

From: [Betty Traynor](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD NOT in Compliance with AB481 - Item 2 on 7/11/22 Rules Comm. Agenda
Date: Sunday, July 10, 2022 7:11:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear members of the Rules Committee,

I am writing to urge you to NOT recommend to the full Board of Supervisors the SFPD's proposed policy related to AB 481 until the policy fully complies with AB481's requirements.

AB 481 is a new law that requires California law enforcement agencies to publish information about a range of militarized gear used in policing and jails, and to obtain approval of policies about the use of this military equipment.

SFPD's proposal for military equipment has several problems, including points of non-compliance with AB 481.

Examples include:

- The proposed policy excludes both an inventory and policy for assault rifles that SFPD possesses.

- The proposed policy is missing independent oversight required by AB 481.

- The proposed policy doesn't define authorized uses, and grants limitless authorization.

- The proposed policy fails to comply with AB481's ban on chemical and impact weapons (tear gas and rubber bullets) for crowd control.

Also, the proposed policy doesn't limit use on persons experiencing mental health crises - including those indicating self-harm.

The policy for deploying armored vehicles is ambiguous and vague, with no limits on authorized uses.

Important Question: Does the use policy exclude or prohibit use of military equipment for public relations purposes or activities, such as bringing an armored vehicle to a fair or school? It should--We do not want children thinking armored vehicles or other military equipment are toys to play with and thus harmless.

Please take time to thoroughly consider the proposed policy.

The Board of Supervisors has until mid-November to take action before the use of equipment would be affected. ***This is a serious matter and the Board should not do this quickly.*** The law gives the Board time to listen and consider objections by community members, send the policy back to staff for amendments, consult with the department, city attorney, and others, before adopting a policy.

Thank you very much for your serious consideration of my concerns with the SFPD's compliance with AB 481.

Betty Traynor

S.F. Resident

Member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) - S.F. Branch

Oldest women's peace organization, began in 1915.

From: [regina.sneed](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: SFPD NOT in Compliance with AB481 - Item 2 on 7/11/22 Rules Comm. Agenda
Date: Sunday, July 10, 2022 8:40:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear members of the Rules Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

AB481 requires the City to provide information to the public annually on the range of military equipment the police and sheriff departments use in policing . The Board must approve the policy. To my knowledge the Sheriff's department has not submitted its proposed policy, having missed the statutory deadline.

I urge the Rules Committee to return the Police department policy for further development to address deficiencies in meeting the requirements of AB 481. It would make sense to review and approve both policies together and you have plenty of time to do so.

I want to provide just a few examples of things that need to be addressed:

I do not see any mention of the use of assault rifles. I believe Both Departments have them.

There is no independent oversight of the policy as required. If this ordinance is not done correctly now, there will be no adequate annual review and oversight.

As San Francisco is a city with many protests, I do not see references required by AB481 that ban chemical or impact weapons like rubber bullets and tear gas from being used for crowd control.

I do not see affirmative statements about how the city will use this equipment in situations involving people suffering mental breakdowns, or people with disabilities that could be harmed by equipment.

There are other issues which are not included in the draft that deserve a public hearing. I request that the appropriate Board Committee hold a hearing to get public input on this subject.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns on the city's compliance with this important law.

Regina Sneed
San Francisco resident
And member of San Francisco Branch
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

From: [Arla Ertz](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD NOT in Compliance with AB481 - Item 2 on 7/11/22 Rules Comm. Agenda Inbox
Date: Monday, July 11, 2022 7:44:53 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear members of the Rules Committee:

I am a San Francisco resident, taxpayer, and voter. I strongly urge you to **NOT** recommend to the full Board of Supervisors the SFPD's proposed policy related to AB481 until the policy fully complies with AB481's requirements, which it currently fails to do.

AB481 is a new law that requires California law enforcement agencies to publish information about militarized gear they use in policing and jails, and to obtain approval of policies about the use of this military equipment. SFPD's proposal for military equipment has several problems and key omissions, including points of noncompliance with AB481.

Please carefully consider each element of the proposal, including the following examples:

- ~ As proposed, SFPD's policy would exclude both an inventory and policy for assault rifles that SFPD possesses
- ~ As proposed, the policy omits independent oversight required under AB481.
- ~ As proposed, the policy fails to define authorized uses, and grants limitless authorization.
- ~ As proposed, the policy is out of compliance with AB481's ban on chemical and impact weapons (tear gas and rubber bullets) for crowd control.
- ~ As proposed, the policy neglects to limit use on persons experiencing mental health crises, including those indicating self-harm.
- ~ As proposed, the policy for deploying armored vehicles is ambiguous and vague, with no limits on authorized uses.

