

File No. 220606

Committee Item No. 6

Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date July 25, 2022

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date _____

Cmte Board

- Motion
- Resolution
- Ordinance
- Legislative Digest
- Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
- Youth Commission Report
- Introduction Form
- Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- Grant Information Form
- Grant Budget
- Subcontract Budget
- Contract/Agreement
- Form 126 - Ethics Commission
- Award Letter
- Application
- Form 700
- Information/Vacancies (Boards/Commissions)
- Public Correspondence

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- Charter Amendment _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Completed by: Victor Young

Date July 21, 2022

Completed by: _____

Date _____

1 [Administrative Code - Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City
2 Entity Surveillance Cameras]

3 **Ordinance approving Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of**
4 **non-City entity surveillance cameras.**

5 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
6 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
7 **Deletions to Codes** are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.
8 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.
9 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
10 **Asterisks (* * * *)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code
11 subsections or parts of tables.

12 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

13 Section 1. Background.

14 (a) Administrative Code Chapter 19(B) establishes requirements that City departments
15 must follow before they may use or acquire new Surveillance Technology. Under
16 Administrative Code Section 19B.2(a), a City department must obtain Board of Supervisors
17 approval by ordinance of a Surveillance Technology Policy before: (1) seeking funds for
18 Surveillance Technology; (2) acquiring or borrowing new Surveillance Technology; (3) using
19 new or existing Surveillance Technology for a purpose, in a manner, or in a location not
20 specified in a Board-approved Surveillance Technology ordinance; (4) entering into
21 agreement with a non-City entity to acquire, share, or otherwise use Surveillance Technology;
22 or (5) entering into an oral or written agreement under which a non-City entity or individual
23 regularly provides the department with data or information acquired through the entity's use of
24 Surveillance Technology.

25 (b) Under Administrative Code Section 19B.2(b), the Board of Supervisors may
approve a Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance under Section 19B.2(a) only if: (1) the

1 department seeking Board approval first submits to the Committee on Information Technology
2 (COIT) a Surveillance Impact Report for the Surveillance Technology to be acquired or used;
3 (2) based on the Surveillance Impact Report, COIT develops a Surveillance Technology
4 Policy for the Surveillance Technology to be acquired or used; and (3) at a public meeting at
5 which COIT considers the Surveillance Technology Policy, COIT recommends that the Board
6 adopt, adopt with modification, or decline to adopt the Surveillance Technology Policy for the
7 Surveillance Technology to be acquired or used.

8 (c) Under Administrative Code Section 19B.4, the City policy is that the Board of
9 Supervisors will approve a Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance only if it determines that
10 the benefits that the Surveillance Technology ordinance authorizes outweigh its costs, that the
11 Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance will safeguard civil liberties and civil rights, and that
12 the uses and deployments of the Surveillance Technology under the ordinance will not be
13 based upon discriminatory or viewpoint-based factors or have a disparate impact on any
14 community or Protected Class.

15 Section 2. Surveillance Technology Policy Ordinance for Police Department Use of
16 Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras.

17 (a) Purpose. The Police Department seeks Board of Supervisors authorization under
18 Section 19B.2(a) to use surveillance cameras and surveillance camera networks owned,
19 leased, managed, or operated by non-City entities to: (1) temporarily live monitor activity
20 during exigent circumstances, significant events with public safety concerns, and
21 investigations relating to active misdemeanor and felony violations; (2) gather and review
22 historical video footage for the purposes of conducting a criminal investigation; and (3) gather
23 and review historical video footage for the purposes of an internal investigation regarding
24 officer misconduct.

1 (b) Surveillance Impact Report. The Police Department submitted to COIT a
2 Surveillance Impact Report for Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras. A copy of the Police
3 Department Surveillance Impact Report for Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras is in Board
4 File No. 220606, and is incorporated herein by reference.

5 (c) Public Hearings. Between March 25, 2022 and April 21, 2022, inclusive, COIT and
6 its Privacy and Surveillance Advisory Board (PSAB) conducted four public hearings at which
7 they considered the Surveillance Impact Report referenced in subsection (b) and developed a
8 Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance
9 cameras. A copy of the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of the
10 Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras ("San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Non-City
11 Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy") is in Board File No. 220606, and is incorporated herein
12 by reference.

13 (d) COIT Recommendation. On April 21, 2022, COIT voted to recommend the SFPD
14 Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

15 (e) Findings. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the stated benefits of the
16 Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras outweigh the costs and risks
17 of use of such Surveillance Technology; that the SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras
18 Policy will safeguard civil liberties and civil rights; and that the uses and deployments of non-
19 City entity surveillance cameras, as set forth in the SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance
20 Cameras Policy, will not be based upon discriminatory or viewpoint-based factors or have a
21 disparate impact on any community or a protected class.

22 Section 3. Approval of Policy.

23 The Board of Supervisors hereby approves the SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance
24 Cameras Policy.

1 Section 4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
2 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
3 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
4 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

5 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
6 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

7 By: /s/ Zachary Porianda
8 ZACHARY PORIANDA
9 Deputy City Attorney

10 n:\govern\as2022\1900636\01602001.docx

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Administrative Code - Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras]

Ordinance approving Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Background Information

Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 19B.2(b), the Police Department seeks Board of Supervisors approval of a surveillance technology policy regarding use of the Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras (“San Francisco Police Department Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy”). The proposed Surveillance Technology Policy would authorize the Police Department to use surveillance cameras and surveillance camera networks owned, leased, managed, or operated by non-City entities to: (1) temporarily live monitor activity during exigent circumstances, significant events with public safety concerns, and investigations relating to active misdemeanor and felony violations; (2) gather and review historical video footage for the purposes of conducting a criminal investigation; and (3) gather and review historical video footage for the purposes of an internal investigation regarding officer misconduct.

n:\govern\as2022\1900636\01602069.docx



Surveillance Technology Policy

Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras
San Francisco Police Department (SFPD)

The City and County of San Francisco values the privacy and protection of San Francisco residents' civil rights and civil liberties. As required by San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 19B, the Surveillance Technology Policy aims to ensure the responsible use of "Non-City Entity" Security Camera System by Department as well as any associated data to which Department is privy, and the protection of City and County of San Francisco residents' civil rights and liberties.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Pursuant to the San Francisco Charter, the Police Department is required to preserve the public peace, prevent, and detect crime, and protect the rights of persons and property by enforcing the laws of the United States, the State of California, and the City and County. The Department's mission is to protect life and property, prevent crime and reduce the fear of crime by providing service with understanding, response with compassion, performance with integrity and law enforcement with vision.

The Surveillance Technology Policy ("Policy") defines the way the non-city entity Security Camera System will be used to support department operations.

This Policy applies to all department personnel that use, plan to use, or plan to secure non-city entity security camera systems or data, including employees, contractors, and volunteers. Employees, consultants, volunteers, and vendors while working on behalf of the City with the Department are required to comply with this Policy.

POLICY STATEMENT

This policy applies to security camera data sharing between SFPD and the following entities:

- Any non-City entity or individual, through consent, subpoena search warrant or other court order, who provides SFPD with data access or information acquired through the entity's or individual's use of surveillance cameras or surveillance camera networks owned, leased, managed and/or operated by the entity or individual. These entities do not have financial agreements with SFPD.

This policy excludes any surveillance cameras that meet both of the following conditions:

- Paid for through a city grant
- Owned by a non-City entity that is under a contractual agreement with the City requiring them to share live feed or historical footage from the camera

SFPD is limited to the following authorized use(s) and requirements listed in this Policy only.

Surveillance Oversight Review Dates

COIT Review: April 21, 2022

Board of Supervisors Review: TBD

Authorized Use(s):

1. Temporary live monitoring during an exigency as defined by San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 19B, or Significant Events with public safety concerns, or investigations relating to active misdemeanor and felony violations. Temporary live monitoring will cease, and the connection will be severed within 24 hours after the non-city entity has provided access to SFPD. SFPD shall not record live monitoring however, if misdemeanor or felony violations are observed, nothing in this policy ordinance prohibits SFPD from deferring to authorized use No. 2 or No. 3 of this section.
2. Requesting, obtaining, and reviewing historical video footage for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to a criminal investigation.
3. Requesting, obtaining, and reviewing historical video footage for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to an internal investigation regarding officer misconduct.

Prohibitions:

- Surveillance camera footage will not on its own identify an individual, confirm racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, or information concerning an individual person's sex life or sexual orientation.
- SFPD is prohibited from using biometric identification or facial recognition technology in connection with non-City entity surveillance cameras or associated data.
- SFPD is prohibited from live monitoring inside residential dwellings where homeowners/renters have a reasonable expectation of privacy unless one the following conditions exist: Exigency per SF Admin Code 19b.7; a homeowner/renter/individual with legal authority to do so provides consent; or a warrant is issued. If the conditions exist, SFPD shall adhere to the authorized use and reporting provisions relating to temporary live monitoring.
- SFPD is prohibited from monitoring any certain groups or individuals based, in whole or in part, on race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation. Race, color, ethnicity, or national origin may not be used as a motivating factor for initiating police enforcement action.
- SFPD is prohibited from accessing, requesting, or monitoring any surveillance camera live feed during First Amendment activities for reasons outside of redeployment needs due to crowd sizes or other issues creating public safety hazards. SFPD members are required to comply with SFPD Department General Order (DGO) 8.03 Crowd Control,

DGO 8.10 Guidelines for First Amendment Activities and its annual audit requirements, and the SFPD Event Manual to ensure the safety of those attending planned or spontaneous events.

- SFPD members shall not acquire or use surveillance camera footage in cooperation with or assisting U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement or U.S. Customs and Border Protection in any investigation, detention, or arrest procedures, public or clandestine, where in any such instance the purpose is the enforcement of federal immigration laws. SFPD complies with SF Administrative Code Chapters 12H "Immigration Status" and 12I "Civil Immigration Detainers" and [SFPD General Order \(DGO\) 5.15 "Enforcement of Immigration Laws"](#).

BUSINESS JUSTIFICATION

[A description of the product, including vendor and general location of technology]

Categories: Residential, Small Business, Commercial Security Camera Systems.

Subcategories: Indoor, Outdoor

Typical Camera Types [Not vendor specific]:

- Box Camera: A Box Style camera is a standalone camera. The name is derived from the shape of the camera.
- Dome Camera: A dome camera is a combination of camera, lens, and ceiling mount packaged in a discreet dome shape.
- PTZ Camera: A PTZ camera contains mechanical controls that allow the operator to remotely pan, tilt, and zoom the camera.
- Bullet Camera: A bullet camera is a combination of camera, lens, and housing packaged in a bullet-style body.
- IP Camera: An IP camera transmits a digital signal using Internet Protocol over a network
- Wireless IP Camera: Wireless IP security cameras offers ease of installation and eliminates the cost of network cabling when adding this camera to your video surveillance system.
- Day/Night Camera: A Day/night camera is a camera used indoor and outdoor for environments with low light conditions.
- Wide Dynamic Cameras: Wide Dynamic Cameras can balance light-levels on a pixel-by-pixel basis
- Smart/Doorbell Cameras: cameras typically affixed to a or inside of a residence.

