

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R1	In response to the "San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Community Policy Working Groups Overview," the Police Commission representative made the following comments to all working group members: - Non-members who can provide useful information may be invited as guest speakers, but this must be arranged in advance through the working group facilitator. - "Replying all" to emails between working group members may constitute a meeting, potentially violating open meeting laws. If a working group member wants to share specific documents, they should do so in advance through the working group facilitator to ensure everyone receives them before the next meeting. - The 120-business day completion timeline for a given working group is flexible. An extension can be requested if more meetings are needed to complete the work and robust discussions are ongoing. - Working Group members, including officers, can influence policy outside the working group process. The commission takes public comments, and concerns regarding Department General Orders (DGOs) or recommendations made in the WG can be addressed at the commission level once the DGO is agendized for discussion.	N/A	9/17/24	Administrative Question and Answer not for inclusion in DGO	The Department values the insights shared by the Police Commission representative during the meeting. Additionally, it is important to note that after the working group process concludes, the draft DGO is posted on the Department's website for 30 business days, allowing the public, including working group members to provide additional feedback.	Closed
R2	A working group member asked if a redlined version of the Stage 1 draft for DGO 6.16 could be provided.	N/A	9/17/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The Department will provide a redlined version of the Stage 1 draft for DGO 6.16 before the next meeting on Thursday, October 3, 2024.	Closed
R3	A working group member asked if, in the event they cannot attend a meeting, another colleague from their organization could attend in their place.	N/A	9/17/24	Administrative Question and Answer not for inclusion in DGO	The working group facilitator stated that a member can send a designee in their absence, provided that each organization has only one vote on matters requiring a vote in the meeting.	Closed
R4	A working group member asked whether the Stage 1 draft includes procedures for officers working at the airport, given that trafficking, domestic violence, and sexual assaults are significant issues there, and officers at the airport are usually exempt from such procedures.	N/A	9/17/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The Department has reinstated the language from the currently active version into draft DGO 6.16: "Airport Bureau members shall follow Airport Bureau General Orders and San Mateo County protocols."	Closed
R5	During the Officer Panel Q/A, the following issues were identified for potential revisions of draft DGO 6.16: 1. Ensuring timely notifications to the Special Victims Unit (SVU) by Patrol Officers initially responding to the scene. 2. Familiarizing Patrol Officers with the written call-out criteria to notify SVU, and clarifying how it differs from the criteria for SVU to respond. 3. Changing the wording in Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 (A) from "Initial Response" to "Patrol Initial Response". 4. Ensuring Patrol Officers ask detailed questions to establish the occurrence of sexual crimes before notifying SVU. 5. Changing the "2-day timeline" to "2-business day timeline" in Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 (C) (3) for picking up Sexual Assault Evidence Kit (SAEK) from the Recovery/Rape Treatment Center after SVU notification. 6. Establishing protocols for Patrol Officers when outside law enforcement agencies completing a courtesy report for a sexual assault don't wait for SVU to pick up the SAEK.	N/A	10/3/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	All recommendations arising from the Officer Panel Q/A were thoroughly reviewed and appropriately incorporated by implementing the suggested amendments to the relevant sections of the draft DGO 6.16.	Closed
R6	During Officer Panel Q/A, the working group discussed the following points: 1. The current notification process between patrol officers and SVU. 2. Whether patrol officers have a checklist of questions to identify crimes. 3. The possibility of using CA POST minimum facts interview questions as a guide for determining if a crime occurred. 4. Evaluating if the current training for patrol officers is sufficient for recognizing sexual crimes and/or appropriately notify SVU, or if additional training is necessary. 5. Improving collaboration between CPS and patrol officers to reduce repetitive minimal facts interview questions and minimize retraumatization of child victims while allowing for necessary clarifying questions. 6. Addressing public confusion, particularly among educators, about correct authorities to initially report child abuse, including sexual abuse. 7. Potential conflicts with Proposition 115 requirements that officers must hear information firsthand to testify in preliminary hearings.	N/A	10/3/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	For 1 and 2, the response was provided by the SME for DGO 6.16 and other SFPD members participating in the working group and/or Officer Panel. Additionally, all issues identified in bullet points 3-7 in this recommendation were appropriately addressed by implementing the necessary changes to the relevant sections of the draft DGO 6.16.	Closed
R7	A working group member requested clarification on whether the primary audience for DGO 6.16 is Patrol, SVU, or a combination of both.	N/A	10/3/24	Administrative Question and Answer not for inclusion in DGO	The Subject Matter Expert (SME) for DGO 6.16 and other Department members in the working group explained that the primary audience for DGO 6.16 includes SFPD members, particularly patrol officers and sergeants, to guide them in properly responding to sexual assault reports. However, certain sections are specifically targeted at SVU investigators handling these cases.	Closed
R8	A working group member requested digital copies of the documents listed in the "References" section of Draft DGO 6.16.	N/A	10/3/24	Administrative Question and Answer not for inclusion in DGO	The Community Working Group Facilitator provided digital copies of requested materials to all working group members on October 11, 2024. Additionally, the requested materials are posted on the "Policy Working Groups" webpage as supporting materials for the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, October 15, 2024, under "DGO 6.16 (Sexual Assault Investigations)". Update 4/4/25: The "References" section was removed from draft DGO 6.16 since all documents listed under this section are already referenced (and hyperlinked in some cases) throughout the document.	Closed
R9	A working group member asked a question regarding the need to include value statements in the "Purpose" section of Draft DGO 6.16, arguing that DGOs should serve as practical tools for SFPD members rather than a means to capture organizational values. The subsequent discussion generated the following brainstorming ideas: 1. Keeping the "Purpose" section concise while ensuring policies and procedures reflect organizational values. 2. Dividing the "Purpose" section into two paragraphs: the first addressing the DGO's purpose, and the second including value statements. 3. Considering moving the "Policy" section immediately after "Purpose" to emphasize SFPD values, particularly for readers such as victims of sexual assault. 4. Emphasizing the importance of DGOs as practical documents for SFPD members and as public statements of Department Policies.	1	10/3/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	[Draft DGO Section 6.16.01- Purpose] - Previous Language: "The purpose of this order is to establish general policies and procedures for a trauma-informed approach to sexual assault investigations that prioritizes community values, the well-being of survivors, and ensures Safety with Respect". [Draft DGO Section 6.16.01- Purpose] - Proposed New Language: "The purpose of this order is to establish general policies and procedures when responding to and investigating reports of sexual assault cases. The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) is committed to a victim-centered approach in sexual assault investigations: ensuring respectful and empathetic interactions, building trust, minimizing re-traumatization, and understanding victims' varying life circumstances often requiring additional awareness and resources". [Draft DGO Section 6.16.03- Policy] - Previous Language: "It is the policy of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) that members recognize the profound impact of trauma on survivors of sexual assault and work to minimize re-traumatization, ensure respectful and empathetic interactions, and strive to preserve the integrity of the investigation and safety of the community". [Draft DGO Section 6.16.03- Policy] - Proposed New Language: "SFPD members shall treat all sexual assault reports as genuine, follow proper procedures to apprehend and assist in conviction of perpetrators, and ensure the safety of victims and the community". Update 4/4/25: [Draft DGO Section 6.16.01- Purpose] - Updated Proposed New Language: "The purpose of this order is to establish general policies and procedures when responding to and investigating reports of sexual assault cases. The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) is committed to a victim-centered and trauma-informed approach while responding to and investigating sexual assault investigations. SFPD members aim to build trust, mitigate re-traumatization, and address specific needs of victims". [Draft DGO Section 6.16.03- Policy] - Updated Proposed New Language: "SFPD members shall follow procedures outlined in this order and shall treat all sexual assault reports seriously with the goal of apprehending and assisting in the conviction of perpetrators while prioritizing the safety of victims".	Closed
R10	A working group member asked about the sources of the definitions in the draft DGO section, "Definitions," particularly questioning if the definition of sexual assault is a legal one. The ensuing discussion considered changing "Sexual Assault" to "Sexual Crimes."	1	10/3/24	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	This recommendation will be further discussed at the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, October 15, 2024. Update 11/08/24: The working group decided to retain the original term, "Sexual Assault" at the working group meeting that was conducted on Tuesday, October 15, 2024. See R# 23.	Closed
R11	A working group member inquired whether sexual harassment could be included in the list of sex crimes under the definition of Sexual Assault.	1	10/3/24	Administrative Question and Answer not for inclusion in DGO	Sexual harassment is not classified as the type of sexual crime investigated under the guidelines of DGO 6.16.	Closed
R12	A working group member proposed adding the Children Advocacy Center and Human Services Agency to the Sexual Assault Response Team (SART). The discussion that followed then considered substituting the Children Advocacy Center with the Children Advocacy, Support, and Resources Center (CASARC), as it is more familiar to members. They also debated whether the SART definition should specify the names of participating agencies or focus on their roles, considering that agency names might change in the future. Ultimately, the working group recommended including "Human Services Agency Protective Services Workers" in the list of SART members.	1	10/3/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The definition of SART was updated to read as follows: "A multidisciplinary team working collaboratively to meet the medical and emotional needs of the sexual assault victim and the forensic needs of the criminal justice system. This team includes, but is not limited to, advocates, law enforcement officers (including prosecutors), forensic interviewers, Human Services Agency (HSA) protective services workers, and Sexual Assault Forensic Examiners (SAFEs)". Update 3/4/25: See response to R#93.	Closed
R13	A working group member recommended to update the definition of SART Examination with the suggested language, "A forensic-medical examination conducted by a Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner (SAFE). During a SART Examination, the victim will be offered: 1. Forensic documentation of injuries and collection of evidentiary products for purposes of a law enforcement investigation, and 2. Medical evaluation and treatment".	1	10/3/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Previous Language: "A forensic, medical examination conducted by a SANE. Injuries, wounds, evidence, and the survivor's statement are documented during the examination. Post-exposure prophylaxis and therapeutic medications may be provided at the examination". Proposed New Language: "A forensic-medical examination conducted by a Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner (SAFE). During a SART Examination, the victim is offered: 1. Forensic documentation of injuries as well as collection of evidentiary products for purposes of a law enforcement investigation, and 2. Medical evaluation and treatment".	Closed

