

From: [Arthur Koch](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: AB 481. How should San Francisco PD use its militarized equipment?
Date: Monday, November 7, 2022 12:16:29 AM

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

Victor,

I'm not sure who I should be sending this to, but I plan to give on site testimony in Monday's Rules Committee Meeting in room 250 at 10:00am. I understand I only have two minutes to speak so I would like this on the written record in case I don't get to it all. Please forward to whoever documents the written record, or needs to know.

Thanks!

Art Koch

415-385-4136

Hi, my name is Arthur Koch and I live in San Francisco District #9. I represent the SF Friends Meeting Just a couple blocks from here at 65 S. 9th street. I ask the Board of Supervisors to call for further amendment of the proposed military equipment policy to:

1. Fully define authorized use for all weapons, especially assault weapons.
2. Align receipt of annual report with budgets.
3. Require transparency and restocking – no blank checks for up to \$10 million.
 - As a Quaker pacifist, I don't think the SFPD should have so many weapons of War. We are a city not a military. I think the proposed policy is morally and ethically wrong.
 - This policy does not safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, or civil liberties (and AB 481 requires governing bodies to ONLY approve the use policy if it "will safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties.")

My personal story is: I visited a friend in Visitacion Valley a couple years ago (one of the poorest neighborhoods in San Francisco) and I witnessed a military style armored vehicle making a drug bust at his neighbor's house. It was shocking and seemed way out of proportion to me, like it was a different reality than other neighborhoods in SF. I was more afraid of the Police than all the poverty and crime that surrounded me. Breaching devices should not be deployed against a person, and should only be used on doors or similar entryways. Military equipment is more frequently deployed in low-income Black and Brown communities, meaning the risks and impacts of police militarization are experienced most acutely in marginalized communities." [AB 481]

If I get to it:

The proposed policy should not allow unrestricted restocking

The proposed policy allows SFPD to acquire equipment without prior BOS approval if it runs low on any of its stock, or simply wishes to replace any of its equipment. SFPD may do so for up to *ten million dollars*.

What could SF fund with ten million dollars? How might that go towards schools, housing, youth employment, or public infrastructure?

If stocks run low, this is exactly the situation in which *more* oversight is needed, not less. 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.

From: [Arthur Koch](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rules Committee Military Equipment Policy agenda item: File number 220641 testimony for November 7, 2022
Date: Monday, November 7, 2022 8:55:20 AM

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

To the Rules Committee Members,

My name is Arthur Koch and I live in San Francisco District #9. I represent the SF Friends Meeting Just a couple blocks from here at 65 S. 9th street. I ask the Board of Supervisors to call for further amendment of the proposed military equipment policy to:

1. Fully define authorized use for all weapons, especially assault weapons.
2. Align receipt of annual report with budgets.
3. Require transparency and restocking – no blank checks for up to \$10 million.
 - As a Quaker pacifist, I don't think the SFPD should have so many weapons of War. We are a city not a military. I think the proposed policy is morally and ethically wrong.
 - This policy does not safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, or civil liberties (and AB 481 requires governing bodies to ONLY approve the use policy if it "will safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties.")

My personal story is: I visited a friend in Visitacion Valley a couple years ago (one of the poorest neighborhoods in San Francisco) and I witnessed a military style armored vehicle making a drug bust at his neighbor's house. It was shocking and seemed way out of proportion to me, like it was a different reality than other neighborhoods in SF. I was more afraid of the Police than all the poverty and crime that surrounded me. Breaching devices should not be deployed against a person, and should only be used on doors or similar entryways. Military equipment is more frequently deployed in low-income Black and Brown communities, meaning the risks and impacts of police militarization are experienced most acutely in marginalized communities." [AB 481]

If I get to it:

The proposed policy should not allow unrestricted restocking

The proposed policy allows SFPD to acquire equipment without prior BOS approval if it runs low on any of its stock, or simply wishes to replace any of its equipment. SFPD may do so for up to *ten million dollars*.

What could SF fund with ten million dollars? How might that go towards schools, housing, youth employment, or public infrastructure?

If stocks run low, this is exactly the situation in which *more* oversight is needed, not less. 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.

My story: A couple years ago I visited a friend in Visitation Valley, one of the poorest neighborhoods in San Francisco, and I witnessed a military style armored vehicle making a drug bust at his neighbor's house. It was shocking and seemed way out of proportion to me, like I was in another reality that I don't see in other neighborhoods.

The proposed policy cedes authority to other jurisdictions

The section on "Collaboration With Outside Law Enforcement Agencies" allows other jurisdictions to potentially deploy military weapons with fewer safeguards in place with no accountability to the people of San Francisco.

SFPD should instead adopt a policy that restricts equipment use to be the same as what the Board of Supervisors has approved. Sample language to use instead:

Equipment not listed in this policy shall not be used by any other law enforcement agency or member in this jurisdiction. When collaborating with outside agencies within San Francisco's jurisdiction, SFPD shall ensure all outside agencies' weapon use shall comply with this policy.

Align receipt of annual report with budget process

- How many personnel devoted how many hours toward training on each weapon? What was the cost of that personnel time?
 - How many hours were devoted by all personnel towards cleaning rifles? Towards cleaning or maintenance on each weapon?
- Were any of the above at an overtime rate?

To support SFPD in meeting this requirement, San Francisco should follow neighboring cities Berkeley and Oakland in setting a specific delivery date of its annual report (which the state law only requires to be delivered "within one year of approval"). Oakland requires the first annual report be delivered by March 15. By setting a similar 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](#).

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 7, 2022
Date: Sunday, November 6, 2022 9:55:59 AM

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

Dear Rules Committee members:

I have reviewed the most recent draft policy that will be considered by the Rules Committee on November 7, 2022. Please call for further amendments to address the following issues that are needed to ensure the public has full knowledge of how military equipment is being used by the police.

Remember that San Francisco is a city of peace. This policy should protect peace by the Board adopting a policy that embodies the highest level of accountability and transparency to protect the public from the misuse of military equipment.

The policy still is lacking in specificity for defining authorized uses. It is not clear to me under what circumstances and exactly how these weapons will be used. Assault weapons need to be added back into the policy as citizens are concerned that their use has led to unnecessary deaths. We need real accountability here.

The policy needs to be tied to the budget cycle. I strongly recommend that we have an initial report in March 2023. Supervisor Chan has raised concerns about the annual report. Having an initial smaller report will go a long way to seeing whether the reporting is meeting the requirements of the State law. It will let the Board of Supervisors budget process increase the transparency around the police budget for the public's benefit.

I also want to note that the State law requires the annual report to include personnel costs associated with the equipment items and that includes training and maintenance costs. It appears that the police department may not be maintaining the required records. If this is accurate, then it is another reason to call for a process aligned with the budget to correct these possible reporting deficiencies.

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this policy.

Regina Sneed
District Two resident