Security Cameras supports the Department's mission and provides important operational value in the following ways:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Health | Protect safety of visitors and residents of San Francisco. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Environment | |

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| X | Criminal Justice | Review video footage after a crime has occurred; officer and community safety during live monitoring; corroborate witness statements; investigative tool; provide objective video evidence to the DA's office for prosecutorial functions or provide to the public upon request through a formal process, order, or subpoena. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Housing | |
| X | Other | Effective public-safety interventions to curb crime and improve livability and wellbeing of communities. |

In addition, the following benefits are obtained:

| Benefit | | Description |
|----------------|-------------------|---|
| X | Financial Savings | Non-city entity Security Camera Systems do not require Department operational funding and reduce reliance on first-hand accounts by patrol officers or fixed posts, making deployments more effective and efficient. |
| X | Time Savings | Non-city entity Security Camera Systems may run 24/7, thus decreasing or eliminating building or patrol officer supervision. Reviewing Third Party data may also decrease demands on investigative units corroborating first-hand accounts of criminal activity. |
| X | Staff Safety | Non-city entity Security Camera Systems provide situational awareness and increase officer safety, particularly during live video reviews. |
| X | Service Levels | Non-city entity Security cameras will enhance effectiveness of incident response, criminal investigations, and result in improved level of service. Criminal activity captured through video can help verify the act of the crime and corroborate whether a suspect has been correctly identified and corroborate witness statements to assist with conviction rates. |

POLICY REQUIREMENTS

This Policy defines the responsible data management processes and legally enforceable safeguards required by the Department to ensure transparency, oversight, and accountability measures. Department use of surveillance technology and information collected, retained, processed, or shared by surveillance technology must be consistent with this Policy; must comply with all City, State, and Federal laws and regulations; and must protect all state and federal Constitutional guarantees.

Data Collection: Department shall only collect data required to execute the authorized use case. All surveillance technology data shared with Department by Non-city entity, including PII, shall be classified according to the City's [Data Classification Standard](#).

The surveillance technology collects some or all the following data types:

| <i>Data Type(s)</i> | <i>Format(s)</i> | <i>Classification</i> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Video and Images | MP4, AVI, MPEG | Level 4 |
| Date and Time | MP4 or other format | Level 4 |
| Geolocation data | TXT, CSV, DOCX | Level 4 |

Notification: Departments shall rely on the non-city entity vendor to manage public notifications relating to surveillance technology operation at the site of operations through signage in readily viewable public areas in accordance to Section 19.5 of the Administrative Code.

Access: Prior to accessing or using data, authorized individuals within the Department receive training in system access and operation, and instruction regarding authorized and prohibited uses.

Access to live views and recorded footage is restricted to members who have receive authorization from their officer and charge and have reviewed this policy, connected written directives, and acknowledged on SFPD Power DMS.

A. *Department employees*

Once collected, the following roles and job titles are authorized to access and use data collected, retained, processed, or shared by the surveillance technology with Level 4 classification:

- Non-sworn members, at the direction of Officer in Charge. The Officer in Charge (OIC) is any member working in a supervisory capacity over a unit, group, or team. The OIC is not rank specific.
- Q2-Q4, Police Officer
- Q35-Q37, Assistant Inspector
- Q0380- Q0382, Inspector
- Q50-Q-52, Sergeant
- Q60-Q62, Lieutenant
- Q80-Q82, Captain
- 0488-0490, Commander
- 0400-0402, Deputy Chief
- 0395, Assistant Chief

- 0390, Chief of Police

Live monitoring requests shall be limited to the following roles and job titles upon authorization of a Captain (Q80-Q82) rank:

- Q2-Q4, Police Officer
- Q35-Q37, Assistant Inspector
- Q0380- Q0382, Inspector
- Q50-Q-52, Sergeant
- Q60-Q62, Lieutenant
- Q80-Q82, Captain

The approving Captain shall use good faith belief or objectively reasonable reliance on information confirming exigency or misdemeanor or felony violations for the basis of approving or denying live monitoring requests. Upon Board of Supervisors approval of this policy ordinance, the Department will determine a mechanism for the ranks Q2 – Q62 to receive Captain rank approval. The Department’s Written Directives Unit shall update the “Permission to Search -Form 468” that may be provided to the non-city entity or individual to substantiate the consent for SFPD live monitoring request. The non-city entity or individual retains the right to refuse the request.

Live monitoring viewing rights include the following roles and job titles:

- Q2-Q4, Police Officer
- Q50-Q-52, Sergeant
- Q35-Q37, Assistant Inspector
- Q0380- Q0382, Inspector
- Q60-Q62, Lieutenant
- Q80-Q82, Captain
- 0488-0490, Commander
- 0400-0402, Deputy Chief
- 0395, Assistant Chief
- 0390, Chief of Police

B. Members of the public

Members of the public may request access by submission of a request pursuant to San Francisco’s [Sunshine Ordinance](#). No record shall be withheld from disclosure in its entirety unless all information contained in it is exempt from disclosure under express provisions of the California Public Records Act or some other statute.

Data Security:

Department shall secure any PII received from non-city entity or individuals (or shared by non-city entity) against unauthorized or unlawful processing or disclosure; unwarranted access, manipulation, or misuse; and accidental loss, destruction, or damage. Surveillance technology data collected and retained by the Department shall be protected by the safeguards appropriate for its classification

level(s) as defined by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) security framework 800-53, or equivalent requirements from other major cybersecurity framework selected by the department.

Departments shall, at minimum, apply the following safeguards to protect surveillance technology information received from non-city entity from unauthorized access and control, including misuse:

- Storage: Any storage of a non-city entity's camera footage must reside in a SFPD specified repository that meets the City's cyber security requirements as well as Department of Justice California Law Enforcement Telecommunications Systems (CLETS) and Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) requirements. Video Retrieval Officers may initially store footage provided by a business or individual on a USB or CD. Upon the execution of a city contract with a digital evidence management system vendor, members shall transfer the footage to this system that requires an agency domain and log in. The evidence management system will have a platform that is auditable and can track the source of upload and number of views. This platform will not be accessible to members of the public or anyone without an approved log-in. This platform will meet the requirements of the Office of Contract Administration ("OCA") who promulgates rules and regulations pursuant to Chapter 21 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The SFPD Contracting Department shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 21 and cooperate to the fullest extent with OCA in the Acquisition of Commodities and Services.
- Audits: SFPD members shall note in the chronological record of investigation ("chron") time/date surveillance footage was requested, approved, or denied by non-city entity, and in the case of live monitoring requests, SFPD members shall note in an incident report and/or the chron the captain's approval, date/time of access, duration of access and outcome of access. Upon implementation of the internal records management system, SFPD members shall note this information in this system. This data will serve as the Department's audit log, which is electronically accessible for on-demand audits
- Reporting: SFPD shall submit an annual surveillance report as outlined in SF Administrative Code Sections 19B.1 and 19B.6. Upon adoption of the non-city entity surveillance camera policy ordinance, SFPD shall submit a quarterly report tracking live monitoring requests to the Police Commission, copying the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. The reporting requirement shall commence 60 days after the first full quarter following adoption and every quarter thereafter. After the first two years of quarterly reports to the Commission, the Department will thereafter submit a bi-annual report.

Data
Sharing:

The Non-city entity is the custodian of its Surveillance Technology data. The non-city entity may share such data with the Department or other entities solely at its discretion.

Data is shared by non-city entity with the Department on the following schedule:

X Upon Request

X As needed

Weekly

Monthly

Other:

A. Internal (City Entity) Data Sharing

Department shares the following data with the recipients:

-District Attorney's Office for use as evidence to aid in prosecution, in accordance with laws governing evidence.

-Public Defender's Office or criminal defense attorney via the District Attorney's Office in accordance with California discovery laws.

-The Department of Police Accountability per Section 4.136(j) of the San Francisco Charter

-Other City agencies impacted by a criminal incident captured by the surveillance camera footage.

Data sharing occurs at the following frequency: As needed

B. External (Non-City Entity) Data Sharing

Department shares the following data with the recipients:

-Law enforcement partners, as part of a criminal or administrative investigation; Parties to civil litigation, or other third parties, in response to a valid Court Order; Media may receive redacted footage relating to Officer Involved Shooting Townhall meetings or other public safety issues requiring the public's awareness or assistance.

To ensure that entities receiving data collected by the surveillance technology comply with the Surveillance Technology Policy, Department shall: Comply with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations, including but not limited to, to the extent applicable, the California Values Act (Government Code Section 7284 et seq.) which prohibits state and local law enforcement agencies from engaging certain acts related to immigration enforcement.

If determined by Department's general counsel or SFPD's legal division, surveillance camera footage can be disclosed in response to a public information request. Based on legal advice, the department will redact PII as it may be considered investigative/evidentiary material. The Department may use its discretion when releasing investigative/evidentiary material per [SFPD DGO 3.16](#).

Data sharing occurs at the following frequency: As needed

Data Retention: Department may store and retain PII data shared by the non-city entity only as long as necessary to accomplish a lawful and authorized purpose. Records shall be purged according to the current San Francisco Police Department Records Retention and Destruction Schedule which calls for destruction of intelligence files two years from the last date of entry with the following exceptions:

- a) Information may be maintained if it is part of an ongoing investigation or prosecution.
- b) All investigative files shall be maintained according to CA Penal Code, Evidence Code, department retention guidelines and according to state and federal law.
- c) Records showing violation of these guidelines shall not be destroyed or recollected for the purpose of avoiding disclosure.

The Department's data retention period and justification are as follows:

- Security Camera data shared with Department by Non-city entity will be stored only for the period necessary for investigation or litigation following an incident. As the data is associated with a criminal investigation, the data is retained for a minimum of two years, or as required by State evidence retention laws. Camera footage associated with an officer misconduct or Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) investigation will be maintained in perpetuity.
- Justification: A shorter retention period safeguards PII from inappropriate or unauthorized use by minimizing the period and purposes for which it may be retained. For data affiliated with criminal investigation, two years allows adequate time for the Department and partner departments to access footage to determine whether it constitutes meaningful evidence. If so determined, the SFPD will retain data in a safe environment as required by relevant evidence laws to ensure access for legal discovery.

Data may be stored in the following location:

- Local storage (e.g., local server, storage area network (SAN), network-attached storage (NAS), backup tapes, etc.)
- Department of Technology Data Center
- Software as a Service Product
- Cloud Storage Provider

Data Disposal: The Police Department does not have a contract or legal agreement with a non-city entity governing non-city entity data use, including but not limited to non-city entity party data use, sharing, signage, retention, and/or disposal.

Upon completion of the data retention period, Department shall dispose of data in the following manner:

- Delete from local storage
- Delete from USB thumb drive or disk if not associated with investigative file

Training: To reduce the possibility that surveillance technology or its associated data will be misused or used contrary to its authorized use, all individuals requiring access on behalf of Department must receive training on data security policies and procedures.

California Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) including but not limited to

- LD 15 Laws of Arrest
- LD 16 Search and Seizure
- LD 17 Presentation of Evidence
- LD 23 Crimes in Progress
- LD 26 Critical Incidents
- LD 30 Crime Scenes, Evidence, and Forensics
- LD 42 Cultural Diversity/Discrimination
- LD 43 Terrorism Awareness
- PC 872 (b) Hearsay Testimony

SF City & County Employee Portal

- Cybersecurity Training

SFPD Training

- Critical Mindset Coordinated Response Training
- DGO 8.10 Guidelines for First Amendment Activities
- Video Retrieval Training (two-day)
- Crowd Control Training

COMPLIANCE

Department shall oversee and enforce compliance with this Policy according to the respective memorandum of understanding of employees and their respective labor union agreement.

