work?
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	In the proposed order, the instances when an officer can use the device is almost the same when an officer can use a firearm. The restrictions almost all but ensure that officers will not ever have the opportunity to use it.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I think this a start, I think we need tasers or CED's, however, they should not be limited to just SPECS, that's ridiculous, look at the WOODS incident, what if a spec wasn't on scene, could you get one there fast enough to deploy a taser? Probably not. Also the policy is too restrictive. It uses terms like ALWAYS, when the problem is, a fight or someone resisting is not a pretty thing. Fights are messy and are constantly changing and not perfect. When you restrict an officer to act like a robot and only use the taser after he's attempted distance and proportionality and etc, you are creating a robot. Officers need some autonomy. I think those ideas should just be guidelines or principles, but not stoneclad guidelines to using force. That's just ridiculous, and the officers in the arena know that.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	If a violent suspect is unarmed but skilled in martial arts or on PCP or some other stimulant that would make my other force options useless, I should not be forced to go hands on. There should be some exigent circumstances that allow me to use this tool to protect myself and other innocent bystanders. Why give it to me if I can't use it when I deem it necessary to protect human life.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I feel that all officers in patrol and enforcement capacities should be issued tasers.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	we should all have them
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I agree that we should get tasers. I do not agree that the taser can be used only on a person with a weapon. A taser should be able to be used to overcome resistance and effect an arrest.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I don't agree with the prohibited use of CEDs against unarmed subjects and fleeing subjects. An officer may encounter a large "unarmed" individual (and possibly under the influence) choking the life out of another person. In this situation, 5.02 is in effect. It does not make much sense that an officer can use his/her firearm due to the threat of GBI and death in this situation, but the use of a CED is prohibited. Using the CED in this situation may preserve both lives. Prohibited use on a fleeing subject armed with a weapon other than a firearm is unclear. In the Mario Woods incident, he was attempting to flee (walking away) while armed with a knife and a threat to the public. A CED could have prevented his death.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Great idea to allow officers to carry CED's. Terrible draft in that only SPECS/TAC can carry them. How will this help officers responding to a call where a CED is needed to preserve "the sanctity of all human life" and there are no SPECS/TAC available? ALL officers who complete the appropriate training should carry CED's.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	II.F.2(a) - Using a CED on a subject could prevent a subject from injuring his/her self without the need for officers or other members of the public from being at risk. This proposed order ignores the potential of a CED to effect a rescue of a person who otherwise may cause themselves severe or lethal harm. II.F.2(f) This proposal ignores the potential of a person suspected of a violent felony or who presents a danger to the general public at large.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	If the public and the City feel that these devices are beneficial to the Dept., shouldn't all our members be able to carry them. A midnight radio car needs the device a lot more than a Tactical Company member who has far less contacts with the public on a day to day basis.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The basic guidelines of the order are valid. However, much like the other drafts the order repeats itself regarding communication, making the order less effective in communicating the guidelines and policies. It also includes the ambiguous language of "shall, when practical." In regard to the issuance of CED only to tac and specs, I wonder why it would not be issued to all officers. It is clear that the department wants to prevent the use of lethal force whenever possible, and the issuance of the CED would be in furtherance of that goal. Why not have the tool available to all officers? The CED obviously requires a large amount of additional training and the officer carrying it holds great responsibility for knowledge, consideration and deci-

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			sion making. If the goal of the department is truly to reduce the use of lethal force, it should not only require its officers to be able to carry that responsibility, but it should have faith that they are able to. The responsibility of the CED is not greater than the responsibility of taking a person's life.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	What's the point.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	If they want us to have these devices, they should equip everyone with one. Situations can change in a split second and waiting on a Spec or Tac member to show up with this device could prove to be useless, where if the officer on scene had one could have deployed the device. In general, I don't want the device at all.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	- why would i NOT be allowed to use CED against a combative subject with no weapon. If Mike Tyson were fighting me, i'd be outside of policy if i used an CED on him?!! -if subject is badly beating a minor with only body weapons i'd be outside of policy if i used CED's -again, policy written by people with opinions but no knowledge.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	All CIT trained officers should carry and utilize Conducted Energy Devices when needed. Situations rapidly evolve and cannot always be de-escalated. If officers not assigned to Tac or Specs can be trained to use a baton and ERIW, they can be trained to use a Conducted Energy Device. If you don't want to give them Conducted Energy Devices, don't require them to carry an ERIW in their car or a baton on their belt.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	There is currently a huge gap in the SFPD use of force continuum. We go from impact weapon, which has proven to be ineffective in some circumstances, to lethal force. CED options would help close this gap, giving officers a less lethal option. It is time the SFPD catch up to the rest of the country in this regard.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I think it is foolish to ultimately only issue CED's to a small percentage of officers. It will be the patrol officers that will find themselves in need of the CED on an almost daily basis. I believe most if not all of the officers in the Mario Wood's OIS were patrol officers. Under this Bureau Order, the outcome would have been the same since none of the officers on scene would have had access to the CED anyways. In addition, the section were the CED cannot be used on an unarmed subject is foolish and dangerous. I myself stand at only 5'6" and 150 pounds. If found myself coming to contact a subject who stood 6'00 200 pounds and who I knew to be a trained and experienced fighter, I would use my CED. I have seen other police agency videos of this very scenario and the subject is able to be taken into custody with minimal incident and injury to both the subject and the officers. This proposed Bureau Order seems to be a token by the Admin to show the officers that they are taking steps to change things, but ultimately nothing is being changed for the officers on patrol.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	As a former CED instructor, and having multiple Taser deployments in the field and in a custodial setting, I can adomently say, issuing CED's to only Specs and Tac is ridiculous!!! Again, why are we making our Officers robots? Why are we not empowering cops? They were chosen and trained as professionals. But we will only issue these incredible (life-saving) devices only

