

FILE NO. 231072

Petitions and Communications received from October 12, 2023, through October 19, 2023, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on October 24, 2023.

Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information will not be redacted.

From the Department of Public Health (DPH), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting an approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Form. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From the Cannabis Oversight Committee, submitting recommendations for improvements to the Medical Marijuana ID Card (MMIC) Program, establishment of a Public Cannabis Bank, and extension of the Temporary Cannabis Events Pilot Program. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME), submitting the OCME Accidental Overdose Report for October 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS), submitting a response to a letter of inquiry issued by Supervisor Connie Chan at the September 26, 2023, Board of Supervisors Meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Recreation and Park Department (RPD), submitting a response to a letter of inquiry issued by Supervisor Connie Chan at the September 12, 2023, Board of Supervisors Meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the California Public Utilities Commission, submitting notice of a project from Verizon Wireless. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From Joe A. Kunzler, regarding various subjects. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From Erdmuth Folker, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From James Miller, regarding public safety. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From the Grover Cleveland Democratic Club of San Francisco, regarding in-person public comment (on file with the Office of the Clerk of the Board). Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From Luke Bornheimer, regarding Shelley Drive. From Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From Tiffany Carter, submitting her resignation to the Small Business Commission. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From Ester Butts, regarding the Resolution authorizing the placement of the Compton's Transgender Cultural District of San Francisco's Cultural Heritage District plaques, to be installed on the sidewalks at various historic location markers along the 6th Street corridor. File No. 230943. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From Both Sides of the Conversation, regarding surveillance technology. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From members of the public, regarding taxpayer funded legal counsel. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From members of the public, regarding cars in Hayes Valley. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Monica D, regarding various subjects. 7 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From members of the public, regarding homelessness. 23 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to clarify the Controller's audit and monitoring responsibilities with respect to nonprofit organizations contracting with the City. 5 Letters. File No. 230973. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Ordinance amending the Planning Code to encourage housing production. 10 Letters. File No. 230446. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution authorizing and approving a sublease agreement for 312,000 square feet of property owned by the California State Lands Commission and leased to the California Department of Parks and Recreation, for the City's continued use as the Bayview Vehicle Triage Center at Candlestick Point State Recreation Area. 11 Letters. File No. 230974. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Resolution urging the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) to develop and implement a plan for No Turn On Red (NTOR) at every signalized intersection in San Francisco and approve a citywide NTOR policy. 19 Letters. File No. 231016. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From members of the public, regarding the Motion amending the Board of Supervisors' Rules of Order by revising Rule 1.3.3 (In-Person and Remote Public Comment) to discontinue remote public comment by members of the public at meetings of the Board

and its committees, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. 31 Letters. File No. 231020; Motion No. M23-129. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From members of the public, regarding the proposed Charter Amendment (First Draft) to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to establish minimum staffing levels for sworn officers of the Police Department. 177 Letters. File No. 230985. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From members of the public, regarding San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Department General Order (DGO) 5.25, Foot Pursuits. 61 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From members of the public, regarding San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Department General Order (DGO) 6.21, SFPD use of Social Media. 70 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: CMD12B0003021 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 11:59:15 AM
Attachments: [ccsfLogoPic.png](#)
[CMD12B0003021.pdf](#)
[image002.png](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 1 12B waiver request form.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: CCSF IT Service Desk <ccsfdt@service-now.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 10:34 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: CMD12B0003021 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)

Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0003021 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

Summary of Request

Requester: Alejandro Garcia

Department: DPH

Waiver Justification: 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

Supplier ID: 0000038638

Requested total cost: \$2,179.95

Short Description: SmartPractice Dermatology Allergy: True Test Patch Test, Panels, allergens

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4573735_QydeJnfg3NIHjgVe8TXu

Report Title: CMD 12B Waiver Details
Run Date and Time: 2023-10-19 10:07:16 Pacific Daylight Time
Run by: ServiceNow Admin
Table name: u_cmd_12b_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

Number:	CMD12B0003021	Request Status:	Completed
Requested for:	Alejandro Garcia	State:	Completed
Department Head/Delegated authority:	Michelle Ruggels	Waiver Type:	12B Waiver
Opened:	2023-10-17 08:57:32	12B Waiver Type:	Standard
		Requesting Department:	DPH
		Requester Phone:	(628) 206-7456
		Awaiting Info from:	
		Awaiting Info reason:	
		Opened by:	Alejandro Garcia
		Watch list:	

Short Description:

SmartPractice Dermatology Allergy: True Test Patch Test, Panels, allergens

Supplier ID:	0000038638	Requested Amount:	\$2,179.95
Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?:	New Waiver	Increase Amount:	\$0.00
Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:		Previously Approved Amount:	\$0.00
		Total Requested Amount:	\$2,179.95
Document Type:	Purchase Order	Enter Contract ID:	
12B Waiver Justification:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)	Enter Requisition ID:	
City Treasurer:	Jose Cisneros	Enter Purchase Order ID:	0000759679
Admin Code Chapter:	Chapter 21 Goods and Services	Enter Direct Voucher ID:	
Select Chapter 21.04 Section:		Waiver Start Date:	2023-10-01
Confirm Dept. has documented this agreement as a Sole Source:		Waiver End Date:	2023-12-31

Advertising:	false
Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :	true
Equipment and Vehicle Lease:	false
On Premise Software and Support:	false
Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:	false
Professional and General Services:	false
Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:	false
Vehicles and Trailers:	false

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

SmartPractice Dermatology Allergy provides a an allergy dermatitis diagnose. This test is used for testing for specific skin allergies and is an essential tool to manage patients with allergic contact dermatitis, which is a common diagnosis made in our clinic. Not having access to these tests will mean we have to refer all these patients to UCSF for this testing, which is much more costly to the system.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

Yes, we have encourage the vendor to become compliant by providing all the apropiate information on how to do so
SmartPractice Dermatology Allergy is under pending compliance. In the interim, SFDPH is seeking a waiver for this procurement needed for skin allergies.

Cancel Notes:

CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:	Jim Oerther	CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang
CMD Analyst Decision:	Reviewed and Approved	Select the reason for this request:	12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)
CMD Analyst Comments:	No compliant source for contact dermatitis diagnosis testing for specific skin allergies.		

CMD Director

CMD Director:	Stephanie Tang	CMD Director Decision:	Reviewed and Approved
Reason for Determination:			
Approved under 12B.5-1(d)(1) authority.			

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:	
Sole Source – Non Property Contract Justification Reason:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	
Explain why this is a Sole Source:	

12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:	
Has DPH Commission qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Chpt 21.42?:	
Has MTA qualified this agreement as a Sole Source under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:	
CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:	
CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:	

12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract
Justification Reason:

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non
Property Contract Justification
Reason:

Has DPH Commission qualified this
agreement as a Sole Source under
Chpt 21.42?:

Has MTA qualified this agreement as
a Sole Source under Charter Sec.
8A.102(b)?:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)
Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)
Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

SmartPractice Dermatology Allergy provides a an allergy dermatitis diagnose. This test is used for testing for specific skin allergies and is an essential tool to manage patients with allergic contact dermatitis, which is a common diagnosis made in our clinic. Not having access to these tests will mean we have to refer all these patients to UCSF for this testing, which is much more costly to the system.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

SmartPractice Dermatology Allergy provides a an allergy dermatitis diagnose. This test is used for testing for specific skin allergies and is an essential tool to manage patients with allergic contact dermatitis, which is a common diagnosis made in our clinic. Not having access to these tests will mean we have to refer all these patients to UCSF for this testing, which is much more costly to the system.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

The SmartPractice Dermatology has been providing skin allergies testing to the Public Health Laboratory for years. As a result, SFDPH will need to continue using their services to ensure its data uses the same base and standardization. Pivoting to another vendor may jeopardize treatments.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

This is an essential service needed for the ZSFGH and their patients, and this supplier is used to maintain standardization across many years to not disrupt treatments.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

Yes

12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Has MTA qualified agreement as Bulk Purchasing under Charter Sec. 8A.102(b)?:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:
- 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

Activities

Additional comments:

Related List Title: Approval List
Table name: sysapproval_approver
Query Condition: Approval for = CMD12B0003021
Sort Order: Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

State	Approver	Approving	Created	Approval set	Comments
Approved	Michelle Ruggels	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	2023-10-17 09:12:40		

Related List Title: Metric List
Table name: metric_instance
Query Condition: Table = u_cmd_12b_waiver AND ID = 9aee1f3f1b3d7d5099d4ed7b2f4bcbcb
Sort Order: None

12 Metrics

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2023-10-17 09:12:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Draft	2023-10-17 09:12:41	2023-10-17 09:12:41	0 Seconds	true
2023-10-17 09:05:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Draft	2023-10-17 09:05:41	2023-10-17 09:12:41	7 Minutes	true
2023-10-17 14:53:20	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Completed	2023-10-17 14:53:15			false
2023-10-17 11:09:31	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2023-10-17 11:09:28	2023-10-17 14:53:15	3 Hours 43 Minutes	true
2023-10-17 09:12:45	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Dept. Head approval	2023-10-17 09:12:41	2023-10-17 10:33:11	1 Hour 20 Minutes	true
2023-10-17 10:33:16	OCA 12B Metric	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2023-10-17 10:33:11	2023-10-17 11:09:28	36 Minutes	true

Created	Definition	ID	Value	Start	End	Duration	Calculation complete
2023-10-17 09:12:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Dept. Head approval	2023-10-17 09:12:41	2023-10-17 10:33:11	1 Hour 20 Minutes	true
2023-10-17 09:05:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Draft	2023-10-17 09:05:41	2023-10-17 09:12:41	7 Minutes	true
2023-10-17 10:33:16	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval	2023-10-17 10:33:11	2023-10-17 11:09:28	36 Minutes	true
2023-10-17 09:12:45	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Draft	2023-10-17 09:12:41	2023-10-17 09:12:41	0 Seconds	true
2023-10-17 14:53:20	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Completed	2023-10-17 14:53:15			false
2023-10-17 11:09:31	Assigned to Duration	CMD 12B Waiver: CMD12B0003021	Awaiting CMD Director Approval	2023-10-17 11:09:28	2023-10-17 14:53:15	3 Hours 43 Minutes	true

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Transmittal of Cannabis Oversight Committee's Recommendations on Medical Cannabis ID Program, Public Cannabis Banking and Temporary Cannabis Events
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:45:00 PM
Attachments: [09.13.2023 COC Recommendations - Medical Cannabis ID Program & Public Cannabis Banking.pdf](#)
[10.11.2023 COC Recommendations - Temporary Cannabis Events.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached recommendations from the Cannabis Oversight Committee.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Dennis, Scott (ADM) <scott.dennis@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2023 4:24 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Hayward, Sophie (ADM) <sophie.hayward@sfgov.org>
Subject: Transmittal of Cannabis Oversight Committee's Recommendations on Medical Cannabis ID Program, Public Cannabis Banking and Temporary Cannabis Events

To the Office of the Clerk of the Board,

The Cannabis Oversight Committee was created through the enactment of legislation #180800 in December of 2018 and is now in its third class. It meets regularly to advise the Board of Supervisors and Mayor regarding the implementation and enforcement of City laws and regulations relating to cannabis in the City and County

of San Francisco.

Please see the attached recommendations from two duly noticed Cannabis Oversight Committee meetings held on September 13, 2023 and October 11, 2023 respectively. A summary of the recommendations can also be found in the body of the email below. Please reach out to me if you have any questions, or require any additional materials.

Recommendation: Improvements to the Medical Cannabis ID Program

Date of Recommendation: 09/13/2023 (renewed)

Introduced by: Former Member Sara Payan

Recommendation Summary:

These recommendations were originally introduced by Sara Payan, who formerly held Seat 16 on the Cannabis Oversight Committee. The recommendations relate to the Medical Marijuana ID Card (MMIC), and are directed toward the Board of Supervisors and the Department of Public Health. The Department of Public Health is in receipt of these recommendations, and also attended both the original meeting at which they were made (12/01/2022) and the subsequent meeting when they were renewed (09/13/2023). The recommendations to the Board of Supervisors concern legislative changes to the hours of operation for the program, the creation of an online system for the processing of MMIC applications, and reimbursement of the card fee through the Office of Vital records.

Recommendation: Establishment of a Public Cannabis Bank

Date of Recommendation: 09/13/2023

Introduced by: Chair Ali Jamalian

Recommendation Summary:

This recommendation was introduced by the current Chair of the Cannabis Oversight Committee, Ali Jamalian. The recommendation concerns the establishment of a public banking institution by the City and County of San Francisco under the California Public Bank Act for use by cannabis businesses. Cannabis businesses have historically struggled to secure banking due to Federal law. This recommendation has not been shared with any City partners at the time of this email.

Recommendation: Extension of the Temporary Cannabis Events Pilot Program

Date of Recommendation: 10/11/2023

Introduced by: Committee Member Shay Gilmore

Recommendation Summary:

These recommendations were introduced by member Shay Gilmore and voted on during the 10/11/2023 Special Meeting of the Cannabis Oversight Committee. The recommendations relate to the Temporary Cannabis Event regulation ([Section 1621.5](#)), in particular the Pilot Program provisions which are set to expire on December 31, 2023. The recommendations to the Board of Supervisors concern extending the Temporary Cannabis Events Pilot Program for 3 years. During the

extension, the Committee also recommends the Department of Cannabis Control (DCC) and the California State Legislature revise the State regulations which govern Temporary Cannabis Events to provide a more comprehensive and accessible framework for event organizers. In tandem with the work at the State level, the Committee recommends that relevant City departments work together to engage with local stakeholders and identify locations and/or venues eligible for cannabis events that can be incorporated into the Pilot Program at a future date to allow for more events. Finally, the Committee recommends that relevant City departments select a specific point-of-contact to work on vetting locations for future events under an expanded Pilot Program.

Best,

Scott Dennis (He/Him)
Administrative Permit Analyst
Office of Cannabis, City & County of San Francisco

**City and County of San Francisco
Cannabis Oversight Committee**

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE
CANNABIS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

The Cannabis Oversight Committee resolves to provide the following recommendation(s) through a vote in a publicly held meeting on October 11, 2023.

Cannabis Oversight Committee: Overview

The Cannabis Oversight Committee was created through the enactment of legislation #180800 in December of 2018 and is now in its third class. It meets regularly, typically on the first or second Wednesday of the month, to advise the Board of Supervisors and Mayor regarding the implementation and enforcement of City laws and regulations relating to cannabis in the City and County of San Francisco. Currently its membership consists of nine (9) voting seats and seven (7) non-voting seats:

Non-Voting:

1. The Director of the Department of Public Health (or their designee)
2. The Chief of the Police Department (or their designee)
3. The Director of the Department of Building Inspection (or their designee)
4. The Director of the Planning Department (or their designee)
5. The Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District (or their designee)
6. The Executive Director of the Entertainment Commission (or their designee)
7. The Chief of the Fire Department (or their designee)

Voting:

8. Ali Jamalian (Chair)
9. Adam Hayes (Vice Chair)
10. Apollo Wallace
11. *Currently Unfilled*
12. Drakari Donaldson
13. David Nogales Talley
14. Shay Gilmore
15. *Currently Unfilled*
16. Antoinette Mobley

Recommendation: Extension of the Temporary Cannabis Events Pilot Program

Date of Recommendation: 10/11/2023

Introduced by: Committee Member Shay Gilmore

Recommendation Summary:

The following recommendations were introduced by member Shay Gilmore and voted on during the 10/11/2023 Special Meeting of the Cannabis Oversight Committee. The recommendations relate to the Temporary Cannabis Event regulation ([Section 1621.5](#)), in particular the Pilot Program provisions which are set to expire on December 31, 2023. The recommendations to the Board of Supervisors concern extending the Temporary Cannabis Events Pilot Program for 3 years. During the extension, the Committee also recommends the Department of Cannabis Control (DCC) and the California State Legislature revise the State regulations which govern Temporary Cannabis Events to provide a more comprehensive and accessible framework for event organizers. In tandem with the work at the State level, the Committee recommends that relevant City departments work together to engage with local stakeholders and identify locations and/or venues eligible for cannabis events that can be incorporated into the Pilot Program at a future date to allow for more events. Finally, the Committee recommends that relevant City departments select a specific point-of-contact to work on vetting locations for future events under an expanded Pilot Program.

Full Text of Recommendation:

- Extend the Temporary Cannabis Events Pilot Program for a period of 3 years
- Engage with relevant State partners to revise the State regulations governing Temporary Cannabis Events (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, Division 19, Chapter 5 – Cannabis Events (§§ 15600 – 15604))
- Expand the Temporary Cannabis Events Pilot Program at a future date to allow for the addition of new, viable locations that reflect a robust community engagement process
- Identify a point-of-contact within all relevant City departments who will work on Temporary Cannabis Event applications and on the vetting of potential locations for future cannabis events under an expanded Pilot Program

**City and County of San Francisco
Cannabis Oversight Committee**

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE
CANNABIS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS AND THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR**

Tuesday, September 26, 2023

The Cannabis Oversight Committee resolves to provide the following recommendation(s) through a vote in a publicly held meeting on September 13, 2023. It further resolves to transmit the recommendation(s) to the Board of Supervisors and the Office of the Mayor.

Cannabis Oversight Committee: Overview

The Cannabis Oversight Committee was created through the enactment of legislation #180800 in December of 2018 and is now in its third class. It meets regularly, typically on the first or second Wednesday of the month, to advise the Board of Supervisors and Mayor regarding the implementation and enforcement of City laws and regulations relating to cannabis in the City and County of San Francisco. Currently its membership consists of nine (9) voting seats and seven (7) non-voting seats:

Non-Voting:

1. The Director of the Department of Public Health (or their designee)
2. The Chief of the Police Department (or their designee)
3. The Director of the Department of Building Inspection (or their designee)
4. The Director of the Planning Department (or their designee)
5. The Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District (or their designee)
6. The Executive Director of the Entertainment Commission (or their designee)
7. The Chief of the Fire Department (or their designee)

Voting:

8. Ali Jamalian (Chair)
9. Adam Hayes (Vice Chair)
10. Apollo Wallace
11. *Currently Unfilled*
12. Drakari Donaldson
13. David Nogales Talley
14. Shay Gilmore
15. *Currently Unfilled*
16. Antoinette Mobley

Recommendation: Improvements to the Medical Cannabis ID Program

Date of Recommendation: 09/13/2023 (renewed)

Introduced by: Sara Payan

Recommendation Summary:

The following recommendations were originally introduced by Sara Payan, who formerly held Seat 16 on the Cannabis Oversight Committee. The recommendations relate to the Medical Marijuana ID Card (MMIC), and are directed toward the Board of Supervisors and the Department of Public Health. The Department of Public Health is in receipt of these recommendations, and also attended both the original meeting at which they were made (12/01/2022) and the subsequent meeting when they were renewed (09/13/2023). The recommendations to the Board of Supervisors concern legislative changes to the hours of operation for the program, the creation of an online system for the processing of MMIC applications, and reimbursement of the card fee through the Office of Vital records.

