

From: [regina.sneed](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Rules Committee Military Equipment Policy agenda item: File number 220641 testimony for November 14, 2022
Date: Sunday, November 13, 2022 12:04:46 PM

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

Dear members of the Board of Supervisors Rules Committee:

In reviewing the latest version of the proposed ordinance which is likely to be voted on by the Committee this week, I wanted to step back a bit and review what AB 481 requires. The law was passed in recognition that the public is deeply concerned with the militarization of the police. The law sets forth some minimum requirements to demilitarize the police by disclosing what military equipment is owned and the associated costs, by providing a policy of the appropriate use of this equipment and by requiring annual reports on the deployment and costs.

Once this ordinance is passed, it will be incumbent on the Board to review these reports to ensure that the police are using the equipment for the authorized use and to consider whether the city should continue to use equipment that could be harmful to the public. The public needs to have timely access to the information in the reports to participate in holding the police accountable for its use.

To accomplish these goals, I would like to see the current draft amended as follows.

1. The police Department owns 608 assault rifles but only includes 375 in the equipment list. While AB 481 does not require weapons that are standard issue to be included, I expect San Francisco to include them in this policy for transparency and clarity. If we don't know what the total number of assault rifles is, how are we to understand how they are deployed for all uses and what replacement requirements are.
2. I would like to see the annual reporting tied to the budget cycle for adopting the police department budget. It makes sense if the Board and the public can look at how the money is being spent at the same time we are seeing how the equipment was used and how much needs to be replaced. I believe our goal should be to look for ways to reduce spending on military type equipment in favor of alternative community policing strategies.
3. I have suggested including a private attorney right of action to the ordinance to add one more accountability tool for the public to use in enforcing the requirements of AB 481.

I want to thank the American Friends Service Committee Healing Justice Project for the work the project is doing in California to help legislators and citizens understand the requirements of AB 481 and for helping me as a citizen advocate for the best policy that represents San Francisco values as a city of peace.

I would like to acknowledge the efforts of Supervisor Peskin and members of the Police Department staff in working through the many policy issues raised in this process. While I still see areas that can be improved from a public protection perspective, the annual reporting process will provide citizens and the Board with opportunities to make adjustments to the ordinance and reporting requirements in the coming years.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Regina Sneed
District Two resident
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

From: [Arthur Koch](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Saini, Nikita \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rules Committee Military Equipment Policy agenda item: File number 220641 testimony for November 14, 2022
Date: Sunday, November 13, 2022 6:54:33 PM

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

Dear members of the Board of Supervisors Rules Committee:

My name is Arthur Koch and I am an artist in San Francisco's District #9. Hillary Ronen is my supervisor and I have an exhibit in her office of paintings and photos of the Mission, Bernal Heights, and the Portola district where I live. I also sent her a letter in anticipation of this going to the Full Board. I am a member of the SF Friends Meeting serving on the Peace and Social Concerns Committee. Our Quaker Meeting House is just a couple blocks from here at 65 S. 9th street, so we are no strangers to City Hall and what goes on in the neighborhood.

Thank you for the improvements to the proposed policy. I ask the Board of Supervisors to call for further improvements of the proposed military equipment use policy. While SFPD's has improved its proposed policy's authorized use definitions, more improvement is still needed.

1. Fully define authorized use for all weapons

· The policy must describe both the *circumstances* in which the weapon may be used, and *how* the weapon may be used, and when use must not occur. We need clear limits to the broad definitions of authorized use. For example, projectile launchers should not be deployed against people in mental health crisis or against children. Automatic assault rifles shall not be used when there is a risk of shooting bystanders.

Also, all 608 assault rifles must be included. The 375 that were removed should be added back.

2. Align receipt of annual report with budget process

San Francisco should set a specific delivery date of its annual report that will align with our city's budget process. By setting a March deadline, SFPD will not only be able to avoid a rush before the last minute, it will also be able to deliver a smaller initial report, confirm earlier in the process whether it is tracking all the information required by law, and provide context for its requested budget for the next fiscal year. These weapons, and the personnel costs involved in training on them and deploying them, are a poor fiscal choice for San Francisco.

3. Require transparency in restocking

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

We all deserve the transparency and accountability required by law. I appreciate that this proposal policy has been improved under Chair Peskin's leadership, and hope there will be continued improvements before the proposed policy is heard by the full board of Supervisors. I appreciate that this proposal policy has been improved under Chair Peskin's leadership, with

due diligence by the Police and Sheriff's Dept. and hope there will be continued improvements before the proposed policy is heard by the full board of Supervisors.

Thank you so much!

Arthur Koch
156 Girard St.
SF, CA 94134