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			to a specific few? Carrying an AED with the CED? How about issuing AED's to each car? I also say this as having a full exposure to a CED deployment.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The policy is a good introduction but needs to be changed to a broader criteria for use. Under new policy it leaves the officers with a small window for use and with a high risk for violation of policy based on subjects' behaviors on the street. This policy endangers officers by not allowing the use of CED.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	SPF needs CED's and will help in a lot of situations help a suspect has an edged weapon or blunt object. It is a great tool to use.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The SFPD does not need more tools on their already limited tool belts.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	I would like to see CED's be issued to all rank and file. This is a tool that is used through out the country and has been for years. The evidence of the benefits of this tool far outweigh the negatives and is clearly demonstrated by the numerous agencies who are issued them to date. Just about all agencies that surround SF are issued a CED as a standard piece of equipment including some agencies within the city and county. In my opinion we are way behind the times on this matter which is too bad because having another tool that we all have access too in the field would be greatly beneficial. However, I disagree with a lot of the proposed policy as again it is vague and leaves out probable situations in which this tool would be an advantage to the members. In addition the vague language of this proposed GO would again leave members with hesitation and uncertainty about the department backing them in the deployment of this tool.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Why would we have to make an incident report detailing why we pulled out a CED and pointed it at someone? This is not a firearm. At this rate, pulling out our batons will become a reportable use of force. Even worse, shining our flashlights at someone will be deemed aggressive and also be deemed a reportable use of force. This is just getting ridiculous. I'd rather not have the tool if there are going to be so many rules and requirements when using it.
Mission Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	As a lateral officer who has used a taser, the proposed order for tasters is not practical. One of the main instances we would use a taser is for when an unarmed subject is resisting. Depending on suspect size, alcohol/drugs that may be a factor, or if the suspect is going thru a mental health crisis, a taser could be the best option and cause the least amount of injury to suspect and officer.
<b><u>Northern Station</u></b>	Administrative	20	In the order it states that we shall not use the CED against an unarmed person. If the situation arises and no access to firearm for whatever reason I should be able to use the CED if I am in danger or the public is in danger of great bodily injury. ie: I'm on the ground beaten and unable to defend myself any weapon lethal or non lethal should be at my discretion
Northern Station	Investigative	20	restrictions are limiting to a necessary tool.
Northern Station	Investigative	0-2	Does not apply to me since I am not a member of Tac or Specs.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I am uncomfortable when an officer is alone and is confronted with a subject armed with an edged weapon. If there are more officers, a lethal cover officer would ensure officer safety (as in the ERIW portocol), but alone? Very risky --- if the CED proves ineffective, the officer is now vulnerable while switching to his/her firearm if the subject attacks.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I hope we are issued conducted energy devices, but there are just too many rules and regulations. Officers will choose to not use the device, feeling that they may just get in trouble.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Too restrictive
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	What good does it do if issued only to TAC and Specs? Using on unarmed subject? Is a violent resistor who is unarmed not dangerous?
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This order limits the CEDs to be carried only by TAC and Specialists. Patrol officers are on average first on scene 95% of the time and yet will not be provided with CEDs. In addition, it appears that CEDs are intended to be carried but not used. It seems pointless to prohibit use of CEDs with unarmed subjects. I believe that this puts officers at risk and takes away a proven and effective use of force option that prevents injuries to officers and suspects alike.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Simply having just TAC and Specs carrying them suggests that they are always available, 24/7 to respond to a situation where a CED is needed. This doesn't take into account TACs hours, or the 65 Specs that are 10 different stations, seven different watch off groups, on any one of four different shifts. Completely shortsighted policy esp considering the oversighted 5.01 and 5.01.1 and 5.02 which appears to be a knee jerk reaction to a sole and rare incident wherein the Officers appear to have been within policy and existing laws.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I refuse to acknowledge something that isn't even on order from a company.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It would be nice if the POA had an opportunity for a meet and confer.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Like I mentioned before if you're going to issue a Taser that should be allowed to be used when it should be used not putting guidelines on it. Not allowed to use it on a unarmed person that is a resistor is a joke
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	This Order has an enormous amount of issues. Here are just a few. B.2 Proportionality principle, is flawed. By its definition its flawed. Often an officer must use force greater than what's being exhibited to gain compliance. If this is implemented officer will get hurt often due to this. A prime example is a passive resistive person. If a subject is passive resistive are we also....i.e man keeping his hands tucked under his body while lying on his belly and near his waistband. This is extremely dangerous to allow this to occur. The waistband is the primary place where people keep weapons and to allow them to remain in this position is extremely poor officer safety. III A. Issuance and carrying I have used these devices at other agency. To limit their use is a disservice to a fraction of officers in SFPD is a disservice not only to the community we serve but the people we might use them on. You can't always wait for people to arrive. In every situation that I have deployed one it was needed in a short time frame. Not to mention that by doing this this short time frame allowed people not be injured or the situa-

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>tion to be resolved without it turning into a shooting situations. III Procedures. To require officers only to have them on one side of the body is also thought of out of ignorance. I've used this and depending on if you're driving or right handed or left handed makes a determination as to what side it should be placed on. I have had it on my weak side (off hand side) and due to that being my left side it was closest to the door when I drove. Thus it would often accidentally turn on. Thus causing, if unnoticed, as in my case the battery was extremely and potential could have been depleted. If you have used a piece of equipment and it didn't work when you needed it to you understand why this is a bad thing. A life of a subject could be hanging in the balance. There are many more reasons. This Bureau Order is not written from the minds of people who serve and protect but sure sounds like it's written from people with a lack of Law Enforcement experience and knowledge. If you want to know how to write a manual on how to fix a car utilize an experienced and knowledgeable mechanics that specialize in the car the manual is for.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>I am not sure that adding a second use of force is going to work. I for one have a small waist and would not have room to effectively fit anymore equipment around it unless I give up one of me force options ie. pepper spray, or baton. Plus must female would not be able to fit all that equipment unless we do drop down knee holsters.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>This proposed Bureau Order is flat out terrible. Instead of giving the CED to Patrol (the one's who will need it most) it will be in the hands of Specialists and TAC? So Patrol is qualified to carry guns but not to carry a less lethal tool - and we will just wait in harm's way while TAC responds. Shameful, despicable, and egregious policy making leaving patrol holding the bag.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>Again with the "safeguarding sanctity and preservation of all human life." These repetitive statements, as if members of SFPD don't value all human life, is insulting. How come the politicians don't abide by this? Liberal politicians in this city and country have made it clear they don't believe cops lives matter and that's considered acceptable? And Section III #1 Can't use on unarmed persons? Whats the point of having it then. I can think of several situations over my career where a taser, oh excuse me, "Conducted Energy Device", on an unarmed person probably would had prevented the suspect or cops getting injured. I have seen or participated in situations where there are four or five of us trying to detain a subject under the influence of the lovely drug PCP. Most of us have. Officers usually get injured. So we can't use the tasers on them? Even if they don't work on these individuals because they are so high on drugs, it would still be nice to know it's an option.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>I think that it is useful if we are allowed as a true police department, to use it ...</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	<p>First off, the CED's are only going to provided to TAC and Specs but they are not always working. Why would only CIT trained Officers be provided with CED's and not all Officers on patrol? The mere pointing of a CED at a suspect is a reportable use of force? What if the mere pointing de-escalated the circumstance. Seems unreasonable that this should be a reportable use of force. As such, deploying a baton (RCB) should be a reportable use of force then. Then if the CED is deployed it's treated as an Officer involved discharge. Do Officers get days off</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			and every time it's deployed an Officer will be given an IA complaint. Completely unnecessary. We haven't even been issued them and given this proposed GO, I do not want a CED if it's an IA every time it's used. CED's are only to be used on armed suspects? What about violent AMS suspects who are violently resisting arrest. Given the circumstances we are no longer allowed to use the carotid restraint, chemical agent is unlikely in this circumstance, and to the general public it would look very bad if 3-4 Officers were striking this individual with batons. So either every Officer on scene piles on this suspect and the risk of injury to everyone involved increases. To me and having been in multiple fights with AMS suspects a CED would be a great tool to use in this situation but we can not. If I respond to an 801 call and subject in this incident puts a knife to his throat and there's a standoff, I cannot use a CED. So if the subject becomes tired and lowers his knife it seems like a CED would be a great tool to save this individuals life. But we can't. Furthermore, Officers can not use the dry stun mode on skin. Why are we being provided with CED's if for the very reason the public wants us to have them we can't use them?
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	CEDs are a necessary tool for all law enforcement.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Are we hoping that a CED equipped officer is around the corner like the current K-9 officers, seldom. Each officer needs to be personally equipped. I carried one for years, we rode solo, only needing to use it twice in a five year period. One incident where I was justified in shooting the woman, she had a steak knife and was running toward another woman, about to stab her. I stopped her from a flank position on a dime, the knife falling from her hand some 10 feet away. It happened so fast that an CED officer would have to have been in my shoes, at that precise moment, to have stopped her from stabbing another woman.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	We should not take on the use of energy devices as tools with complicated rules of engagement that confuse situations and leave an Officer who is PROTECTING the community liable for discipline or investigation for not using the device correctly in accordance to a loaded, confusing Order.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I understand the gentle roll out to SPECS and TAC, but how long will the delay be until they arrive on scene for patrol.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Not being able to use the CED device on a subject who is not armed by still posing a real threat to other people is a mistake. In some situations the subject may be unarmed but still be a threat to other peoples lives.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Why would this be necessary if we aren't issued those devices. It seems like they are putting the cart before the horse.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Reading this policy and the litany of restrictions, I am unclear when we would ever be able to use this tool. It seems like this policy was written with the express intent that we have the conducted energy device on our belt and NEVER deploy it.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I believe they should be available for use on subjects without weapons as well in certain situa-

