

From: [Ana Elisa Fuentes](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)
Cc: [mcagle](#)
Subject: Re: Ordinance approving Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras
Date: Monday, July 11, 2022 12:47:36 PM
Importance: High

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

Monday July 11, 2022

Dear Board of Supervisors, Chan, Reskin, and Mandelman; Mr. Young and Mr. Cagle -

I am writing with concern regarding the San Francisco Police Department's proposed policy for the extended use of non-city entity cameras as a surveillance technology tool. A policy proposal sponsored by Mayor Breed.

First, from this morning's meeting it sounds as if this policy has already been decided. Yet, in the same breath you (SFPD and the BoS) ask for public trust - a trust breached and made apparent by Chief Scott's early departure from the meeting. If he really cared about public trust, he would have stayed to listen to public comments. This is meeting was pro forma not pro fiducia.

All parties represented in the meeting this morning are already keenly aware that the SFPD has breached the public trust on many matters, including the matter held this morning. Nothing was said about BUILDING PUBLIC TRUST.

I do not understand for the life of me, how the latitude and extended use of surveillance technology will repair or assuage *building* public trust.? Are you really listening to your constituents? You keep asking for more and more public trust without earning it; asking for more and more without the conduct that earns it.

Question, please explain how will the expanded, increased, and extended use of surveillance technology will BUILD public trust?

It pains me to express that our police department has done more to violate public trust than it has to earn or build it. For me personally, I over the last few years experienced an egregious violation of identity theft. Upon learning of the violation, I acted promptly and responsibly which included filing a complaint with the SFPD.

San Francisco Police Department made the violations against me worse. Rather than acting to protect me and to investigate the crime against me; they exacerbated the violation; conflated it with another case; confused me with someone else entirely different; and then tried to make me the perpetrator.

It took me, contacting federal authorities and the CA DoJ to motivate SFPD, well over a year later, to send me a stamped investigation copy. At a later date, I personally, went to the SFPD station to update my file with a document of verification by the IRS and the police officer at the station **would not** accept the IRS document. SHE REFUSED TO ACCEPT A ONE PAGE PIECE OF PAPER FROM THE IRS TO UPDATE MY FILE ON MY BEHALF, TO PROTECT ME. How does this build trust?

This breach and violation of my identity impacted my Paralegal studies at SFSU which impacted my tuition and reimbursements and of course my banking; this violation furthers impacts me currently in my housing and employment choices.

If this is happening to me, it is happening to many others. Recently the Journal of the American Medical Association concluded that out of 52 California counties San Francisco had the highest injury rate for Black residents. It is a well known fact that video surveillance, Artificial Intelligence technologies are imperfect and often lead in the mis-identification of darker skinned people. This is common knowledge.

With this awareness, what audacity you have to ask for public trust. Do you really take your constituents for fools? Are we suppose to forget that this same surveillance technology was used to spy on protesters at the Black Lives Matters protesters at Union Square?

Why do you continue to conduct yourselves and make decisions counter to your constituents, pitting us against each other; then demand more public trust? Your job is to listen and to act upon the recommendations of your constituents. Are you listening?

This will be a technology used by a police force that consistently demonstrates corruption; use of force; and a conduct that blurs the lines between police, criminals and criminal conduct. Used by a police force whose officers held up a pharmacy to obtain drugs for their personal use (maybe to sell); officer involved in forgery schemes and identity theft; police officers who employ thugs to frame others; police officers who STORED THE DNA OF RAPE VICTIMS for their personal database.

And we are suppose to believe that SFPD will not abuse the surveillance technology?

Do you really take your constituents for fools?

Are we really suppose to trust that any future breach of trust by police will be governed by fair oversight?

This very lack of oversight is the hallmark of corruption that is the hallmark of this city.

I strongly oppose the latitude the BoS has delivered to the police department.

Most sincerely,

Ana Elisa Fuentes

My concerns on the employment of surveillance technology

Ana Elisa Fuentes

<http://anaelisafoto.wordpress.com>