



# Policy Review of DGO 6.10: Missing Persons

## San Francisco Department of Police Accountability

Prepared for the San Francisco Police Department

Department of Police Accountability

Executive Director Paul Henderson

## Executive Summary

SFPD's DGO 6.10 does not fully incorporate the provisions of Senate Bill 388 (2020), which amended Penal Code §14211 to create statewide consistency in handling missing persons investigations.

Although the SFPD is updating DGO 6.10, its draft currently lacks direction on utilizing public safety notification systems, such as the AMBER Alert system.<sup>1</sup> It also does not provide instructions on leveraging the media to aid in the recovery of missing persons. **These gaps show a need for significant revisions to ensure the policy is comprehensive and effective.**

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) proposes 28 recommendations for the draft of DGO 6.10 with the aim of standardizing investigations for missing persons cases. These recommendations ensure that the SFPD complies with State law and applies guidance from the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) in all missing persons investigations.<sup>2</sup>

### Why DPA's Recommendations Help Ensure Effective Public Safety

The DPA's recommendations aim to ensure SFPD's policies are aligned with State law, clearly define roles and responsibilities, and reduce the administrative burden on patrol officers. POST emphasizes that missing person cases are among the most challenging assignments an officer will handle in their career. Missing person investigation can become a "high profile" case overnight, as shown by local and national coverage of San Francisco missing persons in the past six months.<sup>3</sup> These examples detail the complex nature of missing persons investigations, the importance of sound investigative techniques, and the role the public can play. By including the above statutory requirements, and delegating administrative tasks, the SFPD can reduce the cognitive load on patrol officers while providing them more time to engage in a continuous searches.

<sup>1</sup> The AMBER Alert system was established a year after the 1999 policy was written.

<sup>2</sup> This report was prepared as part our obligation to satisfy S.F. Charter Sec. 4.136 (i) and includes recommendations concerning policies or practices of the Police Department which could be amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public while ensuring effective police services.

<sup>3</sup> Megan Fan Munce, [S.F. Police searching for missing 16-year-old girl](#), San Francisco Chronicle (February 16, 2024); Jennifer Wadsworth and Joel Umanzor, [Ignored by police, a mom tried to find her missing daughter. She wound up in jail](#), S.F. Standard (April 24, 2024); David Sjostedt, [Over 1,400 people are missing in San Francisco. For most, we don't even know their names](#), S.F. Standard, (May 8, 2024); Grace Kahng, [Inside the Frantic Search for Tech Billionaires' Missing Child](#), Daily Beast (May 12, 2024).

## Recommendations

### **Recommendation 1: Ensure DGO 6.10 incorporates CA Pen. Code § 14211(a), which requires departments to prioritize missing persons cases.**

Pen. Code § 14211(a) states in relevant part:

"All local police and sheriffs' departments shall accept any report...of a missing person, including runaways, **without delay** and shall give priority to the handling of these reports over the handling of reports relating to crimes involving property."

The draft DGO cites 14211 (a) under "Reports Missing Persons outside of San Francisco," without defining "without delay" or explaining the importance of handling missing persons reports. It also includes a paraphrased version of 14211(a) in the Policy statement but cites to 14214(a).

California Department of Justice *Guidelines for Handling Missing Persons Investigations*, Section 3, Guideline 3.2(C) advises agencies to, "**define, through their department policies, the words "without delay" with a specific time frame** that conveys urgency with the understanding that a child/adult may potentially be in danger."

**Recommendation 1.1:** SFPD should define "without delay" and change the code citation in the policy statement to 14211(a).

The State of California requires all police departments give priority to missing persons over crimes involving property. However, this language does not appear in the DGO.

**Recommendation 1.2:** SFPD should incorporate the language in the Policy section to emphasize the importance of missing persons cases and ensure that all members are aware of the State requirement to prioritize these cases over property crimes.