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			tions. I don't think you should have to give a warning by displaying the electrical arc. Some of the worst fights I've been in have been unarmed subjects high on narcotics that are larger and stronger. Baton strikes are sometimes ineffective. It should be included in the DGO that we can articulate the use on an unarmed subject.
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	They will saves lives and keep Officers safe.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It is a step in the right direction.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Don't want them if this is the policy. Too restrictive and not available enough. I came from another agency that had tasers. They were simple intermediate level of force (baton, oc, etc.). We never had any problems. It saves lives.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Issuing the CED's to only the Tactical Unit and to Specialists will limit the effectiveness and usefulness of the devices to hopefully provide a non lethal option to armed individuals.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Use is too limited
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The limitation of suspect with weapons seems limiting because there are situations that would warrant its deployment. single officer fighting with a suspect for an extended period of time or a suspect who is under the influence on a stimulant.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	All officers should be trained and carry CED's. The everyday patrol officer that constantly takes on subjects that meet CED deployment criteria could utilize CED's on a daily basis.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	not all stations have Specs. The policy is very restricted and people without edged weapons can also cause a lot of physical harm
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The Order for Conducted Energy Devices does not make sense to me. Tasers are a tool officers use to subdue a dangerous and/or armed person. The proposed Order states an officer shall not use a taser if a person is armed. What is the point of having one?
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Why would you give it to TAC and specs only? TAC is NOT ON PATROL. They take well over 20 minutes to respond to any scene and sure there are SPECS at every station. But there are maybe 1 in a day? 2, if the schedules line up? Patrol officers, ones that have a designated sector need these....not TAC
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Patrol is generally the first unit on a scene and is the unit that should be equipped with conducted energy devices. IT sometimes takes specialized units far to long to arrive to a scene. Things happen within seconds in Police work, and most of the time we cannot wait for another unit to arrive to assist.
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Deployment doesn't seem like a necessary term. A CED is a holstered weapon, so "draw/

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			<p>drew” should be sufficient terminology. This seems engineered to create arbitrary liability for Officers when reporting CED use. Language that Officers shall not simultaneously hold a CED and firearm is problematic. The ideal method of holding a firearm is our currently-trained two-handed grip, that is a given. However Officers are trained currently to manipulate fire-arms with one hand in extreme circumstances. The order may create training conflicts in rare yet dangerous situations where an Officer might be confronted with two armed suspects of differing threat levels. I believe Officers are better “encouraged” to not hold both weapons, as it is not ideal. But it should not be entirely prohibited. The prohibited use section was written awfully. The outlined restrictions are unwarranted, impractical and will put Officers in substantial danger if followed in spite of any extreme risk to life safety. Can someone explain why detainees who have been electrocuted are not allowed to be held in station cells? This makes absolutely no sense. If Officers are being vigilant and constantly monitoring the detainee/arrestee, why is location so critical?</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>I think we all should have the CED devices. I think our policy should be inline with other agencies in California. I think its a great way to stop people from physically resisting the police. Just the threatened use of the CED is enough to get people to comply. We should be allowed to use the CED on people who are actively resisting but not yet handcuffed. We should also be able to use the CED on fleeing subjects when the use would not cause additional harm to the fleeing subject i.e. not to be used while running in traffic or on rooftops or stairs. This subject needs to be talked about more because this is a great tool that we need to utilize.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	<p>I stopped reading it after it stated that only TAC and Specs get to use them. It should be offered as a class that street officers get priority to sign up for.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>There are way to many layers needed to pass though to be able to effectively deploy the CED,</p>
NNorthern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>Officers on the street need those tools. can not rely on Tac when incidents are unfolding rapidly upon contact.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>It is important that all members have the same use of force training, tactics and knowledge of working systems. I have been equipped with and have used the taser several times in my career. In my experience it will be statistically higher that patrol officers encounter incidents where a taser is the most effective non lethal use of force. Also, by eliminating the carotid restraint, the force options are now limited to use of lethal force to subdue a suspect(s).</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>Not exactly sure why someone fleeing is not an option for the use of a CED. Seems like it would be a good way to keep officers safe when dealing with a non compliant suspect.</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>Adding a less lethal alternative like 90% of other agencies will provide us with more tools that results in less fatalities</p>
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	<p>All department members should be trained and have access to conducted energy devices. Providing them to specialists and tactical units defeats the purpose of having them at all. In many situations an officer will be unable to request a CED trained unit to respond before the</p>

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Northern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	situation escalates and force is used. If all officer's had CED devices, I believe that would help immensely when taking suspects into custody.
<b><u>Park Station</u></b>	Administrative	20	only deployed to a limited number of officers is stupid. Making it the same as an AD is ridiculous joke. it's no different than a baton strike, ERIW shot and should be treated the same. It shows that whoever wrote the policy is not a professional law enforcement trainer or expert just a political hack who doesn't want officer to deploy the device. It's also stupid to make it a reportable use of force if it's pointed at someone w out firing it.
Park Station	Investigative	20	prohibitions need to be re-evaluated -Unarmed? How about a giant Somoan -Fleeing Suspect? Why not if custody is paramount to prevent danger to the public
Park Station	Investigative	20	I really don't know enough about tasers to have an opinion.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	- Define "thoughtful communication" - CED should be issued to patrol, not onlyTAC/Specialists. As a patrol officer with LAPD in 1989 I carried a Tazer - that's 27 years ago! We carry guns. We should be issued CEDs. - CED cannot be used unless an AED is available. Interesting. - The fact that a CED can only be used on an armed suspect. Again, we are being asked to be gladiators. If a suspect challenges us to a fight and they are strong and violent, just be cause they don't have a weapon in their hand does not mean we must wrestle them. A CED is a resource that should be available. Also, a fire arm can be used to stop a violent fleeing suspect under certain circumstances, but not the CED? Supervisor response - "initiate an immediate evaluation by IA" Does that mean every time you use a CED that you get an IA case opened? Why bother with a supervisor evaluation? Supervisors will be required to have the training and conduct the evaluations but will not be issued CEDs. Why not?
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	should be used like other departments not watered down
PPark Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Unless department wide why bother? And must be able to use of person resisting. A single officer or smaller officer confronted by a much larger or a person trained in fighting or under the influence can over power an officer in seconds...Only to Tac and specs...I have none of those officers on the midnight shift and most likely very few are assigned to work at night at all so a waste for midnight units. Really start am IA investigation when used? Why would anyone agree to carry? So lets take the Mario Woods case. Just 2 or 3 trained CED officers working in the city at that time. But they are all the way across the city...they are responding but Mr Woods doesnt want to wait...other less lethal means have been tried but he now wants to push the issue and walk away. The officer rightly steps in front of him to prevent him from walking away and Mr Woods raises his hand still holding the knife. If not to every officer then why issue at all?

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	It would be helpful if the entire department can be issued these devices.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Just because a subject is unarmed, does not mean that they are not dangerous.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	When responding to a situation where a CED is needed, it would not be reasonable for normal patrol officers to call and wait to see if there is a spec or tac unit around to respond. useless
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I know little to nothing about this device. The Bureau order is lengthy and covers a lot. Seems like adding this device will be cumbersome on the leather belt. Is this a drop down holster?
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	We should ALL get them not just cool cops with gel in their hair.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	ALL officers should be equipped with CED's.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Again, Proportionality, this order wants officers not to act! They want the officer to not take action and to delay taking the subject into custody! To not take action, the officers will be found to have fulfilled Proportionality! How long will it take to get TACT or Specs to the scene? The incident could and would change in an instant and we will have no other options if we have to wait for them. Why would an immediate evaluation by IA be needed. They are treating the CED as a lethal weapon! Why would any officer want to carry this weapon?
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	If CED issuance takes place it should include all of patrol and not just TAC and Specs.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Very limited. Wont be available to most officers in the field, who would be the first responding unit and need it. The proscription regarding using it against weaponless opponents is frankly, shortsighted, and dangerous to officers. It will take down a person on PCP who has no weapons, when otherwise, a squad of officers might not be sufficient. Is PCP a weapon? Does "weapon" need to be redefined? I cant answer that, but as we have seen recently with the CHP officer who barely survived an attack using a knife after discharging his taser, this technique is severely flawed. One has to be too close most times when employing any hand taser for safety, and many factors can disrupt the discharge into a suspect.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Not realistic
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The only consideration I would request is that the CED is allowed on unarmed subjects given certain circumstances, ie. Subject displaying Mixed-martial arts training, when an Officer is in a physical confrontation and may lose consciousness, any other unforeseen circumstance that the Officer believes he/she should deploy CED.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Too restrictive.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	ALL officers on patrol should be allowed to carry CED's.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	As a lateral Officer and one who has used CED devices on more than one occasion it is a great tool to use. As of right now we have OC, Baton, and our firearms. Being unable to drive stun a subject should not be in policy. Drive stunning a subject is beneficial if an Officer or group of Officers are fighting with a subject on the ground. Studies shall be conducted at the beneficial uses of CED from other agency's

