

From: [Robert Rutkowski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Keith Abouchar](#)
Subject: San Francisco Shouldn't Arm Robots
Date: Thursday, December 1, 2022 9:15:26 AM

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

Mayor London N. Breed
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 554-6141
Fax: (415) 554-6160
Email: MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

President Shamann Walton
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 • Fax: (415) 554-5163 • TTY: (415) 554-5227
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: San Francisco Shouldn't Arm Robots

Dear Mayor and President:

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors on Nov. 29 voted 8 to 3 to approve on first reading a policy that would formally authorize the San Francisco Police Department to deploy deadly force via remote-controlled robots. The majority fell down the rabbit hole of security theater: doing anything to appear to be fighting crime, regardless of whether or not it has any tangible effect on public safety.

These San Francisco supervisors seem not only willing to approve dangerously broad language about when police may deploy robots equipped with explosives as deadly force, but they are also willing to smear those who dare to question its possible misuses as sensationalist, anti-cop, and dishonest.

When can police send in a deadly robot? According to the policy: "The robots listed in this section shall not be utilized outside of training and simulations, criminal apprehensions, critical incidents, exigent circumstances, executing a warrant or during suspicious device assessments." That's a lot of events: all arrests and all searches with warrants, and maybe some protests.

When can police use the robot to kill? After an amendment proposed by Supervisor Aaron Peskin, the policy now reads: "Robots will only be used as a deadly force option when [1] risk of loss of life to members of the public or officers is imminent and [2] officers cannot subdue the threat

after using alternative force options or de-escalation tactics options, ****or**** conclude that they will not be able to subdue the threat after evaluating alternative force options or de-escalation tactics. Only the Chief of Police, Assistant Chief, or Deputy Chief of Special Operations may authorize the use of robot deadly force options.”

The “or” in this policy (emphasis added) does a lot of work. Police can use deadly force after “evaluating alternative force options or de-escalation tactics,” meaning that they don’t have to actually try them before remotely killing someone with a robot strapped with a bomb. Supervisor Hillary Ronen proposed an amendment that would have required police to actually try these non-deadly options, but the Board rejected it.

The Board majority failed to address the many ways that police have used and misused technology, military equipment, and deadly force over recent decades.

Supervisors Ronen, Shamann Walton, and Dean Preston did a great job pushing back against this dangerous proposal. Police claimed this technology would have been useful during the 2017 Las Vegas mass shooting, in which the shooter was holed up in a hotel room. Supervisor Preston responded that it probably would not have been a good idea to detonate a bomb inside a hotel.

The police department representative also said the robot might be useful in the event of a suicide bomber. But exploding the robot’s bomb could detonate the suicide bomber’s device, thus fulfilling the terrorist’s aims. After common sense questioning from their peers, pro-robot supervisors dismissed concerns as being motivated by ill-formed ideas of “robocops.”

The Board majority failed to address the many ways that police have used and misused technology, military equipment, and deadly force over recent decades. They seem to trust that police would roll out this type of technology only in the absolutely most dire circumstances, but that’s not what the policy says. They ignore the innocent bystanders and unarmed people already killed by police using other forms of deadly force only intended to be used in dire circumstances. They didn’t account for the militarization of police response to protesters, such as the Minneapolis demonstration with overhead surveillance of a predator drone.

The fact is, police technology constantly experiences mission creep—meaning equipment reserved only for specific or extreme circumstances ends up being used in increasingly everyday or casual ways. This is why President Barack Obama in 2015 rolled back the Department of Defense’s 1033 program which had handed out military equipment to local police departments. He said at the time police must “embrace a guardian—rather than a warrior— mind-set to build trust and legitimacy both within agencies and with the public.”

Supervisor Rafael Mandleman smeared opponents of the bomb-carrying robots as “anti-cop,” and unfairly questioned the professionalism of civil rights groups. Nonsense. They are just asking why police need new technologies and under what circumstances they actually would be useful. This echoes the recent debate in which the Board of Supervisors enabled police to get live access to private security cameras, without any

realistic scenario in which it would prevent crime. This is disappointing from a Board that in 2019 made San Francisco the first municipality in the United States to ban police use of face recognition.

Thanks to a the strong coalition of concerned residents, civil rights and civil liberties activists, and others who pushed back against this policy. Also appreciated is Supervisors Walton, Preston, and Ronen for their reasoned arguments and commonsense defense of the city's most vulnerable residents, who too are harmed by police violence.

Fortunately, this fight isn't over. The Board of Supervisors needs to vote again on this policy before it becomes effective. Supervisors should vote "no." Do not give SFPD permission to kill people with robots. There are many alternatives available to police, even in extreme circumstances. Police equipment has a documented history of misuse and mission creep. While the proposed policy would authorize police to use armed robots as deadly force only when the risk of death is imminent, this legal standard has often been under-enforced by courts and criticized by activists. For the sake of constituents' rights and safety, they should vote no.

Yours sincerely,
Robert E. Rutkowski

cc:
Correspondence Team
Longworth House Office Building
Washington DC 20515
keith.abouchar@mail.house.gov

2527 Faxon Court
Topeka, Kansas 66605-2086
P/F: 1 785 379-9671
E-mail: r_e_rutkowski@att.net

From: [Janet Goldstein](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please do not approve killer robots
Date: Thursday, December 1, 2022 8:36:39 AM

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

Good morning. Respectfully, I request that the board **not approve** the use of robots that can apply lethal force by the Police Department. Human beings often do not do very well at deciding when to end someone else's life; how can we expect robots programmed by human beings to be any better at it?

Thank you for your consideration.

Janet L. Goldstein
1213 Lewis Dr
Socorro' NM 87801
410-402-3215

From: [Elvira Correa Lazaro](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: NO to Robots
Date: Thursday, December 1, 2022 8:10:58 AM

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

To whom it may concern:

As a citizen of Marin County and an active member of the SF community, I am requesting that you vote NO for the SFPD to have access to robots. The SFPD has shown time and time again that they will continue to use violence toward members of our community. Please stop this violence from increasing and becoming one of the worst mistakes in SF history.

We appreciate your prompt attention to this matter. Thank you for your important service to our community.

Regards,
Elvira Correa Lazaro

From: [Shea Robinson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD robot drones
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 9:46:19 PM

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

To the board of supervisors,

I am writing today in adamant opposition to the police having a robot drone that can kill suspects in its use. We need less police force not more. Our people need services not death sentences. Please oppose this and put the money in the hands of the people—food, shelter, rent relief, COVID support. These are the items people need.

Thank you,
Shea Robinson

Sent from my iPhone

From: [james k purcell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Killer robots
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 9:00:32 PM

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

Shame on you. Setting a policy like this. Very fitting with historical policies of SF. Full of hypocrisy it funny.

Well I hope the board of supervisors have to watch the video of the deaths they will cause by this policy. I just fear it will be enjoyed.

Once again SF shows it citizens why it best to look for someplace else to live.

I hope you

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Deborah Esters](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Lethal Robots for SFPD
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 8:27:37 PM

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

Hello Supervisors,
Please vote no. Vote against allowing lethal robots in SFPD.

Although they are operated by officers they are not officers.
They are a militarization of the police force.
They can be hacked and abused.
Accidents will happen and SF will be liable.
SF is a model city. We do not want the country to move in this direction.

Please. Vote. NO.
No lethal robots on our streets.

I live in SF and I Vote.
Sincerely, Debbie Esters district 2

From: [Maria Yates](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File #220641
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 3:19:46 PM

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

SF Board of Supervisors,

Last night I went into San Francisco and enjoyed some culture in the Castro. I bought some fairly expensive concert tickets. Afterwards I visited a bar in the SOMA district and then played some pool in the Mission. All in all, I had a lovely evening in the city and brought some of my East Bay dollars over the bridge.

I will not be doing that again as long as you allow robots to carry guns. I will not come to San Francisco. I will not spend my dollars there. I will not fly out of your airport. **This may be literally the worst idea I have ever heard of in my 42 years on this planet.**

Please rethink and rescind this decision. You are setting a dangerous precedent not only for San Francisco but for the country. You all should not have the power to make the decision that you made last night.

Sincerely,
Maria Yates
Berkeley, CA (and staying here from now on)

From: [Chrissy Hoffman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Will no longer visit SF
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 2:24:29 PM

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

Dear Board Members,

After my tickets to the SF Ballet in December, I will no longer visit San Francisco from my Berkeley home. I will not go to the DeYoung or SFMoma. I will not shop at Everlane on Valencia and then go get an El Faralito Burrito. I will not go visit my yoga teacher who has a studio in the outer Richmond. I will no longer do these things because of this stupid decision to allow robots capable of killing as police tools.

Supervisor Chan is quoted as saying "Robots equipped in this manner would only be used in extreme circumstances to save or prevent further loss of innocent lives," . Just like guns? Just like choke holds? And oversight when these tools are abused is deplorable coast to coast. There is no sign that these robots will be used thoughtfully or equitably without racism or discrimination.

Shame on you.

Very Sincerely,
Chrissy Hoffman

From: [Carol Denney](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: police use of lethal robots
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 9:31:12 AM

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

Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

November 30, 2022

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,
City Hall, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 • Fax: (415) 554-5163 • TTY: (415) 554-5227 •

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm nearly speechless that any one of you, let alone several of you, seem amenable to the use of lethal police robots even in the proposed constrained circumstances now being reported nationwide.

I would have thought the potential for abuse, especially in the light of the internal and systemic racism in Bay Area policing, would eliminate this proposal long before it was even discussed at the level of the Board of Supervisors.

The justification that "only high-ranking officers will be allowed to authorize deadly force" is hollow considering that high-ranking officers are not separate from the culture that has produced racist police texts and extremely disproportionate arrests of people of color.