Full Text of Recommendation:

Recommendations for Supervisors:

- Extend the hours of operation for DPH's in-person Medical Marijuana Identification Card Program to Monday – Friday, 9 AM – 5 PM
- Addition of online (and postal) verification and processing of applications for Medical Marijuana Identification Cards
- Reimbursement of card fee by the Department of Public Health and/or the Office of Vital Records
- Reimbursement of medical recommendation fees for low-income patients

Recommendations for the Department of Public Health:

- Outreach from the Department of Public Health on how dispensaries can honor their obligations for cardholders
- Access to resources through other City departments (such as public libraries)

Recommendation: Establishment of a Public Cannabis Bank

Date of Recommendation: 09/13/2023

Introduced by: Chair Ali Jamalian

Recommendation Summary:

The following recommendation was introduced by the current Chair of the Cannabis Oversight Committee, Ali Jamalian. The recommendation concerns the establishment of a public banking institution by the City and County of San Francisco under the California Public Bank Act for use by cannabis businesses. Cannabis businesses have historically struggled to secure banking due to Federal law. This recommendation has not been shared with any City partners at the time of this memo.

Full Text of Recommendation:

The City of San Francisco shall incept and fund a Public Cannabis Bank in accordance with the California Public Bank Act, which allows municipalities to establish Public Banks that will use the deposits to make loans that directly benefit local communities.

Priority should be given to local social equity and legacy businesses. However, in the spirit of promoting our beloved City and attracting tenants to the downtown area, I also suggest opening accounts for any cannabis license holders, provided they rent a minimum amount of space in San Francisco, and employ San Francisco residents.

We recommend a minimum threshold of 1200 Sq. Ft. and 2 full time employees for out-of-town Cannabis Companies to qualify for a San Francisco Public Cannabis account.

We recommend the City of San Francisco work closely with the Cannabis Oversight Committee to define the eligibility criteria, community benefits and funding for such a bank.

The San Francisco Cannabis Bank shall render all services traditionally offered to small businesses in accordance with the regulations set forth by the California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation (DFPI). These services shall include but not be limited to:

- Business checking with interest
- Merchant Services
- Treasury Management
- Money and Market Accounts
- Business Credit Cards
- Automated Clearing House Access (ACH)
- Online Banking/Accounting Software Integration
- Payroll Services
- Retirement and Health Savings accounts

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: OCME Accidental Overdose Report - October 2023
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:16:32 AM
Attachments: [2023_10_OCME_Overdose_Report.pdf](#)
[Outlook-cid_image0.png](#)

Hello,

Please see attached OCME Accidental Overdose Report from June 1, 2023 to September 30, 2023.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Rodda, Luke (ADM) <luke.rodde@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:02 AM
To: Colfax, Grant (DPH) <grant.colfax@sfdph.org>; Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Po, Vivian (ADM) <vivian.po@sfgov.org>; Serrano Sewell, David (ADM) <david.serranosewell@sfgov.org>; Johnston, Jennifer (ADM) <jennifer.johnston@sfgov.org>; Pojman, Natalie (DPH) <natalie.pojman@sfdph.org>; Liverman, Christopher (ADM) <christopher.liverman@sfgov.org>; Cretan, Jeff (MYR) <jeff.cretan@sfgov.org>; Hayward, Sophie (ADM) <sophie.hayward@sfgov.org>
Subject: OCME Accidental Overdose Report - October 2023

Dear Mayor Breed, President Peskin, and Director Colfax:

Please find attached the OCME Accidental Overdose Report for October 2023.

The purpose of this Report is to comply with the reporting of overdose deaths pursuant to Article 4, Section 227 of the City and County of San Francisco Health Code.

Regards,



Luke N. Rodda, Ph.D.

Chief Forensic Toxicologist and Director, Forensic Laboratory Division
Asst. Adj. Professor, Laboratory Medicine, University of California, San Francisco

[Office of the Chief Medical Examiner](#)

415.641.3688 | 1 Newhall Street, San Francisco, California, 94124

Accredited by the National Association of Medical Examiners | American Board of Forensic Toxicology

Regards,



Luke N. Rodda, Ph.D.

Chief Forensic Toxicologist and Director, Forensic Laboratory Division
Asst. Adj. Professor, Laboratory Medicine, University of California, San Francisco

[Office of the Chief Medical Examiner](#)

415.641.3688 | 1 Newhall Street, San Francisco, California, 94124

Accredited by the National Association of Medical Examiners | American Board of Forensic Toxicology

City & County of San Francisco
London N. Breed, Mayor



Office of the City Administrator
Carmen Chu, City Administrator
David Serrano Sewell, Executive Director
Office of the Chief Medical Examiner

October 17, 2023

The Honorable London N. Breed, Mayor
City and County of San Francisco

The Honorable Aaron Peskin, President
Board of Supervisors

Grant Colfax, M.D., Director
Department of Public Health

Subject: Report on Accidental Overdose Deaths

Dear Mayor Breed, President Peskin, and Director Colfax:

The enclosed report includes preliminary data of accidental overdose deaths in the City and County of San Francisco from the recent four months of June 1, 2023, to September 30, 2023. This report satisfies the ordinance's reporting criteria. For your reference, reports of preliminary data for accidental overdose deaths from January 1, 2023, to September 30, 2023, are enclosed. The preliminary number of accidental overdose deaths in September 2023 is 54.

The reports are published by the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME), Forensic Laboratory Division, to comply with local and state reporting guidelines and further OCME's mission to provide neutral data to inform policymakers. Please note, these results are preliminary as of testing to October 10, 2023, and are subject to change as the OCME finalizes the manner and cause of each death.

Pertinent for accurate use of these reports is understanding the source of the data and its subsequent summarization process. Decedent demographic and case information were obtained from the OCME case management system. Additionally, specific details from investigator narratives, forensic toxicology results, and where available, preliminary autopsy findings, were utilized. Collected demographic information included race, gender, age, fixed address status, fixed address location, and death location.

Due to their significance in accidental overdose deaths, the reported drugs for open cases were specific to fentanyl, heroin, medicinal opioids, methamphetamine and cocaine. Their detection in blood was captured to best determine relevance in each case. Medicinal opioid-positive cases required the presence of codeine, hydrocodone, oxycodone, morphine, hydromorphone, oxymorphone, buprenorphine, tramadol, and/or methadone. Heroin-likely determination was more closely evaluated, requiring the presence of specific heroin markers in blood or urine, expected morphine to codeine ratios, and/or case details consistent with heroin use. Closed casework included any drug and alcohol-involved accidental overdose where the death has been certified.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Luke N. Rodda".

Luke N. Rodda, Ph.D. MRACI CChem
Chief Forensic Toxicologist and Director, Forensic Laboratory Division


cc: Office of the City Administrator
enclosures: Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Reports for January 2023 through September 2023

**Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report for
January 2023 through September 2023**










Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 10, 2023

JAN-SEP 2023



17.42% ■ Acc. Overdoses Open
82.58% ■ Acc. Overdoses Closed




"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
 "Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.
 "No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).
 "Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.
 "Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.
 For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.
 "Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
 "Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE










Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 10, 2023

JANUARY 2023



0.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00% Acc. Overdoses Closed




"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
 "Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.
 "No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).
 "Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.
 "Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.
 For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.
 "Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
 "Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.










Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 10, 2023

FEBRUARY 2023



0.00% ■ Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00% ■ Acc. Overdoses Closed




"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
 "Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.
 "No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).
 "Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.
 "Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.
 For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.
 "Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
 "Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 10, 2023

MARCH 2023




0.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00% Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender




21% Female
79% Male
0% Non-Binary

Race




6% Asian
29% Black
18% Latinx
0% Native American
38% White
9% Other/Unknown

Age




0% <15 3% 15-24
13% 25-34 26% 35-44
22% 45-54 25% 55-64
10% >=65 0% Unknown

Fixed Address




57% Yes*
35% No
7% Unknown
*See Fixed Address Location

Fixed Address Location




38% Tenderloin (94102)
10% SOMA (94103)
5% Inner Mission (94110)
5% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
31% Others (SF Location)
10% Others (non-SF Location)

Death Location



29% Tenderloin (94102)
10% SOMA (94103)
19% Inner Mission (94110)
22% Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
19% Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death




"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
 "Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.
 "No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).
 "Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.
 "Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.
 For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.
 "Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
 "Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 10, 2023

APRIL 2023




0.00% ■ Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00% ■ Acc. Overdoses Closed


Gender




Race




Age




Fixed Address




Fixed Address Location



Death Location



Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death











"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
 "Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.
 "No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).
 "Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.
 "Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.
 For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.
 "Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
 "Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE



Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 10, 2023

**MAY
2023**




"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
 "Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.
 "No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).
 "Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.
 "Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.
 For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.
 "Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
 "Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 10, 2023

**JUNE
2023**




0.00% ■ Acc. Overdoses Open
100.00% ■ Acc. Overdoses Closed


Gender




Race




Age




Fixed Address




Fixed Address Location



Death Location



Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death




"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
 "Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.
 "No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).
 "Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.
 "Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.
 For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.
 "Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
 "Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 10, 2023

**JULY
2023**




1.28% ■ Acc. Overdoses Open
98.72% ■ Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender




17% ■ Female
83% ■ Male
0% ■ Non-Binary

Race




9% ■ Asian
31% ■ Black
18% ■ Latinx
0% ■ Native American
35% ■ White
8% ■ Other/Unknown

Age




0% ■ <15
14% ■ 15-24
22% ■ 25-34
33% ■ 35-44
6% ■ 45-54
1% ■ 55-64
1% ■ >=65

Fixed Address




65% ■ Yes*
32% ■ No
3% ■ Unknown
*See Fixed Address Location

Fixed Address Location




22% ■ Tenderloin (94102)
25% ■ SOMA (94103)
8% ■ Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
6% ■ Bayview-Hunters Point (94124)
22% ■ Others (SF Location)
18% ■ Others (non-SF Location)

Death Location



17% ■ Tenderloin (94102)
27% ■ SOMA (94103)
19% ■ Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
12% ■ Inner Mission (94110)
26% ■ Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.


"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE




Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 10, 2023

AUGUST 2023




63.86% ■ Acc. Overdoses Open
36.14% ■ Acc. Overdoses Closed

Gender




14% ■ Female
86% ■ Male
0% ■ Non-Binary

Race




6% ■ Asian
28% ■ Black
22% ■ Latinx
2% ■ Native American
39% ■ White
4% ■ Other/Unknown

Age




0% ■ <15
16% ■ 25-34
23% ■ 45-54
8% ■ >=65
6% ■ 15-24
17% ■ 35-44
29% ■ 55-64
1% ■ Unknown

Fixed Address




73% ■ Yes*
27% ■ No
0% ■ Unknown
*See Fixed Address Location

Fixed Address Location




20% ■ Tenderloin (94102)
18% ■ SOMA (94103)
5% ■ Potrero Hill (94107)
21% ■ Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
25% ■ Others (SF Location)
11% ■ Others (non-SF Location)

Death Location



18% ■ Tenderloin (94102)
23% ■ SOMA (94103)
7% ■ Potrero Hill (94107)
25% ■ Polk/Russian Hill (94109)
27% ■ Others

Accidental Overdoses by Day of Death



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.

"Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.

"No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).

"Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.

"Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.

For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.

"Gender" refers to gender at time of death.


"Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE










Preliminary Accidental Drug Overdose Data Report
as of testing to October 10, 2023

SEPTEMBER 2023



100.00% Acc. Overdoses Open
0.00% Acc. Overdoses Closed



"Acc. Overdoses Open" cases do not have a final cause and manner of death classification; "Acc. Overdoses Closed" cases have a final cause and manner of death classification.
 "Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent, which may indicate their residence; it is not intended to verify a decedent's legal domicile, which is a broader legal concept, pertaining to a person's permanent and primary residence for various legal matters.
 "No Fixed Address" denotes a verifiable address associated with the decedent was unable to be determined (e.g., housing insecurity, multiple addresses in a short timeframe).
 "Unknown Address" denotes the inability to identify any reliable address associated with the decedent, or information source.
 "Death Location" denotes the specific location to which the relevant agencies were called upon to locate the decedent.
 For "Fixed Address Location" and "Death Location", the 4 most affected neighborhoods are represented, the "Others (non-SF)" category refers to all out county addresses, and the "Others (SF)" category refers to all other zip codes within the City and County of San Francisco.
 "Gender" refers to gender at time of death.
 "Total Deaths" denotes Accidental Overdoses where one or more drugs contribute to the cause of death; however, every point for each drug series is inclusive, but not necessarily exclusive, of that drug. "Total deaths" represents all accidental overdoses including ones for drugs not specified above.

PLEASE NOTE THIS DATA IS PRELIMINARY INFORMATION AND SUSCEPTIBLE TO CHANGE

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Completed: Signed 20231016 response letter to Supervisor Chan_residential care facility t...
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:47:12 AM
Attachments: [20231016 response letter to Supervisor Chan_residential care facility trends with attchmts.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached response from the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) regarding a letter of inquiry issued by District 1 at the Board meeting of September 26, 2023.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: DocuSign System <dse_na2@docusign.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:58 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Completed: Signed 20231016 response letter to Supervisor Chan_residential care facility t...





Your document has been completed

[VIEW COMPLETED DOCUMENT](#)

Elizabeth LaBarre

elizabeth.labarre@sfgov.org

All parties have completed Signed 20231016 response letter to Supervisor Chan_residential care facility t....

Copy of signed letter for your records.

Powered by



Do Not Share This Email

This email contains a secure link to DocuSign. Please do not share this email, link, or access code with others.

Alternate Signing Method

Visit DocuSign.com, click 'Access Documents', and enter the security code:
D5AE0C1D2A314CD0BC6886651134B8082

About DocuSign

Sign documents electronically in just minutes. It's safe, secure, and legally binding. Whether you're in an office, at home, on-the-go -- or even across the globe -- DocuSign provides a professional trusted solution for Digital Transaction Management™.

Questions about the Document?

If you need to modify the document or have questions about the details in the document, please reach out to the sender by emailing them directly.

Stop receiving this email

[Report this email](#) or read more about [Declining to sign](#) and [Managing notifications](#).

If you are having trouble signing the document, please visit the [Help with Signing](#) page on our [Support Center](#).

 [Download the DocuSign App](#)

This message was sent to you by Elizabeth LaBarre who is using the DocuSign Electronic Signature Service. If you would rather not receive email from this sender you may contact the sender with your request.



SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
**Department of Disability
and Aging Services**

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

October 16, 2023

Supervisor Connie Chan
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

VIA EMAIL

Dear Supervisor Chan,

The Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) and the Planning Department (Planning) have attempted to provide you with the information regarding residential care facility trends you requested in your Letter of Inquiry dated September 26, 2023. As a point of clarification, neither DAS nor Planning have direct operational authority over residential facilities, so we do not have ongoing access to much of the information you are seeking. Where neither of our offices has direct knowledge in order to provide responses, we have supplied answers using information available on the website of the California Department of Social Services Community Care Licensing (CCL) who has oversight of these facilities.

1. The number of residential care facilities currently in operation.

The CCL has authority over several different types of residential facilities. This response focuses on Adult Residential Facilities and Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly.

According to the CCL website, San Francisco's current number of Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly is 54 and the current number of Adult Residential Facilities is 36.

2. The number of residential care facilities that have ceased to operate since 2020.

According to the CCL website, San Francisco's number of Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly that closed since 2020 is 11 (1 in 2020, 3 in 2021, 4 in 2022, and 3 in 2023 to date). The number of closures for Adult Residential Facilities since 2020 is 9 (2 in 2020, 4 in 2021, 1 in 2022, and 2 in 2023 to date).

3. The number of residential care facilities that have applied for Conditional Use Authorization, and the type of use.

The conversion of a residential care facility to any other use was made subject to Conditional Use Authorization (CUA) through interim zoning controls imposed in 2019. Those controls were subsequently made permanent in 2021. Since the onset of controls, seven residential care facilities have applied for CUA. One of these applications was withdrawn, one is still under review, and the remainder were approved. Of the seven applications, three proposed conversion to single-family



London Breed
Mayor

Kelly Dearman
Executive Director



SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
**Department of Disability
and Aging Services**

P.O. Box 7988
San Francisco, CA
94120-7988
www.SFHSA.org

homes, one proposed conversion to a two-family dwelling, and three proposed conversion to City-funded supportive housing for people living with AIDS. More details about these applications are contained in the attached list.

4. What is the transition requirement for residents when residential care facilities cease to operate.

Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly and Adult Residential Facilities have different requirements for "Evicting Residents" which is what this would be considered if a facility closed. Enclosed are the State's Title 22 regulatory requirements for both types of facilities that were taken from the CCL website.

5. How are your departments notified when residential care facilities cease to operate or seek new operators.

As mentioned, neither DAS nor Planning has regulatory authority over the operation of residential care facilities and are not notified directly when there is a change in operators or when a facility is closing.

We hope that this information has been responsive to your request and would be happy to meet with your or your staff to discuss this important topic.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kelly Dearman".

Kelly Dearman
Executive Director
Department of Disability and Aging Services

DocuSigned by:
Rich Hillis
1C9889B890E44CC...

Rich Hillis
Director
San Francisco Planning Department

Attachment: CA Code of Regulations Title 22, Div. 6, Chap. 6 & 8; Health and Safety Code section 1569.682(a)(2)(A) through (I)

Copy (via email)
Kelly Groth, Office of Supervisor Chan
Cindy Kauffman, DAS
Daniel Sider, SF Planning
Aaron Starr, SF Planning
BOS@sfgov.org

Title 22, Div. 6, Chap. 6 Adult Residential Facility

85068.5 EVICTION PROCEDURES

85068.5

- (a) The licensee shall be permitted to evict a client by serving the client with a 30-day written notice to quit for any of the following reasons:
 - (1) Nonpayment of the rate for basic services within ten days of the due date.
 - (2) Failure of the client to comply with state or local law after receiving written notice of the alleged violation.
 - (3) Failure of the client to comply with the general facility policies as specified in the Admission Agreement.
 - (4) A needs and services plan modification has been performed, as specified in Section 85068.3, which determined that the client's needs cannot be met by the facility and the client has been given an opportunity to relocate as specified in Section 85068.3(b)(3).
 - (5) Change of use of the facility.
- (b) The licensee shall be permitted to evict a client by serving the client with a three-day written notice to quit provided that both of the following requirements have been met:
 - (1) The licensing agency has granted prior written and/or documented telephone approval for the eviction.
 - (A) The licensing agency shall reply to a request for such approval within two working days.
 - (B) Failure of the licensing agency to reply within two working days shall be considered approval.
 - (2) The client has engaged or is engaging in behavior which is a threat to his/her mental and/or physical health or safety, or to the health and safety of others in the facility.
- (c) The licensee shall set forth in the notice to quit the reasons for the eviction, with specific facts including the date, place, witnesses, and circumstances.
- (d) The licensee shall, upon completion of the procedures specified in (a) or (b) above, notify or mail a copy of the notice to quit to the client's authorized representative if any.
- (e) A written report of any eviction processed in accordance with (a) above shall be sent to the licensing agency within five days of the eviction.
- (f) Nothing in this section is intended to preclude the licensee or client from invoking any other available remedy.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 1530, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 1501 and 1531, Health and Safety Code.