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The restrictions in this order leave officers open to liability for practically any use of the CED. Many requirements are extremely subjective and do a disservice to officers in the field. The prohibition against using the CED on an unarmed, but combative subject is likewise unhelpful. Often, the subjects that put up the worst fights are unarmed, but are in an altered mental state. They could be more safely taken into custody with the aid of CED, which would allow them to be temporarily incapacitated while officers restrain them. Much less physical force need be used, and both the officers and the subject would be at a lower risk of serious injury.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Why don't regular patrol officers get these? Why is it so high on the use of force continuum?
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Why only TAC and SPECS? Everyone on the street should have one.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	There needs to be more research done, before such a Order is implemented department wide.
Park Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Taser's are another option, a tool we can have at our disposal, but it is not a cure all for dealing with suspects.
<b><u>Richmond Station</u></b>	Investigative	20	I do support the issuance of CED to the patrol force. The limitation of use by tactical, specialists, and CIT members are impractical. The response by these trained members will be limited or non-existent if they are all tied up on something else because the first 2 minutes of the contact/take on of the suspect is crucial.
Richmond Station	Investigative	11-15	should be more assigned to patrol officers
Richmond Station	Investigative	6-10	Tac is the only ones who don't need tasers. It will take them too long to respond. Officers in almost every bay area county carry them and the statistics show they are an effective tool for a patrol officer.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Just hope they are available for all shifts and every day of the week in case they are needed for deployment.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	F:1 Unarmed subject needs to be removed, ALL non-compliant subject have to ability to be concealing a weapon. The size, build, and fight skill of an unarmed subject can be a deadly factor for an officer. ( If the huge built man is coming after the officer, he/she can NOT fire the CED, but ok to fire the firearm?) We are back to "ferguson " now????!!!! this is ridiculous. F:D exception should be size and/or if armed F:F; should have exceptions, what if he/she just begins to flee?? I think 50% would, once we display the CED at them. maybe word like in an on-going pursuit where the suspect has been continuously fleeing and where tif the CED was deployed, may put the suspect at greater risk involving the environment. such as stair case , etc. F;G should be taken out or revised, a person with a bat or weapon, who refuses to drop it, but is acting passively we can NOT taz?? so some officer has to put themselves at risk first and go hands on with a armed suspect to find out that he/she will actively resist, now becomes ok to deploy?? This is badly written and sounds ridiculous. FH do we carry alcohol based OC?? if not then why is this even written? if we do, then our escalation of force goes to baton or firearm with someone who has been sprayed? Doesn't sound right.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	We need them, but not just for SOG. Every officer should get them.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Only TAC and Specs get the CED. It should be available to everyone since some stations, such as Richmond do not have any specialists.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Activate CED only when the subject is armed (with a weapon other than a firearm)? And if the subject is 6'4"/300lb and the officer is 5'2"/180? Ridiculous.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	we don't have time to wait for a call-out
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	If tasers are implemented they should be available to all members in a uniformed capacity
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The chief doesn't trust anyone to use Energy Devices but TAC and other specialized units. Let's wait 45 minutes to have an Officer respond with a Taser. Better yet lets just go home.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I believe street Sergeants should be the ones carrying CEDs. It ensures not everyone gets them and higher accountability. Tac/Specs will never be there in time for this to be an effective policy.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	We are the front line officers, we are the ones who come in contact with the public and subjects first. I do not understand what conducted energy devices will do in the hands of specialized units. What are their response times?
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Positive: The department is getting CED's. Negative: Only a select few will be trained and allowed to use the CED's. A majority of the situations that would require the use of a CED will not be responded to by the Officers that are trained for and permitted to use CED's. Responding Officers will not be equipped with or allowed to use CED's.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	All of patrol should be able to carry a "taser." I believe a "taser" could de-escalate dangerous situations effectively without causing physical injuries to officers and suspects. "Tac" or "Specs," in many circumstances, will not be able to respond in time to be of any assistance to patrol officers when confronting a dangerous subject. Also, I believe a subject can be deadly even if he or she is not holding a weapon. An officer should be allowed to deploy a taser if he/she feels a threat to life is about to occur (whether it be to him/herself, a suspect, or any bystander). I believe a policy written to allow these kind of uses for a taser would save lives.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Taser guns should be available to all patrol officers, not just Specialists and Tactical units. Also, the use of tasers should be allowed on not only subjects with weapons, but on all other unruly subjects who pose threat to safety of the public or the officer.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	If an innocent woman is being kicked in the head by a professional fighter, I am supposed to NOT taze him, makes NO sense.
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	As officers we already try to deescalate situations. This proposition puts us at risk to get hurt because it has a strong emphasis on deescalation to satisfy to the public not to take care of its officers.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Richmond Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Conducted Energy Devices should not be just for Tactical and Specialists Units. Patrol Street Enforcement Officers have the most interaction with the community and dangerous individuals in the community and Street Enforcement Officers will be the ones who will need the extra tool in order to keep each other safe, the community safe, and the subjects who we intend to use this tool for.
<b><u>Southern Station</u></b>	Investigative	11-15	I am pleased that there will be CEDs available on the street. However I believe their use should be prohibited on “unarmed subjects”. There are times when a CED will be much safer than other force options on unarmed subjects, for example; Suspect high on drugs A trained MMA fighter Subject who “may have weapons” but not scene.
Southern Station	Investigative	11-15	Only TAC and SPECS, really? They aren’t always around. CED should be given to patrol. Maybe supervisors should select those to carry the CEDs. Or maybe HNT officers, who work patrol should carry them. It just doesn’t make sense to limit this tool to only TAC and SPECS.
Southern Station	Investigative	6-10	There are entirely too many limitations regarding the device’s use. There are 17 documentation requirements regarding reporting the use of force of the device. SEVENTEEN!! That is ridiculous! And if it is so important to issue these devices to our members, then why are they only being issued to approximately 5% of the Department (Tac/Specs)?
Southern Station	DOC Light Duty	11-15	Why must a subject be armed to use a CED? What about a 300 lbs fighter who has already hurt multiple Officers. Why is it a documented use of force when you point an CED but not pepper spray or baton?
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I would like more information on case laws and current practices in other agencies. It is my hope that this policy was not hastily prepared and does not consider the safety (legally and administratively as well) of the members of this department.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This is not very practical when you have limited officers authorized to carry them. Street supervisors should be added into use.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	With the strict use of taser guideline, why would an officer want one issued to them? A simple activation of the taser is considered similar to a firearm discharge? I do understand that certain city officials were vehemently against the police department being issued taser. But, based on PERF’s recommendations, and the chief wanting the tasers, the compromise reached in the restricted use of the tasers is comical. It is better not to have them issued to officers; I don’t even know why a member from specs of swat would want one issued to them.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The tasers should be issued to all officers. It does no one any good if a situation arises where a taser is needed but the person who is trained with a taser is not present or has a delayed response. It creates a safety issue for all people involved.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	De-escalation is a wonderful concept, one that all officers already employ. To present it now as something new is not only disrespectful, but misleading to the public and their perception, and apparently their perception is fueling these changes.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	CED manufacturers do not recommend using the device when being threatened with a deadly weapon, such as a knife or bat. CED can be used effectively on combative subjects that may not be responsive to traditional pain compliance, physical control, OC, Baton. CED can reduce injuries to citizens and officers.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I don't have enough experience with this weapon to comment, but most departments have used tasers successfully for decades. Our policies should be in line with existing policies that have been used in practice in similar sized departments.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	F. PROHIBITED USE. Officer are prohibited from using the CED: 1. On an unarmed subject; If a subject poses a threat to officer based on size or AMS from drugs or other this should be authorized and articulated. Use of a CED warrants an IA investigation? Are the officers on days off or no contact during investigation? No information given about reviewing stored data on CED only that it is to be uploaded. Loaded where what is stored video audio length of discharge, number of discharges.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	When a situation requires the use of one of these devices it is not practical in most instances to have one of the very few members that will be issued them to respond to the scene. Not sure the person(s) writing this order have been on the streets recently.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	This piece is the most ridiculous of all. Only to be used against subjects with a weapon? Plenty of officers have been forced to use DEADLY force against unarmed assailants. This policy is absurd from beginning to end. I have too much to say to spend the time typing up right now, but it is a poorly thought out and misguided proposal. We would be better off never having CED's than to utilize a policy so far out of touch with reality and standard practices of policing.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	If we are getting tasers then all of us need to be trained on their use. We can't wait for a specialist or supervisor to bring out a taser.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	All officers should have Conducted Energy devices, and if not all officers at least officers who are trained in CIT
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	All officers should be assigned a CED. Limiting CED usage to a threat that is armed with a weapon is ludicrous.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Why not just be like EVERY OTHER AGENCY and issue CEDs to all units?
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It should be for all patrol, not for tactical unit. It should be allowed to be deployed on unarmed suspects.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	5% issuance is way too low. TAC/Specs and all patrol Sergeants should be issued the CEDs. You cannot issue them to station CIT trained officers, because you want them talking to the subjects without a tool in their hand.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Based on the proposed policy regarding CED's, I believe it limits the scope of use. In many instances I have dealt with subjects of larger stature, fighting abilities and mental mind frames.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			It would have been useful to deploy the CED in order to gain compliance, but instead resulted in myself and other Officers getting hurt. I also believe that arming TAC and Specs is not the right procedure either. If a supervisor “Shall” respond to incidents related described in the proposed CED bureau order, I believe the Supervisors should be armed with the CED instead of TAC/Specs.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	BULLSHIT! First of all only TAC and Specialists can have them.....Who is TAC???? oh yeah those guys who are too good to help patrol and do nothing but train all week and practice “call out” search warrants....What a great help to patrol that would be for TAC to have these while they oil each other up at the DeHaro facility. Either Patrol gets them, or nobody! That includes the officers on the Specialists team with 2 years in
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Why do only the Tac and Specs get them. I am a member of the Spec team and our numbers as a team are down. We are to spread out and short handed that the incident will already have been over by the time we get there with the taser.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I strongly disagree that CED’s will only be issued to members of the Tactical Company and Specialist Team. Depending on the location of a member of one of those two units, responding Officers could be waiting for an unreasonable amount of time for a CED to arrive on scene. I propose that every sworn member of the San Francisco Police Department be issued a CED. If that is not attainable, then no members should be issued a CED.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I don’t think that having a small amount of officers utilizing this tool is effective at all. I don’t think getting rid of an effective tool as the carotid restraint just to implement a tool in which most officers wont be able to utilize is a smart idea.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Issue everyone tasers not just specialists and tac. Some shifts don’t have a spec, and tac’s response times are too long.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	All officers should be allowed to deploy CEDs. CEDs should be allowed to be deployed on unarmed subjects if they are posing a threat to officer or public safety. CEDs are an excellent tool in the use of force spectrum and should not be limited.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	This is the topic I feel strongest about. I have been an officer for 10 years, 6 years spent at another agency where I had a Taser. I think it is ridiculous that only specs and tac are being provided the opportunity to have this tool. Furthermore, I think it is ridiculous that tasers are only to be used on armed subjects. Typically, most departments would encourage the use of a Taser on anyone but an armed person. If someone is armed with a firearm, the Taser is the last thing that I would consider using. It is sad that we don’t have these tools in today’s day and age and now that we are on the brink of possibly getting them, such a ridiculous policy comes out where they don’t even go to the people that need them the most. Having worked at Richmond Station, I don’t believe that station (at least in the time I was there) even had any specs. So if a Taser was needed (even under the crazy proposed order), it wouldn’t even be available for use. These tools are only being considered by the department for armed people and earlier it was a possibility they would be considered for mentally disturbed people. What about officers being