Please vote this proposal down. I can't imagine a worse way to increase the suspicion and distrust of the police attempting to serve our community.

Sincerely,

Carol Denney
1970 San Pablo Avenue #4
Berkeley, CA 94702
510-548-1512

From: [Drew Krupa](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Robots
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 8:44:06 AM

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

Board of Supervisors,

Your decision to move forward on allowing the SFPD to deploy robots to use deadly force is horrifying, and truly feels like a large step into a dystopian future. The relationship between the public and police are already strained and for good reason, and giving police another means to execute people publicly without due process is despicable. There are thousands of cases of police choosing to use deadly force and unjustly ending people's lives, and I do not trust their discretion with this either. Creating further degrees of separation between law enforcement and citizens is not the answer. The idea of equipping a robot with a bomb does not make me feel safer, it makes me more afraid of police than I already am. This is NOT a decision that such a small group of people should be making for hundreds of thousands of people. Something like this is enough for me to begin planning to move out of this city for good.

A concerned citizen,
Drew Krupa

From: [Michael Bauce](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Lethal Robots Approval
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 8:33:29 AM

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

To Those Who Voted Yes: Have you lost your minds? Who are you serving, the corrupt SFPD? Shame. Michael Bauce

Sent from my iPhone

From: [James Stieger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: use of lethal force by robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 9:26:02 PM

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

Hello,

I read a draft of a policy condoning the use of deadly force by robots. This is an absolutely disgusting abuse of power. I really can't understand how someone who is supposed to represent the people can be so completely ignorant of the precedent they are setting. I hope the lives lost due to your policy will keep you up at night.

From: [Kristin Tieche](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No to killer robots!
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 7:22:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I do hope you all have the right sense to reject killer robots in the SFPD for the City of San Francisco. This is completely unacceptable and a human rights violation. Please vote no.

Thank you,
Kristin Tieche
94117/D1

--

Kristin Tièche (she/her)
Director, *The Invisible Mammal*
<http://www.theinvisiblemammal.com/>

From: [Emily Jones](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Police robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 6:47:44 PM

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

1. That they are already in use does not rule out the need of an honest dialogue (with what looks like the whole world watching).
2. It's not about whether the robots can be precise or accurate or make good decisions. It's about whether the operators can be precise or accurate or make good decisions. It is now about whether even supervisors can be precise or accurate or make good decisions, even as they fund SFPD at an amount that way surpasses Cuba's military budget. It's about sitting supervisors who used public standing to damage the image of San Francisco with their copaganda.
3. Supes going red in the face and painting a true picture of militarized public in other parts of America, failed to name white militia, of which, law enforcement officers are a big demographic. The only warzone in SF will happen when the whites, including those in uniform, run amock.

From: [Julia Michas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: NO POLICE ROBOTS THAT USE LETHAL FORCE
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 4:54:48 PM

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

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Julia Michas** <julia.michas@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 4:52 PM
Subject: NO POLICE ROBOTS THAT USE LETHAL FORCE
To: <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>

If I needed another reason to leave this city, you are giving it to me now. I've seen this dystopic story both, as told in Terminator 1 AND 2.

Ready to move. I also pay high property taxes

Julia Michas

--

"...that which we do not face in the unconscious, we live as fate." - C.G. Jung

From: [Gee, Natalie \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please vote "NO" on SF BOS Agenda item 28 today: Don't give SFPD the ok to kill people with robots in SF!
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 4:09:46 PM

Natalie Gee 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff
Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10
President, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282
Direct: 415.554.7672 | Office: 415.554.7670

-----Original Message-----

From: Art Persyko <artpersyko@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 12:12 PM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lopez-Weaver, Lindsey (BOS) <Lindsey.Lopez@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please vote "NO" on SF BOS Agenda item 28 today: Don't give SFPD the ok to kill people with robots in SF!

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

Supervisor Walton:

My name is Art Persyko, I live in San Francisco, I am on the Board of the SF Gray Panthers, and I want to convey my strong opposition to an agenda item that the full SF Board of Supervisors will be voting on today. Its Agenda Item 28. 220641 [Administrative Code - Funding, Acquisition, and Use of Certain Police Department Equipment].

A "yes" vote would allow the SFPD to kill San Franciscans with robots.

I join the ACLU of Northern California in asking you to vote NO on this spectacularly dangerous idea.

I urge you to instead adopt language that says: "Robots shall not be used for any remote-controlled Use of Force (including lethal) purposes..."

If past practices are any guide to the future, this policy will likely lead to disproportionate deaths of Black and brown people. Police already shoot Black and Brown people with near impunity.

This policy would make it easier for officers to mistakenly pull the trigger and impede people's ability to seek justice when wrongful killings occur.

The language in the policy is also incredibly broad. Even with assurances from SFPD about their intent for very limited use of killer robots, this policy could break down and lead to wider use, sooner or later. Police could bring armed robots to every arrest, and every execution of a warrant to search a house or vehicle or device. Depending on how police choose to define the words "critical" or "exigent," police might even bring armed robots to a protest.

Before you vote, please ask yourself these two questions:

a) How many examples can you cite in which there was a real-life situation ANYWHERE in the US or in the world in which a killer robot was deemed necessary for police use to resolve a situation; it was used; and it was

successful?; and

b) How many examples can you cite ANYWHERE in the US or in the world in which there was a real-life situation in which a killer robot WOULD HAVE ACTUALLY BEEN HELPFUL to ANY police force in resolving a situation, but unfortunately it was NOT available?

For the sake common sense, of San Francisco and your constituents' rights and safety, please vote no.

Thank you for considering my opinion on this issue before you vote.

-Sincerely Art Persyko.

From: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Public comment for Item 28, 11/29 - Please reject SFPD proposal re: militarized weapons
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 4:04:10 PM

Natalie Gee 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff
Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10
President, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282
Direct: 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670

From: Christine Wei <christine@youngwomenfree.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 3:34 PM
To: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public comment for Item 28, 11/29 - Please reject SFPD proposal re: militarized weapons

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm a homeowner in D8 and am a policy coordinator at the Young Women's Freedom Center, headquartered in D6. I'm writing to strongly urge you to **NOT PASS** the San Francisco Police Department's proposed policy on militarized equipment (File #220641). These high-powered weapons and tanks never belonged in our city in the first place, and we should not allow SFPD to use them to kill or to purchase more without oversight.

I'm especially concerned about these parts of the policy:

- 1.
- 2.
3. **Allowing robot deadly use-of-force:**
4. Oakland rejected a similar proposal in October, and SF should too. These robots can be armed with bullets, explosives, and chemicals that can maim and kill. It's too easy for the police department to argue that any circumstance is "critical" or "exigent,"

5. or that there's a "risk" to their life, to justify unleashing a deadly robot on San Franciscans.
6. SFPD, which has already killed three people this year, does
7. not need additional automated and remote-controlled robots to increase their ability to hurt people.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
13. **Pre-approval to replace existing militarized weapons up to \$10M in value:**
14. Armored tanks, grenade launchers, and assault rifles are weapons of war. SFPD's proposal to skirt oversight in making more of these purchases goes against the spirit and intent of AB 481, meant to set local agencies on the path of demilitarizing our cities
15. and giving the public a say in what happens on our streets. Our
16. neighborhoods are not war zones; we should be getting rid of these dangerous weapons instead of giving SFPD more blanket power to replace them.
- 17.

This is an urgent of racial justice and human rights. Community members have come before the Board countless times to share the racial, gender, and economic disparities among those killed by the police. **Again, I ask you to NOT PASS this proposal — and also ensure that the public has further opportunities to weigh in as amendments are considered.**

Thank you,
Christine Wei

--

Christine Wei

pronouns: she/her

Policy & Advocacy Engagement Coordinator

[Young Women's Freedom Center](#)

c. 415-605-2752



Follow us on social media!



Check out our [report!](#)



From: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW:
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 2:49:28 PM

Natalie Gee 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff
Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10
President, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282
Direct: 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670

From: Adrienne Fong <afong@jps.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 1:10 PM
To: Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>
Cc: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>
Subject:

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

To: Supervisor Catherine Stefani

RE: Agenda item #28 for BoS meeting on November 29th
“28. 220641 [Administrative Code - Funding, Acquisition, and Use of Certain Police Department Equipment] Sponsor: Mayor Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to require Board of Supervisors approval of a policy governing the funding, acquisition, and use of certain law enforcement equipment consistent with the criteria set forth in state law, and approving the Police Department's use of Equipment Policy.

Question: Shall this Ordinance be PASSED ON FIRST READING?”

As a longtime resident in District 2 and a San Francisco Tax Payer, I'm appalled at this item and that the SF Board of Supervisors are even considering passing this. There are so many un-answered questions about this that makes it very dangerous and unacceptable. We all want to keep SF safe but passing this is not the solution.

We know that SFPD has NOT been compliant in following their own protocols and have gotten away with it. There has been no accountability for many of their actions. Some areas not explicitly addressed in this policy:

- Robots shall not be used for any remote-controlled Use of Force (including lethal) purposes.
- "Barricaded subject" needs to be defined so that someone in their own home or vehicle is not considered a "barricaded subject".
- Flashbangs shall not be deployed if there is risk they could come into proximity with a person.
- Automatic assault rifles shall not be used when there is a risk of shooting bystanders.
- Tear gas, "Pepperballs", and "less lethal" projectiles shall not be deployed against children, elderly, or other vulnerable populations.
- "High-risk tactical situation"/"High-risk warrant service" uses a self-referential definition.
 - SFPD definition: "high-risk tactical situations are instances that occur where the potential of death or serious injury is elevated or requires a response from a Tactical/Special Operations unit"
 - What *circumstances* would require a response from a Tactical/Special Operations unit?
 - What *factors* increase potential of death or serious injury? *How much* can they be increased before the situation is considered "high-risk"? Couldn't a traffic stop be considered as potentially increasing death or serious injury?