### **Recommendation 2: Ensure DGO 6.10 incorporates CA Pen. Code § 14213 (b)-(d), which sets specific deadlines for "found person" notifications.**

Pen. Code § 14213 (b)-(c) states in relevant part:

"(b) When a missing person is found, the report **indicating that the person is found shall be made not later than 24 hours after the person is found** to the law enforcement agency that made the initial missing person report.

(c) In the event that a missing person is found alive or dead in less than **24 hours** and the local police or sheriff's department has **reason to believe that the person had been abducted**, the department shall submit a report to the [National Crime Information Center] in a format established by the Attorney General. In the event that a missing person has been *found before he or she has been reported missing to the center, the information related to the incident shall be submitted* to the [National Crime Information Center].

(d) A law enforcement agency shall not establish or maintain any policy that requires the removal of a missing person entry from the center database or the National Crime Information Center database based solely on the age of the missing person.”

The Penal Code requires the above actions to be conducted for found persons within specific timeframes. **The State mandated deadlines should be included in the DGO and assigned to a specific division to ensure that required reports are completed in a timely manner.** First, Section 14213 (b) requires departments to alert agencies that made initial missing persons reports within 24 hours. While the department who found a missing person may have made a report to the Cal DOJ, there is no requirement for Cal DOJ to notify other jurisdictions. The State instead placed this requirement on the jurisdiction that found the missing person.

**Recommendation 2.1:** SFPD should include instruction on who will make a found person alert to an outside jurisdiction.

Second, Section 14213(c) provides deadlines for missing persons who have been abducted and **found alive or dead in less than 24 hours**, “the department shall submit a report to the center in a format established by the Attorney General.” Sub-section “C” also requires reporting directly to NCIC when a **person is found before they have been reported** missing to the center.

**Recommendation 2.2:** SFPD should include guidance on persons found within 24 hours to comply with the format established by the Attorney General.

**Recommendation 2.3:** SFPD should include guidance on who will report persons found before entry to NCIC.

The **State prohibits** departments from establishing policies requiring the **removal** of a missing person **from the center database based solely on the age of the person.**

**Recommendation 2.4:** SFPD should include a sentence explaining that members may not remove a person from the center database based solely on age, to ensure that the intent of the State law is followed.

SFPD should consider assigning all found person notifications to DOC or another specialized unit instead of a patrol officer to free up administrative time. (See Questions for Consideration).

**Recommendation 3: Ensure DGO 6.10 incorporates CA Pen. Code § 14250 (c)(2), which sets statutory requirements for engaging with parents and relatives about DNA testing.**

Pen. Code § 14250 (c)(2) states in relevant part:

“After a report has been made of a person missing under high-risk circumstances, the responsible investigating law enforcement agency shall inform the parents or other appropriate relatives that they may give a voluntary sample for DNA testing or may collect a DNA sample from a personal article belonging to the missing person if available...The responsible investigating law enforcement agency shall wait no longer than 30 days after a report has been made to inform the parents or other relatives of their right to give a sample.”

Currently, the draft DGO lacks guidance on engaging with relatives of missing persons about DNA testing. This Penal Code requirement should be added to the draft and assigned to a specific unit to ensure the Department complies with the statutory deadlines.

**Recommendation 3.1:** SFPD should include this provision of the Penal Code in a section on continuing investigations, which includes non-immediate statutory deadlines. (See Recommendation 11)

SFPD should consider assigning this function to DOC or another specialized unit instead of a patrol officer to free up administrative time. (See consideration #2).

**Recommendation 4: Draft a Checklist for “Initial Investigations” which complies with Penal Code § 13519.07 to ensure consistency in missing persons investigations.**

Penal Code § 13519.07 states that POST’s *Guidelines for Handling Missing Persons Investigations* should be used as the model policy or example in developing the checklist document. Guideline 2.1 and 2.2 provides a systemic framework for responding officers to make initial contact and an initial assessment to determine what reasonable steps should be taken.