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R14	A working group member asked if the definition of the SVU should include other areas of investigation beyond sexual assault that fall under SVU's purview, considering the intersectionality between sexual assault and these other areas. During the discussion on this recommendation, a working group member suggested including the description of SVU in draft DO 1.01, which is currently in the final stage of an update.	1	10/3/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	The definition of SVU was updated to read as follows: "A unit in the Investigations Bureau responsible for the investigation of sensitive crimes including all reported cases of sexual assault regardless of the age of the victim". Additionally, draft DO 1.01 doesn't include the descriptions of individual units falling under a given bureau. To remain consistent, the description of SVU is not added to draft DO 1.01. This also provides flexibility for the Chief of Police to adjust the scope of investigations for Departmental units as needed. Update 3/4/25: See response to R#89	Closed
R15	A working group member suggested replacing the definition of "Advocate" in draft DO 6.16 with the definition of "Victim Advocate" from the "International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Model Policy for Investigating Sexual Assaults (2017)." The ensuing discussion considered the need to include information about privileged communication between some community-based or rape crisis victim advocates and sexual assault victims; ultimately deciding to address potentially in the "Victim Interviews" section of draft DO 6.16.	1	10/3/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	The Department updated the language of "Advocate" with slight modification from what was proposed to be inclusive of advocates from governmental and non-governmental agencies. Previous Language: "Advocate: A civilian representative of a non-government agency, included in the SART via a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or contract with the City and/or participating City agencies, that has undergone specialized training in the SART process, laws, and procedures." Proposed New Language: "Victim Advocate. A service provider, rape crisis counselor, social worker, victim witness provider within a governmental or non-governmental agency, who is trained to assess and address the needs of the victim as well as to provide counseling, advocacy, resources, information, and support". Also, see response to R# 18 and 33.	Closed
R16	A working group member suggested replacing "victim" with "survivor" to ensure consistency throughout the DO.	1	10/3/24	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	To maintain consistency, the Department decided to replace "survivor" with "victim," as the latter term is more commonly used and legally precise for law enforcement investigations. Update 11/08/24: This recommendation will undergo further internal discussion within the Department. If not resolved by the end of the working group meetings, it will be addressed by Department Leadership during subsequent stages of the DO Update. The working group facilitator will ensure all members are kept informed of the Department's response.	Open
R17	In response to the Department's changes to the draft DO based on Recommendation #9, a working group member reiterated their prior suggestion to incorporate value statements in the "Policy" section and consider placing this section immediately after the "Purpose" section in the draft DO. They emphasized that while it is beneficial to mention value statements in the "Purpose" section, it is more crucial that the protocols followed by officers in the field are grounded in these values, suggesting a better placement in the "Policy" section. On the other hand, another working group member argued that while it is important for procedures followed during interactions with sexual assault victims to be based on these values, it is equally important to include the value statements at the beginning of the draft DO. This approach ensures that officers are reminded of the SFPD's values when dealing with sexual assault victims.	1	10/15/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	To maintain consistency in the formatting of all Department General Orders, the Department will retain the original sequence of sections: Purpose, Definitions, and Policy. The value statements will remain within the 'Purpose' section. However, the Department plans to update the procedures throughout the draft DO based on recommendations generated in future working group meetings to ensure they align with the values outlined in the 'Purpose' section.	Closed
R18	Draft DO Section 6.16.02 [Definitions] - The working group recommended to add the following to the list of entities mentioned in the newly proposed definition of "Victim Advocate" in the draft DO: 1. Advocate or Domestic Violence Advocate to be inclusive of domestic violence advocates given the intersectionality of domestic violence and sexual assault cases. 2. A person of the survivor's choosing The subsequent discussion included a suggestion to add clarifying language regarding the person of the survivor's choosing. This clarification would ensure that the person chosen is not involved in any capacity with the case, preventing potential issues for the investigation.	2	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The definition of "Victim Advocate" was updated to read as follows: "A service provider, rape crisis counselor, domestic violence advocate, social worker, or victim witness provider within a governmental or non-governmental agency or someone of victim's choosing as long as not involved in any capacity with the case, who is trained to assess and address the needs of the victim as well as to provide counseling, advocacy, resources, information, and support". Also, see response to R#33.	Closed
R19	A working group member reiterated their recommendation to change the term "victim" to "victim/survivor," as most agencies serving sexual assault victims prefer the term "survivor" to be more trauma-informed. The subsequent discussion included considering adding a definition of "survivor" to the "Definitions" section of the draft DO and potentially including language regarding the interchangeable use of the terms "survivor" and "victim."	N/A	10/15/24	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	This recommendation will undergo further internal discussion within the Department. If not resolved by the end of the working group meetings, it will be addressed by Department Leadership during subsequent stages of the DO Update. The working group facilitator will ensure all members are kept informed of the Department's response	Open
R20	A working group member inquired whether it would be beneficial to use an alternative definition of "SART" found online which is much shorter, instead of the one currently included in the draft DO. The recommended language is as follows: "SART is a group of agencies that provides a team approach to care and services for sexual assault survivors. Our goals are to help survivors know their options and rights, and to provide high quality care for all survivors in our community".	1	10/15/24	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DO	This recommendation will be further discussed at the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, November 12, 2024. Update 11/12/2024: The working group decided to not use the newly recommended language and keep the more expansive definition of SART as it currently stands.	Closed
R21	The working group discussed the need to revise the newly proposed definition of "Consent" in the draft DO, as it was deemed too broad. The discussion included the following points: 1. Potentially including an in-depth definition of "consent" in the training materials. 2. Clarifying what "consent" means in the context of this DO is important because officers' primary role is to document and investigate the crime reported by a victim/survivor. The determination of consent holds more significance during court proceedings than during the initial investigation led by officers following this DO. 3. Consider adding a clarification that the definition of consent in the draft DO is presented from the victim's perspective. 3. Determining whether the proposed definition of "consent" encompasses the consent given by the victim/survivor to be transported to a hospital for forensic examination. 4. Questioning the need to define "consent" in the draft DO, given its limited mention elsewhere in the document. 5. Removal of the definition of "consent" from the draft DO due to its lack of relevance during the investigation phase of reported sexual assault crimes. Based on consensus, the working group ultimately decided to remove the definition of consent from the draft DO.	1	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The Department removed the newly added definition of "Consent" from the draft DO.	Closed
R22	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 - [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - A working group member recommended using the phrase "Trauma Recovery Center/Rape Treatment Center" instead of "Recovery/Rape Treatment Center" in this section. Another member recommended using "Rape Treatment Center -(RTC)/Child Advocacy Support and Resource Center (CASARC)" instead of the previously recommended term.	3	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The term, "Recovery/Rape Treatment Center (RTC)" was changed to "Rape Treatment Center (RTC)/Child Advocacy, Support, and Resource Center (CASARC)".	Closed
R23	The working group decided to retain the term "Sexual Assault" in the "Definitions" section of the draft DO and to keep its current definition unchanged.	1	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The Department kept the original language for the definition of Sexual Assault.	Closed
R24	A working group member recommended to include mental health providers within the definition of SART.	1	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The term, "mental health providers" was added to the list of entities mentioned in the definition of "SART".	Closed
R25	A working group member inquired if there is a need to include the definition of "minimal facts interview" from the "CA POST - Investigation of Child Physical Abuse and Neglect, Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation - Guideline 7: Initial/First Responding Officer Minimal Facts Victim Interview", within the "Definitions" section of draft DO. The subsequent discussion considered including the details of the minimal facts interview in the "Procedures" section of the draft DO.	2	10/15/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	This recommendation will be further discussed at the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, November 12, 2024. Update 11/12/2024: This recommendation will be further discussed at the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, December 10, 2024. Update 1/17/2025: Please see response to R# 47 and 50 Update 4/4/25: See response to R#60	Closed
R26	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Patrol Initial Response] - A working group member inquired whether the listed bullet points in this section are meant to outline the in-depth details officers should not ask during the initial response, or if they are part of the general information collection. They added that since the bullet points appear to represent the general information collected during the initial response, the section might need to be rephrased for clarity.	2	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "After medical aid has been offered, members should attempt to collect general information from the survivor, without the need for in-depth details. Such details should include....." Proposed New Language: "After medical aid has been offered, members should attempt to collect general information from the victim (or witness, in case if victim is incapacitated to provide the information directly), without the need for in-depth details. The general information to be collected includes but is not limited to.....". Update 1/17/2025: Please see response to R# 43 Update 4/4/25: See response to R# 88 and 90.	Closed

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R27	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Patrol Initial Response] - A working group recommended addressing the "minimal facts interview" in this section and changing the term "victim" to "victim/witness" to account for situations where it is not possible to obtain initial information directly from the victim e.g. elderly with dementia or comatose patient. The subsequent discussion considered any conflicts with Proposition 115 requirements in regards to the later part of recommendation.	2	10/15/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	Additional language was added under "General Information Collection" to specifically direct members to refer to "Juvenile Victim Interviews" section to ensure alignment with the requirement of conducting minimal facts interview in case of juvenile victims. Inclusion of the phrase, "minimal facts interview" and it's elements will be further discussed in the next working group meeting that's scheduled for Tuesday, November 12, 2024. In addition, the following phrase, " or witness, in case if victim is incapacitated to provide the information directly " under the general information collection by the patrol officer in case of adult victims. Update 1/17/2025: Please see response to R# 43 Update 4/4/25: See response to R# 88 and 90.	Closed