Having worked professionally for over a couple of decades as a social worker in the field of child mental and behavioral health (as program director of an expressive arts program for homeless and other at-risk children, as an early intervention mental health consultant for an agency serving homeless children and their families, etc.) I am further concerned about whether the use policy excludes or prohibits use of military equipment for public relations purposes or activities, such as bringing an armored vehicle to a fair or school. It must! It is unacceptable to allow use of such equipment in any way that could lead children to think of armored vehicles or other military equipment as fun! They must not be encouraged or even merely tempted to think of them as toys to play with and thus harmless. I'm sure that you can appreciate the myriad negative repercussions of such "training" at young, impressionable ages,

and recognize that it is imperative to ensure the policy clearly prevents risk of such outcomes.

Please take ample time to thoroughly consider all elements of the proposed policy and their weaknesses--there is no requirement or need to rush to a decision! The Board of Supervisors has until mid-November to take action before the use of equipment would be affected. This is a serious matter and I implore you not to move too quickly, at the expense of meticulously diligent attention. The law gives the Board time to listen and consider objections from community members, send the policy back to staff for amendments, consult with the department, city attorney, and others, before adopting a policy.

Thank you for your conscientious consideration of my concerns with the SFPD's lack of compliance with AB481, and for your careful, detailed deliberation.

Sincerely,

Arla S. Ertz
Member, San Francisco branch, Women's International League for Peace & Freedom
1096 Fulton St., Apt. 7
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: [Arla Ertz](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD NOT in Compliance with AB481 - Item 2 on 7/11/22 Rules Comm. Agenda Inbox
Date: Monday, July 11, 2022 7:44:53 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear members of the Rules Committee:

I am a San Francisco resident, taxpayer, and voter. I strongly urge you to **NOT** recommend to the full Board of Supervisors the SFPD's proposed policy related to AB481 until the policy fully complies with AB481's requirements, which it currently fails to do.

AB481 is a new law that requires California law enforcement agencies to publish information about militarized gear they use in policing and jails, and to obtain approval of policies about the use of this military equipment. SFPD's proposal for military equipment has several problems and key omissions, including points of noncompliance with AB481.

Please carefully consider each element of the proposal, including the following examples:

- ~ As proposed, SFPD's policy would exclude both an inventory and policy for assault rifles that SFPD possesses
- ~ As proposed, the policy omits independent oversight required under AB481.
- ~ As proposed, the policy fails to define authorized uses, and grants limitless authorization.
- ~ As proposed, the policy is out of compliance with AB481's ban on chemical and impact weapons (tear gas and rubber bullets) for crowd control.
- ~ As proposed, the policy neglects to limit use on persons experiencing mental health crises, including those indicating self-harm.
- ~ As proposed, the policy for deploying armored vehicles is ambiguous and vague, with no limits on authorized uses.

Having worked professionally for over a couple of decades as a social worker in the field of child mental and behavioral health (as program director of an expressive arts program for homeless and other at-risk children, as an early intervention mental health consultant for an agency serving homeless children and their families, etc.) I am further concerned about whether the use policy excludes or prohibits use of military equipment for public relations purposes or activities, such as bringing an armored vehicle to a fair or school. It must! It is unacceptable to allow use of such equipment in any way that could lead children to think of armored vehicles or other military equipment as fun! They must not be encouraged or even merely tempted to think of them as toys to play with and thus harmless. I'm sure that you can appreciate the myriad negative repercussions of such "training" at young, impressionable ages,

and recognize that it is imperative to ensure the policy clearly prevents risk of such outcomes.

Please take ample time to thoroughly consider all elements of the proposed policy and their weaknesses--there is no requirement or need to rush to a decision! The Board of Supervisors has until mid-November to take action before the use of equipment would be affected. This is a serious matter and I implore you not to move too quickly, at the expense of meticulously diligent attention. The law gives the Board time to listen and consider objections from community members, send the policy back to staff for amendments, consult with the department, city attorney, and others, before adopting a policy.

Thank you for your conscientious consideration of my concerns with the SFPD's lack of compliance with AB481, and for your careful, detailed deliberation.

Sincerely,

Arla S. Ertz
Member, San Francisco branch, Women's International League for Peace & Freedom
1096 Fulton St., Apt. 7
San Francisco, CA 94117