Allegations of 19B Violations: Members of the public may submit written notice of an alleged violation of Chapter 19B to SFPDChief@sfgov.org. If the Department takes corrective measures in response to such an allegation, the Department will post a notice within 30 days that generally describes the corrective measures taken to address such allegation. The Department will comply with allegation and misconduct processes as set forth by the city Charter.

If a Department is alleged to have violated the Ordinance under San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 19B, Department shall post a notice on the Department's website that generally describes any corrective measure taken to address such allegation.

Department is subject to enforcement procedures, as outlined in San Francisco Administrative Code Section 19B.8.

Sanctions for violations of this Policy include the following:

San Francisco Police Department will conduct an internal investigation through the Chief of Staff/Internal Affairs (IA) Unit or may refer the case to the Department of Police Accountability. The results of the investigation will be reported to the Chief of Police, who will determine the penalty for instances of misconduct. Under San Francisco Charter section A8.343, the Chief may impose discipline of up to a 10-day suspension on allegations brought by the Internal Affairs Division or the Department of Police Accountability. Depending on the severity of the allegation of misconduct, the Chief or the Department of Police Accountability may elect to file charges with the Police Commission for any penalty greater than the 10-day suspension. Any discipline sought must be consistent with principles of just cause and progressive discipline and in accordance with the SFPD Disciplinary Guidelines.

DEFINITIONS

Personally Identifiable Information (PII): Information that can be used to distinguish or trace an individual's identity, either alone or when combined with other personal or identifying information that is linked or linkable to a specific individual.

Significant Events: These are large or high-profile events in the city where SFPD Special Events Unit and Traffic Company manage street closures, barricades, and crowd management; Special Investigations Division (SID) manages dignitary escorts; or Homeland Security Unit (HSU)/Special Ops is assigned to thwart potential terrorist or criminal attacks. These units may require and request additional deployment efforts

during these high-profile events based on activity detected during live monitoring which allows for situational awareness and the ability to coordinate resources based on information obtained.

Exigent Circumstances: See Admin Code Sec. 19B.1

AUTHORIZATION

Section 19B.4 of the City's Administrative Code states, "It is the policy of the Board of Supervisors that it will approve a Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance only if it determines that the benefits the Surveillance Technology ordinance authorizes outweigh its costs, that the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance will safeguard civil liberties and civil rights, and that the uses and deployments of the Surveillance Technology under the ordinance will not be based upon discriminatory or viewpoint-based factors or have a disparate impact on any community or Protected Class."

QUESTIONS & CONCERNS

Complaints of Officer Misconduct: Members of the public can register complaints about SFPD activities with the Department of Police Accountability (DPA), 1 Van Ness Ave 8th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103, (415) 241-7711, <https://sf.gov/departments/departments-police-accountability>. DPA, by Charter authority, receives and manages all citizen complaints relating to SFPD. DPA manages, acknowledges, and responds to complaints from members of the public.

Concerns and Inquiries: Department shall acknowledge and respond to concerns in a timely and manner. To do so, the Department has included a 19B Surveillance Technology Policy page on its public website : <https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/your-sfpd/policies/19b-surveillance-technology-policies>. This page includes an email address for public inquiries: SFPDChief@sfgov.org. This email is assigned to several staff members in the Chief's Office who will respond to inquiries within 48 hours.

City and County of San Francisco Employees:

All questions regarding this policy should be directed to the Chief of Police at SFPDChief@sfgov.org. Similarly, questions about other applicable laws governing the use of the surveillance technology or the issues related to privacy should be directed to the Chief of Police at SFPDChief@sfgov.org



Committee on Information Technology

Office of the City Administrator

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Carmen Chu, City Administrator

Jillian Johnson, Director, Committee of Information Technology

Date: May 18, 2021

Subject: Legislation introduced to approve Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras

In compliance with Section 19B of the City and County of San Francisco's Administrative Code, the City Administrator's Office is pleased to submit the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

To engage the public in discussion on the role of government surveillance, the Committee on Information Technology (COIT) and its subcommittee the Privacy and Surveillance Advisory Board (PSAB) held 4 public meetings between March and April to review and approve the policy. All details of these discussions are available at sf.gov/coit.

The following page provides greater detail on the review process for the Surveillance Technology Policy, and COIT's recommended course of action.

If you have questions on the review process please direct them to Jillian Johnson, Director of the Committee on Information Technology (COIT).

Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras

| Department | Authorized Uses |
|-------------------|--|
| Police Department | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Temporary live monitoring during an exigency as defined by San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 19B, or Significant Events with public safety concerns, or investigations relating to active misdemeanor and felony violations. Temporary live monitoring will cease, and the connection will be severed within 24 hours after the non-city entity has provided access to SFPD. SFPD shall not record live monitoring however, if misdemeanor or felony violations are observed, nothing in this policy ordinance prohibits SFPD from deferring to authorized use No. 2 or No. 3 of this section. 2. Requesting, obtaining, and reviewing historical video footage for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to a criminal investigation. 3. Requesting, obtaining, and reviewing historical video footage for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to an internal investigation regarding officer misconduct. |

Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Public Meeting Dates:

| Date | Meeting |
|----------------|--|
| March 25, 2022 | Privacy and Surveillance Advisory Board (PSAB) |
| March 31, 2022 | Privacy and Surveillance Advisory Board (PSAB) |
| April 7, 2022 | Committee on Information Technology (COIT) |
| April 21, 2022 | Committee on Information Technology (COIT) |

COIT recommends the following action be taken on the policy:

- Approve the Non-City Entity Cameras Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department.

Non-City Entity Surveillance Camera Policy Ordinance

SF Admin Code 19B



CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Police Department

July 11, 2022

Public Hearings

Pursuant to SF Admin Code 19B, Department's must submit a Surveillance Impact Report (SIR) in order to develop a Surveillance Tool Policy (STP) with the Committee on Information Technology (COIT) through the Privacy Surveillance Advisory Board (PSAB). STPs reach the Board of Supervisors (BoS) upon COIT recommendations to adopt, adopt with modifications or decline to adopt.

| |
|---|
| March 25, 2022: PSAB Meeting |
| March 31, 2022: PSAB Meeting |
| April 7, 2022: COIT Meeting |
| April 21, 2022: COIT Meeting (recommended BoS to adopt) |
| July 18, 2022: BOS Rules Committee |

Any non-City entity or individual, through consent, subpoena, search warrant or other court order, who provides SFPD with data access or information acquired through the entity or individual's use of surveillance cameras or surveillance camera networks owned, leased, managed and/or operated by the entity or individual.



SFPD Authorized Uses


These are the three ways SFPD may request access to non-city entity surveillance cameras

Temporary live monitoring during an exigency, or Significant Events with public safety concerns, or investigations relating to active misdemeanor and felony violations. Temporary live monitoring will cease, and the connection will be severed within 24 hours after the non-city entity has provided access to SFPD.

Requesting, obtaining, and reviewing historical video footage for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to a criminal investigation.

Requesting, obtaining, and reviewing historical video footage for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to an internal investigation regarding officer misconduct.

Historical Footage Requests



SFPD/DA's Office Prop 115 Form- Witness/ Video Custodian for Prelim

| Witness / Video Custodian Information | |
|---|--|
| Name of Prop 115 Interviewee (Name) | Sex |
| Incident Report # | Date of Prop 115 Interview |
| WITNESS / VIDEO CUSTODIAN INFORMATION | |
| Name of Video Custodian (Last, First, Middle) | Name of Business, Location of video recording device |
| Business Phone | Business Address |
| City | State |
| Zip Code | |
| Home / Cell Phone | Home Address |
| City | State |
| Zip Code | |
| DOB | Form of identification |
| Education | SSN |
| Occupation | E-mail address |

VIDEO CUSTODIAN QUALIFICATIONS
 (The video custodian is the person who attended or who has personal knowledge of the defendant of the video evidence from the recording device.)

- What is the Video Custodian's name and job title? _____
- Who is the Video Custodian's employer? _____ (How long employed?) _____
- Was the Video Custodian working on _____ (Name of business) _____ (Date of incident) _____ (Time of incident) _____? Yes No
- Is the Video Custodian an authorized personnel of the recording device? Yes No
 (The Video Custodian should be either the owner or someone the owner has authorized to control the device.)
- As part of the Video Custodian's duties, is he/she familiar with the operation of the recording device described as to the recording equipment, e.g. brand, model number, if relevant, describe the process? Yes No
- How are recorded videos stored and maintained? _____
 (e.g. recorded onto hard drive, DVD, network server, cloud service, etc.)
- Does anyone OTHER THAN EMPLOYEES AND AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL of the business have access to the recording device? Yes No. If yes, please explain who has access and why _____
- Does the recording device record events in the regular course of business and at the same time that the events occur? Yes No

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
 County of _____

ARREST WARRANT
 Criminal Justice Portal
 Penal Code §§ 815.2

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 do hereby authorize _____
 to use this warrant when _____


Defendant's name: _____
 (Please complete an affidavit that will be used to obtain this warrant. It will be used as a basis for the arrest or to justify the search of a residence. If the arrest has been made, the following must be completed.)

High priority warrants (11-10-10):
 (1) Felony: (The felony cannot be completed or is in progress.)
 (2) Misdemeanor: (Only cases for which arrest is required by law or the law is to be enforced.)

See and see warrant used. Signed by the law enforcement officer: _____
 Arrested defendant: _____



Temporary Live Monitoring Requests



Retention

Video Footage is included in an intelligence file as evidence. As the data is associated with a criminal investigation, the data is retained for a minimum of two years, or as required by CA Penal Code, Evidence Code, W & I code (juvenile), statutes of limitations and other state and federal laws.

As evidence, video must be retained in a safe environment as required by relevant evidence laws to ensure access for investigation and legal discovery.

Video footage associated with an officer misconduct or Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) investigation will be maintained in perpetuity.



| Crime | Time Limit |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Murder in the first degree Treason Rape involving force or violence Aggravated sexual assault of a child Embezzlement of public money | No time limit |
| Certain felony sex offenses against a child | Up to the victim's 40th birthday |
| Felony offenses punishable by eight or more years in prison | 6 years |
| Certain crimes committed against elderly or dependent adults Infliction of corporal (bodily) injury against a current or former intimate partner | 5 years |
| Common Misdemeanor Crimes | 1 year |

First Amendment

SFPD's approach to its handling of public demonstrations has two equal components:

- 1.) Facilitating and upholding the First Amendment rights of demonstrators
- 2.) Ensuring public safety

SFPD Police Commission approved policy allows police to conduct a criminal investigation when there is an articulable and reasonable suspicion to believe that:

- 1.) They are planning or are engaged in criminal activity which could reasonably lead to bodily injury and/or property damage, or misdemeanor hate crime
- 2.) The First Amendment activities are relevant to the criminal investigation.

Temporary live monitoring only for purpose of deployment needs and addressing criminal activity or other public safety hazards.

Alternative to temporary live monitoring is to increase the number of officers deployed and present at onset and throughout event instead of targeted deployment.

Prohibitions

Non-exhaustive list of prohibitions in STP

SFPD is prohibited from monitoring any certain groups or individuals based solely on race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation. Race, color, ethnicity, or national origin may not be used as a motivating factor for initiating police enforcement action.

SFPD is prohibited from accessing or requesting surveillance camera live feed during First Amendment activities for reasons outside of redeployment needs due to crowd sizes or other issues creating public safety hazards.