R28	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Notifications] - A working group member inquired about who is responsible for making the legally required notifications as outlined in the "CA POST - Investigation of Child Physical Abuse and Neglect, Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation - Guideline 4: First Responding Officer Responsibilities." These notifications include: 1. Completion of the Suspected Child Abuse Report (SCAR) form SS 8572 within 36 hours (11166(k) PC). 2. Immediate phone, fax or electronic notification to CPS/CWS. 3. Forwarding the completed SS 8572 to CPS/CWS, the District Attorney's Office and any other required agencies. The ensuing discussion included the following points: 1. Adding language about notification to CPS by the patrol officer if the victim is a juvenile. 2. Considering the placement of the language regarding notification to CPS before the patrol officer begins collecting general information, as outlined in the "Patrol Initial Response" section of the draft DO. 3. Checking the SFPD DO related to Child Abuse Investigations, if any, to ensure that SCAR reporting is mentioned.	2	10/15/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	Two sections of draft DO, "Patrol Initial Response" and "Notifications", were reorganized in a manner to include notification process under patrol initial response. The sub-section for "Notifications" was divided into "Notification to CPS" and Notification to SVU" Update 4/4/25: The "Notification to CPS" section was updated to read as follows: <i>"Notification to Child Protective Services (CPS)/Adult Protective Services (APS):</i> <i>a. If the victim is a juvenile and CPS is not notified/engaged already, the responding officer shall call CPS as soon as practical.</i> <i>b. APS Notification: If the victim is a dependent adult or aged 65 or over and APS is not present on the scene, the responding officer shall call APS".</i>	Closed
R29	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - A working group member recommended updating the language regarding the collection of SAEK by SVU within two business days of notification, noting that the current protocol does not involve the RTC/CASARC notifying SVU. Instead, SVU comes to the RTC/CASARC every other day to pick up any SAEKs.	3	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "Once notified by the Recovery/Rape Treatment Center, a member assigned to SVU shall respond to the Recovery/Rape Treatment Center and take custody of the SAEK no later than two days from the date of notification". Proposed New Language: "SVU or designee shall take custody of the SAEK from the RTC/CASARC no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted". Update 4/4/25: Proposed New Language was updated to read as follows: "SVU or designee shall take custody of the SAEK from ZSFGH no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted. a. SVU or designee shall transport and book the SAEK into evidence at the Property Control Division. b. The Property Control Division shall deliver the SAEKs marked for testing to the Crime Lab within 5 business days of evidence collection".	Closed
R30	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - A working group member recommended establishing a uniform timeline of two business days for retrieving a SAEK from another jurisdiction.	3	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "In the event an outside law enforcement agency has completed a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring within San Francisco, and the sexual assault victim has had a SAEK performed in another jurisdiction, it shall be the responsibility of the SVU to collect the SAEK from the outside law enforcement agency". Proposed New Language: "In the event an outside law enforcement agency has completed a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring within San Francisco, and the sexual assault victim has had a SAEK performed in another jurisdiction, it shall be the responsibility of the SVU or designee to collect the SAEK from the outside law enforcement agency no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted". Update 4/4/25: Proposed New Language was updated to read as follows: "Outside jurisdiction: When an outside law enforcement agency completes a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring in San Francisco or when a SAEK was performed for an outside law enforcement agency, SVU shall be responsible for collecting the SAEK within two business days. Members, if contacted by an outside agency, shall direct them to SVU for SAEK collection".	Closed
R31	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - The working group recommended including the term 'designee' for instances when a SAEK must be picked up from another jurisdiction. This addition ensures inclusivity, acknowledging that an SVU Investigator may designate someone else to retrieve the kit.	3	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The term "designee" was added as recommended in the following sentence, "In the event an outside law enforcement agency has completed a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring within San Francisco, and the sexual assault victim has had a SAEK performed in another jurisdiction, it shall be the responsibility of the SVU or designee to collect the SAEK from the outside law enforcement agency no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted".	Closed
R32	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - A working group member recommended to change "nursing staff" to "medical staff" in this section.	3	10/15/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The Department changed the term, "nursing" to "medical" in this section.	Closed
R33	Draft DO Section 6.16.02 [Definitions] - A working group member recommended to revise the proposed new language for the definition of an "Victim Advocate" to correctly place the mention of "a person of victim/survivor's choosing as their advocate" within the updated definition.	1	11/12/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "A service provider, rape crisis counselor, domestic violence advocate, social worker, or victim witness provider within a governmental or non-governmental agency or someone of victim's choosing as long as not involved in any capacity with the case, who is trained to assess and address the needs of the victim as well as to provide counseling, advocacy, resources, information, and support". Proposed New Language: "A service provider, rape crisis counselor, domestic violence advocate, social worker, or victim witness provider within a governmental or non-governmental agency, who is trained to assess and address the needs of the victim as well as to provide counseling, advocacy, resources, information, and support. A victim/survivor may choose an individual not defined as a Victim Advocate to serve as their support person, as long as the individual is not involved in any capacity with the case". Update 3/21/25: The term "victim/survivor" was substituted with "victim" in the proposed definition of a Victim Advocate to maintain consistent terminology for sexual assault victims throughout the draft of DO 6.16.	Closed
R34	A working group member inquired about the rationale behind including sexual assault investigation protocols for both adults and juveniles within the same general order.	N/A	11/12/24	Administrative Question and Answer not for inclusion in DO	During the working group meeting, the Subject Matter Expert (SME) for DO 6.16 explained that there used to be a separate "Juvenile Division," but now the investigation of sexual assaults for both adults and juveniles falls under the Special Victims Unit (SVU). Additionally, an SVU representative mentioned that the investigative process for both adult and juvenile victims is largely the same, which is why they are included in the same general order, making it simpler for all officers to implement.	Closed
R35	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Notifications to SVU] - A working group member suggested revising the language in this section to ensure that a member must speak directly with a live person within SVU to report an alleged sexual assault. If a live person cannot be reached, members should be instructed to contact the Department of Operations Center (DOC).	2	11/12/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "Business Hours: In all cases where an individual alleges that a sexual assault has occurred, even if an arrest is not made, members shall notify SVU main telephone number as soon as practical". Proposed New Language: "Business Hours: In all cases where an individual alleges that a sexual assault has occurred, even if an arrest is not made, members shall notify the SVU by calling the main telephone number and speaking with a live person as soon as practical. If a live person within the SVU cannot be reached, members shall notify the Department Operations Center (DOC)". Update 4/4/25: See response to R# 92 and 96	Closed
R36	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Notifications to SVU] - A working group member asked whether a specific timeframe could be provided for notifying SVU of a reported sexual assault, instead of using the phrase "as soon as practical." This suggestion was made in light of comments from the Officer Panel Q/A emphasizing the importance of timely notification to SVU for reported sexual assaults by patrol officers.	2	11/12/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	During the meeting, the Subject Matter Expert (SME) for DO 6.16 and other Department members explained that assigning a specific timeframe for patrol officers to notify SVU of a reported sexual assault would conflict with their immediate requirement to inform CPS and ensure crime scene safety before notifying SVU. However, to ensure timely notifications to SVU, the section now includes a requirement for patrol officers to speak with a live person within SVU during business hours, and if this is not possible, to notify the DOC. Update 4/4/25: See response to R# 92 and 96.	Closed
R37	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - The working group recommended revising the language concerning the collection of SAEKs involving outside law enforcement agencies. Specifically, they suggested including procedures for instances when the RTC/CASARC has completed and collected the SAEK from a sexual assault victim for an assault that occurred in another jurisdiction. The discussion also emphasized the importance of ensuring patrol officers understand that all SAEKs must be collected by the SVU or its designee. Officers should not direct outside law enforcement agencies to contact RTC/CASARC for the collection of SAEKs in cases where the sexual assault occurred in another jurisdiction.	3	11/12/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "In the event an outside law enforcement agency has completed a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring within San Francisco, and the sexual assault victim has had a SAEK performed in another jurisdiction, it shall be the responsibility of the SVU or designee to collect the SAEK from the outside law enforcement agency no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted". Proposed New Language: "If an outside law enforcement agency has completed a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring within San Francisco, or if the RTC/CASARC has completed and collected the SAEK for a sexual assault that occurred in another jurisdiction, the SVU or its designee shall be responsible for collecting the SAEK from the outside law enforcement agency or from RTC/CASARC, respectively, no later than two business days after the forensic examination. Members should direct outside law enforcement agency representatives to contact SVU directly regarding the collection of the SAEK". Update 4/4/25: Proposed New Language was updated to read as follows: " <i>Outside jurisdiction: When an outside law enforcement agency completes a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring in San Francisco or when a SAEK was performed for an outside law enforcement agency, SVU shall be responsible for collecting the SAEK within two business days. Members, if contacted by an outside agency, shall direct them to SVU for SAEK collection</i> ".	Closed

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R38	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member highlighted challenges faced by some victims/survivors, particularly at some district stations, where they had to report a sexual assault through plexiglass while neighbors waited in line to report their own crimes. They recommended revising the language regarding privacy during victim interviews in this section to elaborate on its importance in the DGO and to offer victims/survivors reasonably available private locations for interviews. The ensuing discussion included the following suggestions to emphasize the importance of privacy: - Adding a "shall" to ensure officers ask victims/survivors about their preferred location for reporting a sexual crime and accommodate them as reasonably as possible. - Urging members to inform victims/survivors of their procedural right to privacy during an interview to report a sexual crime and offer reasonably available options for private locations. - Providing a handout at the beginning of an interview listing a few private place options and allowing victims/survivors to choose the one they are most comfortable with. - Utilizing private spaces at the offices of sexual assault advocacy groups. - Posting signs at district stations encouraging sexual assault victims to call a phone number to report a sexual crime in a reasonably available private space. - Ensuring privacy for victims from non-police and community members.	3 and 4	11/12/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	In response to R#38 and R#39, the Department proposed the following language for the "Adult Victim Interviews" section. This aims to address the request for more detailed guidelines on ensuring victim privacy during sexual assault reporting, and to clarify the role of patrol officers in collecting additional information as necessary at the direction of SVU or their supervisor, especially when SVU is not responding to take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting. Adult Victim Interviews: <i>a. If the victim is reporting a sexual assault, members shall make reasonable efforts to allow the victim to select a private and comfortable location for the interview that is free from distractions.</i> <i>b. If the on-call SVU team determines they will respond to take over the investigation, members shall limit the initial interview to questions that establish only the basic facts of the assault. This includes information necessary for the immediate needs of the investigation and the safety of the victim, such as the suspect's identity and elements of the crime, when reasonable and practical.</i> <i>c. If the on-call SVU team determines they will NOT respond to take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, members shall continue to collect any additional information as necessary, as directed by their supervisor or SVU, that is reasonably possible. This will occur before a thorough follow-up interview is conducted at a later time.</i> Update 4/4/25: See response to R# 88 and 90.	Closed