The current initial investigations checklist in the draft DGO includes a bulleted list which does not follow linear process. For example:

- a) The first bullet instructs officers to review “results of inquiries made to other departments” without first instructing officers to make inquiries, what they should inquire about, and where they should route the inquiries.
- b) The 5<sup>th</sup> bullet “whether dental or skeletal x-rays of the missing person are available...” is not an initial investigatory step and belongs in a section on follow-up investigations (within 30 days).
- c) The last item on the list includes “broadcast a BOLO”, despite this being a step required without delay by Penal Code § 14211(d).

**Recommendation 4.1:** SFPD should review POST Guideline 2.1 and 2.2 and draft linear guidance in this DGO or a separate Missing Persons checklist.

Several jurisdictions have models that SFPD can use to create a clear and comprehensive list. For example, Oakland PD includes initial steps for preliminary investigations, initial steps for “at-risk” persons, and initial supervisor responsibilities. **Linear guidance ensures that missing persons cases follow the same basic steps and simplifies review for supervisors.**

**Recommendation 4.2:** SFPD should add the following language in the initial investigation section of the DGO, “Officers should never consider any case routine. Officers should assume the missing person is in immediate danger or at risk until the facts contradict that assumption.” (See CA POST Missing Persons Investigation Guidelines and Curriculum, May 2021 at p. xiii). POST’s value statement reminds officers to treat all missing persons cases with urgency until they disprove the individual is not in immediate danger or at risk.

**Recommendation 5: Include CA Education Code § 49068.6 requirements in the DGO, to ensure schools can assist with potential parental abduction or runaway youth.**

Education Code § 49068.6 states in relevant part:

“(a) Any law enforcement agency responsible for the investigation of a **missing child shall inform the school district**, other local educational agency, or private school, in which the child is enrolled, **that the child is missing**. The notice shall be in writing, shall include a photograph of the child if a photograph is available, and shall be given **within 10 days** of the **child's disappearance**.”

**Recommendation 5.1:** SFPD should include direction on the State law requirement to notify schools about missing students.

The State explains that the purpose of the notification is two-fold:

- 1) In cases of parental abduction, the abductor will need to request previous school records to enroll the child in a new school.
- 2) In cases where a child runs away and returns to school without notifying their parents.

Adding the above requirement to the DGO will ensure that schools are prepared to provide notifications to SFPD if the above scenarios occur.

**Recommendation 5.2:** SFPD should additionally ensure that members are directed to use the Cal DOJ “Emergency School Notification Missing Or Abducted Child Alert” which is available [here](#).

**Recommendation 6: Ensure DGO 6.10 incorporates concepts from SFPD Department Bulletin 19-115 which provided clear, concise and specific guidance to officers.**

The following language from DB 19-115 ([expired](#)) provides clarity to officers who are investigating missing persons cases. The Department does not appear to have published additional guidance since the 2019 DB expired.

**Recommendation 6.1:** SFPD should include the following guidance from the expired DB 19-115 in DGO 6.10:

- 1) “...the officer accepting the report shall notify the Department Operations Center...as soon as practical to ensure the SFPD complies with Department of Justice reporting requirements.”

**Recommendation 6.2:** This language should also include the DOC’s timeline requirements, so officers have context for how quickly missing persons reports need to leave the Department. For example, “to ensure the SFPD complies with the Department of Justice requirement to report missing persons within: two hours for missing persons under 21 and at-risk individuals; or, without unreasonable delay for all other missing persons.”

- 2) “In instances where a missing person is already in [the Missing/Unidentified Persons System] and is later reported as a missing person under a new set of circumstances...officers and/or PSAs shall prepare a new incident report and notify DOC.”

**Recommendation 6.3:** Members should be directed to using Category Code "P" per CJIS Manual Section 7.5.1. This will ensure consistent entries for repeat missing persons cases.