Title 22 Div. 6, Chap. 8 Residential Care Facility for the Elderly

87224 EVICTION PROCEDURES

87224

- (a) The licensee may evict a resident for one or more of the reasons listed in Section 87224(a)(1) through (5). Thirty (30) days written notice to the resident is required except as otherwise specified in paragraph (5).
- (1) Nonpayment of the rate for basic services within ten days of the due date.
 - (2) Failure of the resident to comply with state or local law after receiving written notice of the alleged violation.
 - (3) Failure of the resident to comply with general policies of the facility. Said general policies must be in writing, must be for the purpose of making it possible for residents to live together and must be made part of the admission agreement.
 - (4) If, after admission, it is determined that the resident has a need not previously identified and a reappraisal has been conducted pursuant to Section 87463, and the licensee and the person who performs the reappraisal believe that the facility is not appropriate for the resident.
 - (5) Change of use of the facility.
 - (A) The licensee may, upon no less than sixty (60) days written notice, evict a resident due to change of use of the facility.
 1. In addition to written notice to quit requirements specified in Section 87224(d), written notice to evict due to change of use of the facility shall be made to the resident or the resident's responsible person and shall include all requirements specified in Section 1569.682(a)(2)(A) through (F) of the Health and Safety Code.

Health and Safety Code section 1569.682(a)(2)(A) through (F) provides:

- "(a) A licensee of a licensed residential care facility for the elderly shall, prior to transferring a resident of the facility to another facility or to an independent living arrangement as a result of the forfeiture of a license, as described in subdivision (a), (b), or (f) of Section 1569.19, or a change of use of the facility pursuant to the department's regulations, take all reasonable steps to transfer affected residents safely and to minimize possible transfer trauma, and shall, at a minimum, do all of the following:
- (2) Provide each resident or the resident's responsible person with a written notice no later than 60 days before the intended eviction. The notice shall include all of the following:

- (A) The reason for the eviction, with specific facts to permit a determination of the date, place, witnesses, and circumstances concerning the reasons.
 - (B) A copy of the resident's current service plan.
 - (C) The relocation evaluation.
 - (D) A list of referral agencies.
 - (E) The right of the resident or resident's legal representative to contact the department to investigate the reasons given for the eviction pursuant to Section 1569.35.
 - (F) The contact information for the local long-term care ombudsman, including address and telephone number.
- (b) The licensee may, upon obtaining prior written approval from the licensing agency, evict the resident upon three (3) days written notice to quit. The licensing agency may grant approval for the eviction upon a finding of good cause. Good cause exists if the resident is engaging in behavior which is a threat to the mental and/or physical health or safety of himself or to the mental and/or physical health or safety of others in the facility.
- (c) The licensee shall, in addition to either serving the required thirty (30) days notice, sixty (60) days notice, or seeking approval from the Department and service three (3) days notice on the resident, notify or mail a copy of the notice to quit to the resident's responsible person.
- (d) The licensee shall set forth in the notice to quit the reasons relied upon for the eviction with specific facts to permit determination of the date, place, witnesses, and circumstances concerning those reasons.
- (1) The notice to quit shall include the following information:
- (A) The effective date of the eviction.
 - (B) Resources available to assist in identifying alternative housing and care options which include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - 1. Referral services that will aid in finding alternative housing.
 - 2. Case management organizations which help manage individual care and service needs.

Available resources to assist in identifying alternative housing and care options include, but are not limited to:

- 1) California Department of Social Services, Facility Search webpage

<http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/Community-Care-Licensing/Facility-Search-Welcome>

- 2) California Department of Social Services “Other Links and Partner Agencies” webpage
<http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/Community-Care/Other-Links-and-Partner-Agencies>
- 3) California State Long-Term Care Ombudsman
<https://www.aging.ca.gov/ProgramsProviders/LTCOP/>

Licensees may contact advocacy organizations and provider associations to assist in developing a list of resources. Licensees may also refer to the Department’s “Other Links and Partner Agencies” webpage for additional information.

- (C) A statement informing residents of their right to file a complaint with the licensing agency, as specified in Section 87468, subsection (a)(4), including the name, address and telephone number of the licensing office with whom the licensee normally conducts business, and the State Long Term Care Ombudsman office.
- (D) The following exact statement as specified in Health and Safety Code Section 1569.683(a)(4): "In order to evict a resident who remains in the facility after the effective date of the eviction, the residential care facility for the elderly must file an unlawful detainer action in superior court and receive a written judgment signed by a judge. If the facility pursues the unlawful detainer action, you must be served with a summons and complaint. You have the right to contest the eviction in writing and through a hearing."
- (e) Upon request of a resident, or his/her designated representative, the Department shall, pursuant to the provisions of Section 1569.35 of the Health and Safety Code, investigate the reasons given for the eviction.
- (f) A written report of any eviction shall be sent to the licensing agency within five (5) days.
- (g) This section shall not apply to a particular resident who has entered into a continuing care contract with a facility pursuant to Health and Safety Code, Chapter 10, Division 2.
- (h) Nothing in this section is intended to preclude the licensee or resident from invoking any other available remedy.
- (i) Nothing in Section 87224 precludes the licensee from initiating the urgent relocation to a licensed health facility of a terminally ill resident receiving hospice services when the resident's condition has changed and a joint determination has been made by the Department, the resident or resident's health care surrogate decision maker, the resident's hospice agency, a physician, and the licensee, that the resident's continued retention in the facility poses a health and safety risk to the resident or any other facility resident.

- (1) The licensee shall follow the procedures specified in Section 87637(b)(2) to reduce the risk of transfer trauma.

Authority cited: Section 1569.30, Health and Safety Code.

Reference: Sections 1569.1, 1569.2, 1569.31, 1569.312, 1569.315, 1569.54, 1569.682, 1569.683, and 1569.73, Health and Safety Code.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: RPD Response to Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Chan
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:40:17 AM
Attachments: [RPD Response to Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Chan \(Due Oct 13, 2023\).pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached response from the Recreation and Park Department regarding a letter of inquiry issued by District 1 at the Board meeting of September 12, 2023.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Chami, Barbara (REC) <barbara.chami@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2023 4:58 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Madland, Sarah (REC) <sarah.madland@sfgov.org>; Ng, Beverly (REC) <beverly.ng@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>
Subject: RPD Response to Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Chan

Ms. Cavillo,

On behalf of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, please find attached the latest responses to Supervisor Chan's questions on the Golden Gate Park Access and Safety Program.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,
Barbara Swan-Chami

Barbara Swan-Chami

Manager of Policy and Public Affairs

San Francisco Recreation and Park Department
City & County of San Francisco
McLaren Lodge in Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street | San Francisco, CA | 94117
E-mail: Barbara.Chami@sfgov.org
Direct: (415) 831-6813



Visit us at sfrecpark.org

Like us on [Facebook](#)

Follow us on [Twitter](#)

Watch us on [sfRecParkTV](#)

Sign up for our [e-News](#)



London N. Breed, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

October 13, 2023

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Legislative Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Via email: angela.calvillo@sfgov.org.

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

On behalf of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, please find attached the latest responses to Supervisor Chan's questions on the Golden Gate Park Access and Safety Program.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,
Barbara Swan-Chami

Policy and Public Affairs
San Francisco Recreation and Park Department

*CC: Sarah Madland, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department
Beverly Ng, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department*



Q1: Plan to improve shuttle accessibility and remove barriers, including providing fully accessible shuttles with kneeling/low floor/ ramped access.

1. What is the budget, funding source, and costs for the low floor shuttles and disability Access Coordinator?
2. When are the low floor shuttles anticipated to arrive and be in service? When is the anticipated start date and scope of work for the Disability Access Coordinator?

LOW FLOOR SHUTTLES

The Golden Gate Park Shuttles are fully accessible, equipped with a lift, and can accommodate two wheelchairs each. Rec and Park (the Department) allocate \$800,000 annually from our General Fund for the Shuttle program. We have procured one low-floor shuttle which is scheduled for delivery in late 2024. Additional background:

- Last year, RPD brought on a new shuttle contractor, TRANSMETRO, to implement the Golden Gate Park Shuttle Program.
- Due to national supply chain issues and inflated vehicle costs, they could not procure low-floor shuttles. While market conditions have not eased, RPD staff understand the importance and are in the process of procuring a special order one low-floor shuttle. To determine future needs, we will assess the impact of implementing the new low-floor shuttle.

DISABILITY ACCESS COORDINATOR

The Disability Access Coordinator (DAC) is an approved position as 6335 in the Department's General Fund and is expected to begin in mid-November 2023. The DAC will plan, develop, and implement architectural accessibility projects along with developing and supporting programmatic access policies, practices, and procedures. The DAC will streamline departmental compliance set forth by state and federal access codes, as well as other relevant laws, ordinances and regulations impacting people with disabilities, and will be consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). They will also follow best practices and engagement from the disability community.

Q2: Timeline and plan to improve curb ramps and crosswalks to make them fully accessible, and in good condition.

1. What is the budget, funding source, and costs for the accessibility improvements mentioned in the Summer 2022 Report?
2. What is the timeline, plan, and funding sources for the ADA improvements to the Conservatory of Flowers?

CURB RAMPS AND CROSSWALKS

The Department is committed to ADA Improvements along the north side of JFK at Conservatory Drive East, Pompei Circle, and Conservatory Drive West. As part of a larger

barrier removal project on JFK, the Department is replacing (10) curb ramps and improving (3) crosswalks. The estimated project cost is \$350,000 and is being funded by the City's Certificates of Participation program. Construction is scheduled to begin in Winter 2024.

CONSERVATORY TURNAROUND

We are also studying the feasibility of reconfiguring the roadway at Conservatory Drive West to include a turn-around circle near the intersection of JFK. This would allow passenger vehicles to drop park users off at the ADA path of travel, closest to the Conservatory of Flowers. Preliminary cost estimate is forthcoming.

Q3: Improvement of pedestrian safety measures, including best practices for bicycle and scooter safety.

1. What is the budget, funding source, costs, and timeline for the delineations to separate faster moving bikes from slower shared spaces on JFK?

JFK SAFETY

The Department did not commit to delineating between faster and slower moving shared spaces on JFK Promenade. As noted in the Summer 2023 Report, there have been significantly fewer SFPD reported collisions on JFK Promenade (4) than other roads (41) within Golden Gate Park between July 1, 2021 and March 31, 2023. With the installation of the pilot activation spaces along JFK, we have seen that bike and scooter speeds have slowed on the promenade. The Department is continuing to consider how installations can enhance JFK Promenade for all park users.

Q4: Improvement of shuttle stops, including sheltered waiting areas and making stops ADA compliant.

1. What is the budget, funding source, costs and timeline for the permanent shuttle signage and real time passenger information system?

REAL TIME INFORMATION

The Department has implemented public-facing route and schedule-based predictive information on navigation platforms such as Google Maps and Apple Maps. Real-time predictions have been implemented on TransitApp and have begun the process of implementing with Google. We are working with our vendor to ensure our data quality meets Google standards and anticipate full implementation by Winter 2023/2024. The annual software license is \$20,000 and is funded through the annual shuttle fund.

PERMANENT SIGNAGE

Rec and Park staff are working to develop conceptual designs for permanent signage and identifying potential vendors. The signage budget is estimated at \$210,000. There is only enough funding for design, but the project will be 'shovel ready' as soon as construction

dollars become available. Staff are also working on a refresh of current temporary signage which we aim to roll out this Winter 2023/2024.

Q5: Plans to provide reduced parking fees, access improvements to the Music Concourse Garage.

1. No follow up question. The Supervisor looks forward to hearing updates on the facility conditions assessment and proposed access improvements.

Q6: Number of accessible parking spaces in the garage including van accessible parking.

1. No follow up question.

Q7: Additional accessibility improvements to be made to the garage.

1. What is the status of extension of the free loading zones in the Music Concourse garage?

The Department plans to increase the time limit on the free loading zone in the garage from 15 minutes to 30 minutes. These changes will be implemented when the city takes over management of the garage, estimated to be early 2024.

Q8: Plan to remove transportation access barriers to exhibits and events, for example: Hardly Strictly Bluegrass and Entwined in Peacock Meadow.

1. What is the budget and cost for the shuttle, including extended hours and on-call evening service?
2. Do the departments plan to extend on-call evening shuttle service beyond March 2023?
3. Beyond extending shuttle service availability and service, what are the departments' plans to remove transportation access barriers to exhibits and events (ex. Temporary ADA parking availability?)

SHUTTLE COST AND EXTENSION

The overall budget for the shuttle is \$800,000, and in 2022, \$29,400 allocated to extending shuttle hours. Events planned for this year will not require extended shuttle service.

TRANSPORTATION ACCESS

The Department aims to host events that are accessible to all. Our ADA Coordinator creates Access Plans for our in-house events such as the Holiday Tree Lighting. They also work with our Permits and Partnership divisions, to provide consultation with outside organizers, such as Entwined and Hardly Strictly Bluegrass (HSB), to advise them on making their events and exhibits as accessible as possible. This year, HSB is running its own wheelchair-accessible shuttle in the western end of GGP. It also has temporary disability parking and an extensive access plan. [Here are details.](#) Our permits team also works closely with event sponsors and MTA to coordinate additional transportation support such as passenger loading zones for ridesharing and increases to Muni service where appropriate.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Francisco-Lombard & Van Ness Relo - A-418511
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 9:47:00 AM
Attachments: [CPUC_2575.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached notice from the California Public Utilities Commission.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: CPUC Team <westareacpuc@vzwnet.com>
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:05 PM
To: GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov
Cc: westareacpuc@verizonwireless.com; CPC.Wireless <CPC.Wireless@sfgov.org>; Administrator, City (ADM) <city.administrator@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; marcus.silafau@verizonwireless.com
Subject: CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Francisco-Lombard & Van Ness Relo - A-418511

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

This is to provide your agency with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of

the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) see attachment.
This notice is being provided pursuant to Section IV.C.2.

Oct 16, 2023

Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov

RE: Notification Letter for Lombard & Van Ness Relo - A
San Francisco, CA /GTE Mobilnet California LP

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact the representative below.

Verizon Wireless

Ann Goldstein
Coordinator RE & Compliance - West Territory
1515 Woodfield Road, #1400
Schaumburg, IL 60173
WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com

JURISDICTION	PLANNING MANAGER	CITY MANAGER	CITY CLERK	DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL BOARD	COUNTY
City of San Francisco	CPC.Wireless@sfgov.org	city.administrator@sfgov.org	Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org		San Francisco

VZW Legal Entity	Site Name	Site Address	Tower Design	Size of Building or NA
GTE Mobilnet California LP	Lombard & Van Ness Relo - A	2900 Franklin St., San Francisco , CA94123	Rooftop	NA

Site Latitude	Site Longitude	PS Location Code	Tower Appearance	Tower Height (in feet)	Type of Approval	Approval Issue Date
37°48'4.76"N	122°25'33.5"W NAD(83)	418511	50.2' CL	45	Zoning	09/29/2023

Project Description: Installing six 6' panel antennas, three AIR1652 antennas, and three CBRS antennas to new rooftop site.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Operations](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: On the end of unlimited remote testimony at the SFBOS
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:51:00 PM

Hello,

Please see below message from Joe A. Kunzler regarding various subjects.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Joe A. Kunzler <growlernoise@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 1:54 PM
To: Joe K. <growlernoise@gmail.com>
Subject: On the end of unlimited remote testimony at the SFBOS

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

Hi there, Joe Kunzler here. The below is my statement for public record on the end of unlimited remote testimony at the SFBOS, expected time of death 4:30 PM Pacific 17 October 2023, if not sooner.

Let what is going down in San Francisco serve as a warning to free

people. When your community Zelensky is *not* in charge, expect democracy to start dying at the hands of bullies.

But first, to the best Clerk and the best Clerk's Staff in America in Clerk Angel's team. You are all heroic. I hope November 13 can become a civic holiday not just for Supervisor Stefani but also you.

With that, it's now clear what is going to go down tomorrow. Without Supervisor Dorsey's support, unlimited public comment almost certainly ends at America's Best City Hall, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. I respect where Supervisor Dorsey is coming from.

I had my own whip count and was working into the early hours of Monday, fighting like a Stefani for a miracle. If we could get Dorsey and Stefani, democracy's defenders could forge a path to Preston and maybe Melgar & Ronen - thanks to GrowSF's deafening silence on this issue. I don't see a path to a stop now unless Supervisors Preston, Melgar, Ronen, and Stefani don't share my deference to Supervisor Dorsey.

But once this emergency humanitarian disability line is up, what will the response be if White LIES Matter starts abusing the emergency disability line? Nobody *patriotic* wants the emergency humanitarian line that will be set up to fail. President Peskin has been admirably clear that he *will* fire on and *destroy* that line if he gets the legal green light to engage in further self-defense actions. President Peskin could just declare an emergency from anti-Semitic hate and close that line indefinitely. I'm *not* going to be providing the excuse slip or enabling such cruelty and betraying the SF Disability Community, thank you.

#####

But I sincerely hope my CA pals can fix the Brown Act. It will take an Assemblyangel to win the peace, as the mere mortals in the CA Assembly and CA Senate are an absolute, incredible failure in protecting the Supervisors and Clerks of California.

I understand there is one applicant for the job of Asemblyangel who proved in battle how to stand up against anti-Semetic bullies. I didn't want her to apply, but she has and now enjoys my endorsement. This she is a Zelensky in a Bra. A warfighter. A proven leader with frontline experience in local government. Here's her website:

VoteCatherineStefani.com

#####

In the final analysis, you'll have to excuse me, I have to ask the King

County Board of Health to declare anti-Semitism a virus. [Like a Stefani](#), because some of us in Washington State are in a pitched battle against Alex Tsimerman and his war on campaign finance transparency, on our commons, and on elected officials just like the SF Board of Supervisors. We are winning up here, and we are winning because I am persistent, strong, and a leader in continuing education, learning from Zelensky... and Stefani :-).

Yeah, you gotta be super awesome and STRONG like Supervisor Catherine Stefani to pull me away from *that* fight.

Something about fighting the National Rifle Association like a mother - and winning while I lost my tiny effort to try to help the real heroes.

Something about things like solidarity. Comradeship. Brotherhood. Allyship.

Something about Never Again. No, many things are not just something about what Never Again truly means.

It was my honor and duty to be there for a genuine hero when so many weren't, as Kunzlers believe being ungrateful is filthy. To soar and scream like a fighter jet against the dark, viciousness, and vulgarity hurled at good humans on and supporting the Board of Supervisors and spew mostly gratitude, truth, and joy.

So since I can't hug over e-mail, well then, I want The Last Word in that proud MSNBC tradition to go to the HERO, the ZELENSKY fighting for our families, and the MOTHER who I wish my mother was in the fighting spirit we all need to have in these times of trial, ok? [Here goes](#):

"I refuse to be silent and I refuse to sit here and be numb by this sh-t."