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			assaulted or pursuing violent felons? There are 100 different situations a Taser could be used but I feel the department is only considering 1 reason which I don't feel even fits into that 100.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	We on patrol are the first to encounter the subjects that may be the subjects of the use of these devices. Having to wait for TAC or a specialist could take longer than expected.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I feel it unreasonable to be unable to use the CED with a physically combative subject. Additionally, from a fleeing subject who could have, or already, committed any crime including, but not limited to a felony. Personally, I could think of numerous occasions where a simple CED could have prevented resistant subjects who caused injury to myself, and other Q-2s. CEDs are used by the majority of agencies throughout the nation, why not us? The more tools we have at our disposal, the more likely we are able to "de-escalate" a combative subject. CEDs should be issued to not only Specialists and TAC, but mainly to the Q-2s that are actually in the field 40 hrs per week. The Q-2s who are responding to dispatched calls are the ones most likely in need of CED, should the need arise.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	It would be nice to have them. I do not understand why TAC gets them before patrol since we are in daily contact with people all day everyday and waiting for TAC seems useless. SPEC at least there is a good chance one of them is working in your area at the time. Also, so many limits on when to use them- doesn't seem like we will ever be justified to use them with all the limits.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Give them to everyone.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	What's the point having such devices when we wont even have immediate access to them. Absurd.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Give us a weapon that will be impossible to use, by the confines of the order. I will be carrying a several pound paper weight and losing CC.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Ridiculously complex policy will cause officers to avoid an extremely effective less lethal option and resort to force options which will cause more permanent injury or death. Just because a person is unarmed does not mean they do not pose a serious threat such as subject's size, fighting ability or access to potential weapons in close proximity. A CED is also an effective way of preventing a person from harming themselves in a permanent manner.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Patrol is the frontline response to 99% of the incidents that will require the deployment of CED's yet we our treated like we are not capable of using CED's responsibly. I.E. only issuing CED's to TAC and SPECS. How long will it take for a TAC or SPEC to respond to 6th and Mission for a subject in the midst of a drug induced psychotic episode, in the middle of the intersection armed with a (CHOSE YOUR WEAPON, KNIFE, BAT, CROWBAR, BOLT CUTTERS) at 400 pm on a Wednesday? I ask because this happens. These situations are rapidly evolving and need to be dealt with by patrol officers with the training and equipment to stop the threat and get these individuals medical treatment ASAP. I'm not even going to get into the restrictive nature of the policy itself, I.E who we can use the CED on and when and wheth-