R39	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member inquired about the circumstances under which the on-call SVU team determines they will not take over an investigation, and whether this decision means the interview progresses beyond the preliminary stage to an in-depth interview. They added that if a Patrol Officer is required to conduct an in-depth interview, providing privacy and a support person should not be discretionary. The ensuing discussion included the following inquiries and recommendations: - Whether the timing of the interview is still determined by the victim, as mentioned in this section for in-depth victim interviews, in cases where a Patrol Officer conducts the interview. - What constitutes a "preliminary interview" and whether responding officers are trained to know the stopping point before transitioning into an in-depth interview. - Possibly removing the language suggesting patrol officers may conduct an in-depth interview, if that's not the practice. - Adding "at the direction of SVU" at the end of the phrase, "If it is determined by the on-call team at SVU that SVU is NOT responding to take over the investigation, members shall conduct an in-depth interview of the victim."	3 and 4	11/12/24	Administrative Question and Answer not for inclusion in DGO	During the meeting, the Subject Matter Expert (SME) for DGO 6.16 and other SVU representatives in the working group explained that SVU may not immediately take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting for various reasons. These include situations where the victim wants to make a statement and leave because they are tired or emotionally drained, or where it is not optimal for an SVU investigator to conduct an in-depth interview immediately after the incident, provided there are no exigent circumstances. Additionally, more time between the initial and follow-up interviews can allow the victim to arrange for a support person or advocate to be present during the thorough in-depth interview conducted by an investigator. Furthermore, they clarified that SVU will still conduct a follow-up in-depth interview at a later time, even if they do not immediately take over the investigation. While patrol officers may ask a few follow-up questions to the victim at the direction of their supervisor or SVU, this does not replace the need for a comprehensive in-depth follow-up interview by an SVU investigator at a later time. Also, see response to R# 38. Update 4/4/25: See response to R# 88 and 90.	Closed
R40	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member recommended replacing "24 hours" with "one to two sleep cycles" in the following sentence: "Victim dictates the time of the interview depending on their trauma, in some cases requiring a period of 24 hours before they can articulate the details of the reported sexual assault." The ensuing discussion included the following points: - Removing the phrase "in some cases requiring a period of 24 hours." - Removing the sentence altogether, as the DGO is meant to provide direction to Patrol Officers and the sentence pertains to interviews conducted by SVU investigators. - Rephrasing the sentence to tailor it for providing necessary direction to Patrol Officers when the victim is not ready for an in-depth interview. - Balancing the best practice of allowing the victim to dictate the time for an in-depth interview with the need to meet immediate legal requirements, such as timely presentation of the case to the District Attorney. - Keeping the sentence but possibly modifying it to emphasize the sense of empowerment and control for the victim.	3 and 4	11/12/24	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	The following sentence was removed from this section: "Victim dictates the time of the interview depending on their trauma, in some cases requiring a period of 24 hours before they can articulate the details of the reported sexual assault." This is because it pertains more to in-depth follow-up interviews conducted by an SVU Investigator, which are already covered by their unit order guidelines. The "Adult Victim Interviews" section in this DGO primarily addresses initial interviews conducted by Patrol Officers, so there is no need to include directives for SVU investigators here. Update 4/4/25: See response to R# 88 and 90.	Closed
R41	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member recommended replacing the term "private" with "non-public" when specifying the location for interviews in this section. The ensuing discussion included the following key points: - It may not always be feasible to provide a private location for an interview with a sexual assault victim in a busy police station, especially during shift changes, when other officers may be present. - There might be advocates, forensic examiners, or individuals chosen by the victim present during the interview. - Retaining the term "private" is important for the victim's comfort level in sharing details of the assault, particularly after experiencing such a violation. - Considering the use of the phrase "non-public and/or private" as an alternative. - The term "private" can be restrictive for police officers, particularly when providing a private location is impossible, which may cause unnecessary delays or policy violations. - Recommending the replacement of "shall" with "should" to provide more flexibility while maintaining the best practice of finding a private location whenever reasonably possible.	2 and 3	12/10/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Previously Proposed Language: <i>"If the victim is reporting a sexual assault, members shall make reasonable efforts to allow the victim to select a private and comfortable location for the interview that is free from distractions."</i> Proposed New Language: <i>"Members should make reasonable efforts to provide a non-public and comfortable location that is free from distractions and provides as much privacy as reasonably possible."</i> Update 4/4/25: Proposed New Language was updated to read as follows: "Members should make reasonable efforts to take sexual assault reports in a location that prioritizes the victim's privacy. Station lobbies are not considered suitable for taking sexual assault reports, as they do not meet the standards for privacy and non-public settings".	Closed
R42	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member recommended adding the phrase "by SVU" when referencing follow-up interviews in this section. This change aims to specify that these interviews will be conducted by the Special Victims Unit (SVU).	2 and 3	12/10/24	Recommendation will not be included in Draft DGO	Follow-up interviews during sexual assault cases may not always be conducted solely by the SVU. Other entities, such as the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, may also be involved. To maintain flexibility and acknowledge that follow-up interviews may be conducted by entities other than the SVU, this recommendation will not be included in the draft DGO 6.16.	Closed
R43	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member recommended refining the language concerning the limitation of initial interviews to only the basic facts of an assault. This refinement is suggested to prevent the appearance of inconsistent facts when comparing information gathered in different interviews throughout the investigation, which could lead to prosecution challenges in court.	2 and 3	12/10/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The following actions were taken to address this recommendation: 1. Eliminated "Patrol Initial Response" section. 2. Moved the language pertaining to general information collection from the "General Information Collection" to the "Adult Victim Interviews". 3. "Notifications" section was made as its own. 4. "Adult Victim Interviews" section of the draft DGO was updated to read as follows: a. Initial Victim Interview: <i>After medical aid, members should conduct an initial interview with the victim (or witness if victim is incapacitated) to establish the nature of the crime committed. This will occur before a thorough follow-up interview that may be conducted later. Questions should be tailored to the victim's emotional and physical state. Information to be collected includes:</i> • Type and elements of crime(s). • Location and timeframe of the incident. • Suspect information, description, and/or whereabouts • Potential crime scene and/or evidence information. b. Initial Interview Location: <i>Members should make reasonable efforts to provide a non-public and comfortable location that is free from distractions and provides as much privacy as reasonably possible.</i> c. SVU Response: • <i>If the on-call SVU team determines they will take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, members should limit their questioning to initial interview questions as mentioned above.</i> • <i>If the on-call SVU team determined they will NOT take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, members shall continue to collect any additional information as directed by their patrol supervisor or SVU investigator".</i> 5. "Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment" section was moved after the "Victim Interviews" Update 4/4/25: See response to R# 88 and 90.	Closed
R44	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A member of the working group raised a question about whether law enforcement could collect information regarding the sexual assault of an adult victim from an advocate or another trustworthy adult with whom the victim has already shared the information. The purpose of this approach would be to avoid retraumatizing the victim by conducting multiple interviews. Their concern was whether this practice might lead to hearsay challenges in court.	N/A	12/10/24	Administrative Question and Answer not for inclusion in DGO	The District Attorney's Office and advocates present during the working group provided a response stating that an advocate could not be used to gather any information shared by the victim. This is due to confidentiality rules between the advocate and the victim, which, if breached, could lead to the advocate becoming a witness.	Closed
R45	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member recommended adding language to this section that affirms the right of an adult sexual assault victim to have an advocate or a person of their choosing present during any interview.	2 and 3	12/10/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The draft DGO 6.16 already incorporates the recommended language within the legal guidelines. These guidelines will be discussed in future working group meetings. Update 4/4/25: The language regarding victim's right to have a Victim Advocate and a support person of their choosing is moved to "SVU Investigation - Victim Interviews" section of draft DGO.	Closed

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R46	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [JuvenileVictim Interviews] - A working group member recommended to rearrange the bullet points in this section to ensure it aligns with the chronological occurrence of events.	3	12/10/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Juvenile Victim Interviews Section of the Draft DO 6.16 was updated to read as follows: <i>"Juvenile Victims:</i> <i>a. In juvenile cases, a joint investigation involving the SFPD SVU and CPS shall be conducted. Although the Child Advocacy Center (CAC) does not have investigative authority, it supports SVU and CPS during the investigation. Note that the investigative focus of the SVU may differ from that of the social worker.</i> <i>b. Due to the sensitive nature of these crimes, the responding officer should obtain as much information as possible from adult family members, social workers, hospital staff, teachers, or witnesses prior to conducting a minimal facts interview or questioning the child.</i> <i>c. If enough information about the nature of the crime and immediate actions is obtained from a reliable adult, members should avoid further questioning the child.</i> <i>d. Minimal Facts Interview:</i> When a minimal facts interview with the child is necessary, the responding officer should only ask questions needed to determine if the reported crime is of a sexual nature, decide next steps for the investigation, and establish safety. An SVU Investigator may request the responding officer to ask additional questions if warranted. <i>e. Multi-Disciplinary Interview (MDI):</i> In juvenile cases, an MDI is conducted later to gather information about abuse allegations. This interview supports fair decision-making in the justice and child protection systems, carried out by a trained, neutral professional using research-based techniques. Key partners include the Office of the District Attorney, Child Protective Services, SFPD, Department of Public Health, and Office of the City Attorney." Update 4/4/25: See response to R#60.	Closed