As a taxpayer, I want to know how my taxes are being used –

The proposed policy allows SFPD to acquire equipment without prior Board of Supervisors approval if it runs low on any of its stock, or simply wishes to replace any of its existing equipment. This means that the BoS is not taking responsibility on how funds are being used.

Please DO NOT pass this.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Adrienne Fong

afong@jps.net

From: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: URGENT: NO on Item # 28.....PLEASE!
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 2:49:16 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Toby Blomé <toby4peace@sonic.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 1:14 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>
Subject: URGENT: NO on Item # 28.....PLEASE!

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

Dear SF Supervisors,

This is an urgent message to request that you cast a definitive NO vote on Item #28 at today's meeting.

We do not need a further militarization of our city's police force, but rather we need to demilitarize our police, just as we need to demilitarize every other aspect of our society.

We are the most violent society in the world, with mass shootings happening at a rampant rate.

I understand our police need to be safe and protected while serving our citizens, but there are many other ways to create safety, than to use robotic killing machines, that lead to even further unnecessary deaths and injury.

In the memory of Mario Woods, a small man that was wielding a knife that was shot in cold blood by a SF police firing squad.

Let's treat the mentally ill the way they deserve: with compassion, care and respect.

No on Item #28.

No Robot Killing machines in our cities.

Thanks for your consideration,
and I hope to hear from you all.

Toby Blomé
A very concerned citizen

PS: I am not able to attend the meeting today because of a prior commitment, but I hope you will consider the future that we are creating with robotic killing machines.

From: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: No Killer Robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 2:49:04 PM

From: No Robots <no.deadly.robots@proton.me>
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 1:32 PM
To: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>
Subject: No Killer Robots

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

Good afternoon,

Do not give SFPD permission to kill people with robots. This broad policy would allow police to bring armed robots to every arrest, and every execution of a warrant to search a house or vehicle or device. Depending on how police choose to define the words “critical” or “exigent,” police might even bring armed robots to a protest. While police could only use armed robots as deadly force when the risk of death is imminent, this [problematic legal standard](#) has often been under-enforced by courts and criticized by activists. There is a growing body of literature on how the use of drones in warfare dehumanizes the targets of drone strikes, thereby making it easier to kill. These robots would bring similar dehumanization to the streets of San Francisco. For the sake of your constituents' rights and safety, please vote no.

Regards,
An extremely concerned citizen

From: [Deborah Armstrong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment - 11/29 BOS Meeting - Item 28
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 2:44:14 PM

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

Dear Board Members,

I am writing to express my extreme concern over the proposed rules for the use of certain police equipment to be discussed at today's meeting (Item 28, "Administrative Code - Funding, Acquisition, and Use of Certain Police Department Equipment").

I am appalled by the proposed Use of Force policy for certain robots in SFPD's possession, which would allow SFPD to use robots to use force and deadly force against civilians. I am even more appalled given that Supervisor Peskin originally rightly restricted this policy, as can be seen in Supervisor Peskin's original edits, which would prohibit SFPD from using robots to administer force. Supervisor Peskin's edits are appropriate and the better course of action.

SFPD should not be allowed to use robots to administer force against civilians, especially lethal force. Allowing robots to use force and kill people remotely is a dehumanizing, militaristic rule that has no place in a community and certainly has nothing to do with keeping us safe. SFPD already has a history of using excessive force against civilians with dire consequences. They should not be further empowered to do this via robots.

I am writing to ask you to revise Section 5 "Authorized Use" of its Law Enforcement Equipment Policy—and revert to the original language Supervisor Aaron Peskin proposed—as follows:

"The robots listed in this section shall not be utilized outside of training and simulations, criminal apprehensions, critical incidents, exigent circumstances, executing a warrant or during suspicious device assessments. ~~Robots will only be used as a deadly force option when risk of loss of life to members of the public or officers is imminent and outweighs any other force option available to SFPD.~~ Robots shall not be used as a Use of Force against any person."

Sincerely,
Deborah Armstrong

From: [Kevin Goldberg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No killer robots.
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 2:28:37 PM

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

Hello!

Can't believe I'm sending this email, but no—the SFPD should absolutely not have robots that are capable of lethal force.

Sincerely,
Kevin Goldberg

Sent from my phone--pardon the typos!

From: [Connie Jeung-Mills](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: public comment re 11/29 Board meeting: # 220641 [Administrative Code - Funding, Acquisition, and Use of Certain Police Department Equipment]
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 2:18:08 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Hello, I am a resident of District 8 and I also work in the city. I would like to provide a public comment regarding the 11/29 Board meeting, item # 220641 **[Administrative Code - Funding, Acquisition, and Use of Certain Police Department Equipment]**.

I am firmly opposed to any policy that would allow police to arm robots and use them as a deadly force against a person. The potential for overuse and abuse of weaponized robots by police is far too substantial to be considered a viable option.

Once you've opened the door to this approach, it will become even more consequential as robotic technology becomes more sophisticated and fully automated. Weaponized robots create security concerns including the potential to be hacked and sudden equipment failure could have disastrous results.

Please do not approve this part of the draft until you add specific language to safeguard against law enforcement being able to use armed robots to kill people. That is a line that should not be crossed. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Connie Jeung-Mills

From: starebright@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Killer Robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 1:41:11 PM

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

Hello,

Imagine having to write a government body in San Francisco to ask that the city not give armed robots to a police department who already disproportionately kills its Black citizens at alarming levels without said technology.

This is a surreal nightmare and a testament to just how far SF has strayed from its history of pushing the nation towards a more just and equitable society.

I am a 2nd generation San Franciscan who lives in Ingleside and I am asking you to do the right thing: REJECT the police department's request for more firepower. They are alarmingly violent enough with unchecked power.

Thank you,
Star Bright

From: [The Rutherford Institute \(Legal\)](#)
To: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [The Rutherford Institute \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Use of Equipment Policy on Agenda for Today
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 1:39:46 PM
Attachments: [Rutherford letter on SFPD Use of Equipment.pdf](#)

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please find a letter attached which addresses concerns that The Rutherford Institute would like for you to consider regarding the proposed Law Enforcement Use of Equipment Policy for the San Francisco Police Department which is listed as item 28 on your agenda for today. Thank you.

Sincerely,

The Rutherford Institute
P.O. Box 7482
Charlottesville, Virginia 22906

For more information about The Rutherford Institute, visit www.rutherford.org

This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the intended addressee or authorized to receive for the intended addressee, you may not use, copy, or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply to legal@rutherford.org and delete the message.

From: [Pamela Tau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Funding and acquisition of military equipment
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 1:33:01 PM

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

My name is Pam Tau Lee and I am a resident of District 1. In the course of my international travels, I have been invited to observe and document human rights violations in South Africa and the Philippines and offer recommendations to what I witnessed.

Today I am here to comment on the SFPD and Sheriff Department's proposed policy regarding funding and acquisition of military equipment. In my mind, the term, "weapons of war" better describes what is being considered for purchase. While the Sheriff Department provided an inventory of their current weapons, the Department also included a wish list that includes remotely piloted, powered aerial equipment, in other words, drones. While traditionally used as a surveillance tool, a firearm can easily be attached to the drone thus turning it into an aerial weapon of war.

For me, I was in North Dakota at Standing Rock in support of the tribes protecting their sacred land and waters from being harmed by the building of an oil pipeline. There I met with land protectors who were shot at, others who were followed by remotely piloted weaponized drones, and those who were injured by water cannons. I came face to face with armed police and National Guards and tanks during our peaceful marches. In South Africa and the Philippines I met with families whose loved ones were targeted and killed because of their work for human rights. What did these three locations have in common? In each situation the local police had access and unregulated use of military weapons.

I understand that this year, three people were killed by SFPD officers armed with an assault rifle. With these reflections in mind I hope the Board will not to purchase these items. In the event equipment is purchased, the Board should include language stating that these not be used for deadly or any other use of force; that the Board does not pre-authorize acquisition and that there is an accounting of what was used and under what circumstances it was used; that all 608 assault rifles be the number referred to with regard to the development of equipment policy.

In short, I join with others in the hope that the Board adopts community safety policies that are humanistic and not militaristic.

Pam Tau Lee
District 1 resident

From: [Wonway Posibul](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: DON'T GIVE KILLER ROBOTS TO THE SFPD
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 1:32:30 PM

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

Giving SFPD permission to kill people with robots is a spectacularly dangerous idea.

Police already shoot Black and Brown people with near impunity. This policy would make it easier for officers to mistakenly pull the trigger and impede people's ability to seek justice when wrongful killings occur.

Sincerely,
Juan Amador

From: [Derek Thompson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Killer Robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 1:23:47 PM

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

Police already shoot Black and Brown people with near impunity. This policy would make it easier for officers to mistakenly pull the trigger and impede people's ability to seek justice when wrongful killings occur.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Ellen](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Vote No on Police Robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 12:45:59 PM

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

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

My name is Ellen Caminiti and I live on Geary Blvd. in Cathedral Hill. I am writing this email to ask you to please vote no on police robots today. Robots that have the power to kill are not the solution to fix systematic issues in San Francisco. We know that more police presence is not the answer, we have seen the negative effects of this play out too many times. San Franciscans, especially San Franciscans of color, should not live with the threat of killer robots milling about the city. Please vote with the people of San Francisco in mind today, and vote no!