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	er they are armed or not. That portion of the policy is poorly thought out, restricts officer's options, and doesn't take into account the threat posed by unarmed individuals.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	All officers should be given the opportunity and training to carry tasers. I strongly disagree that tasers shall not be used on an unarmed subject. Some people can be very deadly with their fists and feet. A 5'00", 140 lb officer should be able to use the taser against a 6'05" 225 lb suspect. What if the suspect is a violent felon and they flee? There may be a need to apprehend the suspect because they may cause harm to someone else. Same goes if the subject is restrained. What is case law on pointing of tasers, not use of them. I do not see why it would be a use of force if taser is pointed at suspect. Do we need to start reporting force every time we draw our baton or take out or OC, but do not use them. I think the reasoning would be captured by both the body camera and the taser camera. It seems that we will be spending more time writing reports inside than handling calls for service or arresting criminals.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	13. I think the proposed order for the use of CED's is effectively making it unusable. The idea that officers are not supposed to use the device unless someone is armed and using the weapon in a threatening manner is concerning. If a subject is using a weapon in a threatening manner and/or attempting to harm myself or any member of the public, the CED is not a practical weapon that I will be using. The CED is not a proved and reliable weapon and relying on using it while facing a subject that is using a weapon in a threatening manner is going to get officers hurt.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The proposed CED bureau order has too many restrictions on when it can be deployed. The CED should be used on unarmed combative suspects as a safer way to take them into custody. The order also restricts deploying the CED onto suspects who have a weapon and who are fleeing or passively resisting. I believe its a huge officer safety problem to not be able to deploy the CED onto a passively resisting suspect with a weapon. I believe if the suspect does not want to drop a weapon after being given a lawful order, an officer should be permitted in deploying a CED at the suspect.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	There is not enough information provided to consider this proposal. It is my belief that if a subject will not surrender to ERIW rounds, it is also unlikely they are going to surrender after use of an energy device. This is reaction to one isolated incident. To add another tool to our 'tool belt' is another thing we have to think about when there is a serious problem.
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The entire purpose of Tasers are to ensure that officers are not fighting for their lives on the ground with suspects. Why would Tasers NOT be allowed for unarmed but highly combative subjects?! Not only is it against Taser's guidelines, but is also not in line with ANY other department currently using Tasers. It is asinine to not allow officers to use a tool that will keep them out of reach of a noncompliant subject. Isn't that the entire point of the new use of force policies; to employ "time and distance" when dealing with combative subjects so that incidents do not become lethal? Why not allow officers to use the Taser to create time and distance, allowing for a potentially fatal incident to be de-escalated. Tasers should be allowed for any circumstance where a subject is resisting.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Southern Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Another good non-lethal weapon to use.
<b><u>Special Operations</u></b>	Administrative	20	All officers should be issued CED's. If as an officer you thought I was competent enough to be issued a firearm then I think that should apply to a CED.
Special Operations Group	Administrative	11-15	The de-escalation wording, and the proportionality concept, will get Officers hurt as they will tend to under react so that they will not be in the crosshairs of some media, or politically charged, backlash against what should be a reasonable use of force.
Special Operations Group	K9 Handler and Supervisor	20	What a waste of time and money. Who in there right mind believes Tac or Specs are going to be first on scene. CED's should be slowly rolled out to patrol first, then SOG units.
Special Operations Group	Canine Handler	20	I think CED's are less dangerous than this policy makes them out to be. A trained officer should have more latitude to deploy them then currently drafted. What is wrong with using the CED on a huge suspect that has obvious hand to hand combat skills. (MMA is pretty popular now) Is every CED carrying officer going to have and AED to carry too! What is wrong with using a CED on a suicidal person that is not in danger of a fall? Dry stun should be allowed too. What is the point in carrying a tool if the use is so narrow that you never have the ability to use it.
Special Operations Group	Stable attendant	20	the CED would give another option to subduing a resistant subject and would be a great tool without having to use deadly force on a wielding an edged weapon.
Special Operations Group	TAC	3-5	1." TARGET AREAS- Reasonable efforts should be made to target lower center mass and avoid the head, neck, chest and groin." You would like us to target the legs; a moving target that typically does not have mass (to present a sizeable target to hit) and in many cases are clothed by loose fitting material that will result in a failed "positive" connection. Did you account for the downward angle of the second probe that could likely miss a leg that is in motion? The chest or back region should be an approved target area. 2. I do not believe any Officer should be pulling out a "CED" if the suspect is armed in any manner (i.e. brick, knife, bat)... these are all potentially lethal weapons or have the ability to inflict serious bodily injury. If the situation presents itself with lethal cover already available then having a "CED" presented to assist is completely reasonable (just like an ERIW).
Special Operations Group	Homeless Outreach	6-10	patrol is the front line and should be carrying. By the time a specialized unit arrives on scene it may be to late.
Special Operations Group	Mayors Detail	6-10	The proposed CED policy is useless. The usage of the device already appears limited and therefore a wasted tool that will not get to be effectively used. Not being able to use on an unarmed person is incomprehensible.
Special Operations Group	SWAT Team Operator	6-10	I do not believe it should only be TAC and Specs who carry the C.E.D.s. Anyone who works patrol or is otherwise "on the frontline" should be allowed to carry the C.E.D.s.
Special Operations Group	Homeland Security	6-10	Use not authorized for unarmed, non-complaint subject, even if they are extremely violent/dangerous.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Special Operations Group	High risk warrant	11-15	Its unrealistic for SOG only to have tasers. Situations will have escalated or de-escalated by the time SOG arrives on scene. Patrol should have tasers before anybody because they will be the first units on scene. SOG does not have the resources to have personal available for every taser deployment or call, everyday for every shift.
Special Operations Group	Tactical Unit	16-19	I rather not have it. I will avoid it at all cost simply because it is too restrictive.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I have never used one of these items.
SSpecial Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This device to be limited to TAC and Specs is not going to have a positive impact on it use. The opportunities for deployment will be extremely limited. Why not have officers who have completed CIT training be allowed, or have officers at each station, on each watch identified as officers for this training. The use of the device needs to be more spread out. If you require all officers with these devices to have AED's what will you do with foot beat officers, and motor-cycle officers? After all, aren't foot beat officers most likely to encounter, in person, people who are the most threatening in this area. III.F Prohibiting use again a subject because they are unarmed is not realistic. A person taking a combative stance is a serious threat, the reason the device was invented. Why should an officer have to be throated with a weapon in order to utilize the device? If I'm threatened by a weapon, most likely I'm going to resort to a use of force that is farther up the escalation scale.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This device should be issued to patrol as well, it doesn't make sense that a patrol officer should have to wait for TAC or a Specialist.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I don't know enough about tasers to comment, other than having them will give us another option short of lethal force.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	not a big believer . i would be willing to adabpt though if voted in
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Not available to all personnel
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	The experts should design the policy not a chief that has no vested interest in the product because they will never be placed in a position to use it. PT staff at academy should be consulted and local agencies should be reviewed by a committee
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	With III.F.2.f, how can the Chief say that us having Tasers would have changed the Mario Woods incident outcome? Looks like no one would have been able to use it on him once he started to walk away??? Why only Tac and Specs? How many shootings have they been in and how many shootings have regular patrol officers been in? Short sided or "test group"?
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	What is the point of having CED's only for specialists and TAC. Specialists may be on patrol in all districts, yet there are too few of them. We cannot wait for TAC to respond with CED's. It would be to late and the incident will be over. It makes no sense for the patrol officer to not have it. They are in the frontlines taking people on and arresting resisting subjects. Not to mention the policy of not using it on unarmed subjects. What if the subject is twice my size?. What if he has an officer on the ground beating him? Wouldn't it make more sense and be more compassionate to use your CED than possibly your firearm?

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	All patrol officers should have CEDs
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	As a member of the unit that would be responsible for carrying these devices, I have many problems with it. First off, why not give these to the members that will need them in the split second scenarios officers face everyday? To wait and have to call for these tools from other districts is not feasible. I was responding from the same district of the “Mario Woods “ OIS and I could not get there before the situation ended. Also, we don’t have TAC and Specs 24/7. With other operations and depending on the staffing their might not be anyone working with tazer. Thats great, the tool is available but nobody is around that can use it. Additionally, we can TAZE anybody not armed or fleeing. Ok, so a 219 occurs. Suspect flees with the weapon in hand and is running down a street. Responding officers see him and are then left with trying to hit him with an ERIW (12gauge Supersock more often doesn’t work that does). A moving target isn’t exactly easy to hit, so we will probably end up missing those shots. Now we are left with trying to contain him. Per our new DGO’s, we shall establish communication and give space, so we will end up running away from this guy who is still a threat and poses threat to all of society. Great situation that we just handed ourselves
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Why the white glove treatment with regards to CED’s? They are not some revolutionary new fangled technology--they are standard in enough large LE agencies and have been around for long enough that we should be able look at plenty of established data to effectively manage CED’s for all SFPD officers.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	puts a burden on Tac and Specs when PATROL are the ones who need the taser. The requirements to use a taser are overly burdensome and make the taser a complete waste
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The proposed Bureau Order for Conducted Energy Devices is just a temporary Band-Aid that will come flying off, once implemented. It is ridiculous to implement the use of CEDs to only a small fraction of the department and take away useful force options from the rest of the department. Furthermore, the Order is so limited in its application, that is does not make sense for officers that are part of the SOB to even use the CEDs.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I believe that CED’s could significantly help officers in the city. However the order is so convoluted and restrictive on when a CED can be used and how it can be used that it isn’t a feasible order.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	What is the point in being given a tool that the officer can not use. the order is overly restrictive and puts an unneeded burden on the officer. Furthermore restricting it to Tac and Specs only is a complete waste of an effective tool.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Again I’m a SPEC. I welcome the use of the CED as a tool in my kit to peacefully end a potentially dangerous situation. That being said give them to ALL OFFICERS NOT JUST Special Ops Officers. Look at the money spent on other things in the city. This could potentially save the lives of individuals. But again, give them to all officers. We are less then three percent of the police department.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	where are you suppose to aim if you can't aim for center mass? What is lower center mass??? The prongs separate with one dropping lower. If you cant aim at center mass how close to you want the officer to be to a person with an edged weapon so the second prong doesn't the groin. Has anyone even deployed one prior to writing this order? You want an officer to hit the lower center mass but avoid the groin and chest... good luck. This is so limiting all they want is another option to get out of trouble with the media and blame officers .
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It's a step in the right direction.
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The CED is designed to stop people who are incapable of understanding orders (mental illness, drugs) and also combative individuals that normal means will not stop the CED is a tool, just like the baton and OC Spray and should be allowed to use as another option. Having SOG personnel is a ridiculous idea, patrol level officers and sergeants that have thousands and thousands of interactions with the public therefore increase their odds to having to use this. By not providing the patrol level this tool, that is utilized in other police departments across the country, you have told the patrol level they are incompetent of using the tool. By the time SOG personnel have arrived on scene to assess the situation for themselves, the moment had passed and either another form of UOF was used (firearm, baton), or the suspect has escaped, or the officers on scene are now hurt or killed
Special Operations Group	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Officers should be able to use the device on fleeing subjects, and should also be able to deploy the device at the chest area, because that is the best place to make contact and get a good circuit connection to see results.
<b><u>Taraval Station</u></b>	Investigative	6-10	There are no Specs at Taraval. Tac, as far as i know does not hang out in the Taraval often. If an incident occurs in the Taraval where a CED is needed this Bureau Order is useless. In the prohibited use. What if the subject jumped his cuffs (so they are facing the front) and has a knife? Obviously you cant use the CED for torture, interrogation, as an escort device (????), if a subject is armed and fleeing (so if he has a knife, stabbed someone and is running towards a crowd, we can shoot him with our firearms, but not the CED!?) does that need to be a part of the BO? And it limits the use so no one would use it. Why would you not use a CED on a person who is suicidal. If they have a knife and are threatening to 801, you just let them do it?! Of course you try to talk them down, but at what point did we give up on trying to save people? Yes there might be a slight risk that the subject could 802, so we let them kill themselves instead? This is horribly written and would not be usable.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I covered my biggest complaint in a box above but again...I don't understand why I can't use the Taser if the Suspect is not complying with my commands and is walking away from me. I can baton him, shoot him but not tase him?? And why only Sergeants carrying the Taser? We're no the first on scene, patrol officers are.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Patrol officers need the taser, not just specialists. Why does a subject need to be armed for a taser to be used? Again, ridiculous.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Everybody should get them