SFPD members shall not acquire or use surveillance camera footage in cooperation with or assisting U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement or Customs and Border Protection in any investigation, detention, or arrest procedures, public or clandestine, where in any such instance the sole, express, or implied purpose is the enforcement of federal immigration laws. SFPD complies with SF Administrative Code Chapters 12H “Immigration Status” and 12I “Civil Immigration Detainers” and [SFPD General Order \(DGO\) 5.15](#).

SFPD Training

To reduce the possibility that surveillance technology or its associated data will be misused or used contrary to its authorized use, all individuals requiring access on behalf of Department must receive training on data security policies and procedures

CCSF & SFPD Training Courses

- Cybersecurity Training
- Critical Mindset Coordinated Response Training
- DGO 8.10 Guidelines for First Amendment Activities
- Video Retrieval Training (2 day)
- Crowd Control Training
- CLETS/CORI & CJIS Training

California Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Basic Courses

- LD 15 Laws of Arrest
- LD 16 Search and Seizure
- LD 17 Presentation of Evidence
- LD 23 Crimes in Progress
- LD 26 Critical Incidents
- LD 30 Crime Scenes, Evidence, and Forensics
- LD 42 Cultural Diversity/Discrimination
- LD 43 Terrorism Awareness
- PC 872 (b) Hearsay Testimony

Impact Report

Surveillance Impact Report (SIR) identifies potential impact on civil liberties and civil rights and discusses plans to safeguard the rights of the public.

SFPD considered the following potential civil liberties impacts along with mitigating measures.

| |
|-----------------------------|
| Right to Privacy |
| Loss of Liberty |
| Warrantless Searches |
| Equal Protection of the Law |

Questions?

SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT



Brooke Jenkins
District Attorney

July 11, 2022

Supervisor Aaron Peskin
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca 94102

Re: File No. 22060 – Administrative Code - Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras.

Dear Chair Peskin;

I am writing in support of File # 22060 – Administrative Code - Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras. This ordinance will provide law enforcement with a critical tool to make our city safer while also supporting accountability.

As prosecutors, we can deliver justice for residents when our Police Department is able to make arrests, and provide sufficient evidence to support a conviction. This policy will help us promote and protect public safety, while also maintaining strong safeguards to prevent any misuse of technology. I know this balance is important to you, and that you have been working diligently with the Mayor's Office, the Police Department and others to achieve it.

The proposed Policy would authorize the Police Department to use cameras owned, leased, managed, or operated by non-City entities to temporarily monitor activity live during exigent circumstances, significant events with public safety concerns, and investigations relating to active misdemeanor and felony violations. I believe this policy can help address the existence of open-air drug markets fueling the sale of the deadly drug fentanyl. Drug dealers are destroying people's lives and wreaking havoc on neighborhoods like the Tenderloin. Mass organized retail theft, like we saw in Union Square last year, or targeted neighborhood efforts like we've seen in Chinatown is another area where the proposed policy can help. These are just a few examples where the use of cameras can help us tackle the significant public safety challenges facing our city.

This ordinance can also aid in conducting investigations into police misconduct. By allowing the review of historical video footage for the purposes of investigations into alleged officer misconduct, this policy can become a critical part of increasing transparency and accountability in law enforcement. Increased transparency like this is essential for building and maintaining trust between the public and law enforcement.

Finally, as prosecutors, it's essential that we prosecute the right people who are committing crimes. Camera footage can help identify the perpetrators of crime, and also prevent law enforcement from pursuing the wrong person. We can ensure that appropriate charges are filed based on the actions that actually took place. That serves and promotes justice.

I support this policy because not only will it serve a practical purpose of helping us to deter crime and hold those who commit crimes in our city accountable, but it will also send a message to those scheming to prey on our city that there will be consequences for their actions. Our tone and approach matters. As important as it is to be able to respond to a crime and prosecute when it occurs, it's just as important to be able to prevent them from ever happening in the first place. This policy is a responsible tool to help us make our city safer.

Thank you for leadership on this important policy matter. I urge this committee and all members of the Board of Supervisors to support this critical public safety measure.

Sincerely,



Brooke Jenkins
District Attorney

cc: Victor Young, Clerk

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

TO: William Scott, Police Chief, Police Department

FROM: Victor Young, Assistant Clerk

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Victor Young".

DATE: June 14, 2022

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Rules Committee received the following proposed legislation:

File No. 220606 Administrative Code - Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras

Ordinance approving Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

If you have comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at: victor.young@sfgov.org.

cc: Lisa Ortiz, Police Department
Lili Gamero, Police Department
Diana Oliva-Aroche, Police Department
Sgt Stacy Youngblood, Police Department/Commission

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>

From: [Paul Liao](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Initially disappointed Surveillance Technology Policy was not passed, BUT..
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 10:21:39 PM

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

Supervisor Peskin
Supervisor Chan
Supervisor Mandelman:

I was unable to view yesterday's meeting in real time, but I just finished watching a replay of it. Before watching the replay, I had learned of, and was disappointed in, your decision to continue, and not pass, the proposed San Francisco Police Department Surveillance Technology Policy. However, after viewing the recording, I found myself pleased with the vigor at which the SF Rules Committee examined the policy; and I recognized that the policy does address one possible issue of legitimate concern - an issue that definitely warranted a continuance of your deliberation.

Before discussing that one issue, I wish to thank the Committee for its patience in listening to the many ill informed, and truly outrageous, public comments about the proposed policy. Despite the fact that Supervisor Peskin noted that this policy is NOT an expansion of current police department practices, most public comments continued an unreasonable harangue that the policy will rob people of their civil rights. The truth is that a properly designed policy, not only protects the privacy of individuals, but recognizes that modern video surveillance technologies provide the information necessary for law enforcement to better protect people and property in San Francisco. And we know that these same surveillance technologies assure improved police accountability.

The vigorous committee discussion, Starting with Chairman Peskin's comment that the recent Supreme Court's ruling concerning Roe v Wade has opened new conversations about surveillance information, opened my eyes to a key deficiency in the policy. Specifically, the policy presently lacks an assurance that any surveillance information that comes into the possession of the San Francisco Police department will NOT be used by other states to prosecute any person or organization for acts that are not crimes in California.

Once this issue is addressed, it is my hope that the policy will be pass by your committee. I also urge our City to be increasingly proactive in its deployment of technologies, including surveillance technologies, that help assure public safety in ways that also protect the public's rights to privacy. It must be noted that such technologies not only help identify the culprits of crimes (and deter criminal activities), but are a key to reducing the potential for violent confrontation between law enforcement and the public.

Please revise the Surveillance Technology Policy and approve it at your next meeting.

Paul Liao

PS. Below is the text of my original email requesting your support for this policy that I sent to you yesterday.

A recent email message from the ACLU has informed me that a Surveillance Technology Policy will be discussed during Monday's San Francisco Rules Committee meeting.

I urge you to support the Surveillance Technology policy for the following reasons.

If you are a fan of BBC shows such as Morse, Lewis, etc., you know that cameras are often the key to solving crimes. It's also true that here in San Francisco, individual citizens, store owners, and apartment buildings are using cameras to monitor their property in hopes of improving their security and safety. Most are more than willing to voluntarily share the video captured by those camera systems with law enforcement officials, if it helps to enforce laws against crime and/or deter those crimes from being committed in the first place. In addition, we know that cameras can be, and already are, an effective method for enforcement of many laws such as those that require stopping at a red light, for payment of tolls, and for assuring police accountability.

Modern camera technologies could do still more to improve the safety and quality of life in San Francisco. For example, reckless driving and speeding could be greatly reduced, and pedestrian safety improved, if cameras aided law enforcement in the efforts to enforce these laws that protect our safety. Unfortunately at present, despite the efforts of our local representatives, those cameras are not permitted in California. I hope that situation will change in the future.

Consider also how enforcement of traffic safety violations using information captured by cameras would virtually eliminate potentially dangerous, even life threatening, confrontations between police officers and the public. **We should be encouraging the use of these non-confrontational approaches to law enforcement, rather than discouraging them**

There can be privacy concerns that should, and indeed must be, addressed. However, the attached ACLU (to which national organization I send contributions every year) is a hysterical call that sends the mistaken impression that all surveillance cameras should be banned. In my opinion, it sends exactly the WRONG message.

ON MONDAY, PLEASE SUPPORT SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY POLICY
Paul Liao



July 12, 2022

Rules Committee
Supervisor Peskin
Supervisor Mandelman
Supervisor Chan
SF Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Hotel Council Support for File # 220606 Surveillance Camera Policy for SFPD

Dear Supervisors, Peskin, Mandelman and Chan,

On behalf of the Hotel Council of San Francisco, I am writing to express our support for the prescribed use of video surveillance access when crimes are in progress.

Currently, The San Francisco Police Department is barred from accessing any live video to solve or prevent crime except if there is imminent danger of serious injury or death. This leaves neighborhoods across the city vulnerable to organized criminal activity, such as the mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries that have happened in the city over the past several years.

We acknowledge the valid and appropriate concerns around the issue of privacy and potential misuse of this video information. However, there are protective measures and safeguards that address this concern, and we believe the benefits derived from protecting citizens and residents in the “real time” involvement of a crime, and the opportunity to reduce the risk of further escalation of criminal activity is paramount. Many cities across the U.S. have seen a rise in gun violence and it allows communities the opportunity to examine the tools they have in place if such a crisis were to occur in their cities. We believe this tool is needed to prevent the escalation of certain threats and dangers when criminal activity is happening in San Francisco.

Again, on behalf of our 22,000 Hotel Employees in San Francisco, our visitors, and guests, we ask you to support this policy proposal to further safeguard our residents and visitors from potential acceleration of criminal activity or violence that might occur because this vital tool was not available to our officers.

Sincerely,

Kelly Powers
Director
Hotel Council of San Francisco

From: [Shadd Newman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); ["info@midmarketcbd.org"](#)
Cc: [Amy Hull](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 9:45:22 AM
Attachments: [image048973.png](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support the legislation for allowing San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

Residents and prospective tenants at Trinity Place in mid-Market lament the crime and lack of safety in the neighborhood, expressing concern about open air drug dealing. Providing SFPD access to already existing tools to help them do their job is an important step in addressing these concerns and making our streets safer for all members of the community.

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,

Shadd Newman

Shadd Newman
Vice President
(415) 575-3356



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.

trinitysf.com

Email Disclaimer

From: [Helene Sautou](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Info Info](#)
Subject: Support for Police Department of non-City entity surveillance cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 9:47:00 AM
Attachments: [Camera Support for Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras .pdf](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please find attached the Mid Market CBD letter of support for use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Best regards,



Helene Sautou

Project Director

Mid Market Community Benefit District

[\(415\) 957-5985](tel:(415)957-5985)

hsautou@midmarketcbd.org

midmarketcbd.org

From: [Tracy Everwine](#)
To: [Helene Sautou](#)
Cc: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Info Info](#)
Subject: Re: Support for Police Department of non-City entity surveillance cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 9:58:22 AM
Attachments: [Screen Shot 2022-07-15 at 9.56.14 AM.png](#)

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

Just FYI heading was incomplete. Please fix if you forward anywhere else.