Best,

Ellen Caminiti

From: [Carolyn Dorricott](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Killer Robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 12:19:28 PM

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

To whom this may concern,

The SFPD should not have killer robots. As a bay area local, I am absolutely disgusted that this is being discussed today at 2pm. I DO NOT support this and you should not either.

Carolyn Dorricott

From: [Nisha Masharani](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#)
Subject: SF resident against use of force by police robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 11:49:21 AM

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

To the board of supervisors, Mayor Breed, and Police Chief Scott -

My name is Nisha Masharani and I am a resident of San Francisco. I am writing because I am appalled by the recent proposal by SFPD to allow robots to use deadly force.

The SFPD suggested the following policy: "robots will only be used as a deadly force option when risk of loss of life to members of the public or officers are imminent and outweigh any other force option available to the SFPD."

This is an absurd and deeply concerning suggestion. SFPD already enjoys significant impunity to use force, and this results in reduced public safety and the death of Black and Brown people in our city. This policy would make it easier for officers to mistakenly pull the trigger and impede people's ability to seek justice when wrongful killings occur.

The language in the policy is also incredibly broad. Under it, police could bring armed robots to every arrest and every execution of a warrant to search a house or vehicle or device. Depending on how police choose to define the words "critical" or "exigent," police might even bring armed robots to a protest.

Most importantly, use of force does not protect San Franciscans or save lives. Research shows that a living wage, access to holistic health services and treatment including mental health services, educational opportunity, and stable housing are far more successful at reducing crime and increasing safety than punitive systems like police or prisons (Source: [Popular Democracy](#)). There's no evidence that implicit bias training or community relations initiatives help with reducing the abuses of policing (Sources: [The Nation](#), [The Atlantic](#)). Militarization of the police, such as militarization under program 1033, only results in increased use of force and decreased safety for communities, especially communities of color (Source: [ACLU](#)).

For the sake of your constituents' rights and safety, please vote no.

Thank you for your time,

Nisha Masharani, District 2 Resident
3126 Laguna St, San Francisco, CA 94123
nmasharani@gmail.com
650-740-0185

From: [Luke Benfey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Reject the Draft Law Enforcement Equipment Policy (so-called "Killer Robots")
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 11:47:59 AM

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

Hello! I am a San Francisco Resident and voter, and am writing to strongly urge the rejection of the draft Law Enforcement Equipment Policy ("220641 - Law Enforcement Equipment Policy 111022 Draft"), the so-called "Killer Robots" proposal.

Remote Controlled (or even plausibly autonomous) "robots" should not be armed with lethal weaponry or EVER used as a deadly force option.

To phrase this a "slippery slope" is putting it mildly. Police-on-citizen violence is already out of control, and putting the weaponry on a machine only further removes fundamental humanity/empathy from the decision to use deadly force.

Again, I urge the Board of Supervisors to reject the current draft of this policy.

Thank you for your time,

- Luke Benfey
Mission St
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: alicekezhaya@uemail.ucsb.edu
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: NO ROBOT COPS // NO KILLER ROBOTS
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 11:22:12 AM

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

Hello,

I am writing to express my absolute dissent regarding the arming of robots for use by the police.

If you insist on policing, then it should be human-police who take on the burdens of choosing whether or not to shoot a weapon at a living being and acting on that choice.

As an abolitionist I am against policing entirely. However, as things stand, I absolutely do not condone the use of robots for this purpose in my city.

Regards,

Alice Kezhaya

From: [B.J. Herbison](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Who goes to jail for murder if I'm killed by a police robot?
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 11:22:12 AM

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

Without a clear answer to that question I wouldn't consider visiting or vacationing in San Francisco.

And an answer of "we will investigate if someone dies" isn't a good answer. That's how organizations avoid responsibility.

There has to be clear, legal, responsibility. Some person with the responsibility and the blame, if someone is inappropriately killed by an armed police robot.

The firing of weapons is serious, and someone with serious responsibility needs to make decisions and take responsibility for actions.

And this includes responsibility for the "accidental" discharge of weapons as well.

B.J.

--
B.J. Herbison / bj@herbison.com / <https://url.ayaman.click/v2/> / <http://www.herbison.com/herbison/bj.html> / YXAafOnNmZHQyOmlE6bzpkN2Y4MmUyNWY3OGUyYyadYmQSNWUxMTYhNmlsNTRhNzo3QY1MlU5OTc2MTgzYmZmMTNkMjM5NzQ3NzhmZWU0MGQ1OWM0ZmErNk43MzcyZmIuZilyMThYBzOTQ3NDJlYzRANmlsOTpwoIO
The Next Asylum / 203 Long Hill Road / Bolton, MA 01740-1421 / 1-978-634-1061

From: [Joel Shapiro](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: info@eff.org
Subject: No lethal force for robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 9:55:26 AM

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

Hello

I urge you to vote AGAINST the proposed policy to let the SFPD arm their robots with lethal force. There are way too many risks involved (some of which are delineated in this article by the Electronic Frontier Foundation:

<https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2022/11/red-alert-sfpd-want-power-kill-robots>)

Thank you.

-Joel Shapiro
52 Virginia Ave
94110

From: [Lisa Tennenbaum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment re: Item 28 of the Nov 29th BOS Meeting
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 9:42:20 AM

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

Board of Supervisors,

I am a lifelong unwilling participant in the SFPD. Both of my parents, both of my stepparents, and now my brother are or were members of that institution.

I also have a decade of experience as a municipal lawyer.

This proposed policy by the SFPD should not be approved. It should not come from them, they should not put it forward, and it should absolutely not be implemented for their benefit.

The entire police department, and quite frankly any police department in this country, should not be able to implement the use of force via robotics ever. The moral and ethical, let alone legal questions, are not ones that any member, nor the collective department, are equipped to handle and have clearly not even pondered in putting this policy forward.

As I said, my ample, forced experience with every layer of the SFPD makes me well aware of the intellectual capabilities of your sworn officers and I, in most instances, don't think they should be carrying the guns they already have. And now you want to imbue them with the power to employ what I know they will view as cool toys for their benefit to cause actual physical harm to people? I hope you are prepared for the plethora of lawsuits and costs to taxpayers if you approve this policy.

Further, the continued capitulation to one department of the great city I grew up in when they lack the intellectual acumen to appreciate their power and privilege is a grave mistake. You should give the police less power and fewer resources, not more. What possible need do they have for robotics outside of bomb disarmament and how often do they need that? For every toy the police department receives, a road goes unpaved. For every loosening of their rules and regulations, you are welcoming lawsuits and hurting the general fund, which has large downstream ripples that harm the community.

Please invest in the community, in housing, in answers, in resources for those that aren't privileged to be making over a hundred thousand dollars a year, easily, with the barest of education and training. And please do not give that department, with its base-level intellect, the power to physically harm anyone via robot. And while you're at it, update the use-of-force policy so they can't hurt anyone ever.

Thank you,

Lisa Tennenbaum

From: [Joyce Nakamura](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 11/29/2022 BOS Meeting, Item 28 - Administrative Code - Funding, Acquisition, and Use of Certain Police Department Equipment
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 9:39:38 AM

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

I am writing in reference to proposed Ordinance 220641 to express my concern about use of robots by the SFPD as a lethal force.

With remote access, the ability to determine use of lethal force is limited and the inappropriate use of lethal force is likely. I would like to see explicit language in the policy preventing the SFPD to use these robots in this manner.

Joyce Nakamura
District 3 resident
415-948-0131

From: [Mullane](#)
To: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [angela.cavillo@sfgov.org](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Moral Authority to Vote No
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 9:30:31 AM
Attachments: [Moral Authority to Vote No.pdf](#)

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

Esteemed Supervisors,

As a resident, a civil rights advocate, and a policy nerd — I humbly submit this letter imploring you to exercise your moral authority and vote against weaponization of robots by the San Francisco Police Department. Your consideration is most valued and appreciated.

Kindly,
Mullane Ahern
she / her / ella
415.582.3200

(District 5 Resident)

From: [Katie Rosenfeld](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Do not arm robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 9:24:17 AM

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

Dear Board,

This is a nightmare straight out of dystopian fiction. Please do not consider this idea; armed robots will not make our community safer. We should be funding housing, education, food equity, and mental health programs, not bringing more weapons to our city.

Katie Rosenfeld
Voter in district 7

From: [Anna Asebedo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Do not vote in favor of killing suspects using robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 9:21:54 AM

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

Please do not vote in favor to authorize San Francisco police to kill suspects using robots.

Thank you for supporting practices that deescalate interactions of conflict and for funding public organizations that serve the well-being of our city's people whether they own property or not.

Sincerely,
Anna Asebedo

From: [Sean Murray](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: against the Law Enforcement Policy, specifically SFPD robots using deadly force
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 8:52:30 AM

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

Hi,

I am a resident of the city living in Polk Gulch. I wanted to reach out regarding today's vote on the updated Law Enforcement Equipment Policy. I am strongly against permitting SFPD robots to use deadly force as I believe this is an over the top use of power that would disproportionately harm the most disadvantaged San Franciscans. I urge you to please take into account the opinions of your constituents when casting your vote today.

Thank you.

Sean Murray

From: [The Heated](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: san francisco resident against killer robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 8:36:34 AM

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

Hello,

I am writing in advance of the meeting today to say I am a San Francisco resident (Church and Market area) and am against SFPD having robots armed with guns. Thank you for your time.

Best,

Cristina Espinosa

--

www.theheated.com - buy pretty, useful things

From: [Michael Burch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No Lethal Force Robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 7:17:05 AM

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

Hello Rep Stefani & supervisors,

My name is Michael Burch I live in District 2 at 1690 Broadway. I'm writing you, because I want to make it clear that I do not support militarizing the SFPD, even more, with lethal force robots. I hope during your conversations today on this measure you continue to focus those resources into community based organizations and education throughout our great city.