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Section F- prohibited use- can't deploy on a fleeing suspect. So a man running with a knife towards a crowd can't be shot with a CED!!
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Again we need Department members input.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	This is a tool that would exponentially assist officers in the performance of their duties. I think it should be available to all patrol officers. Limiting it to special groups essentially means that it will not be used or available.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Conducted Energy Devices should be at the patrol officers level, for many life threatening reasons. We should not have to wait for the Conducted Energy Devices in order to save lives or protect ourselves.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	I am trained as a CIT. I believe that the taser, or "CED", would not only be more of a risk, but perceived as one. I do not know the long-term affects of "being tased", but I do not think it wise. I would lean more towards ERIW, verbal judo, or "hands-on" techniques taught at our Academy. In fact, two hours before each shift, in tactical training would benefit both our minds/physical fitness, confidence and competence.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	These tools need to be given to all officers on patrol, it is ridiculous that we would have to wait for someone else to deploy such weapon and waste valuable time.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	We have very few Spec's in the Taraval & I never see TAC in district other then a K9 units going or coming from the range. If we need someone with a CED immediately are we supposed to wait the 10 minutes for TAC to arrive from the Bayview or the Mission? "Pardon me crazy person with the knife, can you promise to stay put for 10 minutes or so until we can get someone here from the other side of the city to Taze you, Yes, Great! we appreciate your help in this matter".
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	This draft is very confusing. The whole point of CED is to safely subdue a subject/suspect with little to no injury to themselves, the Officers and the public. If the subject/suspect has a weapon other than a firearm we can't utilize the CED? Then what's the point?! Unless they're Specialists. Co. I does not have any Specialists.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	The first responder should have it on his/her person. They shouldn't have to wait for a specialized unit that may or may not be available.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Give CED's to all officers or AT LEAST street supervisors. TAC and Specialists take too long to get to the scene of incidents.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Dispatch TAC to all calls involving edged weapons...etal and I will stay at the station creating time and distance.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Based on the way it is written. I'd prefer not to have a CED issued to me. If someone has an edged weapon, blunt force object, I would prefer not to be within six feet of them attempting to "laser" them, "arc the device" in an attempt to gain compliance, or even utilize the electric probes. I believe the proposed bureau order for CED's puts officer's in harms way without prac-

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			tical guidelines for use.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The proposed policy regarding “tasers” is so restrictive that it is unlikely they would ever be of use on the street.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Considering the limitations, what’s the point in even having CED’s?
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	A category for Tasers is proposed, but it is useless since regular patrol officers will not have access to them and, using them against an unarmed subject is prohibited. This is ridiculous.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	If the department takes away a tool like the Carotid Restraint from regular patrol, they should at least equip the officers with a CED.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	I think the benefits of carrying this device could definitely outweigh the negative factors. However, adding another device to my already full duty belt will be an issue.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Make the tool available to everyone not just a small group. Most citizens think we already have tasers. Other agencies that I talk to always question why we do not have tasers.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	What we have now is sufficient and taking away one level of force (carotid restraint) and replacing it with an “energy device” that the citizens of San Francisco will not even provide us is ridiculous.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Unarmed does not make them not dangerous
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	the taser was designed to stop a threat without causing harm to an officer. The simple fact that a taser can only be used on armed subject is ridiculous. It would be safer to not to deploy a taser instead of putting an officer within the dangerous range of an armed subject.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Not considered for use by all bureaus.
Taraval Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	If SFPD were to arm officers with taser, all officers should be armed. The wait time for a SPEC or TAC officer to arrive on scene can change the dynamic of the situation causing an officer to be hurt or injured.
<b><u>Tenderloin Station</u></b>	Investigative	11-15	Should be able to use on subjects without weapons
Tenderloin Station	Investigative	16-19	I would like to see a plan to eventually roll out the CEDs as was done with ERIW. I’m sure this is the plan, but it needs to be communicated to reassure line officers, that they are being considered when the policy is being devised.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	This option should be available to first responders on the scene. Particularly the homeless cars that are having to deal with armed AMS people early in the morning.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	I will believe it when and if we get them
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	At this time I believe all officers should have it and under the belief that its a good alternative to deadly force options. I do not think its practical to think a trained officer will be able to re-

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
			spond especially in a real time fluid situation where there is no time. Every officer like in other large agencies should have a taser type means for self defense.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	with only Tac getting the. That means on wed when Tac is training no one will 10-8 to deploy them. Remember 101 California it was a wed. and no Tac made it there. Also when you factor in days off, Va, and sp hoe many officers with tazers will be on the street
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Have you ever seen a handcuffed subject resist? Have you ever seen an unarmed subject defeat and officer... if not, google Michael Brown. Again, who among the writers of this proposed order has any actual street level, police experience withing the last 12 months?
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Note: this is a continuation from a previous survey. This policy is completely out of line with a majority of other TASER equipped Departments. Limiting them to just TAC and Specs shows Patrol Officers that they are not worthy or have the trust of Command Staff to implement the TASER, and therefore, would NOT benefit from this tool. Not allowing the use on an unarmed subject shows that this Command Staff is incredibly out of touch with current law enforcement doctrine, and this policy will place Officers at risk. It will also place resistive/combativ suspects at risk; i.e. would the Dept rather see an unarmed violent resister taken into custody by a simple TASER deployment, or, instead, with multiple control holds, baton strikes, etc?
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	Poorly written, especially I.B.2, which, as written, seems to assume that the Officer's actions will lead to the death of the suspect.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	16-19	I think every officer on patrol should be issued one
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	11-15	Under this order most officers will be wrong 80% of the time when this is deployed. I will never carry one if this order is enacted.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The proposed order for CED limits it's use to subjects with weapons. If a weapon is involved, the proper use of force is a firearm. So with this proposed order, we a back to square one and are limited to using firearms. The CED will be of NO use with this proposed order.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	There are way to many restrictions on when we should use CEDs. I don't see the point of having them if we can't use them. All of these restrictions are going to make officers second guess themselves when it comes time to using them. The police commission needs to take a good hard look at other agencies policies regarding CEDs and do a thorough study with approval from our union. What if there are no SPECS/TAC on duty? What if they are on duty but are to far away from the incident? Bottom line, we should of had CED's a long time ago but the police commision let politics get in the way of approving them. How many officers and citizens have been hurt over the past decade or so during an incident in which a CED could have CODE 4 the situation? Many. To me that is the real story. The Police Commission needs to admit that they dropped the ball by not getting us CED's sooner.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	How is an officer suppose to know if a suspect is a) mentally disturbed, b) a juvenile c) has a health condition based on appearance?