Like a Stefani, the rest I submit;

Joe A. Kunzler
growlernoise@gmail.com

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: One last note of thanks and warning
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 9:01:29 AM
Attachments: [A RESOLUTION DECLARING ANTI-SEMITISM A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS.docx](#)

Hello,

Please see below message from Joe A. Kunzler regarding various subjects.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Joe A. Kunzler <growlernoise@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:39 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: One last note of thanks and warning

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

Dear SFBOS;

First, the Supervisor Stefani Superfans from out-of-CA like I pledge NOT to use the humanitarian remote testimony line. We want that line set up to protect the locals.

Second, another heel from that vote is dropping. Namely, in a proposed resolution to the King County Board of Health is this:

WHEREAS, anti-Semitic semi-anonymous attacks using remote public comment have closed many Californian skies to remote public comment – thereby denying accessibility to even Catherine Stefani’s San Francisco Board of Supervisors because the Brown Act does not ban anonymity;

Call it "Covering for Catherine". As always.... who fought the NRA and stands with the Jews, huh? Yeah.

Call it "Avenging Stefani" whose valor got thrown in the trash bin but at least in my last remote testimony got replayed in tribute to a REAL hero. So yeah that President of yours - bonus points for keeping his word, I guess, but you lose branding around here.

Call it my rage is at anti-Semites and that horrendous excuse of a Brown Act you got is big. Wanna fix the Brown Act? Hire an Assemblyangel. Here's the only one you need:

VoteCatherineStefani.com

Call it, "I have to go as much as I wanna do more StefaniStuff. I stopped the Trans attacks. I did what I could to protect Saint Catherine. Now I've got a full-on war to fight up here - and I have to stop Tsimerman while I can."

Call it *all of the above*.

I hope Supervisor Mandleman had a good birthday. Especially considering a certain vote...

No hard feelings towards ANY Supervisor. I am ALWAYS grateful to the clerks, for Supervisor Dorsey for standing with Supervisor Stefani, and of course my Polaris, my hero, Supervisor Catherine "Maverick" Stefani!

You all please protect Clerk Angela and her deputies like a Stefani, you hear? THANKS!

Thoughtfully submitted;

Joe A. Kunzler
growlernoise@gmail.com

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

From: **Joe A. Kunzler** <growlernoise@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 18, 2023 at 2:48 PM
Subject: Request for Discussion on Attachment Declaring Anti-Semitism A Public Health Crisis
To: <KCBOHAdmin@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: <ari@kvi.com>, <chrisdaniels@komotv.com>, <mike@kvi.com>, <teresa.mosqueda@seattle.gov>, <info@teamteresa.org>, Joe McDermott <joe.mcdermott@kingcounty.gov>, <reagan.dunn@kingcounty.gov>, <jeanne.kohl-welles@kingcounty.gov>, David Baker <dbaker@kenmorewa.gov>, <susan.honda@cityoffederalway.com>, Claudia Balducci <claudia.balducci@kingcounty.gov>, cityclerk <cityclerk@bellevuewa.gov>, Robinson, Lynne <lrobinson@bellevuewa.gov>, Dave Upthegrove <Dave.Upthegrove@kingcounty.gov>, <Dow.Constantine@kingcounty.gov>

2023 Oct. 18

Dear King County Board of Health;

Below and attached is a suggested resolution from the relative of a Jew and the friend of another Jew regarding anti-Semitism.

I admit it's the sun, moon, and Sound Transit size of an ask, but I must *do something*. We're there. We're seeing not just Tsimerman at his most vulnerable, where just a little more effort can bring about his end after Monday's victory at Bellevue City Council and the recent PDC fines against Tsimerman; but also vicious, malicious anti-Semitic protests at UofW and it's time for leaders to speak out against anti-Semitism.

WHY?

As per the Tony Blair quote I have memorized... "THE KALEIDOSCOPE HAS BEEN SHAKEN, THE PIECES ARE IN FLUX, SOON THE PIECES WILL SETTLE. BEFORE THEY DO, LET US REORDER THIS WORLD AROUND US."

I won't support edits to this unless a blunt anti-Tsimerman component remains. Not gonna let this international crisis or the ones Tsimerman is directly involved in go to waste. No way. We have an opportunity to end this bullying in our midst, let's do it. We can't hold accountable all the vicious anti-Semite racist sexist scum of the Earth, but when we can do so and stop the hate, we should. There you go, after I ask you note the CCs please.

Very respectfully;

Joe A. Kunzler
growlernoise@gmail.com

=====

= =

A Resolution Declaring Anti-Semitism A Public Health Crisis

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism has deep and harmful impacts that triggers hate towards Jews and more than Jewry;

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism leads to racism, which was found to be a public health crisis in Resolution 20-08.2;

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism is found in the form of Nazi salutes, mocking Yellow stars, recent rallies calling for the end of Israel with “from the river to the Sea” and a certain regular public commentator crying out “Sieg Heil”,

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism by Tsimmerman led to threats of sexual assault against two Latina Seattle City Councilmembers in 2019, as profiled in “Tackling Tsimmerman”;

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism creates a climate of fear that not just silences voices but also makes Jews want to arm in self-defense;

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism led to the Holocaust that killed approximately 6 million Jews, 9 million persons throughout the former Soviet Union, both civilian and Prisoner of War, 3 million Poles, up to 600,000 Serbs, 270,000 disabled persons and up to 15,000 homosexuals for starters;

WHEREAS, anti-Semitic semi-anonymous attacks using remote public comment have closed many Californian skies to remote public comment – thereby denying accessibility to even Catherine Stefani’s San Francisco Board of Supervisors because the Brown Act does not ban anonymity;

WHEREAS, on Saturday, October 7, 2023, Hamas terrorists attacked wantonly Israeli civilian targets, committing many war crimes, taking several hundred hostages – including American citizens, and ignited a new wave of global anti-Semitism,

WHEREAS, the leaders of France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States of America said in a joint statement, “The terrorist actions of Hamas have no justification, no legitimacy, and must be universally condemned. There is never any justification for terrorism!”

WHEREAS, US President Joe Biden responded,

“There are moments in this life — and I mean this literally — when the pure, unadulterated evil is unleashed on this world.

The people of Israel lived through one such moment this weekend. The bloody hands of the terrorist organization Hamas — a group whose stated purpose for being is to kill Jews.

This was an act of sheer evil.

WHEREAS, US President Joe Biden also added about these events of sheer evil,

I would argue it’s the deadliest day for Jews since the Holocaust — the deadliest day since the Holocaust, one of the worst chapters in human history that reminded us all

that — that expression I learned from my dad early on: “Silence is complicity.”

I’m not — I mean, silence is complicity. It really is. And I want you to know — I think you’ve already figured it out — I refuse to be silent, and I know you refuse to be silent as well.

THEREFORE, the King County Board of Health considers anti-Semitism a public health crisis, and
THEREFORE, the King County Board of Health invites Ari Hoffman and other King County Jewish
Community leaders to come before the Board and work with Jewry to resolve this crisis and

THEREFORE, the King County Board of Health finds Avrum (Alex) Tsimerman anti-Semitic and
terroristic and calls upon the Public Disclosure Commission and the Bellevue City Council to refer
Tsimerman for his crimes under PDC Case 136406 and the disruption of Bellevue City Council on
October 16, 2023, to the Washington State Attorney General’s Office for maximum prosecution, and

THEREFORE, the King County Board of Health finds anti-Semitic speech disruptive at public
meetings as anti-Semitic speech deters public participation – and counsels all King County-based
governmental bodies to ban such anti-Semitic speech until a court order or an Attorney General’s
Opinion is issued on the subject.

A RESOLUTION DECLARING ANTI-SEMITISM A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS.

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism has deep and harmful impacts that triggers hate towards Jews and more than Jewry;

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism leads to racism, which was found to be a public health crisis in Resolution 20-08.2;

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism is found in the form of Nazi salutes, mocking Yellow stars, recent rallies calling for the end of Israel with “from the river to the Sea” and a certain regular public commentator crying out “Sieg Heil”,

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism by Tsimmerman led to threats of sexual assault against two Latina Seattle City Councilmembers in 2019, as profiled in “Tackling Tsimmerman”;

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism creates a climate of fear that not just silences voices but also makes Jews want to arm in self-defense;

WHEREAS, anti-Semitism led to the Holocaust that killed approximately 6 million Jews, 9 million persons throughout the former Soviet Union, both civilian and Prisoner of War, 3 million Poles, up to 600,000 Serbs, 270,000 disabled persons and up to 15,000 homosexuals for starters;

WHEREAS, anti-Semitic semi-anonymous attacks using remote public comment have closed many Californian skies to remote public comment – thereby denying accessibility to even Catherine Stefani’s San Francisco Board of Supervisors because the Brown Act does not ban anonymity;

WHEREAS, on Saturday, October 7, 2023, Hamas terrorists attacked wantonly Israeli civilian targets, committing many war crimes, taking several hundred hostages – including American citizens, and ignited a new wave of global anti-Semitism,

WHEREAS, the leaders of France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States of America said in a joint statement, “The terrorist actions of Hamas have no justification, no legitimacy, and must be universally condemned. There is never any justification for terrorism!”

WHEREAS, US President Joe Biden responded,

“There are moments in this life — and I mean this literally — when the pure, unadulterated evil is unleashed on this world.

The people of Israel lived through one such moment this weekend. The bloody hands of the terrorist organization Hamas — a group whose stated purpose for being is to kill Jews.

This was an act of sheer evil.

WHEREAS, US President Joe Biden also added about these events of sheer evil,

I would argue it's the deadliest day for Jews since the Holocaust — the deadliest day since the Holocaust, one of the worst chapters in human history that reminded us all that — that expression I learned from my dad early on: "Silence is complicity."

I'm not — I mean, silence is complicity. It really is. And I want you to know — I think you've already figured it out — I refuse to be silent, and I know you refuse to be silent as well.

THEREFORE, the King County Board of Health considers anti-Semitism a public health crisis, and

THEREFORE, the King County Board of Health invites Ari Hoffman and other King County Jewish Community leaders to come before the Board and work with Jewry to resolve this crisis and

THEREFORE, the King County Board of Health finds Avrum (Alex) Tsimerman anti-Semitic, and terroristic and calls upon the Public Disclosure Commission and the Bellevue City Council to refer Tsimerman for his crimes under PDC Case 136406 and the disruption of Bellevue City Council on October 16, 2023, to the Washington State Attorney General's Office for maximum prosecution, and

THEREFORE, the King County Board of Health finds anti-Semitic speech disruptive at public meetings as anti-Semitic speech deters public participation – and counsels all King County-based governmental bodies to ban such anti-Semitic speech until a court order or an Attorney General's Opinion is issued on the subject.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: JFK Drive
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:19:34 PM

Hello,

Please see below message regarding John F. Kennedy Drive.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Erdmuth Folker <Erdmuth.Folker.497173810@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 6:32 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: JFK Drive

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The current closure of JFK Drive severely impacts people with disabilities, seniors, and communities not directly neighboring Golden Gate Park.

As we emerge from COVID, it's time to reopen JFK Drive. Golden Gate Park belongs to the people of San Francisco, not just a few.

I strongly encourage you to support JFK Drive returning to the conditions pre-COVID, with all roadways open to vehicle traffic and street closures on Sundays, holidays and Saturdays, 6 months of the year.

Regards,
Erdmuth Folker

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Finally something being done about the Mission crisis
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:38:25 PM

Hello,

Please see below message regarding public safety.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: james miller <jmwebdesigns@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:54 PM
To: RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; DPW, (DPW) <dpw@sfdpw.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; District Attorney, (DAT) <districtattorney@sfgov.org>
Subject: Finally something being done about the Mission crisis

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

Ms. Ronen,

Thank you for finally paying attention to the ridiculous plethora of so-called sidewalk vendors in the Mission. It has become such a mess that we can no longer walk from 14th to 24th and Mission. I have long shopped from 16th to 24th sts, but the congestion and security hazards are now overwhelming. No more can we safely board the busses or BART at 16th & 24th, since they are overtaken by criminals and petty thieves selling stolen goods and other merchandise taken from reputable store owners. It is so crowded and filthy and continues to get worse.

This is just one more embarrassment the City has let proliferate, along with the fentanyl crisis, the so-called homeless, the blatant looting and robberies, the mass departure and closing of so many good businesses. When will our officials take action and say "This is bullshit, time to do something"

But why just a 90-day ban? This baby-step approach to criminal, drug-related and unsanitary activity has never worked. Maybe it is time we get a new board, a new mayor and a new attitude on how to run a city, because what you have done, or HAVE NOT done is the worst crime of all.

James Miller
San Francisco

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please support restricting private vehicle access to a portion of Shelley Drive (aka Shelley Promenade)
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:20:57 PM

Hello,

Please see below message regarding Shelley Drive.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Luke Bornheimer <luke.bornheimer@gmail.com> **On Behalf Of** Luke Bornheimer
Sent: Sunday, October 1, 2023 12:33 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Cc: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Stokle, Brian (REC) <brian.stokle@sfgov.org>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; Commission, Recpark (REC) <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>; MTABoard@sfmta.com; PROSAC, RPD (REC) <prosac@sfgov.org>; cac@sfmta.com
Subject: Please support restricting private vehicle access to a portion of Shelley Drive (aka Shelley Promenade)

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

Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Preston, and Member Peskin,

I urge you to support the ordinance before you — sponsored by Mayor Breed and Supervisor Walton — to restrict private vehicle access on a portion of John Shelley Drive in McLaren Park (informally known as Shelley Promenade) and send it to the full Board of Supervisors with a positive recommendation.

Similar to Car-Free JFK Promenade and Great Highway Park, the car-free portion of Shelley Drive has been a refuge for people to gather, connect with family and friends, recreate, improve their health, and learn how to use active transportation like bikes, scooters, and skateboards, particularly for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities.

The creation and preservation of this space has been one of the silver linings from the COVID Pandemic, it has enhanced our city, and its approval as a permanent space for people will make our city a more sustainable and livable place for people of all ages and abilities, especially those who cannot or do not use a car including children and many seniors, people living with disabilities, and low-income individuals.

We face a roadway safety crisis, a climate crisis, and a public health crisis, and car-free spaces like this portion of Shelley Drive help the City make progress towards addressing those crises. Supporting this ordinance will help us take action towards addressing the crises, and you are in the unique position to help make it a permanent space for people. Please take this opportunity to lead for our people, city, and planet.

Thank you to Mayor Breed and Supervisor Walton for sponsoring this ordinance, and to the Recreation Parks Department staff who worked to tirelessly to create this public space, engage the public, and make improvements — previous and proposed — to an already great space. This space wouldn't be possible without the City staff who made it a reality and have continued to work on it, so I want to extend a special thanks to them and hope they are recognized for their extraordinary work.

I urge you to support the ordinance before you — sponsored by Mayor Breed and Supervisor Walton — to restrict private vehicle access on a portion of John Shelley Drive in McLaren Park, and send it to the full Board of Supervisors with a positive recommendation.

Thank you, and please take care,

Luke Bornheimer | Sustainable Transportation Advocate | [Linkedin](#) | 617-899-4487

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SF Small Business Commission - Tiffany Carter
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 11:16:51 AM

Hello,

Please see below message regarding Tiffany Carter's resignation to the Small Business Commission.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Tiffany Carter <tiffanysfblackwallstreet@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 11:02 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Subject: SF Small Business Commission - Tiffany Carter

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

President Peskin and fellow Board of Supervisors,

I Tiffany Carter is formally resigning from my seat as a San Francisco Small Business Commissioner. As I am rebuilding my business I will be bidding on potential opportunities that may have conflicts.

It has been an honor and I look forward to serving in different capacities in the future. Thanks!!

Tiffany Carter

SF Black Wealth Matters

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment File No. 230943
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 4:42:00 PM
Attachments: [PC File No 230943.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached public comment from Esther Butts regarding:

File No. 230943 - Resolution authorizing the placement of the Compton's Transgender Cultural District of San Francisco's Cultural Heritage District plaques, to be installed on the sidewalks at various historic location markers along the 6th Street corridor between Market Street and Howard Street, and initiating the process set forth in Public Works Code, Sections 789 et seq., to provide for the creation of a program for and installation of commemorative plaques in Compton's Transgender Cultural District.

Regards

Richard Lagunte

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163

richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

File No 230943

I think the plaques should be distributed, by Section 67.71 just as long as there are mixed but equal Bathroom facilities and that said plaques should be distributed in the Castro from Castro and 18th Street going down Castro Street

I believe in a private but equal said facilities and plaques. Thank you Very Much in consummate;

Carver Butts

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SF Safe Camera surveillance program
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:19:46 AM

Hello,

Please see below message regarding surveillance technology.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Jon Henry <jonhenry@bsotc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:13 AM
To: SFPD, Commission (POL) <SFPD.Commission@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Info, HRC (HRC) <hrc.info@sfgov.org>; Flaherty, Steve (DPA) <steve.flaherty@sfgov.org>; Henderson, Paul (DPA) <paul.henderson@sfgov.org>
Subject: SF Safe Camera surveillance program

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

Dear President Elias and Commissioners,

I write to you with concerns regarding the SF Safe City Camera Program and the broader implications of surveillance in our communities. While we acknowledge the program's goal to improve public safety, there remain pressing questions about transparency, fairness, and accountability.

First and foremost, who is the private entity involved in this initiative, and what is their vested interest in our community? We must educate the public about the reasons behind their involvement and ensure they are made aware of the implications of their participation.

San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 19B: Surveillance Technology Policy Ordinance, specifically Section 19B.2, mandates signage requirements for city-operated surveillance technology, including cameras in public places. Clear signage and online location disclosure are required to ensure transparency. Is the SF Safe City Camera Program in full compliance with these requirements?

We must know the locations of these cameras to perform a demographic analysis. Are these cameras dispersed citywide or targeted to specific areas? Such insights would offer clarity on potential biases in the program's implementation.

Additionally, the frequency with which law enforcement requests footage remains unknown to us. Establishing clarity here would help in fostering transparency and trust.

Given the potential concerns around privacy and surveillance, we urge the establishment of a Community Oversight Committee (COC). Such a committee can serve as a bridge between the community, law enforcement, and policymakers, ensuring that surveillance is carried out ethically and transparently. This will aid in improving relations between law enforcement and the community, creating a collaborative environment that prioritizes public safety while respecting the rights and concerns of community members.

We strongly advocate for:

Clear, ongoing communication with the public regarding surveillance practices.

A commitment to ensure that the program operates within the stipulations of the Surveillance Technology Policy Ordinance.

The establishment of the proposed COC to play an active role in program oversight, community

feedback, and relationship-building with law enforcement.

Community members have the right to understand how surveillance affects their daily lives. They also have the right to participate in shaping policies that concern their privacy and safety. Although it is stated that there is no live monitoring, no facial recognition, and footage requests are limited to law enforcement entities, we still need further reassurances.