R47	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [JuvenileVictim Interviews] - A member of the working group recommended incorporating language on "minimal facts interviews" in this section, referencing the 2021 CA POST Guidelines for the Investigation of Child Physical Abuse and Neglect, Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation. This addition aims to provide clear guidance on conducting interviews that gather only essential information to avoid further trauma to the victim while ensuring compliance with best investigative practices.	3	12/10/24	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	The following language regarding the "Minimal Facts Interview" was added to Draft DO Section - Juvenile Victim Interviews: <i>"Minimal Facts Interview: When a minimal facts interview with the child is necessary, the responding officer should only ask questions needed to determine if the reported crime is of a sexual nature, decide next steps for the investigation, and establish safety. An SVU Investigator may request the responding officer to ask additional questions if warranted".</i> Update 4/4/25: See response to R#60.	Closed
R48	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [JuvenileVictim Interviews] - A working group member recommended adding "witnesses" to the list of individuals from whom the responding officer should gather as much information as possible before conducting a minimal facts interview or questioning the child.	3	12/10/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: <i>"The responding officer shall obtain as much information as possible from the adult family member, social worker, hospital staff, or teacher regarding the assault prior to conducting minimal facts interview or questioning the child."</i> Proposed New Language: <i>"the responding officer should obtain as much information as possible from adult family members, social workers, hospital staff, teachers, or witnesses prior to conducting a minimal facts interview or questioning the child".</i> Update 4/4/25: See response to R#60.	Closed
R49	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [JuvenileVictim Interviews] - A working group member recommended removing the phrase "by a stranger or known person" when referencing a joint response or investigation in this section.	3	12/10/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previously Proposed Language: <i>"When a juvenile has been sexually abused or assaulted by a stranger or known person, a joint investigation...."</i> Proposed New Language: <i>"In juvenile cases, a joint investigation involving..."</i> Update 4/4/25: See response to R#60.	Closed
R50	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [JuvenileVictim Interviews] - The working group recommended the following changes to this section when referencing a joint response or investigation: 1. Consider moving this language to the forefront of the section to emphasize its importance. 2. Rewording the role of the "Children Advocacy Center" to clarify that, while it does not have investigative authority, it supports other investigative agencies like the Special Victims Unit (SVU) or Child Protective Services (CPS) during the investigation.	3	12/10/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The 'Juvenile Victim Interviews' section of draft DO 6.16 was updated to read as follows: <i>"Juvenile Victims:</i> <i>a. In juvenile cases, a joint investigation involving the SFPD SVU and CPS shall be conducted. Although the Child Advocacy Center (CAC) does not have investigative authority, it supports SVU and CPS during the investigation. Note that the investigative focus of the SVU may differ from that of the social worker.</i> <i>b. Due to the sensitive nature of these crimes, the responding officer should obtain as much information as possible from adult family members, social workers, hospital staff, teachers, or witnesses prior to conducting a minimal facts interview or questioning the child.</i> <i>c. If enough information about the nature of the crime and immediate actions is obtained from a reliable adult, members should avoid further questioning the child.</i> <i>d. Minimal Facts Interview:</i> When a minimal facts interview with the child is necessary, the responding officer should only ask questions needed to determine if the reported crime is of a sexual nature, decide next steps for the investigation, and establish safety. An SVU Investigator may request the responding officer to ask additional questions if warranted. <i>e. Multi-Disciplinary Interview (MDI):</i> In juvenile cases, an MDI is conducted later to gather information about abuse allegations. This interview supports fair decision-making in the justice and child protection systems, carried out by a trained, neutral professional using research-based techniques. Key partners include the Office of the District Attorney, Child Protective Services, SFPD, Department of Public Health, and Office of the City Attorney." Also, see response to R# 60.	Closed
R51	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Suspect Interviews] - A working group member recommended to add the language regarding that CPS is required to interview suspects in cases of juvenile sexual assault cases.	4	12/10/24	Recommendation requires further discussion w/ other city departments. Outside scope of working group.	The Department will discuss this recommendation in the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 21, 2025. Update 1/21/2025: After further discussion, the working group withdrew this recommendation. The procedures for CPS to interview sexual assault suspects are outside the scope of this draft DO, which is intended to provide instructions to patrol officers initially responding to sexual assault reports.	Closed
R52	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Suspects Interviews] - The working group recommended updating the language in this section to reflect the current field practices for interviewing adult suspects during sexual assault investigations.	4	12/10/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The language for the "Adult Suspect Interviews" section of draft DO 6.16 is updated to read as follows: <i>"Adult Suspects</i> <i>a. If probable cause exists to place an adult suspect under arrest, notify a SVU Investigator as soon as practical. If it is determined by the on-call team that SVU is responding to take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, follow the instructions and guidance provided by the SVU Investigator. If it is determined by the on-call team that SVU is NOT responding to take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, follow all current Department policy and procedures and instructions of supervisor. Members shall ensure the Miranda Advisement is provided prior to conducting a suspect interview.</i> <i>b. If probable cause does not exist to place an adult suspect under arrest, patrol officers shall not attempt to interview the suspect as this may compromise the integrity of the investigation. Patrol officers shall notify an SVU Investigator as soon as practical. SVU Investigators will provide instructions and guidance to the reporting officers".</i> Update 4/4/25: See Response to R#78	Closed
R53	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Juvenile Suspects Interviews] - A member of the working group recommended updating the reference to DO 7.01 in this section to match its updated name as publicly posted on the SFPD website	4	12/10/24	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: <i>"DO 7.01 Juvenile Policies and Procedures for Youth Non-Psychological Detention, Arrest, and Custody".</i> Proposed New Language: <i>"DO 7.01 Policies and Procedures for Juvenile Detention, Arrest, and Custody".</i>	Closed
R54	During the public comments period, a community member raised concerns about the current DO revision process, highlighting that it does not include Special Victims Unit (SVU) procedures during the investigation of sexual assault cases. They emphasized the importance of making these procedures accessible and transparent to the public while ensuring they do not retraumatize individuals under investigation.	N/A	1/21/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	Special Victims Unit (SVU) procedures are guided by specific unit orders and specialized training provided by California Peace Officers and Standards Training (CA POST) for sexual assault investigators. This working group's draft DO focuses on procedures for responding officers, making a discussion of SVU-specific procedures beyond its scope. Additionally, to ensure the successful prosecution of suspects and justice for victims, the Department must maintain the confidentiality of SVU procedures outlined in specific unit orders to prevent potential suspects from evading investigation.	Closed
R55	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member raised concerns about the phrase "after medical aid" in this section, as it implies officers can only act after providing medical aid. Since calling for medical aid is standard procedure, the phrase seems redundant and may confuse officers, suggesting they must delay important actions, like gathering suspect information, until after medical aid is given.	2	1/21/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previously Proposed Language: <i>"After medical aid..."</i> Proposed New Language: <i>"In addition to calling for medical assistance for the victim when necessary or requested,..."</i> Update 4/4/25: Proposed new language was updated to read as follows: <i>"Summon medical response, if needed"</i>	Closed
R56	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member recommended replacing "initial" with "preliminary" in this section, as the latter is more commonly used among law enforcement.	2 and 3	1/21/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The word, "Initial" was replaced with "Preliminary" in the "Adult Victim Interviews" section of Draft DO 6.16. Update 4/4/25: See response to R# 88 and 90.	Closed
R57	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member recommended adding a note stating that station lobbies should not be considered non-public locations for taking counter reports of sexual assault in this section.	3	1/21/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The following language was added as recommended: <i>"Station lobbies do not meet the criteria for non-public interview locations for sexual assault reports".</i> Update 4/4/25: Proposed New Language was updated to read as follows: <i>"Station lobbies are not considered suitable for taking sexual assault reports, as they do not meet the standards for privacy and non-public settings".</i>	Closed
R58	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member recommended including language about deactivating body cameras when encountering sexual assault victims during preliminary investigations, as outlined in DO 10.11.03 (D) Prohibited Recordings, in the draft DO 6.16.	2 and 3	1/21/25	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	Including guidelines regarding the prohibition of body-worn cameras when taking sexual assault reports in draft DO 6.16 is redundant, as these guidelines are already outlined in DO 10.11. However, a reference to DO 10.11 has been added under the "References" section of draft DO 6.16. Update 2/28/25: The following proposed language was added under Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (Notifications): <i>"See DO 10.11, Body Worn Cameras, for authorized deactivations of body worn cameras".</i> Update 4/4/25: Proposed new language was updated to read as follows: <i>"See DO 10.11 Body Worn Cameras for deactivation guidance".</i>	Closed

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R59	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Victim Interviews] - A working group member inquired if there is a way to establish the presence of an advocate and/or support person as the best practice in draft DO 6.16.	3	1/21/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Draft DO 6.16 already includes the recommended language under "Legal Guidelines" section as follows: <i>"Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 679.04(a), a victim has the right to have an advocate and support person of the victim's choosing present during any interview with law enforcement. Members may exclude a support person from an interview if the member determine that the presence of that individual would be detrimental to the purpose of the interview."</i> Update 4/4/25: The language regarding victim's right to have a Victim Advocate and a support person of their choosing is moved to "SVU Investigation - Victim Interviews" section of draft DO.	Closed