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	It makes absolutely no sense to not be able to deploy on an unarmed person. The purpose of this tool is to humanely reduce injury. Why then would the alternative to shocking the unarmed man be hitting them with a stick or shooting them with a firearm. Having a Conducted Energy Device with this rule makes no sense and it should not ever be issued.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Only SWAT or Specialists. Not realistic.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	To only allow TAC and Specs to carry & deploy a CED is absurd. The chance of TAC responding and being on scene to deploy a CED is slim to none in an active and fast evolving situation. There is a little more of a chance to get a SPEC but this defeats the purpose of the real reason to provide SFPD with CED's. All this says is the Dept does not want to pay to train all Officers in the use of CED's. The real reason to equip Officers is to allow them to have an additional tool to de-escalate situations. I come from an agency where CED's "Tasers" were issued to every member. They were by far the most effective tool when it came to resolving situations using no physical force that caused injury to the Officer or subject subdued. I can also say that every time one was deployed, there was absolutely no time to "wait" for a unit (TAC or SPEC) to respond to use their tool that I didn't have. It would have definitely resulted in the additional force option available, no different than the way it is now. prohibited use: subject only a danger to themselves (with a knife)... let them stab themselves even though we can stop them without hurting them... the entire CED order is smoke and mirrors. a way to say. "look what we have now" while completely ignoring the potential they have to make a difference and save lives the way they do across the country.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I disagree with the drafted policy that CED's shall not be used on unarmed subjects. I understand that the possible implementation of CED's now is solely a result of the politics involved with the Mario Woods incident, who wielded a weapon other than a firearm. What I do not understand is why the deployment of CED's should not, and I guess shall not, be utilized in order to gain compliance from subjects who do not wield a weapon. If the drawing and firing of our firearm on an unarmed subject is articulable, how can any lesser form of force not also be articulable? If the department is concerned about CED's being over-utilized in the place of de-escalation tactics or other uses of force, then that should be a matter of training and not policy. I'm not an expert on CED's, but it seems to me that other departments that have utilized CED's for years do not have this restriction on CED deployment. The way our policy is drafted, the CED shall only be utilized as an electrified ERIW alternative that only specialized personnel will have, specialized personnel that may or may not be at a scene when the immediate use or threatened use of a CED could preclude a critical incident from occurring in the first place.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	It is unacceptable that CED's would be against policy if deployed on a subject who did not have a weapon.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Restrictions and use by only specialized units will serve no purpose in an emergency situation.

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	I think the proposed changes will compromise our safety and get officer hurt. The new changes will compromise public safety
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	The bureau order is far too limiting. Having specs and Tac be the only ones that are equipped with them makes the use of the conducted energy devices highly unlikely.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	There is one specialist on my shift. There will be one CED on patrol, providing that officer isn't sick that day. This is foolish. All officers should have the choice or opportunity to become certified with CEDs and carry such devices if they so choose. It's foolish that CEDs are prohibited from being used on unarmed subjects or following armed subjects. The drive stun mode is also an important tool when subjects are actively resisting, used in order to end the fight before further injury.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	3-5	Not being able to use a CED unless they have a weapon makes the CED not an effective option when they don't have a weapon, and could cause more Officers getting injured and on DP because they have to go hands on.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Implementation for the new use of force is incorrect in my opinion.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Before purchasing Tasers we should look into other departments GO's and come up with a order that actually allows us to use them. This proposed bureau order is a joke. Tasers would be a valuable asset to this department, but only if we can actually use them. The proposed order doesn't allow officers to deploy the taser on fleeing subjects or any subject without a weapon. What is the point of them then?
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Why are tasers only being deployed to Tac and Specs? will they be deployed in a critical incident within minutes?
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The DGO appears to negate the majority of situation where a CED should be used. Officers who have read the proposed DGO don't even want the devices due to the extreme restrictions placed on their use and the subsequent liability they face if they elect to use them.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	Conducted Energy Devices should be provided to all officers in the department and officers should be allowed to deploy them within the recommended distance determined by the experts who developed the device.
Tenderloin Station	Patrol-Street Enforcement	0-2	The proposed changes take away options and go against the reasonableness principle. I have carried a Taser at previous law enforcement agencies and was a past Taser instructor. The proposed policy regarding CED use is unsafe and impractical. How is it that the use of CED on an unarmed subject is prohibited, but, under certain circumstances, the use of a firearm would be allowed on an unarmed person? I also take issue with the target area being the lower body. Taser recommends the back being the preferred target area since it is a larger target area, thus giving the officer a better chance striking the subject resulting in the CED being effective. The lower body is very difficult to hit with a CED, making it difficult to have success in using the device. These are only a couple problematic issues.

Current assignment	Primary job duty	Years with SFPD	Comments
<b><u>Traffic Division</u></b>	Administrative	20	Why does a specialized unit that does not respond to calls for service get a less lethal tool? We call TAC for lethal force! What happens when CED is not available and deadly force is used. This is setting the Dept up for failure. But if this is just to get your foot in the door and then provide it to patrol like rifles, then I'm on board.
Traffic Division	Investigative	11-15	From my initial reading it seems like an IA investigation starts any time the device is used. I'm glad I wouldn't be on the short list to get one. Why would anyone want to take on the liability of using one?
Traffic Division	Traffic Enforcement	11-15	Tasers are needed as an additional tool, that could potentially save lives.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	To only issue these C.E.D's to Tactical and Specialist Members makes absolutely no sense. Either train Patrol and issue them to the Officers on the street, or don't issue them at all. The first Officers to immediately have a need for them, would be Officers responding to regular calls for service.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	CED should be provided to all officer's assigned to street duties.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Which police department policy is this copied from? Was this thought up by our leaders? It is set up for failure by SFPD officers deploying it in violent struggles/encounters. I think additional language and CED deployment rules need to be researched to protect the officer as much as the suspect.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Too many restrictions on using it. Feet and hands are weapons. I do not know the distance the CED can be deployed, but if it is closer than 21 feet that is going to be an issue with any weapon. Why are we using an intermediate level of force against a deadly weapon.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	20	Everyone needs one especially the beat cop that's out there everyday many times alone
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	The order is fashioned so TASER is used against armed subjects (other than firearms). This goes against every officer safety protocol I've been exposed to in my 14 years as a police officer. The proposed order does not mention any need of armed cover (as in the policy with ERIW). It places officers in great danger.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Two issues: One, only TAC and Specs, who have received crisis intervention training (that's what, like ten people), will be issued the devices. So, everyone else has to wait for those authorized members to arrive on-scene. Potentially creating a situation that further deteriorates to where deadly force is used because a viable tool was not available to all members. Two, the suspect has to be armed with a non-firearm weapon (Sec. III.D.). So, if the suspect is choking a victim, a member could not use the CED to stop the attack. Some things need to be worked out, but acquiring CED's for the Department is a great step in the right direction.
Traffic Division	Patrol-Street Enforcement		Why only TAC & SPECS? That doesn't help the regular officer on the street. That is asking for officers to be injured or worse.
	Patrol-Street Enforcement	6-10	Only arming tac/specs with a taser does not help at the patrol level. All officers should be trained and carry the taser. The Order restricts the use of the taser too much. Only using it on

---

<u>Current assignment</u>	<u>Primary job duty</u>	<u>Years with SFPD</u>	<u>Comments</u>
			armed suspects is dangerous and reckless. Also having to determine if someone is on alcohol/ drugs or has a mental disability is also dangerous for members.

6-10