Transparency, collaboration, and oversight are non-negotiable components of a just surveillance system. We await your proactive steps in this direction, and we're hopeful for a future where community-centric values guide our public safety efforts.

Sincerely,

Jon Henry

Executive Director

Both Sides Of The Conversation (BSOTC)

Jon Henry - Executive Director
Both Sides of the Conversation - BSOTC
Phone 1-415-913-9034
Email jonhenry@bsotc.org
Info@bsotc.org



Mission: To increase mobilization of advancement in Black and Brown communities by providing a safe space for conscious dialogue concerning the needs, systemic barriers, resources, and remedies.

Vision: We envision a world where Black and Brown communities thrive in love, health, education, information, and resources, through open, empowering dialogue.

BOTH SIDES OF THE CONVERSATION. CHANGING THE NARRATIVE FROM OUR VOICES

[Home Page](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) |

[Click here to Schedule an Appointment with me](#)

PO Box 347518 San Francisco, CA, 94134

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

This response is from a mobile device. Please excuse any typos or any words that might be misrepresented by autocorrect.

Thank you

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 2 Letters Regarding Tax Payer Funded Legal Counsel
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:24:13 PM
Attachments: [2 Letters Regarding Tax Payer Funded Legal Counsel.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 2 Letters Regarding Tax Payer Funded Legal Counsel.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Jorge Freyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 10:31:48 AM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Jorge Freyer
Email jlfreyer@gmail.com
I live in District [District 9](#)

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: [Ronald Mungai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 11:12:30 PM

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

Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent **Ronald Mungai**

Email limo4usf@gmail.com

I live in District [District 3](#)

I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Message: Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins
Mayor London Breed

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 5 Letters Regarding Cars in Hayes Valley
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:25:23 PM
Attachments: [5 Letters Regarding Cars in Hayes Valley.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 5 Letters Regarding Cars in Hayes Valley.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Cynthia Horiguchi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Support for car-free Hayes Valley
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 10:36:07 AM

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

Hi BoS, hope you're all well. I'm really hoping that something can be done to make car-free Hayes Valley permanent 3 days a week. I live in the neighborhood and we love it. The recent news cycle says the local community wants it to be reduced, but none of my neighbors or I have been asked. There has to be a way to figure it out. It's been such a positive thing for the neighborhood, local businesses and the city.

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

From: **Cynthia Horiguchi** <choriguchi@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Oct 13, 2023 at 10:23 AM
Subject: Support for car-free Hayes Valley
To: <MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org>
Cc: <Monica.Munowitch@sfmta.com>, <info@hayesvalleysf.org>

Hi Mayor Breed,

First of all, appreciate everything you do for SF!

I'm writing in about the recent media coverage that car-free Hayes Valley could be reduced to one day a week. I live in the neighborhood and would be so, so disappointed to see it drop down from the current 3 days a week.

Hayes Valley has become a symbol of SF's recovery. We love car-free Hayes. I look forward to it at the end of every work week. My friends come to the neighborhood from elsewhere because of it, and out of town visitors are always shocked at how vibrant it is, especially given everything they hear about SF on the news. It's been such a positive thing for the neighborhood, local businesses, and the city in general. I'm shocked that we're trying to get rid of one of the best things to come out of the pandemic.

I really, really hope we can figure out a way to make it permanent -- three days a week, not just one.

Thanks!
Cynthia Horiguchi

From: [Rachel Colson](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: info@hayesvalleysf.org; [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Munowitch, Monica \(MTA\)](#)
Subject: Keep Hayes Valley Car-Free Please!
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 10:47:14 AM

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

Hi Mayor Breed,

I'm reaching out about the recent media coverage that car-free Hayes Valley could be reduced to one day a week. I frequent the neighborhood often (I also used to live there) and would be incredibly disappointed to see fewer car-free days.

If car-free is in our future (as it should be!), we need to commit to invigorating walkable neighborhoods with pedestrian-first access.

Long-term, I hope we can find a way to make this permanent -- three days a week (or seven!), not just one.

Thanks for considering,
Rachel

From: [Luke C.-H. Lu](#)
To: MTABoard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Preserving the Vibrancy of Hayes Valley: An Appeal for Three Car-Free Days
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 12:22:43 PM

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

Hi SFMTA board members,

Thank you for your dedication to SF!

I'm reaching out concerning the recent discussions about reducing car-free Hayes Valley to just one day a week. As a resident, it would be disheartening to see this shift from the existing three days.

The car-free days have added a unique vibrancy to Hayes Valley. Every weekend, we eagerly anticipate this change in atmosphere. It not only attracts friends from other parts of the city but also captivates visitors who get to experience a side of SF contrary to what's often portrayed in the media. The initiative has been a beacon of positivity for our neighborhood, local businesses, and the entire city. In many ways, Hayes Valley has emerged as a testament to SF's resilience post-pandemic.

I earnestly hope we can retain the three-day car-free tradition. Please consider this perspective in the upcoming discussions.

Warm regards!
--Luke

From: [Nikhil Tellakula](#)
To: MTABoard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: car-free Hayes
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 1:25:18 PM

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

Hi SFMTA board members,

First of all, appreciate everything you do for SF!

I'm writing in about the recent media coverage that car-free Hayes Valley could be reduced to one day a week. I live in the neighborhood and would be so, so disappointed to see it drop down from the current 3 days a week.

We love car-free Hayes and look forward to it at the end of every work week. My friends come to the neighborhood from elsewhere because of it, and out of town visitors are always surprised at how vibrant it is, especially given everything they hear about SF on the news. It's been such a positive thing for the neighborhood, local businesses, and the city in general. Hayes Valley has become a symbol of SF's recovery, and I'm shocked that we're trying to get rid of one of the best things to come out of the pandemic.

I really, really hope we can figure out a way to make it permanent -- three days a week, not just one. I hope you take this into consideration when this topic comes up next week.

Thanks!

From: [Paola Trejos](#)
To: MTABoard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\); Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 7:16:06 PM

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

Hi SFMTA board members,

First of all, appreciate everything you do for SF!

I'm writing in about the recent media coverage that car-free Hayes Valley could be reduced to one day a week. I live in the neighborhood and would be so, so disappointed to see it drop down from the current 3 days a week.

We love car-free Hayes and look forward to it at the end of every work week. My friends come to the neighborhood from elsewhere because of it, and out of town visitors are always surprised at how vibrant it is, especially given everything they hear about SF on the news. It's been such a positive thing for the neighborhood, local businesses, and the city in general. Hayes Valley has become a symbol of SF's recovery, and I'm shocked that we're trying to get rid of one of the best things to come out of the pandemic.

I really, really hope we can figure out a way to make it permanent -- three days a week, not just one. I hope you take this into consideration when this topic comes up next week.

Thanks!

Paola

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 7 Letters From Monica D
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:29:21 PM
Attachments: [7 Letters From Monica D.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 7 Letters From Monica D.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Monica D](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#)
Subject: Biden's open border
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 10:39:51 PM

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

You woke DemTurds can't even take care of your own! Biden/Harris ticket is going to be scorched in 2024! We ain't paying for this bullshit!



5.7 million non-detained migrants in US, ICE reports — 'at a minimum'; taxpayer-funded program will provide medical services, housing
[theblaze.com](#)

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!
TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From: [Monica D](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#)
Subject: Dems hijacked by the woke
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 9:11:20 AM

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

Too late! Woke cancer has already spread so far into the Dem party. TRANSpartying.



San Francisco Democrats Fighting Over Future Endorsements
sfstandard.com

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!
TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From: [Monica D](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#)
Subject: Newsom is a self-serving fraud
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 9:14:44 AM

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

Only because Newsom is positioning himself for the presidency and he knows that his woke shit only flies in woke-ass California. Newsom is a fuckin two-faced fraud! Can't trust a Democrat nowadays. Once woke, always woke. TRANSpartying.



Newsom slides to right, frustrating progressives politicians' big hopes
calmatters.org

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!
TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From: [Monica D](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#)
Subject: SFPD and technology
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:33:28 AM

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

It's about goddamn time! Police officers spend hours on paperwork! SF is the tech hub yet technology lags when it comes to any government entity. Less time spent on paperwork, more time spent policing the community to safety, and less hours taxpayers pay for paperwork!

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From: [Monica D](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#)
Subject: SFPD and technology
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 2:53:26 PM

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

It's about goddamn time! Police officers spend hours on paperwork! Criminals they arrest get released by these woke judges faster than police officers can finish said paperwork. SF is the tech hub yet technology lags when it comes to any government entity. Less time spent on paperwork, more time spent policing the community to safety, and less hours taxpayers pay for paperwork!

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From: [Monica D](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov; assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Police Commission
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:56:06 PM

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

The ever so controversial police commission. Why do we have them??? We don't appreciate you at all, Carter Oberstone!



SF Police Commissioners Walk Out Amid Criticism of Mayor
sfstandard.com

KARMA IS A BITCH IN 2024!

TRANSpartying!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter
(TRANSpartying)

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 22 Letter From Julien Defrance Regarding Homelessness
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:39:54 PM
Attachments: [22 Letters From Julien Defrance Regarding Homelessness.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 22 Letter From Julien Defrance Regarding Homelessness.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*





From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

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

BLOCKING SIDEWALK. REMOVE IMMEDIATELY.








From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

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

BLOCKING SIDEWALK, REMOVE IMMEDIATELY.
THIRD WORLD COUNTRY SLEAZES
TRASHFUL IN EVERYWHERE
SANDY AND HAGARE









From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

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

**BLOCKING SIDEWALK. REMOVE IMMEDIATELY.
SANITARY ENGINEER**







From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2010 at 10:30 AM

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

BLOCKING SIDEWALK



From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

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

**BLOCKING FULL SIDEWALKS.
MATTRESSES.
PILING UP WASTE.
BIG FIRE HAZARD.
SIGNS OF STOLEN WARE CROPSHOP ACTIVITY.
REMOVE IMMEDIATELY.**





From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampment at 1350 Van Ness Ave
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 7:32:27 PM

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

CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:41 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
BLOCKING SIDEWALK. Remove immediately.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampment at 1450 Van Ness Ave/Austin St
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 7:32:43 PM

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

CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:43 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
BLOCKING SIDEWALK. REMOVE IMMEDIATELY.
THIRD WORLD COUNTRY SLUM.
TRASH/FILTH EVERYWHERE
SANITARY HAZARD

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampment at 110 Austin St
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 7:32:59 PM

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

CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:44 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
BLOCKING SIDEWALK. REMOVE IMMEDIATELY.
SANITARY HAZARD.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampment at 110 Fern St
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 7:33:11 PM

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

CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:45 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
BLOCKING SIDEWALK.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampments on Fern St between Polk and Larkin St
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 7:33:23 PM

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

CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:47 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

BLOCKING FULL SIDEWALKS.
MATTRESSES.
JUNK EVERYWHERE.
BBQ. FIRE HAZARD.
SIGNS OF STOLEN/BIKE CHOP SHOP ACTIVITY.

REMOVE IMMEDIATELY.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampments on Fern St between Franklin and Van Ness Ave (200 Block)
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 7:33:42 PM

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

CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:48 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:

BLOCKING FULL SIDEWALK.
JUNK EVERYWHERE.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampment at 110 Austin St
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 8:21:35 PM

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

GET THOSE F***** TENTS OUT OF HERE! NOW!

The following article was full of hope. What happened since?
What are you waiting for to ramp up street sweepings again?

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/sf-homeless-camps-lawsuit-coalition-ninth-circuit-18387283.php>

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 7:32 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:44 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
BLOCKING SIDEWALK. REMOVE IMMEDIATELY.
SANITARY HAZARD.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampments on Fern St between Polk and Larkin St
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 8:21:42 PM

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

GET THOSE F***** TENTS OUT OF HERE! NOW!

The following article was full of hope. What happened since?
What are you waiting for to ramp up street sweepings again?

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/sf-homeless-camps-lawsuit-coalition-ninth-circuit-18387283.php>

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 7:32 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:47 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
BLOCKING FULL SIDEWALKS.
MATTRESSES.
JUNK EVERYWHERE.
BBQ. FIRE HAZARD.
SIGNS OF STOLEN/BIKE CHOP SHOP ACTIVITY.

REMOVE IMMEDIATELY.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampments on Fern St between Franklin and Van Ness Ave (200 Block)
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 8:21:47 PM

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

GET THOSE F***** TENTS OUT OF HERE! NOW!

The following article was full of hope. What happened since?
What are you waiting for to ramp up street sweepings again?

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/sf-homeless-camps-lawsuit-coalition-ninth-circuit-18387283.php>

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 7:33 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:48 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
BLOCKING FULL SIDEWALK.
JUNK EVERYWHERE.

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampment at 110 Fern St
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 8:21:47 PM

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

GET THOSE F***** TENTS OUT OF HERE! NOW!

The following article was full of hope. What happened since?
What are you waiting for to ramp up street sweepings again?

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/sf-homeless-camps-lawsuit-coalition-ninth-circuit-18387283.php>

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 7:32 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:45 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
BLOCKING SIDEWALK.

Location: a table drop shop



Best Seen on iPhone

On Oct 11, 2017, at 10:31, John DeLano <john.delano@gmail.com> wrote:

GET THESE ***** IDENTIFY OF BEING SOME
The following which was full of hope. What happened then?
What are you waiting for, coming to your meetings again?

<https://www.facebook.com/JohnDeLano/>

On Thu, Oct 12, 2017, at 7:52 PM John DeLano <john.delano@gmail.com> wrote:

***** IDENTIFY OF BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

BEING SOME

From: [Julien DeFrance](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [SFPD Northern Station, \(POL\)](#); [Info@lowerpolkcbd.org](#); [Lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](#); [Chris Schulman](#); [DPW, \(DPW\)](#)
Subject: Re: Illegal encampment at 1301 Van Ness Ave
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 7:31:53 PM

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

For f*** sake, what are we paying you for?

GET THOSE F***** TENTS OUT OF HERE, NOW!

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 8:20 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
GET THOSE F***** TENTS OUT OF HERE! NOW!

The following article was full of hope. What happened since?
What are you waiting for to ramp up street sweepings again?

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/sf-homeless-camps-lawsuit-coalition-ninth-circuit-18387283.php>


On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 7:31 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
CLEAN UP THIS MESS IMMEDIATELY.

On Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 6:40 PM Julien DeFrance <julien.defrance@gmail.com> wrote:
BLOCKING SIDEWALK. REMOVE IMMEDIATELY.

Page: 1
Date: 10/13/2021 11:52 AM
Location: 10/13/2021 11:52 AM

GET THOSE ***** TENTS OUT OF HERE, NOW!
The following article was full of bugs. What happened here?
What are you doing here to keep up your mess? [View Article](#)

On Thu, Oct 13, 2021 at 5:07 PM John DeWine <john.dewine@delaware.gov> wrote:
Locations at this camp site.



See More at Photo
On Thu, Oct 13, 2021, John DeWine <john.dewine@delaware.gov> wrote:
GET THOSE ***** TENTS OUT OF HERE, NOW!
The following article was full of bugs. What happened here?
What are you doing here to keep up your mess? [View Article](#)
On Thu, Oct 13, 2021 at 5:07 PM John DeWine <john.dewine@delaware.gov> wrote:
LOCATIONS OF THIS CAMP SITE IMMEDIATELY
SEE PHOTO
PLEASE STOP THIS
AND THE TRUCKS
SOUND OF JACKHAMMERS CAMP TRUCK ACTIVITY
REMOVING IMMEDIATELY

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

This message is from outside the [redacted] system. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources.

More info...



Send from my iPhone

On Oct 13, 2023, at 15:53, Andrew DeRamus <andrew@andrewderamus.com> wrote:

Location is a bike shop along
<andrew@andrewderamus.com>

Send from my iPhone

On Oct 13, 2023, at 10:23, Andrew DeRamus <andrew@andrewderamus.com> wrote:

GET THOSE ***** BENTLEY OUT OF HERBY NOW!
The following article was full of lies. What happened was?
What are you waiting for to stop an entire innocent species?
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1234567890>

On Thu, Oct 13, 2023 at 11:01 PM Andrew DeRamus <andrew@andrewderamus.com> wrote:

1. I AM NOT A BENTLEY. I AM A BENTLEY.
2. I AM NOT A BENTLEY. I AM A BENTLEY.
3. I AM NOT A BENTLEY. I AM A BENTLEY.
4. I AM NOT A BENTLEY. I AM A BENTLEY.
5. I AM NOT A BENTLEY. I AM A BENTLEY.
6. I AM NOT A BENTLEY. I AM A BENTLEY.
7. I AM NOT A BENTLEY. I AM A BENTLEY.
8. I AM NOT A BENTLEY. I AM A BENTLEY.
9. I AM NOT A BENTLEY. I AM A BENTLEY.
10. I AM NOT A BENTLEY. I AM A BENTLEY.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2023 OCT 13 AM 9:04

BY JA 605-11

October 10, 2023

Mayor London Breed
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Room 200
San Francisco, Ca 94102
MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org

✓ San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, Ca 94102
Board of Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: Homeless Housing

Honorable Mayor and Board of Supervisors:

With 8,000 people living in tents on the streets of San Francisco, we need to get less political and more practical problem solving.

San Francisco is spending \$1.1 billion dollars on the 8,000 “unhoused”. The simple math equals \$125,000 per person. The cost of living in the US is \$55,000 per person. This is completely counter intuitive.

First, the city needs to find housing for our “unhoused” population.

Second, offer the housing and if not accepted,

Third, then enforce the laws through the criminal justice system.

2.

Where is the housing? It is in our back yard. Just a few miles south is the Cow Palace. This is a state facility that is used only a few times a year for which there are several alternate facilities available in the city.

The Cow Palace consists of over 250,000 square feet and has capacity for over 16,000 people with three exhibit halls and infrastructure for food facilities, restrooms, showers, medical clinic etc and all of the infrastructure necessary to provide basic services to the “unhoused”.

But then where do 8,000 people live? The 62 acres of parking lots that accommodate over 2,500 cars. Why not fill those spaces with 2,500 “tiny houses”. (See attached)

With the Cow Palace building a short walk away, all of the other infrastructure is close at hand. And in addition within the Cow Palace there is room for several thousand more “acute care” beds.

The entire area can be secured with existing controlled egress and ingress.

In addition, the 3rd St Muni can be used for those who need to get to their jobs in San Francisco.


I realize that the “devil is in the details” but at least this is a realistic start toward a solution to a very complex socioeconomic problem that is an embarrassment to our world class city and only getting worse.

Please contact me should you wish to discuss this issue in greater detail.

Sincerely,

Tony Graham
1501 Greenwich St. #604
San Francisco, Ca 94123
tony_maryanne@hotmail.com
cell 707 888 2211

cc; Catherine Stefani Stefanistaff@sfgov.org



BUNKHOUSE builds are underway.

