

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: CHARNA B <charnab1@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 11:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS)
Subject: Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology"

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about the amendment (page 12, lines 8-9) that says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance. The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part of the amendment should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you,
Charna Ball
Pierce Street
SFCA 94123

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Calvin Chow <chow299@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 10:40 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: Amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

San Francisco Police needs private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe. **Thank you.**

Calvin Chow
Resident of District 8

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Angelica Nguyen <angelica@zfplaw.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 1:58 PM
To: Major, Erica (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc: Ryan Patterson
Subject: RE: RE File No. 140049-Amendments to the HCO at Land Use Committee Today Monday, April 29

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

Good Afternoon,

Our process server submitted the hard copies earlier today to Richard Lidente. We were informed that he declined to provide us with an endorsed stamped copy. Can you please assist with this situation and clarify as to how we can obtain an endorsed copy of our submission?

Thank you.

Regards,
Angelica Nguyen
Administrative Assistant
Zacks, Freedman & Patterson, PC
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 956-8100
Facsimile: (415) 288-9755
www.zfplaw.com

This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies. Unless expressly stated, nothing in this communication should be regarded as tax advice.

From: Angelica Nguyen
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 12:34 PM
To: 'erica.major@sfgov.org'; 'Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org'
Cc: Andrew Zacks; 'Emery, Jim (CAT)'; 'Ruiz-Esquide, Andrea (CAT)'; 'Jensen, Kristen (CAT)'; 'arthur.coon@msrlegal.com'; Ryan Patterson; Autumn Skerski; Mary Bhojwani
Subject: RE File No. 140049-Amendments to the HCO at Land Use Committee Today Monday, April 29

Dear Mss. Calvillo and Major:

Please find attached a letter from Ryan Patterson and Declaration in Support regarding file number 140049.

Regards,
Angelica Nguyen
Administrative Assistant
Zacks, Freedman & Patterson, PC
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 400

San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 956-8100
Facsimile: (415) 288-9755
www.zfplaw.com

This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies. Unless expressly stated, nothing in this communication should be regarded as tax advice.

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Laura Fingal-Surma <laura.surma@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 12:46 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Cc: stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject: Please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you,
Laura Fingal-Surma
Noe Valley

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: EAK <eak@prodigy.net>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 11:56 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about the amendment (page 12, lines 8-9) that says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance. The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part of the amendment should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thanks,

EA Kline
Pac Heights

Sent from an iPhone

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: EAK <eak@prodigy.net>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 11:54 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Allow vidcams to help stop crime

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

Thanks,

EA Kline
Pac Heights

Sent from an iPhone

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Peter Fortune <peter.fortune@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 11:33 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: AMEND the video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisors:

Many in our residential and commercial neighborhoods have private security cameras whose video footage is readily, and eagerly, available to the SFPD to support their efforts to catch criminals, especially auto burglars and package thieves.

Supporting the SFPD is the primary — if not the only — reason why we have these private video cameras.

So PLEASE AMEND the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance such that it CLEARLY ALLOWS the SFPD to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) says only that police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where the current version says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be UNDULY AND UNNECESSARILY ONEROUS if applied to private citizens and businesses. PLEASE DELETE THIS PART.

EVERN WORSE is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could -- and probably would -- jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

I parrot here the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

Peter Fortune
3579 Pierce Street, SF

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: JeNeal Granieri <jenealann@att.net>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 10:52 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

JeNeal Granieri
Golden Gate Heights

SF.

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: lorrie french <outlook_7F7C3A13B310547F@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 9:48 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

Lorraine French
1325 Page Street #4
San Francisco, CA 94117
lorriefrench@gmail.com

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Scott Sellman <ssellman@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 9:35 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: Please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thanks you for listening,
Scott Sellman
849 Noriega St

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Matthew Rivette <rivettematthew@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 8:32 AM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor: Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses. There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video. I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted. Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety. These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you,
Matthew Rivette
Corona Heights

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: BH <brian@bayplan.onmicrosoft.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 8:23 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

Sincerely,
Brian

Brian Higginbotham
616 Sanchez Street
San Francisco, CA 94114-2611

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Meredith Serra <meredithserra@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 8:20 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisors:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety. This part should be deleted.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Meredith Serra
Westwood Highlands

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Karen Crommie <kcrommie@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 3:24 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Karen Crommie
628 Ashbury St
SF94117

Sent from my iPad

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Deb Holcomb <dholcombca@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 9:37 PM
To: Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Amend the Video Surveillance Law

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

Dear Supervisor Yee:

I live in District 7 near the Tiled Steps and not far from Golden Gate Park where I run every morning. I regularly see the smashed glass on the sidewalks due to smash n' grabs in my neighborhood. I take extra precautions whenever I leave my home because of the property crimes in my area. Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

I rely on groups like Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime, to make my neighborhood safer for all its residents. I agree with Stop Crime SF that the Video Surveillance Law legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about the amendment (page 12, lines 8-9) that says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance. The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part of the amendment should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it

could jeopardize public safety.