- 3) "If any of the following at-risk or exigent circumstances exist, the SVU-Missing Persons Unit shall be notified, if after hours the Station Investigation Team shall handle the case until an investigator at SVU-Missing Persons can be contacted to take over the investigation."
- 4) At risk includes, "the missing person is over the age of 75."

**Recommendation 6.4:** SFPD should continue to include guidance on an upper age for at risk missing persons. However, SFPD should amend the to 65 because persons aged **65 or older trigger a quick response Silver Alert** and should be treated as an "at-risk" group.

- 5) "Per DGO 6.10, II, C, district station personnel are responsible for conducting an immediate and continuous search in cases involving risk- or exigent circumstances. The duration of a continuous search is at the discretion of the platoon commander of the affected station."

**Recommendation 6.5:** The current draft is missing any discussion of "continuous search." This concept should be explained for initial officers, SIT teams, supervisors, and the Platoon commander.

- 6) "All other missing person reports shall be assigned to the Station Investigation team..."

**Recommendation 6.6:** SFPD should provide guidance to the SIT teams included in the bulletin because they will be responsible for missing persons outside of business hours. The DN provides a paragraph of information that is missing from the DGO.

- 7) "If a missing person is located, the officer preparing the Found Person report shall confirm the identity of a found person, conduct a well-being check on the person, (and/or if found person is over the age of 75, have person medically assessed) and notify DOC as soon as practical."

These previously required steps will ensure that officers conduct a thorough debriefing with a found person to ensure that found persons are safe. This is especially important in cases where an individual goes missing without additional information or an elderly person suffering from a medical condition. The DPA has received multiple complaints related to elderly or developmentally disabled persons who were found and not properly debriefed.

- 8) "Members shall ask the found person if they were the victim of any crime."

As above, this should be standard practice for any found person. The DPA currently has a tolled case addressing this point which can be provided to the COP prior to closure.

- 9) "If an officer locates a missing person during a separate investigation or arrest, that member shall complete a supplemental report/separate found person report using the initial missing person case number."

10) "Officers assigned to the Airport Bureau shall follow the San Mateo County guidelines for Missing Persons."

**Recommendation 7: Re-arrange Policy Before Definition to Ensure Consistency.**

The current order does not fall in line with SFPD style guide.

**Recommendation 8: Incorporate information on California Highway Patrol's Emergency Notification and Tactical Alert Center (ENTAC), which manages Amber Alert, Silver Alert, Ebony Alert, EMA.**

The CHP Emergency Notification and Tactical Alert Center (ENTAC) is the State's coordinator for missing persons alerts in California and offers investigatory assistance for missing persons investigations. The draft DGO does not include guidance on contacting ENTAC or using California's multiple public alert systems (including Amber, Silver and EMA).

**Recommendation 8.1:** SFPD should include information on ENTAC/Public Alerts so initial officers collect relevant information for supervisors to engage with ENTAC.

Expired DB 19-030 stated that the SVU Investigator and the SVU Lieutenant shall make the determination as to whether the incident meets the AMBER Alert Criteria. Additionally, it instructed the SVU Investigator to call CHP to when the criteria is met or to cancel AMBER alerts.

**Recommendation 8.2:** SFPD should designate who is responsible for engaging with ENTAC to activate alert systems.

**Recommendation 9: Facilitate training for members designated to engage with ENTAC.**

California has seven recognized alerts: Amber Alert, Blue Alert, Silver Alert, Feather Alert, Yellow Alert, Ebony Alert, and Endangered Missing Advisory. The CHP is responsible for activating all alerts but encourages investigating agencies to attend their free training. The training will enable members understand the procedures for each alert system, provide them with an opportunity to ask questions that arise, and hopefully improve public safety outcomes.

**Recommendation 9.1:** SFPD should require training for members designated to engage with ENTAC.

**Recommendation 10: Include Previously Removed Guidance from DGO 6.10 (Sept. 1999)**

SFPD removed prior guidance about what the OIC should do if they decided to end the search prior to locating a missing person.