R60	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Juvenile Victim Interviews] -The working group recommended reordering and synthesizing the information in this section. The ensuing discussion included the following points: - Combine the bullet points regarding joint investigation and multidisciplinary interview, placing this information towards the end of the section. - Exclude granular details about the multidisciplinary interview and joint investigation regarding their composition or purpose. - Omit the role of the Child Advocacy Center in the joint investigation. - Replace "SFPD SVU" with simply "SFPD" when referencing the joint investigation. - Consider including a more detailed version of the multidisciplinary interview in the training manual for Patrol Officers.	3	1/21/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 - [Juvenile Victim Interviews] was updated to read as follows: <i>"a. Due to the sensitive nature of these crimes, the responding officer should obtain as much information as possible from CPS (if they are the first to arrive on the scene) and/or adult family members, social workers, hospital staff, teachers, or witnesses, prior to conducting a minimal facts interview or questioning the child. b. If enough information about the nature of the crime and immediate actions is obtained from a reliable adult or CPS, members should avoid further questioning the child. c. Minimal Facts Interview: When a minimal facts interview with the child is necessary, the responding officer should only ask questions needed to determine if the reported crime is of a sexual nature, decide next steps for the investigation, and establish safety. In juvenile cases, SVU typically collaborates with CPS at a later stage to conduct a multidisciplinary interview, gathering in-depth details about the abuse allegations; however, SVU Investigator may request the responding officer to ask additional questions if warranted."</i> Update 4/4/25: The language within "Juvenile Victim Interviews" section was moved to "Patrol Initial Response on Scene or District Stations", titled as "Child Victims: Preliminary Investigation", and the content was updated to read as follows: <i>"Responding officers shall: a. Obtain information from Child Protective Services (CPS) (if on scene), non-involved adult family members, social workers, hospital staff, teachers, and/or other witnesses before conducting a minimal facts interview of the child victim. b. If the witness information allows the responding officer to determine that the child is a victim of sexual assault, the responding officer should avoid questioning the child victim. c. If the witness information does not provide enough information for the responding officer to determine that the child is a victim of sexual assault, the responding officer may conduct a minimal facts interview (confirm crime was sexual in nature, outline next investigative steps, or ensure safety of child). Nothing precludes the responding officer from asking open-ended questions needed to determine suspect information or confirm elements of a crime"</i> .	Closed
R61	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Suspects Interviews] - The working group recommended synthesizing the language in the section related to arresting an adult suspect when probable cause exists.	4	1/21/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previously Proposed Language: <i>"If probable cause exists to place an adult suspect under arrest, notify a SVU Investigator as soon as practical. If it is determined by the on-call team that SVU is responding to take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, follow the instructions and guidance provided by the SVU Investigator. If it is determined by the on-call team that SVU is NOT responding to take over the investigation at the time of incident reporting, follow all current Department policy and procedures and instructions of supervisor. Members shall ensure the Miranda Advisement is provided prior to conducting a suspect interview."</i> Proposed New Language: <i>"If probable cause exists to arrest an adult suspect, notify a SVU Investigator as soon as practical. If SVU is responding to take over the investigation, follow their guidance. If not, follow Department policy and supervisor instructions. Ensure Miranda Advisement before a suspect interview."</i> Update 4/4/25: See Response to R#78.	Closed
R62	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Suspects Interviews] - The working group recommended rephrasing the section that provides instructions for patrol officers when probable cause does not exist to arrest an adult suspect. The ensuing discussion included the following points: - Clarifying the rationale behind notification to SVU in instances when there is no probable cause to arrest an adult suspect. - Rephrasing the section to instruct patrol officers to contact SVU for further direction after obtaining statements from the victim. - Considering scenarios where the suspect is in the victim's home, such as a sexual assault response where the victim escapes, and determining whether patrol officers should engage the suspect. - Potentially excluding the entire section on adult suspects from the Draft DO due to confusion and unclear guidance for patrol officers. - Considering scenarios of "gone on arrivals."	4	1/21/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: <i>"If probable cause does not exist to place an adult suspect under arrest, patrol officers shall not attempt to interview the suspect as this may compromise the integrity of the investigation. Patrol officers shall notify an SVU Investigator as soon as practical. SVU Investigators will provide instructions and guidance to the reporting officers"</i> . Proposed New Language (To be further discussed and possibly amended in the next working group meeting scheduled for Thursday, February 6, 2025): <i>"If probable cause does not exist to place an adult suspect under arrest after obtaining victim/witness statements, patrol officers shall not attempt to interview the suspect as this may compromise the integrity of the investigation"</i> . Update 4/4/25: See Response to R#78.	Closed
R63	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Evidence Collection] The working group recommended excluding all details except for references to leaving SAEKs with the nurse/medical staff examining the victim. These references should be replaced with a mention of DO 6.02, as it already includes the procedures for collecting physical evidence, including during sexual assault cases.	4	1/21/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: <i>"Evidence Collection. It is the responsibility of the officer who first arrives on scene to isolate and protect the crime scene from contamination until relieved by the direction of a superior officer (see DO 6.02, Physical Evidence). 1. Do not leave any evidence with the nurse or doctor examining the victim. However, as stated above, all SAEKs collected by medical staff will be retained at the Recovery/Rape Treatment Center"</i> . Proposed New Language: <i>"Evidence Collection: 1. See DO 6.02 (Physical Evidence and Scene Preservation). 2. Note: SAEK collected by medical staff should be the only evidence left with the nurse or doctor examining the victim"</i> . Update 4/4/25: The language regarding "Evidence Collection" was moved under "SART Examination" (previously titled as Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment) and the language is updated to read as follows: "Members shall leave the SAEK with medical staff, until SVU can respond and take custody. For all other evidence, see DO 6.02, Physical Evidence and Scene Preservation".	Closed
R64	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Evidence Collection] - The working group recommended updating the name of DO 6.02 to match its current name on the SFPD website: "Physical Evidence and Scene Preservation"	4	1/21/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: <i>"Physical Evidence"</i> Proposed New Language: <i>"Physical Evidence and Scene Preservation"</i> .	Closed
R65	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Other Duties/Services] - The working group recommended incorporating language in the draft DO to allow sexual assault victims to sit in the front of a police vehicle when being transported, if feasible. This measure is intended to ensure that victims do not feel like perpetrators.	4	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Proposed Additional Language for Draft DO Section 6.16 (Other Duties/Services): <i>"As a reminder, victims are not suspects and are not required to sit in the backseat. Therefore, when feasible, they should be allowed to be transported in the front seat of a police vehicle"</i> . Update 4/4/25: Proposed Additional Language was updated to read as follows: "Avoid seating the victim in the caged section or backseat, if possible".	Closed
R66	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Other Duties/Services] - A working group member recommended including the provision of "Marsy's Card" to victims in the draft DO 6.16. This card informs victims of their rights under Marsy's Law, also known as the California Victims' Bill of Rights Act of 2008.	4	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The Department added the requirement for members to provide the sexual assault victim with a "Marsy's Card" in Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (Other Duties/Services)	Closed
R67	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Other Duties/Services] - A working group member recommended to remove the specific mention of	4	2/6/25	Recommendation has been	The Department removed the following language from the Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (Other Duties/Services): <i>"If an individual responds to a District Station to report they were the victim of a"</i>	Closed
R68	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Other Duties/Services] - A working group member recommended removing the requirement for officers to inform victims of their right to have a Victim Advocate present during report-taking at district stations, due to the exception in California Penal Code Section 679.04 (c) which states that "an initial investigation by law enforcement to determine whether a crime has been committed and the identity of the suspects shall not constitute a law enforcement interview." The ensuing discussion included the following points: - Frequent complaints from the local sexual assault advocacy community and survivors about Victim Advocates being turned away during interviews between victims and law enforcement, despite the victim's legal right, under California Penal Code Section 679.04 (a), to have a Victim Advocate or a person of their choosing present during any interview with law enforcement. - Lack of clarity in distinguishing between an initial investigation and an initial interview. - Application of the exception found in California Penal Code Section 679.04 (c) when an initial investigation is conducted at the Emergency Department during the completion of the forensic exam, where the victim retains the absolute right to have a Victim Advocate and a person of their choosing present. - Possibly removing the phrase regarding follow-up interviews in the "Victim Interviews" section of the draft DO. - Preliminary investigation at the crime scene is usually not considered a formal interview. - Police Academy training guidelines on how preliminary investigation is distinct from preliminary interview. - Considering the difference between "cold interview" vs. "formal preliminary interview." - Clarifying what "being present" means in terms of either physical attendance or availability by phone.	4	2/6/25	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DO	To address the recommendation, the following actions were taken: 1. Removed the language from Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (Other Duties/Services): <i>"Members shall advise the victim of their right to have a victim advocate and a support person of their choosing present during the report taking at district stations"</i> . 2. Replaced "Victim Interviews" with "Victim Preliminary Interviews." 3. Moved the language pertaining to general information collection to determine if a sex crime has occurred and the identity of a suspect from the "Adult Victim Preliminary Interviews" section to the newly proposed "Preliminary Investigation" section. 4. Modified and moved the language regarding "SVU Response" from the "Adult Victim Preliminary Interviews" section to the "Notifications" section to provide clear guidelines to responding officers on when to transition from preliminary investigation to preliminary interview, thereby triggering the requirement to advise the victim of their right to have a Victim Advocate and a person of their choosing present during any interview with law enforcement. - Proposed modified language for "SVU Response": <i>"If SVU is not responding immediately to take over the investigation or based on further guidance of an SVU Investigator or Patrol Supervisor, members may need to conduct a preliminary interview with the victim (or a witness if the victim is incapacitated)"</i> . 5. Added language regarding referring to DO 10.11 for authorized deactivations of Body Worn Cameras (BWCs) under the Notifications section prior to the Victim Preliminary Interviews section as an additional trigger point for responding officers to know the transition from preliminary investigation to victim preliminary interviews. 6. Added the following language under the "Adult Victim Preliminary Interviews" section: <i>"Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 679.04, once it is determined that a sex crime has occurred and the suspect's identity is known and prior to the commencement of a preliminary interview, members shall advise the victim of their right to have a Victim Advocate and a support person of their choosing present (either in-person or virtually) during any investigative interview. However, the support person may be excluded from an interview if their presence is deemed detrimental to its purpose."</i> Update 4/4/25: See response to R# 88 and 90.	Closed
R69	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Other Duties/Services] - A working group member inquired if the SFPD 369 Form is titled as "Victims of Crime" or "Victims of Violent Crimes" Card.	4	2/6/25	Administrative Question and Answer- not for inclusion in DO	The SFPD 369 Form is titled as "Victims of Crime" card.	Closed

DO 6.16 - Post Working Group (Final) SFPD Policy Working Group Recommendations and Discussion Tracking Grid

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R70	A working group member recommended to capitalize "Victim Advocate" throughout the draft DO for the purposes of consistency.	N/A	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The term "Victim Advocate" was capitalized throughout draft DO 6.16 as recommended.	Closed