June 23, 2023



\$ 15,000

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 5 Letters Regarding File No. 230973
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:28:07 PM
Attachments: [5 Letters Regarding File No. 230973.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 5 Letters Regarding File No. 230973:

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to clarify the Controller's audit and monitoring responsibilities with respect to nonprofit organizations contracting with the City.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: mawindisch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Michelle Hughes](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:14:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends \$1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Michelle Hughes
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: ashleywessinger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [ashley wessinger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:37:09 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends \$1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
ashley wessinger
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: lala.t.wu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Lala Wu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:57:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends \$1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Lala Wu
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: liz_briggs@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Elizabeth Farrell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:58:47 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends \$1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Farrell
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: forrest.liu@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Forrest Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: In Support of File #230973 - Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:46:46 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to express my support of Supervisor Stefani's Nonprofit Auditing Ordinance and urge you to vote in support of it.

The City currently spends \$1.7 billion on contracts with over 600 nonprofits. While many of these organizations provide valuable services to our communities, the City's lack of guidelines for these contracts has resulted in waste and redundancy.

By requiring the Controller to develop guidelines on metrics that must be included in City contracts, it will ensure consistency across the variety of contracts that nonprofits have with the city, thereby enabling that nonprofits to best deliver against clear metrics. Not only is this good governance to hold nonprofits accountable for results, it is needed to enable the City to measure progress towards addressing its most pressing problems, including homelessness and the drug and mental health crisis.

Finally, the high profile collapse of Baker Places and corruption discovered at United Council of Human Services highlights the need for increased oversight of service providers to ensure money is accounted for and is being used effectively to provide our most vulnerable the help they need.

Ultimately, this legislation will help improve oversight of taxpayer money, address the issues faced by nonprofits contracting with the City, and increase public access to information around nonprofit contracts.

I hope you will vote in support of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Forrest Liu
San Francisco, CA 94103

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 10 Letters Regarding File No. 230446
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:31:28 PM
Attachments: [10 Letters Regarding File No. 230446.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 10 Letters Regarding File No. 230446:

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to encourage housing production.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Jovita Mendoza](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 1:23:57 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Across the state from Sacramento down we are seeing housing bills (over 100 since 2016) that have become a threat to everyone who lives in California, most importantly lower income households and the environment.

The Trickle down has never worked. If you'd like real solutions:

- impose 20% low & very low inclusionary affordable housing in ALL developments
- remove opportunity for developers to pay in-lieu fees on the 20% of units (for anything over 9 units)
- ban short term rentals for full units, San Francisco has 4,834 units per <http://insideairbnb.com/>
- implement a vacancy tax for homes
- earmark vacancy tax revenue to refurbish houses that owners would rent as low & very low rentals for 15 years

There are other solutions to the housing affordability crisis that hurt people or the environment.

Even as amended, the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") still contains sweeping unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over \$230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **A Bad Decision Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while grasping at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than \$80,000 per year.
- **Corporate Housing Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over \$230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones,

setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the *wealthy*, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,
Jovita Mendoza

From: [Francesca Pastine](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Carrall, John \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Strongly AGREE with Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production" Ordinance File #230446
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:00:48 PM

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

Hello All,

We are in a housing crises. Opposition to ordinances such as file #230446 is why. Building more housing will not only create much needed homes for San Franciscan's, it will also create more vibrant neighborhoods, help local business thrive, and divert a financial crises by creating a larger tax base. Please stop listening to anti-housing hysterics. We need more housing of all types. Period.

Francesca Pastine
President, Inner Mission Neighborhood Association
94110

--

<https://www.francescapastine.com/>
www.pastineprojects.com
[IN THE MAKE](#)
<http://francescapastine.blogspot.com>
<http://www.innermissionneighborhood.com>
www.hillaryronenmission.com

Life is short
Art is long
Opportunity fleeting
Experience treacherous
Judgment difficult

Hippocrates 400 b.c.

From: [Wendy Williams](#)
To: [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:17:32 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Even as amended, the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") still contains sweeping unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over \$230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **A Bad Decision Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while grasping at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than \$80,000 per year.
- **Corporate Housing Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over \$230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted

into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Wendy Williams
Day Moon (small business owner)
94122

From: [Elliot Helman](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:21:14 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Even as amended, the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") still contains sweeping unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over \$230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **A Bad Decision Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while grasping at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than \$80,000 per year.
- **Corporate Housing Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over \$230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental

and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

elliot helman
Mission Bay 94158

From: [RL](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:33:53 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

We are NOT Paris!!

Even as amended, the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") still contains sweeping unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over \$230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high-priced housing that is not "affordable." It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels! *There is nothing "affordable" about this type of ordinance but a subsidized program that only benefits buyers, developers, real estate interests or speculators etc. and not those most in need.*
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more working class (low/middle income) San Franciscans either out of the City, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 plus vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands and thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction; we need to make our existing housing space affordable.
-
- **NO Housing Crisis** – Lets use simple math & logic, since 2022 the population of San Francisco has declined by over 65,000 which certainly has increased for

2023 and continues to decline. There are approximately 143,000 plus units that are vacant, have been built, are currently being built, that are coming soon and are in the pipeline for building, so, why would we need 82,000 more units?

Reason - we do NOT have a housing crisis but a crisis where HCD (RHNA) over-inflated the figures for housing needs & their veiled threats that if cities don't build these numbers, funding will not be given to cities such as San Francisco.

- The Communities do NOT need Six (6) Story complexes or greater on “every corner” or elsewhere. As stated previously, there is plenty of Vacant Office Space/Housing/Units that can be converted in an area that is more appropriate. As well, it seems the owners of these vacancies are willing, although challenging, to address options. Allowing this type of ordinance to pass would DESTROY the Neighborhoods where owners/renters desire to live in a SFR Community not an area of over-sized, over-priced cramped buildings.
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to build unhealthy housing even more easily on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up"), as well as 2550 Irving and thousands of other sites in the City with similar issues. CEQA and other agencies of this nature were established to protect the Communities and to enforce doing the right thing like doing the proper testing, remediate a site properly, not build on toxic sites or not cut corners for the sake of making money. Removing these protections will harm the Community and all those you profess to care about.
 - **Removing / Demolishing** a long-established Row House will create issues with soil, foundation, sinkage as well as so many other issues for the surrounding homes. Also, Environmental issues to consider would be the OLD materials (e.g. Mercury, Asbestos, Lead etc.) that have not been disturbed since the homes were build but would certainly be exposed & impact the Neighborhoods/Communities.
 - Another very important reason to retain **CEQA**
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.
- **Urban Renewal 2.0** – Ordinances of these nature are and will follow the same trajectory as the past like Geneva Towers.* They will be built, not be occupied only to sit vacant (e.g. The Westerly on Sloat), become mismanaged*, not benefit the people's needs and a blight on the Neighborhoods.

- **Financial Concerns** – Removing existing homes to build new low-high, high rise apartments/condos would NOT be financially beneficial to the Owner as the creators of this ordinance would have them or you all believe. The person selling their property is most likely elderly, the property is FREE & CLEAR of a mortgage with low property taxes and on a fixed income. However, selling the property will displace them from their home and they will have to find housing at an expensive monthly rate. Staying in their home would give them more financial power/freedom, not have to pay Capital Gains and this alone would certainly be more financially beneficial. Selling and being able to move back into a new unit, does NOT necessarily guarantee them a unit or when that would occur (building delays etc.) and certainly does not offer them financial flexibility/power.
 - Furthermore, it has not been discussed whether this transaction as with their “owned” home could be considered part of their Estate to leave to their heirs.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Consider and remember your Constituents and Neighborhoods needs NOT big money or HCD.

Please **vote DOWN** this unacceptable political and corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and Community integrity!

Thank you,
<!--[endif]-->

Renee Lazear

D4 Resident - 94116

SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

Preserve the Nature & Character of Our Neighborhoods

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Francesca Pastine](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Public Comment: Strongly AGREE with Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Housing Production" Ordinance File #230446
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 3:52:35 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230446 – [Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production]

John Carroll

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

San Francisco City Hall, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Francesca Pastine <fpastine@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:00 PM

To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>;

Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>

Subject: Public Comment: Strongly AGREE with Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Housing Production' Ordinance File #230446

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

Hello All,

We are in a housing crises. Opposition to ordinances such as file #230446 is why. Building more housing will not only create much needed homes for San Franciscan's, it will also create more vibrant neighborhoods, help local business thrive, and divert a financial crises by creating a larger tax base. Please stop listening to anti-housing hysterics. We need more housing of all types. Period.

Francesca Pastine
President, Inner Mission Neighborhood Association
94110

--

<https://www.francescapastine.com/>
www.pastineprojects.com
[IN THE MAKE](http://www.pastineprojects.com)
<http://francescapastine.blogspot.com>
<http://www.innermissionneighborhood.com>
www.hillaryronenmission.com

Life is short
Art is long
Opportunity fleeting
Experience treacherous
Judgment difficult

Hippocrates 400 b.c.

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Elliot Helman](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 3:52:37 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230446 – [Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production]

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Elliot Helman <muzungu_x@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:21 PM

To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#) <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; [Ronen, Hillary](#) <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>;

Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>

Subject: Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Constraints Reduction' 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

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

Dear Supervisors,

Even as amended, the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") still contains sweeping unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over \$230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **A Bad Decision Making Process** - Allowing the Mayor and Supervisors to ram forward a massive, destructive ordinance that will demolish and gentrify neighborhoods all over the city, while grasping at straws to try to amend it, is extremely bad process. We need to scrap this ordinance and draft legislation that will produce 100% affordable housing for families making less than \$80,000 per year.
- **Corporate Housing Takeovers** - The five year "look back" provisions in the amendments are useless. Wall Street and other corporate speculators buy, demolish, build and sell housing in five year investment cycles. They will have no problem waiting five years to demolish a neighborhood and gentrify it. We need *ten year* prohibitions on corporate housing speculation which apply to *all* housing, not just rent controlled housing.
- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making over \$230,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote **DOWN** this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

elliot helman
Mission Bay 94158

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [RL](#)
Cc: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 3:52:39 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230446 – [Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production]

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: RL <redpl@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:33 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>;

Thongsavat, Adam (BOS) <adam.thongsavat@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS) <ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Rosas, Lorenzo (BOS) <Lorenzo.Rosas@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>

Subject: Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Constraints Reduction' 'Housing' Ordinance File #230446

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

Dear Supervisors,

We are NOT Paris!!

Even as amended, the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") still contains sweeping unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making over \$230,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high-priced housing that is not "affordable." It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels! *There is nothing "affordable" about this type of ordinance but a subsidized program that only benefits buyers, developers, real estate interests or speculators etc. and not those most in need.*
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more working class (low/middle income) San Franciscans either out of the City, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and

underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 plus vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands and thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction; we need to make our existing housing space affordable.
-
- **NO Housing Crisis** – Lets use simple math & logic, since 2022 the population of San Francisco has declined by over 65,000 which certainly has increased for 2023 and continues to decline. There are approximately 143,000 plus units that are vacant, have been built, are currently being built, that are coming soon and are in the pipeline for building, so, why would we need 82,000 more units?
Reason - we do NOT have a housing crisis but a crisis where HCD (RHNA) over-inflated the figures for housing needs & their veiled threats that if cities don't build these numbers, funding will not be given to cities such as San Francisco.
 - The Communities do NOT need Six (6) Story complexes or greater on “every corner” or elsewhere. As stated previously, there is plenty of Vacant Office Space/Housing/Units that can be converted in an area that is more appropriate. As well, it seems the owners of these vacancies are willing, although challenging, to address options. Allowing this type of ordinance to pass would DESTROY the Neighborhoods where owners/renters desire to live in a SFR Community not an area of over-sized, over-priced cramped buildings.
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to build unhealthy housing even more easily on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up"), as well as 2550 Irving and thousands of other sites in the City with similar issues. CEQA and other agencies of this nature were established to protect the Communities and to enforce doing the right thing like doing the proper testing, remediate a site properly, not build on toxic sites or not cut corners for the sake of making money. Removing these protections will harm the Community and all those you profess to care about.
 - **Removing / Demolishing** a long-established Row House will create issues with soil, foundation, sinkage as well as so many other issues for the surrounding homes. Also, Environmental issues to consider would be the OLD materials (e.g. Mercury, Asbestos, Lead etc.) that have not been disturbed since the homes were build but would certainly be exposed &

impact the Neighborhoods/Communities.

- Another very important reason to retain **CEQA**
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.
- **Urban Renewal 2.0** – Ordinances of these nature are and will follow the same trajectory as the past like Geneva Towers.* They will be built, not be occupied only to sit vacant (e.g. The Westerly on Sloat), become mismanaged*, not benefit the people’s needs and a blight on the Neighborhoods.
- **Financial Concerns** – Removing existing homes to build new low-high, high rise apartments/condos would NOT be financially beneficial to the Owner as the creators of this ordinance would have them or you all believe. The person selling their property is most likely elderly, the property is FREE & CLEAR of a mortgage with low property taxes and on a fixed income. However, selling the property will displace them from their home and they will have to find housing at an expensive monthly rate. Staying in their home would give them more financial power/freedom, not have to pay Capital Gains and this alone would certainly be more financially beneficial. Selling and being able to move back into a new unit, does NOT necessarily guarantee them a unit or when that would occur (building delays etc.) and certainly does not offer them financial flexibility/power.
 - Furthermore, it has not been discussed whether this transaction as with their “owned” home could be considered part of their Estate to leave to their heirs.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Consider and remember your Constituents and Neighborhoods needs NOT big money or HCD.

Please **vote DOWN** this unacceptable political and corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and Community integrity!

Thank you,

Renee Lazear

D4 Resident - 94116

SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

Preserve the Nature & Character of Our Neighborhoods

From: [Jeantelle Laberinto](#)
To: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Gluckstein, Lisa \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: 10/12/23 Letter re: Legislative File #230446, "Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production"
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 2:25:48 PM
Attachments: [Letter to Supervisors re Housing Element Streamlining Legislation 12Oct23.pdf](#)

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

Dear Chair Melgar and the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

Please find the attached letter from the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP-SF) regarding Legislative File #230446, "Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production," which is on the Land Use and Transportation Committee agenda this coming Monday, October 16th.

Respectfully,
Jeantelle Laberinto
on behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition



12 October 2023

Chair of the Land Use & Transportation Committee, Supervisor Melgar
Land Use & Transportation Committee Members, Supervisors Peskin and Preston

Re: Legislative File #230446, "Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production"

Dear Land Use & Transportation Committee Chair Melgar and Supervisors Peskin and Preston:

Despite amendments made by the Mayor and Supervisor Melgar, the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition of San Francisco (REP-SF), strongly urges the Land Use & Transportation Committee to reject this legislation and take up new legislation that:

- Puts affordable housing first
- Protects tenants against displacement
- Values and retains the voices and aspirations of historically marginalized communities in project approval processes with significantly shorter durations
- Expands and modifies the Priority Equity Geographies SUD (PEG-SUD), and provides additional protections and opportunities to people who live within the expanded PEG-SUD.

This City has already passed several significant measures intended to "reduce constraints" for market rate housing. These include:

- [File #230026](#): Creates the Family Housing Opportunity Special Use District.
- [File #230374](#): Cuts more than a year off the site permit and building permit process.
- [File #230764](#) and [File #230769](#): Reduces impact fees paid by market rate developers.
- [File #230855](#): Reduces inclusionary housing requirement for market rate developers.
- [File #230732](#): Streamlines commercial properties converting to residential.

The City has also proposed other measures that are still pending Committee action, including:

- [File #230734](#): Replaces residential density limits in Certain Neighborhood Commercial Districts.
- [File #230735](#): Removes residential density limits in Neighborhood Commercial Districts.
- [File #230372](#): Exempts projects from impact fees that convert from commercial to residential

Although San Francisco fell 8,298 units short of its affordable housing goals for the last Housing Element cycle, and is facing a goal of nearly 47,000 affordable units for the current Housing Element cycle which is 57% of the overall goal, these ordinances prove that the City is only moving forward with the same failed housing policies and priorities.

Continuing to push even more legislation to further "reduce constraints" when our City already has a backlog of tens of thousands of already-entitled market rate developments, and more than

60,000 vacant market rate units avoids our City's legal obligation to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH) and policy objectives to prioritize racial and social equity.

As policymakers, we urge you to ask, with the legislative decisions you make, "who are we as a City building for?". [This article from the San Francisco Chronicle, "SF's luxury condo market is cooling. Here's why it might be a good time to buy"](#) on October 10, 2023 seems to indicate that most of the condo buildings being built in San Francisco are largely vacant, and that the market for these units is foreign investors. There isn't any discussion in this article among developers about targeting these units to San Francisco's low to moderate income households either in the short or long term. This article underscores the fact that in order to provide housing that very-low, low, and moderate income households can truly afford, we need to prioritize other Implementation Actions from the Housing Element that focus on truly affordable housing.

Putting Affordable Housing First

1. The Housing Element commits the City to build 57% of its new housing in the next eight years as price restricted to be affordable for very-low, low and moderate income households. This legislation must prioritize strategies for price-restricted affordable housing.
2. Add a budget supplemental and/or a dedicated revenue source to commit significant new funding to affordable housing per **Housing Element action 1.1.2**.
3. Include a provision that identifies enough development sites and building acquisitions to meet our RHNA mandate for Very low, Low and Moderate income housing. Please refer to **Housing Element Actions 1.2.2 and 1.4.6**.

Protecting Tenants Against Displacement

1. Retain the Citywide requirement for Conditional Use Authorization (CUA) for any proposed demolition of existing rent-controlled units.
 - a. The Housing Element includes Implementation Actions that speak to retention of rent controlled units even if Conditional Use Authorization policies are updated. Please refer to **Housing Element Actions 8.4.8, 8.4.9**,
2. Expand rent control to all new units
3. Protect small businesses from displacement
 - a. Prohibit demolition of buildings occupied by community-based, community-serving small businesses within the five years prior to the project application. This pertains as well to legacy businesses and priority businesses identified by Cultural Districts as being important in their CHHESS reports.

Valuing and Retaining the Voices of Historically Marginalized Communities

1. REP-SF supports efforts to reduce the duration of project reviews and uncertainty in the process. We, however, demand a process that continues to put the voices and expertise of low income and communities of color out front in the approval process.
 - a. Please refer to **Housing Element Action 8.4.21** for how to retain meaningful input and participation citywide, especially from low-income communities and communities of color.
 - b. Develop new project approval systems that strengthen the ability for Cultural Districts, low income communities and communities of color to direct how our communities grow and develop as supported by **Housing Element Actions**

3.4.2; 4.1.1; 4.1.2; 4.1.4; 4.2.4; 4.2.5; 4.2.6; 4.4.2; 4.5.12; 5.2.4; 5.4.1; 6.1.3; 6.3.2 among others.