1) "If the officer-in-charge decided to end the search prior to locating the missing person he/she shall... [include sub-bullets]."

**Recommendation 10.1:** The following language from DGO 6.10 should be added back into the current draft DGO.

**Recommendation 11: Delineate responsibilities for members and stages of investigation; including follow-up investigations.**

The current DGO draft lacks clarity because it mixes responsibilities of various members throughout the draft. The DGO should provide specific guidance for various units who are activated and involved in different stages of the missing persons investigation.

**Recommendation 11.1:** SFPD should organize the DGO based on the stage of the investigation. This should include urgent statutory deadlines in the “initial investigation” section and other deadlines in “follow-up investigations,” or a similar header.

- 1) Initial Investigation
- 2) Exigent Circumstances/At-Risk
- 3) Follow-Up Investigation (not included)

**Recommendation 11.2:** SFPD should organize sections to provide guidance to the specific units/members who have responsibilities during each stage.

- 1) Initial Officers
- 2) DOC Members
- 3) Supervisory Members
- 4) SVU/MPU

Several model policies and jurisdictions provide separate guidance for supervisors and follow-up investigations. For example, see National Center for Missing and Exploited Children Investigative Checklist for First Responders, the POST Guidelines and Curriculum, POST LD, and Oakland PD’s Missing Person’s policy.

**Recommendation 12: Develop criteria and guidance to engage with the Media Relations unit during missing persons cases.**

The SFPD’s Media Relations unit could play an important role in disseminating timely and accurate information, coordinating with local media, and engaging with the public during missing persons cases. The SFPD currently has no guidance in the Missing Persons DGO to utilize the Media Relations unit or harness social media to assist with investigations and amplify ENTAC’s media strategy.

**Recommendation 12.1:** SFPD should draft guidance for Investigators to work the Media Relations unit to publicize Missing Persons cases, especially child abductions and at-risk persons.

**Recommendation 13: Muni/BART notifications.**

In a recent DPA case, the responding officers made immediate BOLO notifications to Muni and BART for a missing juvenile whom they knew liked trains. While the missing juvenile was not found on either transit system, it was later determined that the juvenile did use BART. Quick thinking on the part of the responding officers created an opportunity for transit officials to find the juvenile.



**Recommendation 13.1:** SFPD should consider meeting with SFMTA and BART to establish a missing persons protocol that notifies vehicle operators and station agents about missing persons.

**Recommendation 13.2:** SFPD should consider adding guidance to the “initial officer checklist” to ask about a missing person’s familiarity with public transportation.

**Recommendation 14: Publish a Unit Order on Obtaining Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Evidence.**

The MTC is available to provide evidence such as Clipper Card, FastTrack, license plate images, but requires a search warrant to obtain the information. (California Streets and Highway Code § 31490) Members who would like to collect MTC evidence should fax their search warrants directly to MTC at (415) 536-9801 and address the search warrants to:

1. The “BATA Custodian of Records” for BATA (if requesting information from the State-owned toll bridges)
2. The “BAIFA Custodian of Records” for BAIFA (if requesting information from the Express Lanes under MTC’s control), and
3. The “MTC Custodian of Records” for any Clipper records

Additionally, members should know that:

1. BATA video footage from the State-owned toll bridges automatically rolls off servers after 60 days and is not retrievable after that.
2. BAIFA collects license plate images and transponder readings for all vehicles using the express lane only during tolling hours (5AM to 8PM Monday through Friday). During non-tolling hours, BAIFA does not take images and only collects transponder readings. Additionally, BAIFA does not save video footage. Transaction data is kept for 4.5 years while images are kept for 2 years.

**Recommendation 14.1:** SFPD should publish a unit order on obtaining Metropolitan Transportation Commission evidence.

**Recommendation 14.2:** SFPD should draft boilerplate search warrants that satisfies California Streets and Highway Code § 31490 to expedite missing persons evidence collection.