R71	The working group member suggested adding to the draft DO 6.16 the contact information for the entity responsible for providing a Victim Advocate upon a victim's request. Additionally, they recommended including procedures for responding members to follow when a Victim Advocate is unavailable.	3	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The following language is proposed as an addition to Draft DO Section 6.16.04 (Adult Victim Preliminary Interviews) to address this recommendation: "If requested, refer to "Your Rights as a Survivor of Sexual Assault" card, that has contact information for local rape crisis center to arrange for a Victim Advocate. If a Victim Advocate is requested and cannot be arranged by a local rape crisis center within a reasonable amount of time for a preliminary interview, members shall document this in the incident report. The victim should be given the choice to either continue without a Victim Advocate or postpone the interview to a later date, as long as the delay does not negatively impact the investigation". Additionally, the following language was added under the newly proposed "Preliminary Investigation" section of Draft DO 6.16 to comply with CA Penal Code Section 680.2. This ensures the "Your Rights as a Survivor of Sexual Assault" form is introduced early, helping the responding officer locate contact information for a local rape crisis center when needed. Update 4/4/25: See response to R#88 and 90; consequently, the language as indicated above is no longer needed in draft DO 6.16 since responding officers do not engage in the process of arranging a Victim Advocate during preliminary investigation.	Closed
R72	A working group member suggested clarifying that during business hours, if the local hospital is able to provide a Victim Advocate, another advocate should not be activated when the preliminary interview is conducted at the local hospital.	3	2/6/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	This recommendation will be further discussed in the next working group scheduled for Tuesday, March 4, 2025. Update 3/4/2025: This recommendation was revisited during the working group meeting held on March 4, 2025. It was determined that the Executive Sponsor and Subject Matter Expert (SME) for the DO 6.16 Community Working Group would be notified of the proposed changes to the "Your Rights as a Survivor of a Sexual Assault" card. These changes include adding San Francisco General Hospital and specifying the operating hours for both San Francisco General Hospital (SF GH) and San Francisco Women Against Rape (SF WAR) to be contacted when coordinating a Victim Advocate.	Closed
R73	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Incident Reports] - A working group member recommended removing the redundant language in the "Incident Reports" section of Draft DO 6.16 that is already outlined in Department's Report Writing Manual.	5	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previous Language: "Members shall complete an incident report for any reported sexual assault. Whether or not a SVU Investigator responds to an incident or is notified, the responding officer is expected to submit an initial and/or supplementary report indicating information reported, observations, statements, evidence, and other related information". Proposed New Language: "Members shall complete an incident report for any reported sexual assault whether a SVU Investigator responds or not to the incident".	Closed
R74	The working group discussed the need to include language in the draft DO to mandate that officers take sexual assault reports at the district station where the report is made, regardless of the district in which the assault occurred.	4	2/6/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance	The responsibility of members in a given district where a counter report is being made, including for sexual assault reports, for initial investigation instead of directing citizens back to the District where the incident occurred, is already outlined in Department Bulletin (DB) 19-117 [Requests for Service] . The Department is in the process of reissuing this bulletin soon.	Closed
R75	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Data Reporting and Collection] - The working group recommended removing the "Data Reporting and Collection" section of the draft DO, as it does not pertain to the procedural responsibilities of responding officers, which is the primary focus of the draft DO, and it contains the same information that can be found in the SF Police Commission Resolution # 16-28.	5	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The "Data Reporting and Collection" section of Draft DO 6.16 has been removed as recommended by the working group.	Closed
R76	Draft DO Section 6.16.05 [Legal Guidelines] - The working group recommended removing the "Legal Guidelines" section as a separate entity and incorporating relevant information into other corresponding sections of Draft DO 6.16.	6	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The following actions were taken to address this recommendation: 1. Legal Guideline related to California Penal Code Section 293(a) is moved to "Other Duties/Services" section of draft DO. Update 4/4/25: This is instead moved to "Incident Reports" 2. Legal Guideline related to California Penal Code Section 680.2 is moved to "Preliminary Investigation" section of draft DO. Update 4/4/25: This is instead moved to "Other Duties/Services" 3. Legal Guidelines related to California Penal Code Section 679.04(a) and 679.04(b)(4) are moved to "Adult Victims Preliminary Interviews" section of draft DO. Update 4/4/25: This is instead moved to "SVU Investigation - Victim Interviews" 4. Legal Guideline related to California Penal Code Section 679.04(d) is moved to "Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment" section of draft DO	Closed
R77	Draft DO Section 6.16.05 [Legal Guidelines] - A working group member recommended removing the legal guideline concerning California Family Code Section 6228, as the patrol is not responsible for its implementation.	6	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The language related to California Family Code Section 6228 has been removed from the draft DO 6.16.	Closed
R78	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Adult Suspect Interviews] - The working group recommended revising the current language in this section to specify deviations from standard police procedures when interviewing crime suspects in specific sexual assault cases.	4	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previously Proposed Language: "Adult Suspects a. If probable cause exists to arrest an adult suspect, notify an SVU Investigator as soon as practical. If SVU is responding to take over the investigation, follow their guidance. If not, follow Department policy and supervisor instructions. Ensure Miranda Advisement before a suspect interview. b. If probable cause does not exist to place an adult suspect under arrest after obtaining victim/witness statements, patrol officers shall not attempt to interview the suspect as this may compromise the integrity of the investigation". Proposed New Language: "Adult Suspects If the suspect is not on scene, contact SVU prior to attempting to contact the suspect, otherwise, standard procedures apply". Update 4/4/25: Proposed new language was updated to read as follows: "Adult Suspects: Responding officers should seek SVU guidance prior to interviewing the suspect, except during exigent circumstances."	Closed
R79	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Evidence Collection] - A working group member recommended adding guidelines to instruct officers on when to collect Sexual Assault Evidence Kits (SAEKs) if they are picking up a kit from an outside county where the sexual assault forensic and medical examination was conducted.	4	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	The following language was proposed to be added in Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Evidence Collection]: "If any questions arise regarding the collection of SAEK, contact SVU". Update 4/4/25: The language regarding "Evidence Collection" was moved under "SART Examination" (previously titled as Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment) and the language is updated to read as follows: "Members shall leave the SAEK with medical staff, until SVU can respond and take custody. For all other evidence, see DO 6.02, Physical Evidence and Scene Preservation".	Closed
R80	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Evidence Collection] - A working group member recommended replacing "doctor or nurse" with "SAFE" (Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner) in this section.	4	2/6/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previously Proposed Language: "Note: SAEK collected by medical staff should be the only evidence left with the nurse or doctor examining the victim". Proposed New Language: "SAEK collected by medical staff should be the only evidence left with the SAFE examining the victim". Update 4/4/25: The language regarding "Evidence Collection" was moved under "SART Examination" (previously titled as Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment) and the language is updated to read as follows: "Members shall leave the SAEK with medical staff, until SVU can respond and take custody. For all other evidence, see DO 6.02, Physical Evidence and Scene Preservation".	Closed
R81	Draft DO Section 6.16.04 [Other Duties/Services] - A working group member suggested rephrasing the proposed language about transporting victims in the front seat, when feasible, to make it more concise. The subsequent discussion included the following points: 1. Clarifying whether all victims/survivors are aware they can request transportation and considering the addition of "offering transportation" to the sentence. 2. Generalizing transportation destinations rather than specifying particular locations where transportation may be provided when requested and feasible. 3. Possibly matching the language that's in the SFPD Field Training Manual.	5	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DO	Previously Proposed Language: "If requested, provide the victim with transportation to their residence or another appropriate location within San Francisco. As a reminder, victims are not suspects and are not required to sit in the backseat. Therefore, when feasible, they should be allowed to be transported in the front seat of a police vehicle". Proposed New Language: "Members may offer a ride to victims, within 50 miles of the city and county. Avoid seating the victim in the caged section or backseat, if possible".	Closed
R82	A working group member recommended to replace the term, "victim" with "victim/survivor" throughout the draft DO.	N/A	3/4/25	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	This recommendation will undergo further internal discussion within the Department and will be addressed by the Department Leadership during subsequent stages of the DO Update. The working group facilitator will ensure all members are kept informed of the Department's response.	Open
R83	The working group proposed the following updates to the "Your Rights as a Survivor of Sexual Assault" card: 1. Replace references to CALCASA with VALOR. 2. Consider redesigning the card/form to be a single page printed front and back, rather than a trifold format. 3. Include SF General Hospital on the card/form. 4. Specify the hours during which SF General Hospital or SF WAR should be contacted to arrange for a Victim Advocate, if requested by the victim. 5. Add details clarifying that if the victim is transported to SF General Hospital during work hours, it is unnecessary to contact the hospital to arrange for a Victim Advocate, as the hospital has an established process to provide one upon the victim's request in the Emergency Department.	N/A	3/4/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	The Community Working Group Coordinator will communicate this information to the Executive Sponsor and the SME for DO 6.16 Community Working Group to review and ensure that the "Your Rights as a Survivor of Sexual Assault" card is updated in accordance with the recommended changes.	Closed

DKO 6.16 - Post Working Group (Final) SFPD Policy Working Group Recommendations and Discussion Tracking Grid

#	Working Group Recommendations	Page Number	Meeting Date	SFPD Response	SFPD Explanation	Open/Closed
R84	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - The working group recommended the removal of the newly added reference to California Penal Code 264.2 in the draft DGO, as it may disrupt the existing operational workflow between SF General Hospital and SFPD. It was suggested that this reference would be more appropriately placed in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two agencies, which delineates their respective staff roles.	4	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The proposed language referencing California Penal Code Section 264.2, which stated, "Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 264.2, members shall immediately notify the local rape victim counseling center whenever a victim of an alleged violation of California Penal Code Sections 261, 261.5, 262, 286, 288a, or 289 is transported to the hospital for any medical evidentiary or physical examination," has been removed. Furthermore, the Community Working Group Coordinator will present this recommendation to the Executive Sponsor and the Subject Matter Expert (SME) for the DGO 6.16 Community Working Group. They will review and assess whether the procedures in accordance with California Penal Code Section 264.2 should be incorporated into the MOU between SF General Hospital and SFPD.	Closed