Expanding and Modifying the Priority Equity Geographies SUD

1. This Committee should be aware that despite the fact that so much attention is being paid to areas outside the PEG-SUD, the Housing Element still results in most of the housing being built within the PED-SUD. Please see the [Planning Department's map below](#). As our communities have experienced, this scale of market rate development results in escalation of housing costs and displacement, especially of households with low incomes, and historically marginalized San Francisco residents.
2. Expand the PEG-SUD with input from American Indian, Black and other people of color communities and low income communities throughout the City, and input from all Cultural Districts.
 - a. Retain and strengthen public noticing, anti-displacement and other community stabilization policies and procedures within the expanded PEG-SUD. Several Implementation Actions in the Housing Element refer to "Priority Equity Geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement" but the "areas vulnerable to displacement" are not considered in this legislation.
 - b. Restore Impact fees and inclusionary housing requirements to their prior levels within the expanded PEG-SUD.
 - c. Commit significant new investments and resources for affordable housing for communities within the expanded PEG-SUD.
 - d. Update the PEG-SUD, [which is already out of date](#), with new data and input from historically marginalized communities at least every five (5) years.

Conclusion


Despite the amendments that were incorporated into the legislation at the October 2, 2023 hearing, this legislation fundamentally moves our City in entirely the opposite direction of racial and social equity with an approach that silences our communities, encourages demolitions and displacement of existing housing throughout vast areas of the City, and provides no resources or meaningful benefits for affordable housing.

REP-SF requests that the Land Use & Transportation Committee reject this legislation, and commence working with low income and people of color communities throughout the City to move forward legislation that implements the Housing Element to affirmatively further fair housing and center racial and social equity. REP-SF looks forward to working with you all on new legislation to reorient the priorities of Housing Element implementation.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeantelle Laberinto

on behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition, San Francisco



San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update
Case No. 2019-016230ENV

Figure 2-9
Projected Housing Unit Density Under the Proposed Action

From: [kaylena katz](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 7:36:34 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community, and demolition reviews that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high-priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower-class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with

luxury condos and rental towers will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Kaylena Katz
SFSU MPH Candidate
94122

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Cabrerera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 11 Letters Regarding File No. 230974
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:33:50 PM
Attachments: [11 Letters Regarding File No. 230974.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 11 Letters Regarding File No. 230974:

Resolution authorizing and approving the Director of Property, on behalf of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, to negotiate and enter into a sublease agreement for 312,000 square feet of property owned by the California State Lands Commission and leased to the California Department of Parks and Recreation, for the City's continued use as the Bayview Vehicle Triage Center at Candlestick Point State Recreation Area.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Edward.Ho@respondi.com
To: [Walton, Shannon \(BOS\)](#); [Bonen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EggarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); cahlerine.stefani@sfgov.org; [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peakin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; Philip.Ginsburg@sfgov.org; bkecho@hotmail.com
Subject: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 9:34:09 PM

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

Dear Representatives,

I am a Bayview resident and I do not support the extension of the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) at the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) in Bayview.

In 2021, HSH introduced a plan to reduce vehicular homelessness with safe parking areas, aiming to stabilize lives and connect people to housing. However, the results have been dismal. Over 18 months (January 2022 - September 2023), of 113 VTC clients, only 15 found permanent housing. As total program costs have not been shared, at initial VTC estimates of \$15.3 million, this means that it has cost taxpayers \$1 million per permanently housed person from this program.

HSH also failed the neighborhood. Promised services like parking enforcement, preventing re-encampments, and tackling illegal dumping have been half-heartedly pursued. Moreover, HSH polluted the community by secretly operating 16 diesel generators for lighting at the site, after initially claiming it was already electrified. HSH is still seeking more diesel power permits with BAAQMD. This would add even more cancer-causing air pollution to the community.

I'm not opposed to providing services to unhoused communities. But what the city does can't be at the expense of the Bayview community, which has long borne historical discrimination and pollution, while having less access to parks and open space. The CPSRA is a vital outdoor recreation area, and should be used for that purpose.

As the city's own budget and legislative analyst writes in the BLA Report 092223, it is "by far the most expensive homeless response intervention". It should not be the discretion of direct financial beneficiaries to drive this agenda forward at the expense of area residents, as evidenced at the September 29, 2023 Committee Meeting - [https://url.lavanan.click/v2/___https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzp\)MjIxMzE1MTkYTeZTUyYWlyMzJjMwI3OWQyNDgzMDo2OjY2YmU6Njg5Yzg5YTJmMzdlOWJhZTRkZTNmOWE0ZTE1NWY4ODEzM2ZmYWMyZTk4MDQwZTA5ZWYxYzJkMGE1OTBjMzI2MzpwOKY](https://url.lavanan.click/v2/___https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzp)MjIxMzE1MTkYTeZTUyYWlyMzJjMwI3OWQyNDgzMDo2OjY2YmU6Njg5Yzg5YTJmMzdlOWJhZTRkZTNmOWE0ZTE1NWY4ODEzM2ZmYWMyZTk4MDQwZTA5ZWYxYzJkMGE1OTBjMzI2MzpwOKY)

It is time to end the VTC experiment at Candlestick and invest in proper development and infrastructure in the area. That's why I urge the city not to extend the VTC beyond its initial 2-year term, ending in January 2024.

Regards,

Edward Ho
Residing in 94134

From: Johnson.Ling@espondi.com
To: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Bonen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); cahterine.stefani@sfgov.org; [Safal, Alisha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peakin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Sharsen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); CSLC.Commissionmeetings@sic.ca.gov; Phillip.Ginsburg@sfgov.org; Johnson.ling@gmail.com
Subject: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 9:40:18 PM

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

Dear Representatives,

I am a Bayview resident and I do not support the extension of the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) at the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) in Bayview.

In 2021, HSH introduced a plan to reduce vehicular homelessness with safe parking areas, aiming to stabilize lives and connect people to housing. However, the results have been dismal. Over 18 months (January 2022 - September 2023), of 113 VTC clients, only 15 found permanent housing. As total program costs have not been shared, at initial VTC estimates of \$15.3 million, this means that it has cost taxpayers \$1 million per permanently housed person from this program.

HSH also failed the neighborhood. Promised services like parking enforcement, preventing re-encampments, and tackling illegal dumping have been half-heartedly pursued. Moreover, HSH polluted the community by secretly operating 16 diesel generators for lighting at the site, after initially claiming it was already electrified. HSH is still seeking more diesel power permits with BAAQMD. This would add even more cancer-causing air pollution to the community.

I'm not opposed to providing services to unhoused communities. But what the city does can't be at the expense of the Bayview community, which has long borne historical discrimination and pollution, while having less access to parks and open space. The CPSRA is a vital outdoor recreation area, and should be used for that purpose.

As the city's own budget and legislative analyst writes in the BLA Report 092223, it is "by far the most expensive homeless response intervention". It should not be the discretion of direct financial beneficiaries to drive this agenda forward at the expense of area residents, as evidenced at the September 29, 2023 Committee Meeting - https://url.avanan.click/v2/_https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YXAzOnNnZHQyOmE6bzozYjQxN2NhZmQ2MWRmYzZkMDZjNTA3ZGM0YTkyOGNjMTto2Ojg2ZTQ6YjNjMjRhNDVhZmNiODk0NjVzMzJjNjMjMTRhMjIjMmVIMmQZTc1NGZhZjY3MTQ3NTE2ZTk1YzksMzgyMzpwOKY.

It is time to end the VTC experiment at Candlestick and invest in proper development and infrastructure in the area. That's why I urge the city not to extend the VTC beyond its initial 2-year term, ending in January 2024.

Regards,

Johnson Ling
Residing in 94134

From: Alex.Louie@respondd.com
To: [Walton, Shannon \(BOS\)](#); [Bonen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [IngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MekjarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); cahterino.stefani@sf.gov; [Safal, Absha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Paskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MVR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; Phillip.Ginsburg@sf.gov; alexwlouie@yahoo.com
Subject: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 11:12:24 PM

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

Dear Representatives,

I am a Bayview resident and I do not support the extension of the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) at the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) in Bayview.

In 2021, HSH introduced a plan to reduce vehicular homelessness with safe parking areas, aiming to stabilize lives and connect people to housing.

However, the results have been dismal. Over 18 months (January 2022 - September 2023), of 113 VTC clients, only 15 found permanent housing. As total program costs have not been shared, at initial VTC estimates of \$15.3 million, this means that it has cost taxpayers \$1 million per permanently housed person from this program.

HSH also failed the neighborhood. Promised services like parking enforcement, preventing re-encampments, and tackling illegal dumping have been half-heartedly pursued. Moreover, HSH polluted the community by secretly operating 16 diesel generators for lighting at the site, after initially claiming it was already electrified. HSH is still seeking more diesel power permits with BAAQMD. This would add even more cancer-causing air pollution to the community.

I'm not opposed to providing services to unsheltered communities. But what the city does can't be at the expense of the Bayview community, which has long borne historical discrimination and pollution, while having less access to parks and open space. The CPSRA is a vital outdoor recreation area, and should be used for that purpose.

As the city's own budget and legislative analyst writes in the BLA Report 092223, it is "by far the most expensive homeless response intervention". It should not be the discretion of direct financial beneficiaries to drive this agenda forward at the expense of area residents, as evidenced at the September 29, 2023 Committee Meeting - https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YXAzOnNmZHqyOmE66zo5OWFhMjQ2ZTU2YWWE3MzE1MmEzMG15ZjE4ZmYzZWVjYzo2OjkyNjc6NDg5NGM2ODAyMzgwYTQ0ZWZlN2U0OTU4NDRjY2VlNGE4MzAxOGJhZlZlZmVhZDI1ZGMwNDQ1NzhkZGh1YjhiYTpwOKY

It is time to end the VTC experiment at Candlestick and invest in proper development and infrastructure in the area. That's why I urge the city not to extend the VTC beyond its initial 2-year term, ending in January 2024.

Regards,

Alex Louie
Residing in 94124

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Mila.Pramanik@respondl.com](#); [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); [CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov](#); [sharmilapramanik@hotmail.com](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA - BOS File No. 230974
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 10:34:54 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230974 – [Sublease Agreement - California State Lands Commission - Candlestick Point State Recreation Area - Vehicle Triage Center - Base Rent of \$312,000]

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

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

From: Mila.Pramanik@respondl.com <Mila.Pramanik@respondl.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 8:24 AM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; cahterine.stefani@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>;

CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; Philip.Ginsburg@sfgov.org; sharmilapramanik@hotmail.com
Subject: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA

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

Dear Representatives,

I am a Bayview resident and I do not support the extension of the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) at the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) in Bayview.

In 2021, HSH introduced a plan to reduce vehicular homelessness with safe parking areas, aiming to stabilize lives and connect people to housing. However, the results have been dismal. Over 18 months (January 2022 - September 2023), of 113 VTC clients, only 15 found permanent housing. As total program costs have not been shared, at initial VTC estimates of \$15.3 million, this means that it has cost taxpayers \$1 million per permanently housed person from this program.

HSH also failed the neighborhood. Promised services like parking enforcement, preventing re-encampments, and tackling illegal dumping have been half-heartedly pursued. Moreover, HSH polluted the community by secretly operating 16 diesel generators for lighting at the site, after initially claiming it was already electrified. HSH is still seeking more diesel power permits with BAAQMD. This would add even more cancer-causing air pollution to the community.

I'm not opposed to providing services to unhoused communities. But what the city does can't be at the expense of the Bayview community, which has long borne historical discrimination and pollution, while having less access to parks and open space. The CPSRA is a vital outdoor recreation area, and should be used for that purpose.

As the city's own budget and legislative analyst writes in the BLA Report 092223, it is "by far the most expensive homeless response intervention". It should not be the discretion of direct financial beneficiaries to drive this agenda forward at the expense of area residents, as evidenced at the September 29, 2023 Committee Meeting - https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzoyNGU4MTIxN2RhNzQyMTQwZGU3ZDI2ZDUzYTcxYWQzZDo2OmQyOTQ6YTAzNDE1MjdlODU3ZTliN2I2MTY4NjZmNGM5N2MwYWU3M2MyZTZINGQxOVRkYTE4MjUxNDJjZGJkNjNlZTQzMjpwOkY.

It is time to end the VTC experiment at Candlestick and invest in proper development and infrastructure in the area. That's why I urge the city not to extend the VTC beyond its initial 2-year term, ending in January 2024.

Regards,

Mila Pramanik
Residing in 94134

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: Michelle.Truong@respondl.com; [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; minhchau2001us@gmail.com; [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA - BOS File No. 230974
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 10:35:05 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230974 – [Sublease Agreement - California State Lands Commission - Candlestick Point State Recreation Area - Vehicle Triage Center - Base Rent of \$312,000]

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

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

From: Michelle.Truong@respondl.com <Michelle.Truong@respondl.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 9:13 AM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; cahterine.stefani@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>;

Regards,

Michelle Truong
Residing in 94124

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: Michelle.Truong@respondl.com; [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; minhchau2001us@gmail.com; minhchau2001us@gmail.com; [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA - BOS File No. 230974
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 10:35:13 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230974 – [Sublease Agreement - California State Lands Commission - Candlestick Point State Recreation Area - Vehicle Triage Center - Base Rent of \$312,000]

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

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

From: Michelle.Truong@respondl.com <Michelle.Truong@respondl.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 9:13 AM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; cahterine.stefani@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>;

CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; Philip.Ginsburg@sfgov.org; minhchau2001us@gmail.com;
minhchau2001us@gmail.com

Subject: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA

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

Dear Representatives,

I am a Bayview resident and I do not support the extension of the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) at the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) in Bayview.

In 2021, HSH introduced a plan to reduce vehicular homelessness with safe parking areas, aiming to stabilize lives and connect people to housing.

However, the results have been dismal. Over 18 months (January 2022 - September 2023), of 113 VTC clients, only 15 found permanent housing. As total program costs have not been shared, at initial VTC estimates of \$15.3 million, this means that it has cost taxpayers \$1 million per permanently housed person from this program.

HSH also failed the neighborhood. Promised services like parking enforcement, preventing re-encampments, and tackling illegal dumping have been half-heartedly pursued. Moreover, HSH polluted the community by secretly operating 16 diesel generators for lighting at the site, after initially claiming it was already electrified. HSH is still seeking more diesel power permits with BAAQMD. This would add even more cancer-causing air pollution to the community.

I'm not opposed to providing services to unhoused communities. But what the city does can't be at the expense of the Bayview community, which has long borne historical discrimination and pollution, while having less access to parks and open space. The CPSRA is a vital outdoor recreation area, and should be used for that purpose.

As the city's own budget and legislative analyst writes in the BLA Report 092223, it is "by far the most expensive homeless response intervention". It should not be the discretion of direct financial beneficiaries to drive this agenda forward at the expense of area residents, as evidenced at the September 29, 2023 Committee Meeting -

https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YxAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzoyNzg1YmU3NmZiNmExYjE1OGExOTg5YWE5ODg2MjU2NDdo2OmNINjk6NWEzMjlxMDEyY2lzMDk5MDNkNDgxM2I3Njg0ZWxODI5NjUyZjlkMjQ4NGE2Yjk4ZDc5MWRINTVkyYjlyNDY3MjpwOKY.

It is time to end the VTC experiment at Candlestick and invest in proper development and infrastructure in the area. That's why I urge the city not to extend the VTC beyond its initial 2-year term, ending in January 2024.

Regards,

Michelle Truong
Residing in 94124

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: D.Powell@respondl.com; [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; powzack@sbcglobal.net; [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA - BOS File No. 230974
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 10:35:16 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230974 – [Sublease Agreement - California State Lands Commission - Candlestick Point State Recreation Area - Vehicle Triage Center - Base Rent of \$312,000]

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

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

From: D.Powell@respondl.com <D.Powell@respondl.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 9:58 AM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; cahterine.stefani@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>;

CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; Philip.Ginsburg@sfgov.org; powzack@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA

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

Dear Representatives,

I am a Bayview resident and I do not support the extension of the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) at the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) in Bayview.

In 2021, HSH introduced a plan to reduce vehicular homelessness with safe parking areas, aiming to stabilize lives and connect people to housing. However, the results have been dismal. Over 18 months (January 2022 - September 2023), of 113 VTC clients, only 15 found permanent housing. As total program costs have not been shared, at initial VTC estimates of \$15.3 million, this means that it has cost taxpayers \$1 million per permanently housed person from this program.

HSH also failed the neighborhood. Promised services like parking enforcement, preventing re-encampments, and tackling illegal dumping have been half-heartedly pursued. Moreover, HSH polluted the community by secretly operating 16 diesel generators for lighting at the site, after initially claiming it was already electrified. HSH is still seeking more diesel power permits with BAAQMD. This would add even more cancer-causing air pollution to the community.

I'm not opposed to providing services to unhoused communities. But what the city does can't be at the expense of the Bayview community, which has long borne historical discrimination and pollution, while having less access to parks and open space. The CPSRA is a vital outdoor recreation area, and should be used for that purpose.

As the city's own budget and legislative analyst writes in the BLA Report 092223, it is "by far the most expensive homeless response intervention". It should not be the discretion of direct financial beneficiaries to drive this agenda forward at the expense of area residents, as evidenced at the September 29, 2023 Committee Meeting - https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo2ZThiM2E1OTQyYmE1NGM5M2Q3MzVjMzI4YzIxY2RjYjo2OjM5ZDE6ZjM0ZWJkMmY5OTNmYjdkNzAxZDc0MGU3ODBiM2Q1Y2MyODViN2FkZWMyY2I1YjFkZmU0YzQyMWZhMmY0OWJmODpwOkY.

It is time to end the VTC experiment at Candlestick and invest in proper development and infrastructure in the area. That's why I urge the city not to extend the VTC beyond its initial 2-year term, ending in January 2024.

Regards,

Debra Powell
Residing in 94134

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Linda.Kolbach@responidl.com](#); [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); [CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov](#); [kolinniego@gmail.com](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA - BOS File No. 230974
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 10:35:17 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230974 – [Sublease Agreement - California State Lands Commission - Candlestick Point State Recreation Area - Vehicle Triage Center - Base Rent of \$312,000]

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

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

From: Linda.Kolbach@responidl.com <Linda.Kolbach@responidl.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 12:12 PM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; cahterine.stefani@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>;

CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; Philip.Ginsburg@sfgov.org; kolinniego@gmail.com
Subject: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA

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

Dear Representatives,

I am a Bayview resident and I do not support the extension of the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) at the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) in Bayview.

In 2021, HSH introduced a plan to reduce vehicular homelessness with safe parking areas, aiming to stabilize lives and connect people to housing. However, the results have been dismal. Over 18 months (January 2022 - September 2023), of 113 VTC clients, only 15 found permanent housing. As total program costs have not been shared, at initial VTC estimates of \$15.3 million, this means that it has cost taxpayers \$1 million per permanently housed person from this program.

HSH also failed the neighborhood. Promised services like parking enforcement, preventing re-encampments, and tackling illegal dumping have been half-heartedly pursued. Moreover, HSH polluted the community by secretly operating 16 diesel generators for lighting at the site, after initially claiming it was already electrified. HSH is still seeking more diesel power permits with BAAQMD. This would add even more cancer-causing air pollution to the community.

I'm not opposed to providing services to unhoused communities. But what the city does can't be at the expense of the Bayview community, which has long borne historical discrimination and pollution, while having less access to parks and open space. The CPSRA is a vital outdoor recreation area, and should be used for that purpose.