**Question for Consideration:**

Are there additional **administrative responsibilities DOC** can **manage** to free up patrol officer time?

For example:

1. Receive initial reports and coordinate follow up with SVU/MPU/Station Investigation Teams.
2. Coordinate with Media Relations.
3. Make all MUPS and NCIC Notifications.

4. Manage timing for ongoing missing persons cases (e.g. School notification, DNA sample collection, and NCIC notifications.)

## **Objectives**

DPA drafted the above recommendations with the following goals in mind:

1. Ensure SFPD adheres to relevant legal standards.
2. Provide guidance to members about roles and responsibilities.
3. Reduce administrative burden for patrol officers.
4. Ensure that DPA case examples are considered for policy purposes.

## **Missing Persons**

### **6.10.01 PURPOSE**

This order establishes policy concerning accepting reports of missing persons as directed by the California Penal Code, specifies when immediate searches are required, and provides guidance for handling the initial missing persons investigation.

### **6.10.02 DEFINITIONS**

**Missing Person** – Any person who is reported missing to a law enforcement agency until the person is located or determined to be a voluntarily missing adult. Additionally,

- Any child (any person under 18yrs of age) who is missing voluntarily or involuntarily, or under circumstances not conforming to his/her ordinary habits or behavior and who may need assistance (Penal Code §14215)
- Any child who has been taken, detained, concealed, enticed away, or retained by a parent in violation of the law (Penal Code § 277 et seq.).

**At risk** – A person is “at risk” when there is evidence or indications of the following, but is not limited to (Penal Code § 14215):

- A victim of a crime or foul play.
- A person missing and in need of medical attention.
- A missing person with no pattern of running away or disappearing.
- A missing person who may be the victim of parental abduction (Penal Code § 277 et seq.).
- A mentally impaired missing person, including cognitively impaired or developmentally disabled.
- A missing person under the age of 12

### **6.10.03 POLICY**

It is the Policy of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) that members shall immediately make an incident report in all cases where a concerned individual reports a person missing (including telephonic reports), regardless of the residence address or location of the reportee or missing person, the time reported, the age of the missing person, or the length of absence (Penal Code §14214(a)).

## 6.10.04 PROCEDURES

A. **Inquiries** - Prior to preparing an incident report, check with the County Jail or Juvenile Justice Center, SFGH (and any hospitals the missing person may frequent), and the Medical Examiner's Office to determine if any of these facilities have knowledge of the person.

### B. Initial Investigation

1. **Checklist** - Members conducting the initial investigation should reference and include the following:
  - Results of inquiries made to other departments.
  - Determine whether the person qualifies as a missing person and whether the person may be at risk.
  - Be cognizant of potential crime scene evidence, if applicable.
  - Physical descriptions, clothing, tattoos, and/or documented identifications (DMV, SFMUG, School ID, etc.) of the missing person.
  - Whether dental or skeletal x-rays of the missing person are available and the name and contact information of the doctor or dentist.
  - Possible destinations, places frequented, schools, addresses of friends and family and place of employment.
  - Information regarding the missing person's electronic communications devices such as cell phone number, e-mail address, and social media accounts.
  - If available, obtain a current photograph (either an electronic version, hard copy, or social media image and upload it to the incident report.
  - Whether a welfare check was conducted of the missing person's residence, business, and/or school and the results of that check.
  - Shall broadcast a "Be On Look-Out" (BOLO) notification via Dispatch, "on an all," if the person is under 21 years of age or if there is evidence that the missing person is at risk, without delay (Penal Code § 14211(d)).

The listed steps meet the checklist requirement set forth in Penal Code § 13519.07, for an initial missing persons investigative checklist.