R85	A working group member raised the question of whether the draft DGO should include language similar to the "Non-Investigative Reports" section outlined in the San Jose Police Department Duty Manual.	N/A	3/4/25	Recommendation included in training, Department Manual, or other procedural or guidance document	A working group member, who is also part of the Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) for San Francisco County, stated during the meeting that an established procedure already exists in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SF General Hospital and SFPD. This procedure addresses cases where a victim opts not to file a police report but requests a medical/forensic exam. In such instances, the hospital takes specific actions to file a mandated report and collaborates with SFPD to generate a CAD number, which is then attached to the report. The Community Working Group Coordinator will relay this information to the Executive Sponsor and the SME for DGO 6.16 Community Working Group to confirm its inclusion in the relevant MOU and to allow the Executive Sponsor to assess whether the memo requires updates to further formalize this procedure.	Closed
R86	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Other Duties/Services] - A working group member suggested condensing the bullet point regarding victims' confidentiality of incident reports for brevity purposes.	5	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Previous Language: "Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 293(a), members shall inform victims that their name will become a matter of public record unless they request otherwise. Members shall offer victims confidentiality for incident reports". Proposed New Language: "Additionally, members shall offer victims confidentiality in incident reports pursuant to California Penal Code Section 293(a)".	Closed
R87	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Notifications] - A working group member recommended to add notifying Adult Protective Services whenever a sexual assault is reported for a person aged 65 or over or for a dependent adult.	2	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The following was proposed as an addition language for Draft DGO Section 6.16 (Notifications): "APS Notification: If the victim is a dependent adult or aged 65 or over and APS is not present on the scene, the responding officer shall call APS".	Closed
R88	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Notifications] - The working group deliberated on the placement of language outlining procedures for cases where SVU is unavailable to respond, requiring the responding officer to conduct a preliminary interview. They considered integrating this language within the Victim Preliminary Interviews section or creating a standalone section. Additionally, the group discussed revising the language to provide clearer instructions for responding officers regarding their responsibilities when SVU is not present, while also establishing a clear distinction between procedures for preliminary investigations and preliminary interviews.	2	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	Following a thorough discussion within the Department regarding the distinction between initial investigation and initial interview as mentioned in California Penal Code 679.04—it was determined that, the patrol's initial response remains limited to fact-gathering step to establish the nature of the crime with both adult and child victims and any in-depth investigative interview, whether initial or follow-up, falls exclusively under the purview of SVU. Consequently, language suggesting that patrol officers might need to conduct an adult victim initial interview when SVU is unavailable to immediately take over the investigation has been removed from the notifications section. Additionally, to provide clearer guidelines for patrol officers on the next steps upon notifying SVU, the following language has been added under "SVU Notification": "The SVU Investigator or Patrol Supervisor will advise the responding officer on the next steps. These may include directing the responding officer to wait at the scene for SVU, escorting the victim to ZSFGH, or asking additional questions of the victim and/or witnesses."	Closed
R89	Draft DGO Section 6.16.02 [Definitions] - A working group member suggested removing the definition of the Special Victims Unit from this section, as the primary audience for draft DGO 6.16 is SFPD members, who are already familiar with the role and functions of SVU.	1	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The definition of the "Special Victims Unit" was removed from the draft DGO 6.16; however it is spelled out when the abbreviation is used for the first time in draft DGO 6.16.	Closed
R90	The working group deliberated on the appropriate use of the terms "Initial" versus "Preliminary" when referencing Preliminary Investigations and Preliminary Interviews. This discussion focused on aligning the terminology with the language found in relevant California Penal Codes or the Field Training Manual.	2 and 3	3/4/25	Recommendation has been partially included in draft DGO	See Response to R#88. Also, the following changes were made: 1. "Preliminary Investigation" changed to "Patrol Initial Response on Scene or at District Stations": and reads as follows "1. The initial patrol response should aim to collect basic information from the victim (or witnesses, if the victim is incapacitated). This phase is strictly fact-finding to establish the nature of crime and guide the next steps in investigative processes. 2. Members should make reasonable efforts to take sexual assault reports in a location that prioritizes the victim's privacy. Station lobbies are not considered suitable for taking sexual assault reports, as they do not meet the standards for privacy and non-public settings. 3. Members are reminded that victims have experienced a traumatic incident and may not be willing or able to immediately assist with the criminal investigation. Therefore, questioning should be limited according to the victim's emotional and physical state. 4. Adult Victims: Preliminary Investigation. Responding officers shall do the following at the minimum: a. Summon medical response, if needed. b. Determine if elements of crime(s) exist. c. Confirm location and timeframe of the incident. d. Gather suspect's information, description, and/or whereabouts. e. Secure crime scene(s) and/or evidence. 5. Child Victims: Preliminary Investigation. Responding officers shall: a. Obtain information from Child Protective Services (CPS) (if on scene), non-involved adult family members, social workers, hospital staff, teachers, and/or other witnesses before conducting a minimal facts interview of the child victim. b. If the witness information allows the responding officer to determine that the child is a victim of sexual assault, the responding officer should avoid questioning the child victim. c. If the witness information does not provide enough information for the responding officer to determine that the child is a victim of sexual assault, the responding officer may conduct a minimal facts interview (confirm crime was sexual in nature, outline next investigative steps, or ensure safety of child). Nothing precludes the responding officer from asking open-ended questions needed to determine suspect information or confirm elements of a crime. 6. See DGO 10.11 Body Worn Cameras for deactivation guidance". 2. "Victim Preliminary Interviews" changed to "SVU Investigation - Victim Interviews" and reads as follows: "1. Before any investigative interview begins, members shall advise the victim of their right to have a Victim Advocate and a support person of their choosing present (either in-person or virtually) California Penal Code Section 679.04. a. Members may exclude the support person during any investigative interview if the member determines the presence of the individual obstructs the interview process. b. If requested, members shall allow the victim a person of the same or opposite gender to be present during an interview, unless no such person is reasonably available (this request for a same or opposite gender is applicable to either law enforcement or the Victim Advocate present during the interview (California Penal Code Section 679.04(b)(1)))."	Closed
R91	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Notifications] - A working group member suggested adding the article "a" before the term "juvenile" in this section for grammatical accuracy.	2	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The article "a" was added before the term "juvenile" in this section as recommended.	Closed
R92	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Notifications] - A working group member suggested changing the capitalization of the word "Live" to make it lowercase in this section for correctness.	2	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The proposed new language regarding the need to talk to a live person within SVU was changed as follows, therefore, not requiring any un-capitalization of the word, "Live": "Call SVU to speak with an SVU Investigator directly. If no one in SVU can be reached, notify the Department of Operations Control (DOC)".	Closed
R93	Draft DGO Section 6.16.02 [Definitions] - The working group decided to replace "Human Services Agency (HSA) Protective Services Workers" to "Child Protective Services or Adult Protective Services Workers"	1	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	"Human Services Agency (HSA) Protective Services Workers" was changed to "Child Protective Services or Adult Protective Services workers" within the definition of Sexual Assault Response Team (SART).	Closed
R94	Draft DGO Section 6.16.04 [Forensic Examination and Medical Treatment] - A working group member suggested removing the bullet points in this section that outline SVU procedures for custody and transportation of the SAEK. This recommendation was based on the fact that the draft DGO is focused on procedures for Patrol Officers, while those bullet points pertain to tasks handled by SVU.	4	3/4/25	Recommendation requires further discussion/analysis	The language regarding taking custody and transportation of SAEK was kept in draft DGO 6.16 but modified to read as follows: "SVU or designee shall take custody of the SAEK from ZSFGH no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted. a. SVU or designee shall transport and book the SAEK into evidence at the Property Control Division. b. The Property Control Division shall deliver the SAEKs marked for testing to the Crime Lab within 5 business days of evidence collection".	Closed
R95	A working group member recommended maintaining consistency throughout the draft DGO 6.16 by standardizing the use of either bullet points or numbers and letters.	N/A	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	The Department has conformed the draft DGO 6.16 to its official style guide.	Closed
R96	The working group recommended condensing certain sections of the draft DGO 6.16 to enhance brevity, while ensuring the content and meaning remain intact.	N/A	3/4/25	Recommendation has been completely included in draft DGO	1. The language regarding SVU Notification was updated to read as follows: "Special Victims Unit (SVU) Notification: Members shall notify SVU of all reported sexual assault cases. The SVU Investigator or Patrol Supervisor will provide the responding officer with guidance on the next steps. Next steps may include directing responding officers to wait at scene for SVU, taking the victim to ZSFGH, or asking victim/witnesses additional questions. a. Business Hours: Call SVU to speak with an SVU Investigator directly. If no one in SVU can be reached, notify the Department Operations Center (DOC). b. After Hours: Notify DOC." 2. The title for "Forensic Examination/Medical Treatment" section was changed to "SART Examination" and was updated to read as follows: "1. Members shall take sexual assault victims, with consent and regardless of age, to Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center - Emergency Department (ZSFGH) where a SAFE from the Rape Treatment Center (RTC)/Child and Adolescent Support, Advocacy, and Resource Center (CASARC) will perform an examination which includes a SAEK. 2. Members shall not discourage a victim from receiving a medical, evidentiary or physical examination, pursuant to California Penal Code Section 679.04(d). 3. Members shall leave the SAEK with medical staff, until SVU can respond and take custody. For all other evidence, see DGO 6.02, Physical Evidence and Scene Preservation. 4. SVU or designee shall take custody of the SAEK from ZSFGH no later than two business days after the forensic examination is conducted. a. SVU or designee shall transport and book the SAEK into evidence at the Property Control Division. b. The Property Control Division shall deliver the SAEKs marked for testing to the Crime Lab within 5 business days of evidence collection. 5. Outside jurisdiction: When an outside law enforcement agency completes a courtesy report for a sexual assault occurring in San Francisco or when a SAEK was performed for an outside law enforcement agency, SVU shall be responsible for collecting the SAEK within two business days. Members, if contacted by an outside agency, shall direct them to SVU for SAEK collection". 3. The language regarding resources provided to a sexual assault victim (second bullet point) within the "OtherDuties/Services" was updated to read as follows, "Members shall provide the victim or adult family members of minor victims with "Your Rights as a Survivor of Sexual Assault" card (California Penal Code 680.2), "Marsy's Rights" Card, "Victims of Crime" Form (SFPD 369), SVU Follow Up & Referral Card (SFPD 142), and a Follow up form with the incident case number."	Closed