Support for Police Department of non-City entity surveillance cameras



Helene Sautou

to Matt.Dorsey, Rafael, Myrna.Melgar, Brent.Jalipa, Hillary.Ronen, Shamann.Walton, Ahsha.Safai, Gordon.Mar, Connie.Chan, A

On Fri, Jul 15, 2022 at 9:46 AM Helene Sautou <hsautou@midmarketcbd.org> wrote:

Dear Supervisors,

Please find attached the Mid Market CBD letter of support for use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Best regards,



Helene Sautou

Project Director

Mid Market Community Benefit District

[\(415\) 957-5985](tel:(415)957-5985)

hsautou@midmarketcbd.org

midmarketcbd.org

--



Tracy Everwine

Executive Director

Mid Market Community Benefit District

[\(415\) 957-5985](tel:(415)957-5985)

teverwine@midmarketcbd.org

midmarketcbd.org

From: [Dennis Crowe](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); info@midmarketcbd.org
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:25:17 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I support the legislation allowing the San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras and I hope you will too.

I have owned my building and run my business at 6th and Clementina for 18 years now and have given the police access to my cameras when asked. I have seen first hand that these cameras are a critical tool to make our streets safer.

Please support this legislation.

Thank you

Sincerely,
Dennis Crowe

Dennis Crowe
Founder / Creative Director
VehicleSF
275 Sixth Street, SF CA 94103
www.vehiclesf.com
main: 415-777-5560
direct: 415-882-3455
cell: 415-531-6358

From: [Harrison, David](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); info@midmarketcbd.org
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:25:53 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I hope you will support the legislation allowing the San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,

David Harrison

From: [Tina Lauchengco](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Info Info](#)
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:37:32 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support the legislation allowing the San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

[Please add any personal anecdotes]

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Tina Lauchengco

From: [Joe Ching](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); info@midmarketcbd.org
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:40:42 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support the legislation allowing the San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

As a property owner who has recently suffered extensive damage to my property due to someone firing illegal fireworks from outside our building, access to camera footage would have certainly helped to possibly ascertain the perpetrators. Vandalism is a constant issue as well in the Mid-Market area and providing the SFPD with the proper tools to help curb these and other illegal activities is a long overdue action.

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Joe Ching

From: [Nate Haas](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); info@midmarketcbd.org
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:51:08 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support the legislation allowing the San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Nate Haas

From: [Jack Sinow](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); info@midmarketcbd.org
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 11:41:31 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support the legislation allowing the San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

This was an invaluable tool to help us discover who broke our large glass window and how it was done. Anything that helps deter crime on 6th Street and deter violence upon my patient base, which occurs almost daily, would be of immense help.

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Jack H Sinow, OD
71 6th Street

From: [Jane Weil](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); info@midmarketcbd.org
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 12:04:30 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support the legislation for allowing San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

As a homeowner overlooking the troubled corner of Mission & 18th, I want SFPD to have all tools available to keep us safe from the open drug dealing and criminals who hang out all around us. Help us PLEASE!

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Jane Weil
Board President SOMAGrand HOA
1160 Mission St #2108
San Francisco CA 94103

From: [Scott Walton](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); info@midmarketcbd.org
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 1:43:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Ambassador Theatre Group, the owners of the Orpheum, Golden Gate and Curran Theatres, brings more than 1,000,000 people into the Tenderloin neighborhood each year. We support the legislation for allowing San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Rainier Koeners, Managing Director

Ambassador Theatre Group

Sensitivity: Internal Use

From: [Paulina Fayer](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 5:19:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent **Paulina Fayer**

Email plfayer@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 8**

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Robert Chan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 5:32:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Robert Chan

Email RobertYChan@aol.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Dorothy Chan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 5:33:00 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Dorothy Chan

Email dorothywaichan@aol.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Marina Roche](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 5:34:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Marina Roche

Email marinaroche@icloud.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Amy Chan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 5:34:34 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Amy Chan

Email amyrchan@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Ryan Chan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 5:36:11 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Ryan Chan
Email ryanjchan@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 9](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Stephanie Lehman](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 5:57:52 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Stephanie Lehman

Email slehman21@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 1

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.
Stephanie Lehman
Elected delegate AD 19

From: [Kevin Roche](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 6:07:56 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Kevin Roche
Email krochemusic@aol.com
I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [KEVIN OSHEA](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 6:17:40 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent KEVIN OSHEA

Email osheakw@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [William Palladino](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 6:31:05 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent William Palladino
Email wetwilly17@hotmail.com
I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Fiona Montgomery](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 6:34:41 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Fiona Montgomery

Email fiona.thomas@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you, Fiona

From: [Jerry Connolly](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 7:17:14 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jerry Connolly
Email jerconsf@yahoo.com
I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Mike Jones](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 7:24:50 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mike Jones
Email mj357@comcast.net
I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Monthanus Ratanapakdee](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 7:31:03 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Monthanus Ratanapakdee

Email monthanusr@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Charna Ball](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 7:48:19 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Charna Ball

Email genteel-slots.0j@icloud.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Ebert Kan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 8:47:47 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Ebert Kan

Email Nomad627@juno.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Karen Wong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 9:21:46 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Karen Wong

Email cloudsrest789@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 3

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Arthur Hubbard](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 9:49:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Arthur Hubbard

Email amhsf@att.net

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Al Sargent](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 9:51:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Al Sargent
Email al.sargent@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Holland Ja](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:12:48 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Holland Ja

Email hollandyja@comcast.net

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Michael Coll](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:23:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Michael Coll
Email kellsconstructioninc@gmail.com
I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Cynthia Kass](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:41:02 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Cynthia Kass

Email cindikass3@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 3](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Laurie Dolly](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 11:57:10 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Laurie Dolly
Email lauriedolly@gmail.com
I am a resident of District 11

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [jennifer.yan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:45:34 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent jennifer yan
Email jennifer.yan@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [dirk probstel](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:46:56 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent dirk probstel

Email dirkprobstel@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jeff Ricker](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 5:41:10 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jeff Ricker
Email the_dreadnought@yahoo.com
I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Steven Wong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 6:18:08 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Steven Wong

Email steven4274@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 3](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Dena Aslanian-Williams](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 7:26:41 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Dena Aslanian-Williams

Email denawilliams@msn.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Yasmin Staton](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 7:46:17 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Yasmin Staton

Email ydmello@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [kaaren.alvarado](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:02:34 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent kaaren alvarado

Email kaaren25@att.net

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Matthew Faliano](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:06:44 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent **Matthew Faliano**

Email **Faliano3342@gmail.com**

I am a resident of **District 4**

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jamie O'Keefe](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:24:44 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jamie O'Keefe

Email jokeefe415@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Howard Lee](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 9:01:54 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent **Howard Lee**

Email howard.lee90@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 7**

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan, Mandelman, and Melgar:

With the ever-increasing in property theft, we need to give another tool to the police to fight crime. I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Diane Sargent](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 9:05:43 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Diane Sargent

Email diane.sargent@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Tad Sky](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 9:23:49 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Tad Sky
Email tadsky7@gmail.com
I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Meredith Serra](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 9:51:36 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Meredith Serra
Email meredithserra@outlook.com
I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Marjorie Tang](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 10:00:14 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Marjorie Tang

Email shibapaws@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Una Werner](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 10:46:05 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Una Werner

Email unahlp@aol.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Daniel Langford](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 11:09:15 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Daniel Langford

Email langford987@hotmail.com

I am a resident of District 3

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [John Cowan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 11:30:56 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent John Cowan
Email apollofix.24@gmail.com
I am a resident of District 1

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

As you know, crime is out of control in San Francisco. Our building was burglarized at least five times. Thanks for listening.

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Teresa Shaw](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:21:36 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Teresa Shaw

Email terishaw@pacbell.net

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Keith Kandarian](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:23:14 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Keith Kandarian

Email kkandarian@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Aisling Ferguson](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:50:10 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Aisling Ferguson

Email aferguson@gmwest.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Stephanie McKnight](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:51:12 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Stephanie McKnight
Email tatummq@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Robin Adler](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 1:12:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Robin Adler

Email robin@robinadler.me

I am a resident of District 6

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Norah Uyeda](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 4:28:07 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Norah Uyeda

Email yuenuyeda@hotmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Susan OHara](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 5:02:43 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Susan OHara

Email sj_ohara@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 5

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

Please support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras. This is a reasonable tool for safety and fair treatment.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

There are too few tools to allow innocent citizens to protect themselves, and the balance of protections favors criminals and those with mental health issues who harm neighbors and families. Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Frank Noto](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 6:19:49 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Frank Noto
Email frank@fnstrategy.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors:

I urge you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras. This corrects the original ordinance in a way we advocated for years ago.

The revised ordinance balances our rights and public safety. Homeowners, nonprofits or business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Samuel Hom](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 6:42:57 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Samuel Hom

Email samhom1958@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Youn Lee](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 7:33:38 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Youn Lee

Email collin@kobuksan.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Assunta Young](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:18:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Assunta Young
Email assuntayoung46@gmail.com
I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [John Ng](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:54:59 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent John Ng
Email JohnNgSF@aol.com
I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Erin O'Connor](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:55:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Erin O'Connor

Email occonnorstl@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 7

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Nathan Bass](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 10:14:49 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Nathan Bass

Email nathan.bass@ucsf.edu

I am a resident of District 8

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Dona Crowder](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 7:30:51 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Dona Crowder

Email dona@donacrowder.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Amy Chen](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:21:38 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Amy Chen

Email amy080chen@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Teresa Silva](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:22:53 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Teresa Silva
Email teri.esalon@gmail.com
I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Josephine Zhao](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:23:16 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Josephine Zhao

Email josephine_zhao@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [kelvin yip](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:31:35 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent kelvin yip
Email kelvinkyip@gmail.com
I am a resident of District 5

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [dennis dunne](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:39:42 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent dennis dunne

Email dunnedf@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Oleg Tomillo](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:59:27 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Oleg Tomillo
Email otomillo@gmail.com
I am a resident of District 11

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.
Oleg

From: [Mark Clark](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 11:57:06 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mark Clark
Email mpclark704@icloud.com
I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Victor Belfor](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:04:11 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Victor Belfor
Email vbelfor@gmail.com
I am a resident of [District 9](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Selena Chu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:51:44 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Selena Chu

Email selenachu10@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Raymond Wong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:52:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Raymond Wong

Email raymondwong4u@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Mei Chen](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:52:55 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mei Chen
Email meichensf@icloud.com
I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jon Chu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:53:35 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jon Chu
Email zdaiying1@gmail.com
I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [MARIA Ditico](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:55:48 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent MARIA Ditico

Email match94107@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 6](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Gina Tse-Louie](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 1:06:34 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Gina Tse-Louie

Email Informed168@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I find people don't want to be caught on camera doing bad things... the more cameras the more conscientious people will be which is not a bad thing!

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Kaihua Kong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 1:32:07 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Kaihua Kong
Email khzy1997@yahoo.com
I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Wen Zhu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 1:38:15 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Wen Zhu
Email wuminghua@yahoo.com
I am a resident of District 6

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Kent Tran](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 2:02:18 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Kent Tran
Email kayjaig@hotmail.com
I am a resident of District10

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Kelly Powers](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Kevin Carroll](#)
Subject: Surveillance Cameras
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 11:32:10 AM
Attachments: [Surveillance Cameras.docx](#)

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

Dear Members of the Rules Committee,

Please see our letter of support for Legislation supporting responsible policies related to access of Surveillance Camera usage as a tool to keep Residents and Visitors safe.