2. **Notification** - Notify Department Operations Center (DOC). Operations shall enter the name of the missing person and all other required information listed above into the CLETS Missing/Unidentified Persons System (MUPS) as required by the DOJ:

- *within two hours* for persons under the age of 21 or at risk (Penal Code § 14211(e)),
- *within four hours* for persons aged 21 or older after accepting the report.

3. **Reports Missing Persons outside of San Francisco** – Members are reminded to accept all reports of missing persons as noted in this policy (Penal Code §14214(a)). Per Penal Code 14211(g), members shall, without delay, and in the case of persons under 21 years of age or if there was evidence that the missing person was at risk, within no more than 24 hours, notify, and forward a copy of the report to the police or sheriff's

department or departments having jurisdiction of the residence address of the missing person or runaway and of the place where the person was last seen.

### C. Exigent Circumstances / Immediate Searches

1. **Criteria** - Certain circumstances are considered “at risk” and exigent and require an immediate search to be conducted. The following are examples of at risk and exigent circumstances:
  - The missing person is under the age of 12; however, infants or children in the company of the missing parent/legal guardian do not meet the criteria unless the member has reason to believe that the safety of the child or the infant is in jeopardy. When parental abduction is suspected, members shall take a report (Penal Code §14214(a)) and notify the District Attorney’s Child Abduction Recovery Unit (CARU) for follow up investigation.
  - Any juvenile that has no documented or undocumented pattern of running away or disappearing, the disappearance does not appear to be voluntary, and the juvenile has had no contact with the reporting party.
  - Circumstances exist to believe the missing person is a dependent adult or lacks the cognitive abilities to care for themselves.
  - The missing person is not able to care for their safety based on contemporaneous threats of suicide or self-harm.
  - The missing person requires immediate medical attention that if left untreated, would cause death or serious risk to their health.
  - The member suspects foul play or believes exceptional facts exist.
2. **Documentation** - If an immediate search is conducted, members should document the search in a supplemental report, articulating the steps that were taken to locate the missing person. At the end of the searching members’ watch, the platoon commander should either reassign the search to another unit or determine if the search is to be terminated.
3. **Notification** - If exigent circumstances exist, the member should immediately notify their field supervisor, as well as the Missing Person Unit during business hours or DOC after hours/on the weekends.
4. **Immediate Search Termination** - An immediate search can be terminated only when the person is located or with the approval of the platoon commander of the unit conducting the search.

### D. Children Missing from Foster Care, Family Home, or Childcare Institutions.

1. Pursuant to the *Bringing Missing Children Home Act*, all law enforcement agencies are mandated to notify the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) of each child reported missing from a foster care, family

home, or childcare institution. To report a missing child to NCMEC, go to: <https://www.missingkids.org/theissues/missingfromcare>

2. For questions or technical problems, please contact NCMEC at 1-800-THE-LOST.
3. Document date and time the entry to NCMEC was made in the incident report.

#### **E. Found Persons**

1. **Notification** - A missing person needs to be physically seen and identified prior to a “Found Person” report being completed. If a missing person is arrested or detained, add the title, “Found Person,” to the report heading and route a copy to SVU. Notify DOC to remove all entries from the MUPS/NCIC systems once the missing person has been positively identified and located.
2. **Juveniles** - If the person is a juvenile (under 18 years) and there is no reason for a custodial arrest, the following options may be used:
  - If the juvenile resides in San Francisco, return the juvenile to the verified place of residence.
  - Take the juvenile to the district station business office for pickup by a relative or guardian providing the response can be made within one hour (Refer to DGO 7.01 regarding juveniles at District Stations).
  - If a relative or guardian will not or cannot respond within one hour, take the juvenile to Huckleberry House, 1292 Page St.
3. **Returned Before Reporting** - If the missing person returns or is located before the submission of the report, and an incident report is still required, title the report “missing person” and “found person” and include the circumstances in the narrative.

#### References

DGO 7.01 Juvenile Procedures  
National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC)  
SFPD FTO Manual – Missing Persons