Thank you,

- Michael Burch
- he/they

From: [Susan Price](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: NO to Killer Robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 6:57:29 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Please please defeat the motion to authorize use of robots by police to kill suspects. Remote triggers are too easy to pull.

This is too dangerous.

Signed,
Susan Price-Jang

From: [Scott Tsuchitani](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to SFPD having killer robots
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 6:44:20 AM

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

Dear Honorable Board of Supervisors,

I am a 32-year resident of the city and son of a native-born San Franciscan, writing to express my dismay and opposition to SFPD acquiring robots that can kill people.

Police violence is already enough of a crisis as it is. In one of the most progressive cities in the US, the last thing we need is to introduce the possibility of a Robocop scenario. This will go a long way towards undermining SFPD public relations, because what is the one thing that could be more chilling than SFPD's record of police violence toward black and brown people and a DA who is reluctant to prosecute them?

Nothing could be more chilling than a killer police robot. It would be a huge step towards turning our fine city into a horrifying dystopia, and sets a terrible example for the rest of the nation. It's hard to believe you are even considering this.

Does Breed have that much power over the board? Are some of you getting paid off by the tech-military companies that will profit from this?

Whatever your reason for considering it, I implore you to please reconsider it for the future of this fine city. A killer police robot goes against everything that makes San Francisco great and special.

Very truly yours,

Scott Tsuchitani

130 Eureka St., Apt. 1
San Francisco, CA 94114
(415) 218-9356

From: [Erika Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: NO on the SFPD robot proposal
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 2:43:37 AM

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

Hello, I'm a San Francisco native and resident of the Sunset District who has only just heard about the SFPD's proposed policy to use robots to kill suspects. I find it extremely troubling that under London Breed's leadership, the SFPD seems to be more and more emboldened to propose dangerous policies such as using private cameras to monitor people (and save the footage indefinitely) -- and now this policy, which the ACLU and various legal advocates have actively spoken out against.

I don't think it's any secret that Chesa Boudin was forced out of office due to the fact that the SFPD didn't like what he was doing. Can you imagine? Boudin actually did his job and uncovered corruption -- and lost his job for it. What that really says to me, though, is that the SFPD is gaining more and more power under the guise of "public safety". If they could force a DA out because he exposed their abuse of power, what's to stop them from continuing to abuse that power now that he's gone?

I've written the Board before about how I voted for Mark Leno, but was happy to reconsider my opinion of London Breed when I saw how well she initially handled the pandemic.

What I still don't understand is how she could have campaigned so strongly about protecting her "community" and the people she grew up with... and now that she's mayor, she's not doing anything to stop policies like these. Policies that are now, somehow, coming up like clockwork.

Which means that the Board now needs to do the work that Breed is not doing. I ask the Board to not only refuse this policy but to take a good, close look at the level of influence that the SFPD has and is building. Because it seems like you're really the only thing between SF citizens and the SFPD running roughshod over all of our civil liberties.

Thank you,

Erika Young
San Francisco, CA

From: sfrobink@aol.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Absolutely No re robots to shoot people!
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 1:27:01 AM

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

Hi - am totally opposed to the idea of robots shooting people! We have enough trouble as it is when police shoot people when it's not warranted or under very questionable circumstances. Wouldn't this scenario take human judgment out of the picture? Terrible things could happen to people. Please do not approve this request.

Thx - Robin Krop

From: [Meg](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Please Do Not Support the Law Enforcement Equipment Policy on November 29
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 11:50:21 PM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you **do not support the Law Enforcement Equipment Policy**, which would allow SFPD robots to use deadly force. This would remove accountability from police officers in our city. I do not believe the current level of crime or threats facing our city justifies the use of this weapon, and I am concerned that this kind of weapon will be over-used if made available to police officers. In fact, the [ACLU has stated](#) that the type of scenarios that would require this level of force are rare.

Please do not support the Law Enforcement Equipment Policy on November 29.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Meg Carter

Begin forwarded message:

From: Margaret Carter <margaretalice96@gmail.com>
Date: November 27, 2022 at 21:23:57 PST
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org
Subject: Please Do Not Support the Law Enforcement Policy on November 29

Dear Supervisor Peskin,

I am one of your constituents in Polk Gulch. I am writing to ask that you **do not support the Law Enforcement Equipment Policy**, which would allow SFPD robots to use deadly force. This would remove accountability from police officers in our city. I do not believe the current level of crime or threats facing our city justifies the use of this weapon, and I am concerned that this kind of weapon will be over-used if made available to police officers. In fact, the [ACLU has stated](#) that the type of scenarios that would require this level of force are rare.

Please do not support the Law Enforcement Policy on November 29.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Meg Carter

--

(925) 323-6136
margaretalice96@gmail.com

From: [Eddie Dinel](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: To be clear
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 10:51:23 PM

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

There should be no lethally-armed robots allowed in the city of San Francisco. I find it hard to believe we're having this conversation, but please -- PLEASE -- let's be sensible here.

And yes, I live in San Francisco, in Glen Park (94131) and I could not possibly feel more strongly that lethally armed robots have no place in SF.

--

Eddie Dinel
edinel@solace.org

From: [Crystal Le](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Agenda Item #28: No to Killer Robots
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 10:30:17 PM

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

Hello Board of Supervisors,

My name is Crystal, a resident of D6. I am honestly in awe of the fact that I even have to type out "No to Killer Robots," but I urge you to oppose and squash the alarming militarized equipment policy proposed by the SFPD. As someone who lives in SF, the police department's proposal makes me feel the furthest from "safe." It is dangerous and heinous for so many reasons. Just some among them being:

- [Mission Local](#) reports that since 2000, SFPD have murdered 58 people in San Francisco, and there will likely be more unless you step in. Police pull their triggers manually to kill Black and brown San Franciscans with impunity. What will happen when they can do so remotely?
- It sets a precedent for even more lethal and extreme asks from the police department. We do not need to grant them access to more military-grade weapons that are designed to harm and kill.
- There is an incredible lack of transparency with regard to the proposal's costs. That aside, SFPD should not receive funds for their death-making, period, when we could be investing dollars into the actual health and wellbeing of our youth, our unhoused neighbors, and more.

Once again, I urge you to oppose the proposal set forth by SFPD / sponsored by Mayor Breed. Please do not allow the ordinance to be passed.

Crystal Lê
She/her

From: [Mick Glenn](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No killer robots
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 10:29:16 PM

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

Dear board of supervisors,

Do not allow the SFPD to have killer robots. The SFPD as is highly irresponsible and dangerous with their existing firearms. May I remind you they bombed the mayor's house in 1975.

James Cameron, visionary filmmaker, made a movie called Terminator 2 about how murder robots are bad actually. If the board needs to spend more than 2 seconds debating whether to give the SFPD murder robots, then your humanity is gone for good and you have become a robot yourself.

Mick

From: [Sam Engel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No killer robots
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 9:49:04 PM

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

Dear SF Supes,

As a resident of the city for nearly 5 years now, I write to express my strong opposition to the idea of giving robot police officers any sort of deadly force — guns, weapons, explosives, etc. We are better than this.

Thank you,

--

Sam Engel
sam13e@gmail.com

From: [Max Sarosi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose Robot Police Dogs
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 9:00:25 PM

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

Hello,

It is so insane and dystopian that this conversation is even happening but under no circumstances do the police need any more technology, much less lethal robot dogs, to kill people. Since 2021, almost 2,000 people have been killed by police. Folks such as George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Oscar Grant, Freddie Gray, Elijah McClain, Michael Brown and thousands of others would still be alive today had it not been for the murderous and reckless behavior of police. Police do not need any more technology to kill. They need to stop killing people. Please oppose any efforts to use, implement or arm police robots. Under no circumstances does San Francisco need police robots. The focus should be on life-affirming indeed solutions like housing and public health, not life-ending ones like policing.

NO to robot police.

Please.

Max,

From: [Michael Marinucci](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 11/29/22 Item 28: SFPD proposed policy - no killer robots, no purchase pre-auth, transparency on all assault weapons
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 8:10:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Preston et al,

My name is Michael Marinucci and I am a constituent from San Francisco District 5. On Tuesday, the Board of Supervisors considers a military equipment use policy from SFPD (Item 28). I ask for you to call for 3 amendments to the proposed military equipment use policy:

1. Do not authorize robots for deadly or any other use of force

There is no justification for utilizing robots to perform deadly lethal force, especially when those robots will be remotely-controlled. There are already too many unwarranted or unjustified, extrajudicial killings by police. We need *less* lethal force and more training and practice of de-escalation tactics. When deciding whether to approve this language to pass and approve of SFPD using robots for deadly force against humans, *please reject it. Vote no.*

Instead revert it back to “Robots shall not be used as a Use of Force against any person.”

2. Include all assault rifles in policy

SFPD has disclosed only 233 of its 608 assault rifles. If SFPD is using 608 assault rifles, that should be reflected in the policy. The exclusion of 375 assault rifles used by SFPD misleads the public in thinking the police only have 200+ rifles rather than the 600+ assault rifles that they actually have. These weapons need to be included in the policy for two reasons.

First, just this year SFPD has killed three people with assault rifles. One of the three people killed by SFPD was suicidal. The other two men killed were on the ground, grappling with each other for a knife. All 608 assault rifles need to have use policies describing when it is authorized or prohibited to use - including when someone is in a mental health crisis.

Second, every type of equipment covered in the proposed use policy are required to have an annual report. These annual reports are required to include a summary of use, and also describe the fiscal impact. Fiscal impact includes not just the initial acquisition cost, but the ongoing costs (which with training and maintenance will primarily be personnel). The public deserves to know the fiscal impact of ALL these deadly weapons, including all 608 assault rifles in addition to the 15 submachine guns and 64 machine guns.

