

From: [regina.sneed](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rules Committee Military Equipment Policy agenda item: File number 220641
Date: Thursday, October 20, 2022 3:06:57 PM

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

Dear Members:

Please accept these comments on the revised draft ordinance scheduled to be heard in Committee on October 24, 2022, as I am not able to attend the hearing.

AB 481 is a public information and accountability tool. The law requires the Board of Supervisors to approve a use of military equipment ordinance only if the use policy will safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights and civil liberties. I hope you will take the time to ensure that the ordinance does that from its inception and I hope you will include the requirements for the annual reporting to make sure you get all the information to perform your important oversight role.

San Francisco is a city of peace and does not favor the militarization of the police. With this ordinance, the Board has an obligation to review why we need the equipment and whether there are alternate means to accomplish policing policies and programs to protect the public.

Military equipment is more frequently deployed in low-income Black and Brown communities meaning that the impacts of misuse of military equipment is more acutely felt in these communities. Recent news reports indicate that the police and regulators of the police can not yet agree on a use of force policy. Will military equipment be misused if we do not have clear and specific descriptions for its usage that can be understood by citizens.

The ordinance lists all the equipment and it's permitted use but does not adequately explain the actual operational costs which from a citizens perspective includes the purchase price, the storage costs, the maintenance cost, the cost of operation, the training of operators and any need for replacements. Will the annual report provide a cost benefit analysis to determine whether we need the item at all or whether there is a better less costly option. The citizens want better community policing and social services. Where should our limited funds go?

The ordinance relies on the Board of Supervisors to protect the public interest but that is not enough in this complex world. The ordinance should include a private right of action to allow citizens to file suits to insure compliance with the law. California has championed this concept of consumer protection for the public in many laws since the 1970's. The ordinance should include this provision.

There are a few specific concerns that I do not think have been sufficiently addressed in the ordinance. In the description of use for some equipment, it is not clear to me how different special populations such as people with developmental disabilities, people with language barriers and people who can not hear or see would be protected. The ban on use of equipment must be very clear for these populations.

I am not clear whether this draft contains the required ban against use of chemical weapons like tear gas and rubber bullets from being used to control crowds. San Franciscans enjoy their protected first amendment rights to protest peacefully. The ordinance should reflect these rights.

Please take the time to pass a ordinance that safeguards public safety and civil liberties. I would also note that the Sheriff's Department has failed to submit its ordinance to the Board. The public should have a chance to review these ordinances together.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Regina Sneed
District Two resident
Life member Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
San Francisco Branch

From: [regina.sneed](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rules Committee Military Equipment Policy agenda item: File number 220641
Date: Thursday, October 20, 2022 3:06:57 PM

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

Dear Members:

Please accept these comments on the revised draft ordinance scheduled to be heard in Committee on October 24, 2022, as I am not able to attend the hearing.

AB 481 is a public information and accountability tool. The law requires the Board of Supervisors to approve a use of military equipment ordinance only if the use policy will safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights and civil liberties. I hope you will take the time to ensure that the ordinance does that from its inception and I hope you will include the requirements for the annual reporting to make sure you get all the information to perform your important oversight role.

San Francisco is a city of peace and does not favor the militarization of the police. With this ordinance, the Board has an obligation to review why we need the equipment and whether there are alternate means to accomplish policing policies and programs to protect the public.

Military equipment is more frequently deployed in low-income Black and Brown communities meaning that the impacts of misuse of military equipment is more acutely felt in these communities. Recent news reports indicate that the police and regulators of the police can not yet agree on a use of force policy. Will military equipment be misused if we do not have clear and specific descriptions for its usage that can be understood by citizens.

The ordinance lists all the equipment and it's permitted use but does not adequately explain the actual operational costs which from a citizens perspective includes the purchase price, the storage costs, the maintenance cost, the cost of operation, the training of operators and any need for replacements. Will the annual report provide a cost benefit analysis to determine whether we need the item at all or whether there is a better less costly option. The citizens want better community policing and social services. Where should our limited funds go?

The ordinance relies on the Board of Supervisors to protect the public interest but that is not enough in this complex world. The ordinance should include a private right of action to allow citizens to file suits to insure compliance with the law. California has championed this concept of consumer protection for the public in many laws since the 1970's. The ordinance should include this provision.

There are a few specific concerns that I do not think have been sufficiently addressed in the ordinance. In the description of use for some equipment, it is not clear to me how different special populations such as people with developmental disabilities, people with language barriers and people who can not hear or see would be protected. The ban on use of equipment must be very clear for these populations.

I am not clear whether this draft contains the required ban against use of chemical weapons like tear gas and rubber bullets from being used to control crowds. San Franciscans enjoy their protected first amendment rights to protest peacefully. The ordinance should reflect these rights.

Please take the time to pass a ordinance that safeguards public safety and civil liberties. I would also note that the Sheriff's Department has failed to submit its ordinance to the Board. The public should have a chance to review these ordinances together.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Regina Sneed
District Two resident
Life member Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
San Francisco Branch

From: [regina.sneed](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Rules Committee Military Equipment Policy agenda item: File number 220641
Date: Friday, October 21, 2022 4:41:09 PM

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

Dear Members:

Please see the attached article about the use of armed robots by police in Oakland. I wish to add to my statement below that the San Francisco ordinance should ban arming robots for any police use in San Francisco.

Thank you.