Sincerely,

Kelly Powers

From: [Fullmore, Nany](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Camera Surveillance Legislation
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 2:24:50 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

I am writing to ask you to please allow SFPD access or the ability to monitor even temporarily, live video that is owned or operated by third parties. Blinding of law enforcement does not make sense and it does not make us safer.

Several weeks ago, gunshot took place in the alley way of Clementine street late at night The hotel's camera was able to capture the evidence and called the police to view however they were not able to view it as it is owned by third party. This street is hotel's only employees entrance. My employees having witnessed or hearing about what happened and how the police were not able to follow lead to preventing it from happening again made me and my employees feel very unsafe.

Low enforcement need every resources available to them to solve crime and deter possible future crime. Organized crime, whether it's mass looting in Union Square or drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, or retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside -- these are all criminal activities that law enforcement can address more effectively if they have their eyes open. This legislation will allow police to use non-City cameras and camera networks during large scale events with public safety concerns; for investigations of active misdemeanor and felony violations; and investigations into officer misconduct. Video footage can be used as evidence as well to exonerate individuals who may be wrongly accused and help police and prosecutors ensure that they are holding the correct persons responsible

Thank you for your support. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Best,

Nany Fullmore

General Manager

Bring your best to the moment

O: 415-486-6401


The Clancy, Autograph Collection

299 2ND St.

San Francisco, CA 94105

www.marriott.com/sfoaw | [Instagram](#)

The Clancy, a member of Marriott International's extraordinary Autograph Collection.



This communication contains information from Marriott International, Inc. that may be confidential. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law.

From: [Richard Leider](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Support of Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD use of Non City Entity Surveillance Cameras
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 5:56:23 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing in support of the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras. This legislation is a critical step towards improving safety for small business owners, employees, and all San Franciscans. It strategically uses technological advances to strengthen City services and provide the necessary tools for SFPD to solve our most violent, harmful, and persistent crimes. I support improving and clarifying local laws governing the use of cameras during situations with serious public safety impacts.

Our businesses community has suffered incredible financial loss due to organized retail theft, on top of the pandemic economic conditions, and this legislation provides a desperately needed tool for SFPD to better support our merchant corridors and neighborhoods facing critical public safety challenges. San Francisco businesses have storefronts, employees, and customers here and are deeply invested in creating a safer San Francisco.

Please pass this critical public safety legislation.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Leider

1523 Baker Street

San Francisco, CA 94115

Richard J. Leider

D) 415-947-7230

O) 415-285-5000

C) 415-672-2160

RLeider@Leidergroup.com

From: [Tracy Thompson](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#)
Subject: Disappointment in your decision regarding Slow Lake Street
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 6:15:49 PM

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

Mayor Breed,

Your decision to abandon Slow Lake and its countless benefits to our city is extremely disappointing and suggests a lack of forward and visionary thinking on your part. Slow Lake has been an amazing benefit to SF residents, and one of the few bright spots over the last two and a half demoralizing years of the Covid era. Your seemingly cavalier decision to reject the concept of Slow Lake and presumably return the street to its preexisting traffic flow, despite the wishes of the thousands of city residents who provided input, is baffling to say the least, and represents a genuine loss for the city as a whole.

You say you care about Vision Zero, Climate Action, sustainability, building positive community, and keeping families in our city—all of which Slow Lake does—but your decision to reject Slow Lake is in conflict with those goals.

I respectfully request that you reconsider your decision and that you take appropriate and prompt action to move our city towards the Vision Zero and Climate Action goals you claim to uphold by supporting Slow Lake.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tracy Thompson

From: [Nancy Jodaitis](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); MTABoard@sfmta.com; [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); SlowStreets@sfmta.com; LakeStreet@sfmta.com; Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov; Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov; Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov; [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Slow Lake](#)
Subject: Importance of keeping Lake Street SLOW
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:40:53 AM

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

Mayor Breed,

I was really disappointed to hear of your pressure and influence on the SFMTA board to reverse the community's consensus to keep Lake Street slow.

Thousands of people who love Slow Lake and have participated in all of the community meetings, surveys, and letter-writing campaigns were shocked and really disappointed by this reversal. It is frustrating to have gone through this process and heard from the SFMTA community engagement employees that the decision was made to move forward with a slow Street, only to have that abandoned at the last hour. This sudden change is disappointing and demoralizing for all the engaged residents of Lake Street and surrounding communities who participated in good faith.

This sends a clear message of whom and what you value in our city -- and how the process really works. I don't believe this is what you intended to do. I have been told that you stated that slowly "smacks of privilege". However, this was one of the streets that had the highest density during the pandemic and built community in a way that the enrichment has never seen.

You have stated that you care about Vision Zero, Climate Action, sustainability, building positive community, and keeping families in our city—all of which Slow Lake does—but your decision to destroy Slow Lake as we know it contradicts your claimed priorities. We need bold vision and fearless leadership to reach our goals, and you are the person who must lead us.

Please take immediate action to reverse your decision to eradicate slow Lake. And move our city towards the Vision Zero and Climate Action goals you claim to uphold.

ACT QUICKLY to demonstrate you **DO VALUE** the **OPINIONS** of the **MAJORITY** of SF residents-- not just the few off-the-bridge drivers and car-committed SF residents who wish to speed through our neighborhood, destroying the community bonds we have built.

Sincerely,
Nancy Jodaitis
720 Lake St., #5
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: [Wes Tyler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Camera Surveillance Legislation
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:59:00 AM

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

Attention Rules Committee

Please approve the legislation that will allow law enforcement limited, temporary authority to use video footage to help deter, investigate, and solve crime.

Crime and safety are key to our recovery and San Francisco's rebound from the pandemic. This moves us toward that goal.

Thank you.

Wes Tyler, CHA
General Manager
Chancellor Hotel on Union Square
"Where the Cable Cars stop at the doorstep"
433 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Ph. 415.362.2004 Fax 415.395.9476
www.chancellorhotel.com





July 12, 2022

Rules Committee
Supervisor Peskin
Supervisor Mandelman
Supervisor Chan
SF Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Hotel Council Support for File # 220606 Surveillance Camera Policy for SFPD

Dear Supervisors, Peskin, Mandelman and Chan,

On behalf of the Hotel Council of San Francisco, I am writing to express our support for the prescribed use of video surveillance access when crimes are in progress.

Currently, The San Francisco Police Department is barred from accessing any live video to solve or prevent crime except if there is imminent danger of serious injury or death. This leaves neighborhoods across the city vulnerable to organized criminal activity, such as the mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries that have happened in the city over the past several years.

We acknowledge the valid and appropriate concerns around the issue of privacy and potential misuse of this video information. However, there are protective measures and safeguards that address this concern, and we believe the benefits derived from protecting citizens and residents in the “real time” involvement of a crime, and the opportunity to reduce the risk of further escalation of criminal activity is paramount. Many cities across the U.S. have seen a rise in gun violence and it allows communities the opportunity to examine the tools they have in place if such a crisis were to occur in their cities. We believe this tool is needed to prevent the escalation of certain threats and dangers when criminal activity is happening in San Francisco.

Again, on behalf of our 22,000 Hotel Employees in San Francisco, our visitors, and guests, we ask you to support this policy proposal to further safeguard our residents and visitors from potential acceleration of criminal activity or violence that might occur because this vital tool was not available to our officers.

Sincerely,

Kelly Powers
Director
Hotel Council of San Francisco

From: [Robert G Brown](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Policy allowing Police Authority to use Private Cameras for Policing
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 10:32:17 AM

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

Board of Supervisors, per the article in 48 hills you are coming back next week with a proposed amended policy to provide authority for the sfpd to use private cameras for policing.

No, No, No, No, NO!

NOT EVER in our lifetime should we give the SFPD any more authority to spy on San Franciscans.

There would NEVER be enough safeguards that any human could think of and impose that make this policy viable.

San Francisco would literally be a "Police State."

Please abolish this policy from our public discussion while enacting policies that make it impossible for it to ever be considered again.

Thank you

Robert G Brown
1656 Leavenworth St, San Francisco, CA 94109
415.806.0561

From: churbert@outlook.com
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: NO to SF becoming a Police State!
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 1:35:47 PM

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

Connie and BoS,

This is an obscene police overreach and frankly a crass violation of citizen's civil liberty. Anything but a resounding, "HELL, NO!" is akin to your tacit support of a dystopian police state. This is NOT who we are.

<https://missionlocal.org/2022/07/surveillance-critics-blast-police-private-cameras/>

Meanwhile the SFPD literally abdicated their responsibilities and duties while attempting to enact retribution against a DA who for once actually sought to hold "bad apples" accountable. Not surprisingly, the Mayor who remained silent on the recall put in Budin's place an inexperienced, uncouth, hack with her sights on regressive, broken window policies and no accountability for the police. Really???

The Board needs to reign in this out of control Mayor and her SFPD pals or there will be consequences at the ballot box next election.

Again, this is NOT who we are.

Sincerely,

Charles Hurbert, D1

From: [Judith Beck](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No SFPD access to private cameras!!!
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 11:01:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Do not allow SF police access to private cameras on homes and businesses. They have no right to our personal doings in this sweeping, indiscriminate, unwarranted (as in "search warrant") way. Our police have earned no such privilege and should be reined in rather than let loose with surveillance.

Sincerely,

Judy Beck - D5

From: [Kelly Powers](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Kevin Carroll](#)
Subject: Surveillance Cameras
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 11:32:10 AM
Attachments: [Surveillance Cameras.docx](#)

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

Dear Members of the Rules Committee,

Please see our letter of support for Legislation supporting responsible policies related to access of Surveillance Camera usage as a tool to keep Residents and Visitors safe.

Sincerely,

Kelly Powers

From: [Fullmore, Nany](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Camera Surveillance Legislation
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 2:24:50 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

I am writing to ask you to please allow SFPD access or the ability to monitor even temporarily, live video that is owned or operated by third parties. Blinding of law enforcement does not make sense and it does not make us safer.

Several weeks ago, gunshot took place in the alley way of Clementine street late at night The hotel's camera was able to capture the evidence and called the police to view however they were not able to view it as it is owned by third party. This street is hotel's only employees entrance. My employees having witnessed or hearing about what happened and how the police were not able to follow lead to preventing it from happening again made me and my employees feel very unsafe.

Low enforcement need every resources available to them to solve crime and deter possible future crime. Organized crime, whether it's mass looting in Union Square or drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, or retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside -- these are all criminal activities that law enforcement can address more effectively if they have their eyes open. This legislation will allow police to use non-City cameras and camera networks during large scale events with public safety concerns; for investigations of active misdemeanor and felony violations; and investigations into officer misconduct. Video footage can be used as evidence as well to exonerate individuals who may be wrongly accused and help police and prosecutors ensure that they are holding the correct persons responsible

Thank you for your support. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Best,

Nany Fullmore

General Manager

Bring your best to the moment

O: 415-486-6401

The Clancy, Autograph Collection

299 2ND St.

San Francisco, CA 94105

www.marriott.com/sfoaw | [Instagram](#)

The Clancy, a member of Marriott International's extraordinary Autograph Collection.



This communication contains information from Marriott International, Inc. that may be confidential. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law.