3. Require accountability - do not pre-authorize acquisitions

SFPD’s proposed policy would allow SFPD to acquire equipment without prior Board of Supervisor approval if it runs low on any of its stock or wishes to replace any of its equipment. If this happens, this is exactly the situation in which more oversight is needed, not less. If SFPD used over 6000 Pepperball rounds, the public deserves to ask how this happened. The

public has a right to know why that supply was unexpectedly depleted, how it was used, and whether to expect similar levels of use in the future. And if SFPD wishes to replace a robot or vehicle that costs hundreds of thousands of dollars, the public deserves the opportunity to know why.

I appreciate that this proposed policy has improved from its consideration in the Rules Committee under Chair Peskin's leadership, but it is critical for the proposed policy to include these three amendments. San Francisco deserves the full transparency and accountability provided by the new law.

Sincerely,
Michael Marinucci
San Francisco District 5 resident

From: [Katherine Tangalakis-Lippert](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Media request — Robot use of force policy
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 7:38:40 PM

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

Hello SF Board of Supervisors — I hope you're well. I'm reaching out to see if a representative from your office has any statement regarding the policy that will be voted on tomorrow about law enforcement robots and their use of deadly force? Will this draft be sent back for changes to this clause or is it expected to be adopted as-is? Thanks for your time.

Best,

Katherine Tangalakis-Lippert

Reporter, Breaking News
Pronouns: she/her



[Business](#) - [Life](#) - [News](#)

C: 805-404-6255
One Liberty Plaza, 8th FL, New York, NY 10006

From: [Carol Soto](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No Killer Drone Dogs for Police
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 7:27:06 PM

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

Dear Board Members,

I cannot believe that the Board is seriously considering allowing the police to have a military-grade drone with lethal capacity. I strongly oppose this militarization of local police. I hope that you feel likewise.

Thank you,
Carol Soto

From: [Rene Hosman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No killer robots in our city
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 6:23:37 PM

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

I cannot believe this is something citizens actually have to say but who on earth thought that authorizing remote triggers on robots in the city was a remotely okay idea? San Francisco is not a war zone. I understand we like to be on the cutting edge of technology and consider ourselves to be progressive but this is a huge misstep with lives at risk. I strongly urge the Board of Supervisors to reconsider.

Sincerely,
Emily Rene Hosman

--

Rene Hosman
erhosman@gmail.com
650.281.1118

From: [A](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: OPPOSE Lethal SFPD Robots
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 6:22:14 PM

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

Board of Supervisors,

Good evening. I am a resident of San Francisco (a constituent in Supervisor Dorsey's district) writing in **strong opposition** to SFPD's proposed policy of enabling their military grade robots to use lethal force against human beings.

We know that on a national scale, police officers are more likely to interact violently in contact with Black people. Research indicates that police use of force against Black people is more than three times higher than those among white people. Allowing SFPD to steer their robots with use of lethal force will only exacerbate institutional racism and depersonalize--*dehumanize*--our Black neighbors and neighbors of color.

I urge you to either amend the current proposed language to ensure SFPD's robots shall not engage in use of force against any person, or vote **NO** on item no. 28 in tomorrow's BOS meeting.

Regards,
Amy

From: [Rebecca Valentine](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Robots
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 5:47:14 PM

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

This email is regarding the proposal to permit SFPD to use remotely operated robots with the capacity to deploy lethal force.

This proposal is exceptionally dangerous and should not be permitted. The use of remotely operated robots poses at least four dangers to the public:

1. The use of robots makes it easy for the public to misunderstand the nature of the robots as being fully automated rather than remotely operated, as no visible operator is present. This gives the public the erroneous impression that the robots are using some kind of objective AI mechanism for its decision about when to use lethal force or not, when in fact a person is decided.
2. The use of robots makes it easy to transition from human operation to AI operation. Modern AI is typically inscrutable and its decisions cannot be inspected and explained. Computers cannot be held accountable for mistakes, and the use of the AI software launders bias from training data through the algorithms to give it the veneer of objectivity, despite the presence of systemic biases. See the work of Timnit Gebru and Margaret Mitchell for further information on this and related issues.
3. The use of robots creates emotional distance in the operator, replacing the direct personal experience of the situation with mediation through computer screens. The operation of the robot no longer has the same impact, and is more like a videogame, which affects the operator's willingness to actually use lethal force and leads to desensitization to violence and death caused by the operator.
4. The use of robots obscures responsibility. In person, the officer pulling the trigger on a gun, or wielding a baton, or firing a taser, has a badge with their name/number, meaning that abuses and injustices can be recorded and tied to specific individuals in undeniable ways. By putting the operator in a distance office, the only equivalent way to know who pulled a trigger is if the police department reliable logs information in a way that is publicly available in real time. This is unlikely to be implemented, meaning that accountability for the use of lethal force is impossible. Improper record keeping also would mean that since no one person can be ascribed blame beyond reasonable doubt, no one can be ascribed blame at all in the legal sense.

Please prohibit the use of robots for lethal force. Any decision to employ lethal force must be made in person by the person using it, so that the decision is not taken lightly.

Thank you.

- Rebecca Valentine, SoMa resident

From: [Rashi Abramson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Say No to Robocop Lite
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 5:22:16 PM

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

there is also the cybersecurity risk. Don't let a mass shooter hijack the robots. Vote no.

On Mon, Nov 28, 2022, 5:18 PM Rashi Abramson <roshkins@gmail.com> wrote:

The proposal to use robots to kill people puts us on a slippery slope to a world where robots kill people with minimal intervention. Already we see the problems of drones killing people over seas, where it's hard to know if the correct targets are hit when stakes are high.

To do that to U.S. citizens when there is high distrust of police using their force appropriately is dangerous and should not be pursued.

Don't put us on course for Slaughterbots. See <https://youtu.be/9fa91VwHHqg>. Vote no on a world where the people using deadly force have no stake in the outcome of their actions.

Rashi Abramson,
Constituent

From: [Rashi Abramson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Say No to Robocop Lite
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 5:19:02 PM

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

The proposal to use robots to kill people puts us on a slippery slope to a world where robots kill people with minimal intervention. Already we see the problems of drones killing people over seas, where it's hard to know if the correct targets are hit when stakes are high.

To do that to U.S. citizens when there is high distrust of police using their force appropriately is dangerous and should not be pursued.

Don't put us on course for Slaughterbots. See <https://youtu.be/9fa9IVwHHqg>. Vote no on a world where the people using deadly force have no stake in the outcome of their actions.

Rashi Abramson,
Constituent

From: [Colin Cotter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposition to Lethal Robots
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 5:18:49 PM

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

I am a voter in D7, and I cannot express strongly enough my heartfelt opposition to the demand from SFPD to have the option to kill using robots. This city is NOT a war zone! Trying to sell voters on the notion that this department - <https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/police-violence-Black-residents-17272732.php> - should be trusted with yet another means of lethal force is bad enough, but no police department should be insisting on this. We need to step back from the violence. Vote this grotesque plea for enhanced state violence into oblivion where it belongs.

From: [Stephen Allen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Startling SF Police Overreach
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 5:02:11 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I write to you today to plead with you to do the obviously sensible thing and put a stop to the plan to allow SF Police to be equipped with lethal robotic equipment. This plan is obviously an outrageous and frightening example of the extent to which Law Enforcement has been allowed to put the lives of ordinary citizens at risk. As a resident of the Central Valley of California who, like just about everyone here, visits San Francisco from time to time, I can't possibly imagine wanting to come to your city for a Giants game, check out some books stores or simply enjoy the ocean air knowing the extreme risk to my safety posed by such an extremely irresponsible method of policing your community and visitors like myself.

Both of my parents are from San Francisco. I can't imagine, if they were still with us, the disgust they would feel toward their hometown just knowing you would even consider allowing this outrageous overreach. Please do the right thing and stop this outrageous and horrifying plan before the obvious potential for problems becomes a real life horror for the people you are supposed to keep safe.

Yours Truly,
Stephen Allen
Modesto,CA

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Zach Lipton](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Item 28 - SFPD proposed policy - no purchase pre-auth, no killer robots, transparency on all assault weapons
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 3:20:41 PM

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

Dear Supervisors:

My name is Zach Lipton and I am a constituent from San Francisco District 6 supporting the League of Women Voters and their concerns about this item. On Tuesday, the Board of Supervisors considers a military equipment use policy from SFPD (Item 28). I ask for you to call for 3 amendments to the proposed military equipment use policy:

1. Include all assault rifles in policy SFPD has disclosed only 233 of its 608 assault rifles. If SFPD is using 608 assault rifles, that should be reflected in the policy. The exclusion of 375 assault rifles used by SFPD misleads the public in thinking the police only have 200+ rifles rather than the 600+ assault rifles that they actually have.

These weapons need to be included in the policy for two reasons.

First, just this year SFPD has killed three people with assault rifles. One of the three people killed by SFPD was suicidal. The other two men killed were on the ground, grappling with each other for a knife. All 608 assault rifles need to have use policies describing when it is authorized or prohibited to use - including when someone is in a mental health crisis.

Second, every type of equipment covered in the proposed use policy are required to have an annual report. These annual reports are required to include a summary of use, and also describe the fiscal impact. Fiscal impact includes not just the initial acquisition cost, but the ongoing costs (which with training and maintenance will primarily be personnel). The public deserves to know the fiscal impact of ALL these deadly weapons, including all 608 assault rifles in addition to the 15 submachine guns and 64 machine guns.