Regina Sneed

<https://theintercept.com/2022/10/17/police-robot-gun-oakland/> Sent from my iPad

On Oct 20, 2022, at 3:06 PM, regina.sneed <reginasneed@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Members:

Please accept these comments on the revised draft ordinance scheduled to be heard in Committee on October 24, 2022, as I am not able to attend the hearing.

AB 481 is a public information and accountability tool. The law requires the Board of Supervisors to approve a use of military equipment ordinance only if the use policy will safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights and civil liberties. I hope you will take the time to ensure that the ordinance does that from its inception and I hope you will include the requirements for the annual reporting to make sure you get all the information to perform your important oversight role.

San Francisco is a city of peace and does not favor the militarization of the police. With this ordinance, the Board has an obligation to review why we need the equipment and whether there are alternate means to accomplish policing policies and programs to protect the public.

Military equipment is more frequently deployed in low-income Black and Brown communities meaning that the impacts of misuse of military equipment is more acutely felt in these communities. Recent news reports indicate that the police and regulators of the police can not yet agree on a use of force policy. Will military equipment be misused if we do not have clear and specific descriptions

for its usage that can be understood by citizens.

The ordinance lists all the equipment and it's permitted use but does not adequately explain the actual operational costs which from a citizens perspective includes the purchase price, the storage costs, the maintenance cost, the cost of operation, the training of operators and any need for replacements. Will the annual report provide a cost benefit analysis to determine whether we need the item at all or whether there is a better less costly option. The citizens want better community policing and social services. Where should our limited funds go?

The ordinance relies on the Board of Supervisors to protect the public interest but that is not enough in this complex world. The ordinance should include a private right of action to allow citizens to file suits to insure compliance with the law.

California has championed this concept of consumer protection for the public in many laws since the 1970's. The ordinance should include this provision.

There are a few specific concerns that I do not think have been sufficiently addressed in the ordinance. In the description of use for some equipment, it is not clear to me how different special populations such as people with developmental disabilities, people with language barriers and people who can not hear or see would be protected. The ban on use of equipment must be very clear for these populations.

I am not clear whether this draft contains the required ban against use of chemical weapons like tear gas and rubber bullets from being used to control crowds. San Franciscans enjoy their protected first amendment rights to protest peacefully. The ordinance should reflect these rights.

Please take the time to pass a ordinance that safeguards public safety and civil liberties. I would also note that the Sheriff's Department has failed to submit its ordinance to the Board. The public should have a chance to review these ordinances together.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Regina Sneed

District Two resident

Life member Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

San Francisco Branch

From: [Betty Traynor](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rules Committee 10/24/22: Military Equipment Policy agenda item: File number 220641
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 1:26:55 AM

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

Dear members of the SF Board of Supervisors Rules Committee,

I have just looked at the SFPD letter of compliance with AB 481 and its list of military weapons they possess--Unbelievable! See partial list of what SFPD has in its inventory for use (in bold):

- Mine-resistant ambush-protected (MRAP) vehicles or armored personnel carriers: **Lenco BearCat with a Patriot 3 Liberator Ramp System**
- Battering rams, slugs, and breaching apparatuses: **Energetic Breaching Tool, Kinetic Breaching Tool, Pan Disrupter (attached to a robot), Ballistic Breacher Rounds** -
- "Flashbang" grenades and explosive breaching tools, "tear gas" and "pepper balls": **Flash Banks, Pepperball System**
- Projectile launch platforms and their associated munitions: **40mm Launcher, 12 Gauge (GA) Pump-Action Shotgun, 12GA Super-Sock Bean Bag Model 2581, CTS 4556 OC Impact, and more...**

Does the SFPD really need these weapons of war in our city--against whom will they use them? For what purpose? Will they be publicly displayed to be "shown off" in our communities to intimidate us?

Please members of the Board of Supervisors seriously question the SFPD's reason for these weapons? When and why do they anticipate using them? Will their loss really "jeopardize the safety of visitors, residents, and peace officers" or make us less safe by their very presence.

We are not a City at war but one that should be striving for peaceful resolution of conflicts.

Thank you very much,

Betty Traynor
District 5
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom-SF Branch

From: [Adrienne Fong](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: To Rules Committee RE - Item 6 220641 [Administrative Code - Funding, Acquisition, and Use of Certain Police Department Equipment]
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 9:00:50 AM
Importance: High

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

To Supervisors Chan, Peskin and Mandelman,

From: Adrienne Fong (afong@jps.net)

RE: Item 6 on October 24, Rules Committee on the agenda

6. 220641 [Administrative Code - Funding, Acquisition, and Use of Certain Police Department Equipment]

As resident of San Francisco in district 2.

I was shock to learn of the arsenal of military equipment that SFPD has at its disposal.

My first impression was WHY? And WHO is this most likely to be used against. Lastly is do I trust SFPD?

The amount of money used for the equipment is appalling, when we have an increase of homelessness in SF and other pressing issues in SF.

A concern is that this equipment will primarily be used against Black, Brown and poor communities in SF. – especially as the economic situation gets worse.

I ASK THAT YOU QUESTION DEEPLY! There is significant data and guide lines missing in the report by SFPD, that is dangerous.

DON'T BE COMPLICIT IN PUTTING OUR MOST VULERALBE COMMUNITIES IN DANGER!

The militarization of SFPD is frightening!

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Adrienne Fong
afong@jps.net