From: [Richard Leider](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Support of Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD use of Non City Entity Surveillance Cameras
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 5:56:23 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing in support of the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras. This legislation is a critical step towards improving safety for small business owners, employees, and all San Franciscans. It strategically uses technological advances to strengthen City services and provide the necessary tools for SFPD to solve our most violent, harmful, and persistent crimes. I support improving and clarifying local laws governing the use of cameras during situations with serious public safety impacts.

Our businesses community has suffered incredible financial loss due to organized retail theft, on top of the pandemic economic conditions, and this legislation provides a desperately needed tool for SFPD to better support our merchant corridors and neighborhoods facing critical public safety challenges. San Francisco businesses have storefronts, employees, and customers here and are deeply invested in creating a safer San Francisco.

Please pass this critical public safety legislation.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Leider

1523 Baker Street

San Francisco, CA 94115

Richard J. Leider

D) 415-947-7230

O) 415-285-5000

C) 415-672-2160

RLeider@Leidergroup.com

From: [Tracy Thompson](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#)
Subject: Disappointment in your decision regarding Slow Lake Street
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 6:15:49 PM

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

Mayor Breed,

Your decision to abandon Slow Lake and its countless benefits to our city is extremely disappointing and suggests a lack of forward and visionary thinking on your part. Slow Lake has been an amazing benefit to SF residents, and one of the few bright spots over the last two and a half demoralizing years of the Covid era. Your seemingly cavalier decision to reject the concept of Slow Lake and presumably return the street to its preexisting traffic flow, despite the wishes of the thousands of city residents who provided input, is baffling to say the least, and represents a genuine loss for the city as a whole.

You say you care about Vision Zero, Climate Action, sustainability, building positive community, and keeping families in our city—all of which Slow Lake does—but your decision to reject Slow Lake is in conflict with those goals.

I respectfully request that you reconsider your decision and that you take appropriate and prompt action to move our city towards the Vision Zero and Climate Action goals you claim to uphold by supporting Slow Lake.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tracy Thompson

From: [Nancy Jodaitis](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); MTABoard@sfmta.com; [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); SlowStreets@sfmta.com; LakeStreet@sfmta.com; Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov; Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov; Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov; [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Slow Lake](#)
Subject: Importance of keeping Lake Street SLOW
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:40:53 AM

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

Mayor Breed,

I was really disappointed to hear of your pressure and influence on the SFMTA board to reverse the community's consensus to keep Lake Street slow.

Thousands of people who love Slow Lake and have participated in all of the community meetings, surveys, and letter-writing campaigns were shocked and really disappointed by this reversal. It is frustrating to have gone through this process and heard from the SFMTA community engagement employees that the decision was made to move forward with a slow Street, only to have that abandoned at the last hour. This sudden change is disappointing and demoralizing for all the engaged residents of Lake Street and surrounding communities who participated in good faith.

This sends a clear message of whom and what you value in our city -- and how the process really works. I don't believe this is what you intended to do. I have been told that you stated that slowly "smacks of privilege". However, this was one of the streets that had the highest density during the pandemic and built community in a way that the enrichment has never seen.

You have stated that you care about Vision Zero, Climate Action, sustainability, building positive community, and keeping families in our city—all of which Slow Lake does—but your decision to destroy Slow Lake as we know it contradicts your claimed priorities. We need bold vision and fearless leadership to reach our goals, and you are the person who must lead us.

Please take immediate action to reverse your decision to eradicate slow Lake. And move our city towards the Vision Zero and Climate Action goals you claim to uphold.

ACT QUICKLY to demonstrate you **DO VALUE** the **OPINIONS** of the **MAJORITY** of SF residents-- not just the few off-the-bridge drivers and car-committed SF residents who wish to speed through our neighborhood, destroying the community bonds we have built.

Sincerely,
Nancy Jodaitis
720 Lake St., #5
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: [Wes Tyler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Camera Surveillance Legislation
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:59:00 AM

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

Attention Rules Committee

Please approve the legislation that will allow law enforcement limited, temporary authority to use video footage to help deter, investigate, and solve crime.

Crime and safety are key to our recovery and San Francisco's rebound from the pandemic. This moves us toward that goal.

Thank you.

Wes Tyler, CHA
General Manager
Chancellor Hotel on Union Square
"Where the Cable Cars stop at the doorstep"
433 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Ph. 415.362.2004 Fax 415.395.9476
www.chancellorhotel.com





July 12, 2022

Rules Committee
Supervisor Peskin
Supervisor Mandelman
Supervisor Chan
SF Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Hotel Council Support for File # 220606 Surveillance Camera Policy for SFPD

Dear Supervisors, Peskin, Mandelman and Chan,

On behalf of the Hotel Council of San Francisco, I am writing to express our support for the prescribed use of video surveillance access when crimes are in progress.

Currently, The San Francisco Police Department is barred from accessing any live video to solve or prevent crime except if there is imminent danger of serious injury or death. This leaves neighborhoods across the city vulnerable to organized criminal activity, such as the mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries that have happened in the city over the past several years.

We acknowledge the valid and appropriate concerns around the issue of privacy and potential misuse of this video information. However, there are protective measures and safeguards that address this concern, and we believe the benefits derived from protecting citizens and residents in the “real time” involvement of a crime, and the opportunity to reduce the risk of further escalation of criminal activity is paramount. Many cities across the U.S. have seen a rise in gun violence and it allows communities the opportunity to examine the tools they have in place if such a crisis were to occur in their cities. We believe this tool is needed to prevent the escalation of certain threats and dangers when criminal activity is happening in San Francisco.

Again, on behalf of our 22,000 Hotel Employees in San Francisco, our visitors, and guests, we ask you to support this policy proposal to further safeguard our residents and visitors from potential acceleration of criminal activity or violence that might occur because this vital tool was not available to our officers.

Sincerely,

Kelly Powers
Director
Hotel Council of San Francisco

From: [Robert G Brown](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Policy allowing Police Authority to use Private Cameras for Policing
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 10:32:17 AM

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

Board of Supervisors, per the article in 48 hills you are coming back next week with a proposed amended policy to provide authority for the sfpd to use private cameras for policing.

No, No, No, No, NO!

NOT EVER in our lifetime should we give the SFPD any more authority to spy on San Franciscans.

There would NEVER be enough safeguards that any human could think of and impose that make this policy viable.

San Francisco would literally be a "Police State."

Please abolish this policy from our public discussion while enacting policies that make it impossible for it to ever be considered again.

Thank you

Robert G Brown
1656 Leavenworth St, San Francisco, CA 94109
415.806.0561

From: churbert@outlook.com
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: NO to SF becoming a Police State!
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 1:35:47 PM

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

Connie and BoS,

This is an obscene police overreach and frankly a crass violation of citizen's civil liberty. Anything but a resounding, "HELL, NO!" is akin to your tacit support of a dystopian police state. This is NOT who we are.

<https://missionlocal.org/2022/07/surveillance-critics-blast-police-private-cameras/>

Meanwhile the SFPD literally abdicated their responsibilities and duties while attempting to enact retribution against a DA who for once actually sought to hold "bad apples" accountable. Not surprisingly, the Mayor who remained silent on the recall put in Budin's place an inexperienced, uncouth, hack with her sights on regressive, broken window policies and no accountability for the police. Really???

The Board needs to reign in this out of control Mayor and her SFPD pals or there will be consequences at the ballot box next election.

Again, this is NOT who we are.

Sincerely,

Charles Hurbert, D1

From: [Judith Beck](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No SFPD access to private cameras!!!
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 11:01:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Do not allow SF police access to private cameras on homes and businesses. They have no right to our personal doings in this sweeping, indiscriminate, unwarranted (as in "search warrant") way. Our police have earned no such privilege and should be reined in rather than let loose with surveillance.

Sincerely,

Judy Beck - D5

From: [Lily Ho](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 4:35:55 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Lily Ho
Email lily.ho@gmail.com
I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Iris Biblowitz](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose the Mayor's proposal to increase SFPD's access to surveillance technology from private cameras
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 6:34:37 PM

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

Dear Supervisors on the Rules Committee - I'm a nurse who's more and more alarmed by San Francisco's proposals giving SFPD more power without more accountability. Please strongly oppose the proposal to give SFPD the right to access private surveillance cameras in certain neighborhoods if they determine there's a "possibility of a shooting." This is outrageous and frightening. The current law (from 2019) gives SFPD access to private security cameras only if there's serious risk of physical injury or death. I'm asking you to fight any expansion of the current law and practise. We already have the statistics that show that Black and Latinx communities are targeted much more than white and Asian communities in the city. In today's Chronicle, the numbers are revealing of teh great inequities here: In 2020, stop rates by SFPD show 2,313 for Black, 552 for Latinx, 389 for Whites, and 131 for Asians. UCSF's recent study in JAMA revealed that San Francisco had the highest injury rate for Black residents (SF Chronicle 7/3/22). To address these damning inequities, we need to go in the opposite direction of this proposed surveillance policy, and focus on holding SFPD accountable for their actions and violence against communities of color. Since Nov. 2021 (unless I'm forgetting a victim), SFPD has killed 4 people , Ajmal Amani, Nelson Szeto, Rafael Mendoza, and Michael MacFhiongham.

As the city give lip service to treatment for people using drugs (while waiting lists make this very difficult for most people), the possibility of increasing surveillance from private cameras (which would include drug dealing as well as drug use) are terrifying and certainly a violation of First Amendment rights. At a time when San Francisco is supposed to be working on reforming police tactics and policies, we're going in the opposite direction.

As a nurse who cares about the well-being of all San Franciscans, and who's cared for people in their homes as well as people living in the streets as well as people in the hospital and clinics, I'm shocked at this hypocritical and dangerous proposal. Those of us who truly believe in racial and social justice will be out in the streets and at City Hall, fighting.

Sincerely - Iris Biblowitz, RN

From: [Jan Diamond](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 9:24:31 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jan Diamond

Email janmdiamond@pacbell.net

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 11:36:26 AM
Attachments: [image064799.png](#)

For 220606

From: Amy Hull <Amy.Hull@trinitysf.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2022 7:05 AM
To: Shadd Newman <Shadd.Newman@trinitysf.com>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; 'info@midmarketcbd.org' <info@midmarketcbd.org>
Subject: Re: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras

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

Dear Supervisors,

I also support making this provision for access to SFPD.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Amy Hull
Chief Operating Officer
(415) 433-3333



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.
trinitysf.com
[Email Disclaimer](#)

From: Shadd Newman <Shadd.Newman@trinitysf.com>

Sent: Friday, July 15, 2022 12:44:39 PM

To: 'Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org' <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>; 'Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org' <Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org>; 'Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org' <Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org>; 'Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org' <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; 'Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org' <Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org>; 'Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org' <Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org>; 'Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org' <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>; 'Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org' <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>; 'Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org' <Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org>; 'Connie.Chan@sfgov.org' <Connie.Chan@sfgov.org>; 'Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org' <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>; 'Dean.Preston@sfgov.org' <Dean.Preston@sfgov.org>; 'Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org' <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>; 'info@midmarketcbd.org' <info@midmarketcbd.org>

Cc: Amy Hull <Amy.Hull@trinitysf.com>

Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras

Dear Supervisors,

Please support the legislation for allowing San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

Residents and prospective tenants at Trinity Place in mid-Market lament the crime and lack of safety in the neighborhood, expressing concern about open air drug dealing. Providing SFPD access to already existing tools to help them do their job is an important step in addressing these concerns and making our streets safer for all members of the community.