2. Do not authorize robots for deadly or any other use of force

3. Require accountability - do not pre-authorize acquisitions. SFPD's proposed policy would allow SFPD to acquire equipment without prior Board of Supervisor approval if it runs low on any of its stock or wishes to replace any of its equipment. If this happens, this is exactly the situation in which more oversight is needed, not less. If SFPD used over 6000 Pepperball rounds, the public deserves to ask how this happened. The public has a right to know why that supply was unexpectedly depleted, how it was used, and whether to expect similar levels of use in the future. And if SFPD wishes to replace a robot or vehicle that costs hundreds of thousands of dollars, the public deserves the opportunity to know why.

I appreciate that this proposed policy has improved from its consideration in the Rules Committee under Chair Peskin's leadership, but it is critical for the proposed policy to include these three amendments. San Francisco deserves the full transparency and accountability provided by the new law.

Thank you,

Zach Lipton

From: [Diana Scott](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Draft policy on police use of weapons - on agenda at 11/29 BOS mtg.
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 1:38:40 PM

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

To the Clerk of the Board:

Please include this letter, already sent to Sups. Mar and Peskin, in the supervisors' folder for tomorrow's BOS meeting, including better link for the article cited (updated today in 48 Hills):

https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://missionlocal.org/2022/11/killer-robots-to-be-permitted-under-sfpd-draft-policy/___YXAzOhNmZHQyOmE6bzpmZDZjZjQ2NWVmMmZmZu2NjE0Mzg2MGQzY2NiYzJhMzo2Ojkl1ZW66MWJjNzU5MzQwODRkZDE5OWQ0MDFmM2MxZTZhNmE5YjE3ODQ0YzU2Y2ZkZTY2OGewNzJkMWQyOGQ3Y2I2MmJjZDpwOIQ

Thank you.

Diana Scott, Outer Sunset

.....

Dear Supervisor Mar:

I was aghast to read this report about a bill coming up for a vote at the Board of Supervisors tomorrow, and am deeply troubled that Sup.Peskin has backed down on opposing, in no uncertain terms, this police use of deadly armed robots - whatever the qualifying language (which, of course, is open to police interpretation!):

SFPD authorized to kill suspects using robots in draft policy - Mission Local

I urge you and your allies on the Boards of Supervisors to end this outrageous use of surplus military weapons -- and include reporting language on use of assault rifles in its rebuff of the police-proposed measure.

Beyond that, WHY is this city accepting this kind of equipment from the DOD in the first place? Let S.F. become a model of de-escalating police use of deadly force!

Please let me know what I/we can do to prevent this outrageous policy proposal from becoming law!

Thank you.

Diana Scott
(415) 566-7235

From: [Julienne Fisher](#)
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Regarding Upcoming BOS item on 11/28/2022
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 12:59:35 PM

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

November 27, 2022

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

This message is regarding AB 481 and our local guidelines in SF.

Please do not authorize any new robots or military style weapons to be acquired or used by our San Francisco Police Department.

Those acquisitions will not make our city safer.

And increasing available weapons is not a community building use of San Francisco budget.

Below is part of recent news report regarding pending decision.

Thank you for your attention to this request.

Sincerely,

Julienne Fisher
San Francisco Resident
8001 Geary Blvd Apt 4.

San Francisco, Ca 94121
415 307-1213

Rueca said that the San Francisco Police Department “does not have any sort of specific plan in place” for how lethal force would be applied with robots as “the unusually dangerous or spontaneous operations where SFPD’s need to deliver deadly force via robot would be a rare and exceptional circumstance.”

Why is this happening now?

Cities across California are currently drafting new policies on the use of military weapons by local police forces, thanks to a state law called [AB 481](#), which passed last year. Figuring out the force options of robots is one small part of the law’s remit.

The law mandates that every police force in California must annually report its stock of all military-style weapons, their cost, how they can be used, and how they were deployed in the prior year. The law gives local authorities — in San Francisco’s case, the Board of Supervisors — the ability to annually reject or accept the rules governing how the weapons are used.

From: [Robert E. Rutkowski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Keith Abouchar](#)
Subject: The SFPD want the power to kill with robots
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 12:48:17 PM

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

President Shamann Walton
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-5184 • Fax: (415) 554-5163 • TTY: (415) 554-5227
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: The SFPD want the power to kill with robots

Dear President:

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors will vote soon on a policy that would allow the San Francisco Police Department to use deadly force by arming its many robots. This is a spectacularly dangerous idea and the stance must be clear: police should not arm robots.

Police technology goes through mission creep—meaning equipment reserved only for specific or extreme circumstances ends up being used in increasingly everyday or casual ways. We’ve already seen this with military-grade predator drones flying over protests, and police buzzing by the window of an activist’s home with drones.

As the policy is currently written, the robots’ use will be governed by this passage:

“The robots listed in this section shall not be utilized outside of training and simulations, criminal apprehensions, critical incidents, exigent circumstances, executing a warrant or during suspicious device assessments. Robots will only be used as a deadly force option when risk of loss of life to members of the public or officers is imminent and outweighs any other force option available to SFPD.”

This is incredibly broad language. Police could bring armed robots to every arrest, and every execution of a warrant to search a house or vehicle or device. Depending on how police choose to define the words “critical” or “exigent,” police might even bring armed robots to a protest. While police could only use armed robots as deadly force when the risk of death is imminent, this problematic legal standard has often been under-enforced by courts and criticized by activists.

The combination of new technology, deadly weapons, tense situations, and a remote control trigger is a very combustible brew.

This occurs as many police departments have imported the use of robots from military use into regular policing procedures, and now fight to arm those robots.

In October 2022, the Oakland police department proposed a similar policy to arm robots. Following public outrage, the plans were scrapped within a week.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors will be voting on whether to pass this bill on first reading at their November 29, 2022 meeting, which begins at 2pm. Board of Supervisors member must oppose.

Yours sincerely,
Robert E. Rutkowski

cc:
Correspondence Team
Longworth House Office Building
Washington DC 20515
keith.abouchar@mail.house.gov

2527 Faxon Court
Topeka, Kansas 66605-2086
P/F: 1 785 379-9671
E-mail: r_e_rutkowski@att.net

From: [Raya Steier](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Vote No: SFPD's Draft Military Equipment Use Policy
Date: Saturday, November 26, 2022 3:26:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Raya Steier, I am an API immigrant & District 7 resident. I am employed as the Communications Manager at the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights San Francisco (LCCRSF). I am writing to you in my personal capacity.

I urge you to vote No on SFPD's draft military equipment use policy this Tuesday 11/29/2022. As reported in the [media](#), the draft policy:

- Authorizes SFPD to use armed robots
- Excludes hundreds of assault rifles from SFPD's inventory of military weapons
- Does not include personnel costs in the price of its weapons.

ARMED ROBOTS

- The draft policy allows SFPD to use armed robots to execute a warrant, in criminal apprehensions, critical incidents & exigent circumstances. **The policy does not clarify what counts as an 'exigent circumstance' or 'critical incident'. The wide scope of language authorizing its use leaves it open to interpretation & abuse. This will lead to excessive policing in communities of color.**
- 7071 (d) (1) (A) of AB 481 reads: The governing body shall only approve a military equipment use policy pursuant to this chapter if it determines all of the following: (A) The military equipment is necessary because there is no reasonable alternative that can achieve the same objective of officer and civilian safety. **SFPD has successfully executed warrants and apprehended criminals without the use of armed robots up until now. Clearly, SFPD has reasonable alternative means to carry out these tasks without having to deploy armed robots.**
- It is already incredibly difficult to hold police officers accountable for officer misconduct & excessive use of force. **The use of armed robots will make it even harder for us to seek justice for victims of police violence.**
- Remotely controlled armed robots are vulnerable to hackers who may gain access to them to hurt and kill civilians. Hackers have already [successfully hacked](#) into police surveillance cameras. **SFPD has not laid out any plan to prevent hacking in its draft policy. Hacked armed robots pose a great risk to civilian safety.**
- **Armed robots deployed during protests will discourage people from attending protests, threatening democracy in San Francisco.**
- **The SFPD's use of armed robots crosses an ethical and moral line.** This is why the Mission Local story has sparked outrage in our community.

EXCLUSION OF HUNDREDS OF ASSAULT RIFLES FROM ITS INVENTORY & OMISSION OF PERSONNEL COSTS

SFPD has excluded hundreds of assault rifles in its draft military equipment use policy, in violation of AB 481. In the interest of transparency, the Board must direct SFPD to include assault weapons and personnel costs in its policy, just as police departments have done in other jurisdictions. The Board must not allow SFPD to circumvent state laws to shield itself from transparency & accountability.

For the reasons stated above, I urge you to vote NO on SFPD's draft military equipment use policy on Tuesday 11/29/2022.

Thank you,
Raya Steier

From: [Arthur Koch](#)
To: [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Saini, Nikita \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD military equipment proposed policy file number 220641
Date: Wednesday, November 23, 2022 1:14:54 PM

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

Dear Hillary Ronen,

The reason I am writing to you is I want you to be informed about AB481 before it is voted on by the full board meeting Nov. 29th. I've been attending the Rules Committee meetings and giving public comments. I really appreciate Aaron Peskin's due diligence getting the Police and Sheriff's Department to comply with AB481. If you watch all the comments it will give you the background info on how this has evolved.

<https://youtu.be/EiPAIO1IW6s>

<https://youtu.be/0Gt0nvE5SEQ>

Here is some context. Following police brutality in the George Floyd protests, in September 2021 California created laws both to limit police violence in first amendment assembly (AB 48) and also to increase transparency and accountability in the acquisition and deployment of militarized equipment in California communities (AB 481). AB 481 notes that *"Military equipment is more frequently deployed in low-income Black and Brown communities, meaning the risks and impacts of police militarization are experienced most acutely in marginalized communities."* The law also acknowledges the public's right to know and participate in decisions on funding, acquisition, and use of militarized equipment given these weapons' impact on "the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties".