Thank your work to stop crime in District 7 and keep your residents safe (and feeling safe) in their homes and neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Debra Holcomb
54 Lurline Street

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: james reece <macreecejr@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 7:41 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sent from my iPhone

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: David Young <dave@artichokelabs.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 7:40 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about the amendment (page 12, lines 8-9) that says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance. The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part of the amendment should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

—dave

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: armand der-hacobian <hacobian@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 5:29 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Al H <aha711@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 2:54 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

A Hampel

Sent from my iPhone

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: John Cranshaw <johncranshaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 2:41 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to and appreciate your support.

John and Michelle Cranshaw

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Rachel Miller-Garcia <rachelmg2121@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 2:36 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisors:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9).

The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime, of which i am a member and I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you!

Rachel
Rachel Miller-Garcia
415-810-1408 c

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Susan Fisch <sfisch116@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 1:14 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Susan Fisch
Ashbury Heights
SF resident for 29 years

Sent from my iPhone

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Jamie Whitaker <jamiewhitaker@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 12:50 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: Vision Zero goal needs you to please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

I want to express my concern over any impediments to video surveillance being used to hold hit and run drivers in addition to property and violent criminals accountable in San Francisco.

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sincerely,
Jamie Whitaker
District 6 resident

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Devi Joseph <drdevisf@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 12:48 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you,
Dr. Devorah Joseph
862 39th Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94121

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Jorge Garcia <jorge.garcia@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 12:35 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sincerely,
Jorge Garcia (District 5 resident)

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Gugelmann, Hallam (UCSF)
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 11:26 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisors,

As an emergency medicine physician in San Francisco, I have a very special interest in the city's security. I urge you to please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. We have had packages and things stolen out of ours and friends' cars with increasing frequency recently. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Hallam

Hallam Gugelmann, MD MPH
Attending Physician, Emergency Medicine, CPMC Mission Bernal Hospital Medical Toxicology Attending, University of California at San Francisco Assistant Medical Director, California Poison Control System, San Francisco Division

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Art Wydler <aaw215@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:56 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sent from my iPhone

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Art Wydler <aaw215@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:56 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sent from my iPhone

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Mary Burns <mfb613@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:54 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor: Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses. There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video. I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted. Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety. These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Amy Johnson <amykj1@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:49 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: URGENT: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Amy Johnson
Homeowner/resident
District 7, Miraloma Park

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Miner Lowe <minersfo@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:48 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sent from my iPad

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Leslie <koelsch1886@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:42 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: Surveillance Technology

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Luke Perkocha <luke3580@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:19 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisors:

I have been contacted by Stop Crime SF to call your attention to needed amendments to this ordinance. However, I have independently been monitoring this issue and the various supervisors' positions, so am very familiar with the ordinance proposed by Supervisor Peskin, the ballot initiative that it is pursuant to and the issue of property crime in San Francisco. This crime epidemic (there is no other word for it) and the consequent loss of the feeling of safety for residents that it results in, affects far more voting San Franciscans than any hypothetical or actual (and rare) abuses of the technology by our government to date.

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you very much,

Luke Perkocha MD, MBA
Member, Board of Trustees, Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Donna T <donnasffn@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:17 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Local government should not hinder the only tools residents have that provide us with a sense of security. Without our cameras, we are essentially inviting criminals to our City to commit crimes they cannot get away with anywhere else. It is imperative that you allow video camera surveillance to be used by law enforcement without restriction.

Sincerely,
Donna Turner
1154 Alemany Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94112
(415) 425-0872

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: roger capilos <rcapilos@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:16 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: Fw: please amend video surveillance law

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

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: roger capilos <rcapilos@yahoo.com>
To: Joe Fitzgerald Rodriguez <joe@smediaco.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019, 10:15:29 AM PDT
Subject: Fw: please amend video surveillance law

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: roger capilos <rcapilos@yahoo.com>
To: Hillary Ronen <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019, 10:13:48 AM PDT
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

Dear Supervisor: Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses. There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video. I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted. Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety. These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe. You the Supervisors have to make a decision... are you more concerned over the rights of thieves, rapists and taggers or are you concerned with the safety of the citizens of San Francisco. We will be watching the end result of this issue closely and we will be supporting candidates that love San Franciscans and not criminals. Roger Capilos Crocker Amazon 318 Allison St. SF Ca. 94112

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Stop Crime SF <stopcrimesf@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:13 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: please amend surveillance ordinance

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



April 27, 2019

Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

We're also worried about the amendment (page 12, lines 8-9) that says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance. The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part of the amendment should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. We agree that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But we feel that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Frank Noto, president
Joel Engardio, vice president
Stop Crime SF
www.stopcrimesf.com

Young, Victor (BOS)

From: Nancy Panelo <n1panelo@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:10 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); MandelmanStaff, [BOS]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sent from my iPhone