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,

Shadd Newman

Shadd Newman
Vice President

(415) 575-3356



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.

trinitysf.com

[Email Disclaimer](#)

From: [Roger Wong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 12:08:52 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Roger Wong

Email outersunsetresi@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: More 220606 PC
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 2:11:18 PM
Attachments: [Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras.msg](#)
[Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras.msg](#)
[Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras.msg](#)
[Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras.msg](#)

Attached

Brent Jalipa

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

From: [Mary Liang](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 6:02:02 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent **Mary Liang**

Email mkenny1357@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 7**

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 9:44:36 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

From: Mark Meier <mark@starboardnet.com>
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 4:00 PM
To: Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; info@midmarketcbd.org
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support the legislation allowing the San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,

Mark Meier



Mark Meier
Senior Sales & Leasing Associate

Office 415.765.6900
Direct 415.299.7042
Email mark@starboardnet.com

CA BRE# 02047169

Starboard CRE
49 Powell Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

starboardcre.com



From: [Mimi Wu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 10:08:13 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent **Mimi Wu**
Email ms_mimi@hotmail.com
I am a resident of **District 4**

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Barbara Pletz](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 7:14:29 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent **Barbara Pletz**

Email barbarapletz4@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 8**

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Allen Jones](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Enhanced use of surveillance cameras
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 3:27:29 PM

Looping in the clerk, Victor Young, so he can distribute.
Aaron

From: Allen Jones <jones-allen@att.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 2:03:51 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Enhanced use of surveillance cameras

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

Supervisor Peskin,

Many years ago, I was outraged by something, then former Supervisor Scott Wiener did, when former Police Chief Greg Suhr tried enhance use of surveillance cameras.

Chief Suhr wanted to require all new bars to have surveillance cameras. Wiener objected based on what I thought was a ridiculous excuse: some men still in the closet might be exposed. HONEST. This killed that plan in committee or full board. I can't remember which one.

To think someone would place privacy over solving a crime is a tough call in my opinion. Why? I can't always trust SFPD to do the right thing. Personally, I would gladly give up might right to privacy if it will solve a crime against me or anyone.

I also recall, you being opposed to facial recognition based on in part, not being reliable or mis-identifying Black people I think. And I am aware of the breach of agreement for use of the cameras around the BLM protest at Union Square.

Fast forward to today:

I just read of the plan being pushed by Breed and Jenkins to allow SFPD use surveillance cameras from private property (RING etc.) And "share" with the feds.

This to me is a laughable, give them an inch they will take a mile approach to policing in San Francisco.

Pardon my language, but I said all that to suggest another idea: Get your own damn cameras SFPD.

I am not dumb enough to believe San Francisco Police Department will be so willing to share any of the video that captures its own officers going rogue, despite the claims made by our new DA.

Defunding the police, in my opinion, was dead on arrival. But I sure do believe that a \$700+ million police budget could include a video surveillance program to help solve/prevent crime here.

To be clear, I am not opposed to using cameras on businesses for police purposes. But to not get permission from private residents and sharing with the feds is good intentions run amok.

Please share my views with your committee.

Allen Jones
(415) 756-7733
jones-allen@att.net
Californiaclemency.org

The Only thing I love more than justice is the freedom to fight for it.

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 3



City and County of San Francisco

AARON PESKIN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Victor Young, Clerk of the Rules Committee

FROM: Calvin Yan

DATE: July 19, 2022

SUBJECT: Proposed Amendments to File No. 220606

Dear Clerk Young,

As discussed at the Rules Committee meeting on July 18, 2022, Supervisor Peskin requests that the following proposed amendments to File No. 220606 be included in the file for public review.

- Clarifying that authorized requests for historical video footage shall be for “specific portions of” historical video footage that contain evidence relevant to a criminal investigation or internal investigation regarding officer misconduct, and striking the words “for purposes of gathering;”
- Limiting authorization for live monitoring during First Amendment activities “unless there is an exigent circumstance,” and deleting “for reasons outside of redeployment needs due to crowd sizes or other issues creating public safety hazards;” and
- Limiting the sharing of data with recipients to law enforcement agencies “who are California public agencies” and requiring that the Department comply with “San Francisco’s Sanctuary Ordinance (Administrative Code Section 12H & I et seq.)”

1 [Administrative Code - Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City
2 Entity Surveillance Cameras]

3 **Ordinance approving Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of**
4 **non-City entity surveillance cameras.**

5 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
6 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
7 **Deletions to Codes** are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.
8 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.
9 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
10 **Asterisks (* * * *)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code
11 subsections or parts of tables.

12 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

13 Mayor's

14 Section 1 Background

15 (a) Administrative Code Chapter 19B) establish requirements that City departments
16 must follow before they may use or acquire new Surveillance Technology. Under
17 Administrative Code Section 19B.2(a), a City department must obtain Board of Supervisors
18 approval by ordinance of a Surveillance Technology Policy before: (1) seeking funds for
19 Surveillance Technology; (2) acquiring or borrowing new Surveillance Technology; (3) using
20 new or existing Surveillance Technology for a purpose, in a manner, or in a location not
21 specified in a Board-approved Surveillance Technology ordinance; (4) entering into
22 agreement with a non-City entity to acquire, share, or otherwise use Surveillance Technology;
23 or (5) entering into an oral or written agreement under which a non-City entity or individual
24 regularly provides the department with data or information acquired through the entity's use of
25 Surveillance Technology.

(b) Under Administrative Code Section 19B.2(b), the Board of Supervisors may
approve a Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance under Section 19B.2(a) only if: (1) the

1 department seeking Board approval first submits to the Committee on Information Technology
2 (COIT) a Surveillance Impact Report for the Surveillance Technology to be acquired or used;
3 (2) based on the Surveillance Impact Report, COIT develops a Surveillance Technology
4 Policy for the Surveillance Technology to be acquired or used; and (3) at a public meeting at
5 which COIT considers the Surveillance Technology Policy, COIT recommends that the Board
6 adopt, adopt with modification, or decline to adopt the Surveillance Technology Policy for the
7 Surveillance Technology to be acquired or used.

8 (c) Under Administrative Code Section 19B.4, the City policy is that the Board of
9 Supervisors will approve a Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance only if it determines that
10 the benefits that the Surveillance Technology ordinance authorizes outweigh its costs, that the
11 Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance will safeguard civil liberties and civil rights, and that
12 the uses and deployments of the Surveillance Technology under the ordinance will not be
13 based upon discriminatory viewpoint-based factors or have a disparate impact on any
14 community or Protected Class.

DRAFT

15 Section 2. Surveillance Technology Policy Ordinance for Police Department Use of
16 Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras.

17 (a) Purpose. The Police Department seeks Board of Supervisors authorization under
18 Section 19B.2(a) to use surveillance cameras and surveillance camera networks owned,
19 leased, managed, or operated by non-City entities to: (1) temporarily live monitor activity
20 during exigent circumstances, significant events with public safety concerns, and
21 investigations relating to active misdemeanor and felony violations; (2) gather and review
22 historical video footage for the purposes of conducting a criminal investigation; and (3) gather
23 and review historical video footage for the purposes of an internal investigation regarding
24 officer misconduct.

1 (b) Surveillance Impact Report. The Police Department submitted to COIT a
2 Surveillance Impact Report for Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras. A copy of the Police
3 Department Surveillance Impact Report for Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras is in Board
4 File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

5 (c) Public Hearings. Between March 25, 2022 and April 21, 2022, inclusive, COIT and
6 its Privacy and Surveillance Advisory Board (PSAB) conducted four public hearings at which
7 they considered the Surveillance Impact Report referenced in subsection (b) and developed a
8 Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance
9 cameras. A copy of the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of the
10 Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras ("San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Non-City
11 Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy") is in Board File No. _____, and is incorporated herein
12 by reference.

13 (d) COIT Recommendation. On April 21, 2022, COIT voted to recommend the SFPD
14 Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

15 (e) Findings. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the stated benefits of the
16 Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras outweigh the costs and risks
17 of use of such Surveillance Technology; that the SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras
18 Policy, as modified by the Board of Supervisors, will safeguard civil liberties and civil rights;
19 and that the uses and deployments of non-City entity surveillance cameras, as set forth in the
20 SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy, will not be based upon discriminatory or
21 viewpoint-based factors or have a disparate impact on any community or a protected class.

22 In particular, the SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy ("policy") includes
23 on pages 2 and 3 a number of prohibitions on SFPD's use of third-party surveillance cameras
24 and footage. These prohibited uses include a prohibition on monitoring any certain groups or
25 individuals based, in whole or in part, on race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation. The

1 policy also prohibits SFPD from accessing, requesting, or monitoring any surveillance camera
2 live feed during First Amendment activities for reasons outside of redeployment needs due to
3 crowd sizes or other issues creating public safety hazards. SFPD cannot live monitor
4 cameras inside residential dwellings absent specific circumstances. Additionally, SFPD shall
5 not use biometric or facial recognition technology under the policy, and SFPD shall not
6 acquire or use surveillance footage for purposes of assisting U.S. Immigration and Customs
7 Enforcement with the enforcement of immigration laws.

8 Section 3. Approval of Modified Policy.

9 The Board of Supervisors hereby approves the SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance
10 Cameras Policy, with the following modifications:

11 (a) Under "Purpose and Scope" on page 1, adding a fourth paragraph as follows:

12 "Absent a subpoena or search warrant, SFPD access to all systems noted in this policy will be
13 obtained through the express consent of the individual or entity managing the surveillance
14 system at the time of request. SFPD does not manage a surveillance camera registry, have
15 public observation devices, or have a Ring/Neighbors partnership agreement."; and

16 (b) Under Authorized Uses on page 2, the first authorized use is revised and replaced
17 in its entirety as follows:

18 "1. Temporary live monitoring during (a) exigent circumstance(s) as defined by San
19 Francisco Administrative Code, Section 19B, (b) Significant Events with public safety
20 concerns, or (c) investigations of misdemeanor or felony violations if an SFPD Captain or
21 member in rank above Captain determines based on reasonable and articulable facts that
22 there is an operational need for live monitoring to investigate contemporaneous or imminent
23 events, and obtaining historical video footage later either by consent, warrant, or subpoena
24 will be inadequate to meet the operational and investigative need. Temporary live monitoring
25 will cease, and the connection will be severed within 24 hours after the non-city entity has

1 provided access to SFPD. SFPD shall not record live monitoring however, if misdemeanor or
2 felony violations are observed, nothing in this policy ordinance prohibits SFPD from deferring
3 to authorized use No. 2 or No. 3 of this section."

4 (c) Under "Prohibitions," which begins on page 2, adding the following bullet point:
5 "SFPD is prohibited from seeking to obtain surveillance footage for purposes of enforcing
6 prohibitions on reproductive care or interstate travel for reproductive care. Except as required
7 by law, SFPD shall not share surveillance footage with any law enforcement agency for
8 purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or interstate travel for reproductive
9 care"; and

10 (d) Deleting the words "for a minimum of two years, or" that appear on page 9 so that
11 the policy, as amended, reads: "As the data is associated with a criminal investigation, the
12 data is retained as required by State evidence retention laws."

13 The Police Department shall place a copy of the modified policy in Board File No.
14 220606 within 30 days of the effective date of this ordinance.

DRAFT

15
16 Section 4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
17 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
18 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
19 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

20
21 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
22 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

23 By: _____
24 ZACHARY PORIANDA
25 Deputy City Attorney

n:\govern\as2022\1900636\01613349.docx

DRAFT