For more context on police militarization across California, read AFSC's

report: <https://www.afsc.org/militarized-police-california>

Basically we are depending on the Board of Supervisors to take their oversight function of the annual report to ensure public safety by monitoring its use. I'm concerned about the SFPD's decision to classify 375 assault weapons as "Standard issue" out of the 608 total so they would not be accounted for in the annual budget. There is nothing standard issue about an assault rifle. They should only be used in exceptional cases defined by when and in what context they would be used and under what circumstances they should not be used. The cost of training, maintaining them, replacing them, and the injuries they have incurred should be on public record. By reviewing the budget every year the Board can reduce the budget if they are not needed or use of them is abused. Conversely, if there really is a military or terrorist threat, the budget could be increased.

The current draft allows the police department to restock depleted items for up to 10 million dollars without Board approval. This appears to defeat one of the main purposes of this policy which is to provide more oversight and transparency for the public to know and have the information to monitor the funding, acquisition and use of military equipment as decisions are being made. 10 million dollars is an awful lot of equipment to be purchased without Board and public oversight.

I was surprised the SFPD decided to petition the board to use robots to kill suspects that law enforcement deems a sufficient threat. San Francisco has never explicitly allowed for robots to take human lives, with lethal autonomous weapons. The Article below just came out today"

<https://www.yahoo.com/finance/news/san-francisco-police-seek-permission-for-its-robots-to-use-deadly-force-183514906.html>

Thanks for hearing me out. Just let me know if you have any questions.

We really appreciate you for offering to do the ribbon cutting for our Grand Opening Dec. 3rd at 3:00pm. Lisa and I are so excited you will be hanging out with us at our new studio that afternoon!

Much appreciated!

Art Koch

156 girard St
SF, CA 94134
4156-385-4136

From: [Regina Stued](#)
To: [Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Police Department](#)
Subject: [SFPD military equipment use policy](#)
Date: Friday, November 22, 2020, 12:28 PM PST

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

My apologies for misspelling your name. I wrote it down correctly but my fingers typed it wrong. Here is the corrected copy.

Subject: BOS file number 220641: SFPD military equipment use policy

Dear Supervisor Stefani and members of the Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to you to convey my concerns about this policy that will be on the agenda for first reading on November 29, 2022.

The community and the Police Department through the good offices of Supervisor Peikin have worked to improve the draft policy. There is still more that can be done to improve the policy from the communities' viewpoint. Listening to the Rules Committee members comments before the vote to send the policy to the Board, I heard a recognition that close monitoring during the budget process was important. Some of these eligible for renewal items cost a million dollars. That requires close monitoring. Supervisor Chan raised concerns about reviewing the required annual report which will be critical during this first year to determine whether any of the sunset concerns from the community may need to be addressed. We should be asking do we really need this equipment in our community?

I wanted to highlight the preamble from AB 481 here to reinforce the importance of the Board's oversight role. As a San Franciscan I am relying on you my Supervisor to do this job. As a retired attorney I would favor adding a private right of action to the law to provide another avenue for the community to have accountability. Are we going to need that?

Following police brutality in the George Floyd protests, in September 2021 California created laws both to limit police violence in first amendment assembly (AB 48) and also to increase transparency and accountability in the acquisition and deployment of militarized equipment in California communities (AB 481). AB 481 notes that "Military equipment is more frequently deployed in low-income Black and Brown communities, meaning the risks and impacts of police militarization are experienced most acutely in marginalized communities." The law also acknowledges the public's right to know and participate in decisions on funding, acquisition, and use of militarized equipment given these weapons' impact on "the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties".

I understand that it is unlikely that the board will entertain amendments to the policy at the Board meeting. For example, I would like there to be more clarity in defining authorized use for some items. I would like to see personnel time for training and maintenance included in the annual report. I would like all assault rifles to be listed in the report even though those considered standard issue are not required to be included. People really want to know exactly how these weapons are being used. It will be hard to get a clear picture if we don't have all assault weapons in the report.

And finally I want to bring your attention to the attached letter signed by many community organizations which asks Attorney General Bonta to provide statewide guidelines for this state law. That makes sense to me to have a consistent approach as a state. Please review the rationale supporting this request in the letter.

<https://mail.asanra.com/k/32> <https://www.afta.org/sites/default/files/documents/14007%20-%20Attorney%20General%20Bonta%20-%20Request%20for%20Guidance%20on%20Use%20of%20Militarized%20Equipment%20in%20Communities.pdf> https://www.sfpd.org/~/media/Files/Community/2020/11/22/20201122_SFPD_Militarized_Equipment_Use_Policy_Proposed_Changes.pdf

Thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns.

Regina Stued
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom member
Resident of District Two

From: [Gee, Natalie \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Issue Brief re: SFPD's Weaponized Robots Proposal
Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 10:02:13 AM
Attachments: [Policing Project Brief on SFPD's Weaponized Robots Proposal 11.29.22.pdf](#)

Good morning Clerk Team,

Please add this to the communications regarding item #28/file no. 220641. Thank you!

Natalie Gee 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff
Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10
President, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282
Direct: 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670

From: Max Isaacs <max.isaacs@law.nyu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 9:51 AM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Subject: Issue Brief re: SFPD's Weaponized Robots Proposal

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

Dear Supervisor Walton:

I am a staff attorney at the Policing Project at New York University School of Law, a center which partners with communities and police to promote public safety through transparency, equity, and democratic engagement. Among other things, our center has conducted extensive research regarding the ethical implications of police drones and robots.

I write to you regarding the San Francisco Police Department's proposal to authorize the use of weaponized robots by police. This proposal raises significant ethical concerns which SFPD's policy, at present, fails to address.

Please find attached a one-page issue brief detailing our concerns and urging the Board of Supervisors to reject SFPD's proposal at this time.

Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to reach out to me if you have any questions or if we can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Max Isaacs

--

Max Isaacs (*he/him*)
Staff Attorney, Policing Project
NYU School of Law
www.policingproject.org

ISSUE BRIEF: WEAPONIZED ROBOTS

This issue brief shares our perspective on the San Francisco Police Department's proposal to authorize weaponized robots. We applaud the Board of Supervisors' decision to consider this issue in a transparent manner. Having studied police use of weaponized robots in considerable detail, we believe the SFPD's proposal leaves too many important questions unanswered, leaving the Board without critical information it would need to make a sound decision. Thus, we urge the Board to withhold authorization.

For over a year, our organization worked with Axon's independent AI Ethics Board to study the ethical implications of weaponized robotics. This work led a majority of the Ethics Board to recommend that Axon not proceed with a proposed pilot program which would entail equipping police drones with Tasers. Axon's subsequent announcement that it was proceeding with a weaponized drone product to be installed in schools to address mass shootings [led nine of the Ethics Board's twelve members to resign](#). Axon's program differs from SFPD's in many respects, but some of our key concerns apply with equal force.

Although there may well be potentially-beneficial use cases for police robots, and even for weaponized ones, the decision whether to deploy them is a momentous one. No policing agency should be permitted to deploy these tools without express democratic authorization, and that is why we are pleased that the Board of Supervisors is carefully scrutinizing this proposal.

Whether the possible benefits of weaponized police robots outweigh their possible harms depends on numerous factors, including how the technology is designed and policies governing use. As written, however, the SFPD's policy leaves many critical questions unanswered. These questions include:

- **What policies will constrain officer discretion as to when robots will be deployed?** Policing technologies often are disproportionately deployed in overpoliced and disadvantaged communities. It is essential that there be rules constraining police discretion as to when and where robots are deployed.
- **What de-escalation tactics should be used in the context of police robotics?** Careful attention to de-escalation is crucial given the unique dynamics of remote use of force. In the context of military weaponized robots, individuals against whom force is used appear as figures on a screen, potentially leading to the dehumanization of individuals and a diminished sense of moral culpability by operators. This makes it all the more crucial to develop effective ways to avoid the use of force.
- **Will officers be required to be at the scene?** Although robotics enable police to contact suspects remotely, it often is beneficial to have an officer in person at the scene of an incident — for example, to enhance situational awareness, create better conditions to negotiate with a hostage-taker, or to better observe a suspect's demeanor and actions.
- **What rules govern the use of non-deadly force?** Although the SFPD's policy provides that deadly force is authorized only when there is an imminent risk to life, it does not specify whether this standard also applies to non-deadly force. As noted above, for example, Axon has proposed equipping drones with Tasers — tools which, although less deadly than firearms, can still inflict significant bodily injury and even death. More clarification is needed regarding proposed uses for weaponized drones and restrictions on such use.
- **What are the mechanisms for accountability?** If and when problems arise from police use of robotic force (such as injuries caused by accidents, misuse, or operational issues), it may be unclear under existing legal frameworks who would be held responsible — from the police chief to the drone operator to the product vendor — and how.
- **How will the SFPD mitigate operational risks?** The use of weaponized robotics potentially entails a multitude of risks including mechanical failures, operator error, and hacking by bad actors. Any one of these could have catastrophic consequences in the context of weaponized robots, with harms likely to fall disproportionately on overpoliced communities.

These questions only skim the surface. Other questions may include in what situations deployment of robots is inappropriate (e.g., at protests or in situations where deployment may cause public panic), what procedures will govern the decision to deploy robotic force, and how the program's effectiveness will be assessed. We urge the Board of Supervisors to withhold authorization until these and other important questions have been answered and the citizens of San Francisco have had an opportunity to make their voices heard.