As the city's own budget and legislative analyst writes in the BLA Report 092223, it is "by far the most expensive homeless response intervention". It should not be the discretion of direct financial beneficiaries to drive this agenda forward at the expense of area residents, as evidenced at the September 29, 2023 Committee Meeting - https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpkZTU0OTk2YzZkNjg1ODk2N2Q2ZmViYzExMzQxZDM2ZDo2OmMyYmU6NDUxNzgwM2ZlMWMYNTlkOTk4ZTgxNGVKNWY0ZDlkM2Y4YTkyOTljYTZhNzQzOGE1NzEyOTlzZTA3NTRhMjVkJmJpwOkY.

It is time to end the VTC experiment at Candlestick and invest in proper development and infrastructure in the area. That's why I urge the city not to extend the VTC beyond its initial 2-year term, ending in January 2024.

Regards,

{Linda Kolbach}
Residing in {94134}

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: Edward.Ho@respondl.com; [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; hkecho@hotmail.com; [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA - BOS File No. 230974
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 10:35:19 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230974 – [Sublease Agreement - California State Lands Commission - Candlestick Point State Recreation Area - Vehicle Triage Center - Base Rent of \$312,000]

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

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

From: Edward.Ho@respondl.com <Edward.Ho@respondl.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 9:34 PM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; cahterine.stefani@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>;

CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; Philip.Ginsburg@sfgov.org; hkecho@hotmail.com
Subject: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA

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

Dear Representatives,

I am a Bayview resident and I do not support the extension of the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) at the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) in Bayview.

In 2021, HSH introduced a plan to reduce vehicular homelessness with safe parking areas, aiming to stabilize lives and connect people to housing. However, the results have been dismal. Over 18 months (January 2022 - September 2023), of 113 VTC clients, only 15 found permanent housing. As total program costs have not been shared, at initial VTC estimates of \$15.3 million, this means that it has cost taxpayers \$1 million per permanently housed person from this program.

HSH also failed the neighborhood. Promised services like parking enforcement, preventing re-encampments, and tackling illegal dumping have been half-heartedly pursued. Moreover, HSH polluted the community by secretly operating 16 diesel generators for lighting at the site, after initially claiming it was already electrified. HSH is still seeking more diesel power permits with BAAQMD. This would add even more cancer-causing air pollution to the community.

I'm not opposed to providing services to unhoused communities. But what the city does can't be at the expense of the Bayview community, which has long borne historical discrimination and pollution, while having less access to parks and open space. The CPSRA is a vital outdoor recreation area, and should be used for that purpose.

As the city's own budget and legislative analyst writes in the BLA Report 092223, it is "by far the most expensive homeless response intervention". It should not be the discretion of direct financial beneficiaries to drive this agenda forward at the expense of area residents, as evidenced at the September 29, 2023 Committee Meeting - https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzpjMjlxMzE1MTlkYTcyZTUyYWlyMzJjMmWI3OWQyNDgzMDo2OjY2YmU6Njg5Yzg5YTJmMzdlOWJhZTRkZTNmOWE0ZTE1NWY4ODEzM2ZmYWMYzTk4MDQwZTA5ZWYxYzJkMGE1OTBjMzI2MzpwOkY.

It is time to end the VTC experiment at Candlestick and invest in proper development and infrastructure in the area. That's why I urge the city not to extend the VTC beyond its initial 2-year term, ending in January 2024.

Regards,

Edward Ho
Residing in 94134

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: Johnson.Ling@respondl.com; [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; johnson.ling@gmail.com; [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA - BOS File No. 230974
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 10:35:21 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230974 – [Sublease Agreement - California State Lands Commission - Candlestick Point State Recreation Area - Vehicle Triage Center - Base Rent of \$312,000]

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

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

From: Johnson.Ling@respondl.com <Johnson.Ling@respondl.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 9:40 PM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; cahterine.stefani@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>;

CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; Philip.Ginsburg@sfgov.org; johnson.ling@gmail.com
Subject: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA

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

Dear Representatives,

I am a Bayview resident and I do not support the extension of the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) at the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) in Bayview.

In 2021, HSH introduced a plan to reduce vehicular homelessness with safe parking areas, aiming to stabilize lives and connect people to housing. However, the results have been dismal. Over 18 months (January 2022 - September 2023), of 113 VTC clients, only 15 found permanent housing. As total program costs have not been shared, at initial VTC estimates of \$15.3 million, this means that it has cost taxpayers \$1 million per permanently housed person from this program.

HSH also failed the neighborhood. Promised services like parking enforcement, preventing re-encampments, and tackling illegal dumping have been half-heartedly pursued. Moreover, HSH polluted the community by secretly operating 16 diesel generators for lighting at the site, after initially claiming it was already electrified. HSH is still seeking more diesel power permits with BAAQMD. This would add even more cancer-causing air pollution to the community.

I'm not opposed to providing services to unhoused communities. But what the city does can't be at the expense of the Bayview community, which has long borne historical discrimination and pollution, while having less access to parks and open space. The CPSRA is a vital outdoor recreation area, and should be used for that purpose.

As the city's own budget and legislative analyst writes in the BLA Report 092223, it is "by far the most expensive homeless response intervention". It should not be the discretion of direct financial beneficiaries to drive this agenda forward at the expense of area residents, as evidenced at the September 29, 2023 Committee Meeting - https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo3YjQxN2NhZmQ2MWRmYzZkMDZjNTA3ZGM0YTkyOGNjMT02Ojg2ZTQ6YjNjMjRhNDVhZmNiODk0NjVzMzljNjJiMjJhMTRhMjIxMmVlMmQ2ZTc1NGZhZjY3MTQ3NTE2ZTk1YzIxMzgyMzpwOkY.

It is time to end the VTC experiment at Candlestick and invest in proper development and infrastructure in the area. That's why I urge the city not to extend the VTC beyond its initial 2-year term, ending in January 2024.

Regards,

Johnson Ling
Residing in 94134

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: Alex.Louie@responidl.com; [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HOM\)](#); [Cohen, Emily \(HOM\)](#); CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; alexwlouie@yahoo.com; [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA - BOS File No. 230974
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 10:35:23 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your comment letter.

We are adding your comment letter to the legislative file for this resolution matter – File No. 230974 – [Sublease Agreement - California State Lands Commission - Candlestick Point State Recreation Area - Vehicle Triage Center - Base Rent of \$312,000]

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

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

From: Alex.Louie@responidl.com <Alex.Louie@responidl.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 11:12 PM
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; cahterine.stefani@sfgov.org; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; McSpadden, Shireen (HOM) <shireen.mcspadden@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Emily (HOM) <emily.cohen@sfgov.org>;

CSLC.Commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov; Philip.Ginsburg@sfgov.org; alexwlouie@yahoo.com
Subject: Do not extend the VTC for another 2 year term at the CPSRA

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

Dear Representatives,

I am a Bayview resident and I do not support the extension of the Vehicle Triage Center (VTC) at the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) in Bayview.

In 2021, HSH introduced a plan to reduce vehicular homelessness with safe parking areas, aiming to stabilize lives and connect people to housing. However, the results have been dismal. Over 18 months (January 2022 - September 2023), of 113 VTC clients, only 15 found permanent housing. As total program costs have not been shared, at initial VTC estimates of \$15.3 million, this means that it has cost taxpayers \$1 million per permanently housed person from this program.

HSH also failed the neighborhood. Promised services like parking enforcement, preventing re-encampments, and tackling illegal dumping have been half-heartedly pursued. Moreover, HSH polluted the community by secretly operating 16 diesel generators for lighting at the site, after initially claiming it was already electrified. HSH is still seeking more diesel power permits with BAAQMD. This would add even more cancer-causing air pollution to the community.

I'm not opposed to providing services to unhoused communities. But what the city does can't be at the expense of the Bayview community, which has long borne historical discrimination and pollution, while having less access to parks and open space. The CPSRA is a vital outdoor recreation area, and should be used for that purpose.

As the city's own budget and legislative analyst writes in the BLA Report 092223, it is "by far the most expensive homeless response intervention". It should not be the discretion of direct financial beneficiaries to drive this agenda forward at the expense of area residents, as evidenced at the September 29, 2023 Committee Meeting - https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/44554?meta_id=1025273___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzo5OWFhMjQ2ZTU2YWE3MzM1MmEzMGi5ZjE4ZmYzZWRjYzo2OjkyNjc6NDgxNGM2ODAyMzgwYTQ0ZWZIN2U0OTU4NDRjY2VkNGE4MzAxOGJiNzI2ZmVhZDI1ZGMwNDQ1NzhkZGI1YjhiYTpwOkY.

It is time to end the VTC experiment at Candlestick and invest in proper development and infrastructure in the area. That's why I urge the city not to extend the VTC beyond its initial 2-year term, ending in January 2024.

Regards,

Alex Louie
Residing in 94124

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 19 Letters Regarding File No. 231016
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:38:16 PM
Attachments: [19 Letters Regarding File No. 231016.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 19 Letters Regarding File No. 231016:

Resolution urging the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) to develop and implement a plan for No Turn On Red (NTOR) at every signalized intersection in San Francisco and approve a citywide NTOR policy.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Jason Zhang](mailto:Jason.Zhang@sfmta.com)
To: mtaboard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](mailto:Breed.Mayor.London@sfmta.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfmta.com); [MOD. \(ADM\)](mailto:MOD.ADM@sfmta.com); cac@sfmta.com; clerk@sfcta.org; [MDC \(ADM\)](mailto:MDC.ADM@sfmta.com); [Youthcom. \(BOS\)](mailto:Youthcom@sfmta.com); sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; LukeBornheimer@gmail.com
Subject: Urging you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy at your next meeting
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:26:08 AM

Hi SFMTA Board of Directors,

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

In response to the citywide No Turn On Red campaign and overwhelmingly positive support from the public, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted Supervisor Preston's resolution urging you and SFMTA to approve a citywide NTOR policy now, and the people of San Francisco need you to take immediate action and lead on this issue for their safety, roadway safety generally in the city, and climate action, among other related matters.

SFMTA's own evaluation showed that 92% of drivers complied with No Turn On Red, close calls decreased by 80%, and drivers blocking crosswalks decreased 72% after SFMTA implemented NTOR at 50 intersections in the Tenderloin in 2021. No Turn On Red increases safety, access, and comfort for people, and an overwhelming majority of drivers comply with NTOR, even with traffic enforcement at historic lows. A citywide No Turn On Red policy is an easy win for roadway safety and having a citywide policy will only increase compliance. A citywide policy also has widespread public support, including from people who primarily drive, some of whom talk about how a citywide policy would make driving more intuitive and reduce stress from other drivers aggressing at them when the driver behind them wants to turn on red.

Furthermore, an analysis from Washington, DC showed that drivers failing to yield to people crossing the street on a green decreased by nearly 60% — No Turn On Red increases safety for people during green lights in addition red lights. That same analysis showed that No Turn On Red decreased conflicts between cars by 97% — No Turn On Red makes streets significantly safer for car drivers and passengers. Other studies found that allowing turns on red significantly increases crashes and injuries for people walking and people on bikes. The data is clear: Implementing a citywide No Turn On Red policy will make streets safer for all people, especially children, seniors, people living with disabilities, and people walking and on bikes.

You can find all of the information (and related sources) at NTORSf.com.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis, with nearly 40 people being killed on our streets last year — the most since we committed to Vision Zero in 2014 — and supporting this resolution is the least we can do to address that crisis. The people of San Francisco need leadership on our roadway safety crisis, and this is a small but impactful thing you can do to help our city take action in addressing that crisis.

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

From: [Leah Loversky](#)
To: MTABoard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); LukeBornheimer@gmail.com; [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); cac@sfmta.com; clerk@sfcta.org; [MDC \(ADM\)](#); [MOD, \(ADM\)](#); sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; [Youthcom., \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Urging you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy at your next meeting
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 5:33:27 PM

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

Hi SFMTA Board of Directors,

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

In response to the citywide No Turn On Red campaign and overwhelmingly positive support from the public, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted Supervisor Preston's resolution urging you and SFMTA to approve a citywide NTOR policy now, and the people of San Francisco need you to take immediate action and lead on this issue for their safety, roadway safety generally in the city, and climate action, among other related matters.

SFMTA's own evaluation showed that 92% of drivers complied with No Turn On Red, close calls decreased by 80%, and drivers blocking crosswalks decreased 72% after SFMTA implemented NTOR at 50 intersections in the Tenderloin in 2021. No Turn On Red increases safety, access, and comfort for people, and an overwhelming majority of drivers comply with NTOR, even with traffic enforcement at historic lows. A citywide No Turn On Red policy is an easy win for roadway safety and having a citywide policy will only increase compliance. A citywide policy also has widespread public support, including from people who primarily drive, some of whom talk about how a citywide policy would make driving more intuitive and reduce stress from other drivers aggressing at them when the driver behind them wants to turn on red.

Furthermore, an analysis from Washington, DC showed that drivers failing to yield to people crossing the street on a green decreased by nearly 60% — No Turn On Red increases safety for people during green lights in addition red lights. That same analysis showed that No Turn On Red decreased conflicts between cars by 97% — No Turn On Red makes streets significantly safer for car drivers and passengers. Other studies found that allowing turns on red significantly increases crashes and injuries for people walking and people on bikes. The data is clear: Implementing a citywide No Turn On Red policy will make streets safer for all people, especially children, seniors, people living with disabilities, and people walking and on bikes.

You can find all of the information (and related sources) at NTORSf.com.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis, with nearly 40 people being killed on our streets last year — the most since we committed to Vision Zero in 2014 — and supporting this resolution

is the least we can do to address that crisis. The people of San Francisco need leadership on our roadway safety crisis, and this is a small but impactful thing you can do to help our city take action in addressing that crisis.

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

From: ameliachong1@gmail.com
To: mtaboard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MOD. \(ADM\)](#); cac@sfmta.com; clerk@sfcta.org; [MDC \(ADM\)](#); [Youthcom. \(BOS\)](#); sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; LukeBornheimer@gmail.com
Subject: Make Vision Zero Happen: No Turn On Red
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 10:07:21 PM

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

Dear SFMTA Board of Directors,

I am writing to urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th. Everyday when I walk, bike, or drive around San Francisco, I see cars stopping in the middle of the crosswalk trying to turn right on red. I see children, seniors, families, and people with disabilities having to walk dangerously close to moving traffic because these cars are sticking out in their protected space. Yes, it is illegal, and yet it is still a common occurrence throughout our city.

The best way to change this behavior is through design. Enacting a No Turn on Red policy citywide means there is no reason to block the crosswalk, nor to not check for pedestrians because the driver is too concerned looking at oncoming traffic. I often see drivers not even check for pedestrians to their right because they are too concerned about cars coming from the left. We can help San Francisco reach Vision Zero with this policy.

In response to the citywide No Turn On Red campaign and overwhelmingly positive support from the public, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted Supervisor Preston's resolution urging you and SFMTA to approve a citywide NTOR policy now. We need immediate action on this issue for their safety, roadway safety generally in the city, and climate action, among other related matters.

SFMTA's own evaluation showed that 92% of drivers complied with No Turn On Red, close calls decreased by 80%, and drivers blocking crosswalks decreased 72% after SFMTA implemented NTOR at 50 intersections in the Tenderloin in 2021. No Turn On Red increases safety, access, and comfort for people, and an overwhelming majority of drivers comply with NTOR, even with traffic enforcement at historic lows. A citywide No Turn On Red policy is an easy win for roadway safety and having a citywide policy will only increase compliance. A citywide policy also has widespread public support, including from people who primarily drive, some of whom talk about how a citywide policy would make driving more intuitive and reduce stress from other drivers aggressing at them when the driver behind them wants to turn on red.

Furthermore, an analysis from Washington, DC showed that drivers failing to yield to people crossing the street on a green decreased by nearly 60% — No Turn On Red increases safety for people during green lights in addition red lights. That same analysis showed that No Turn On Red decreased conflicts between cars by 97% — No Turn On Red makes streets significantly safer for car drivers and passengers. Other studies found that allowing turns on red significantly increases crashes and injuries for people walking and people on bikes. The data is clear: Implementing a citywide No Turn On Red policy will make streets safer for all people, especially children, seniors, people living with disabilities, and people walking and on bikes.

You can find all of the information (and related sources) at NTORsf.com.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis, with nearly 40 people being killed on our streets last year — the most since we committed to Vision Zero in 2014 — and supporting this resolution is the least we can do to address that crisis. The people of San Francisco need leadership on our roadway safety crisis, and this is a small but impactful thing you can do to help our city take action in addressing that crisis.

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting —

scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

Thank you,
Amy Chong
2710 Cabrillo St

From: [Jack Lynch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Saturday, October 14, 2023 2:00:09 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Jack Lynch
jlynch5000@gmail.com
3320 21st St Ste 4
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Amir Haghghat](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 8:56:34 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Amir Haghghat
amiruci@gmail.com
579 Anderson Street
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Andrew Seigner](mailto:Andrew.Seigner@sfmta.com)
To: mtaboard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MOD. \(ADM\)](#); cac@sfmta.com; clerk@sfcta.org; [MDC \(ADM\)](#); [Youthcom. \(BOS\)](#); sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; LukeBornheimer@gmail.com
Subject: Urging you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy at your next meeting
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 8:20:07 PM

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

Hi SFMTA Board of Directors,

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

In response to the citywide No Turn On Red campaign and overwhelmingly positive support from the public, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted Supervisor Preston's resolution urging you and SFMTA to approve a citywide NTOR policy now, and the people of San Francisco need you to take immediate action and lead on this issue for their safety, roadway safety generally in the city, and climate action, among other related matters.

SFMTA's own evaluation showed that 92% of drivers complied with No Turn On Red, close calls decreased by 80%, and drivers blocking crosswalks decreased 72% after SFMTA implemented NTOR at 50 intersections in the Tenderloin in 2021. No Turn On Red increases safety, access, and comfort for people, and an overwhelming majority of drivers comply with NTOR, even with traffic enforcement at historic lows. A citywide No Turn On Red policy is an easy win for roadway safety and having a citywide policy will only increase compliance. A citywide policy also has widespread public support, including from people who primarily drive, some of whom talk about how a citywide policy would make driving more intuitive and reduce stress from other drivers aggressing at them when the driver behind them wants to turn on red.

Furthermore, an analysis from Washington, DC showed that drivers failing to yield to people crossing the street on a green decreased by nearly 60% — No Turn On Red increases safety for people during green lights in addition red lights. That same analysis showed that No Turn On Red decreased conflicts between cars by 97% — No Turn On Red makes streets significantly safer for car drivers and passengers. Other studies found that allowing turns on red significantly increases crashes and injuries for people walking and people on bikes. The data is clear: Implementing a citywide No Turn On Red policy will make streets safer for all people, especially children, seniors, people living with disabilities, and people walking and on bikes.

You can find all of the information (and related sources) at [NTORSf.com](https://ntorsf.com).

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis, with nearly 40 people being killed on our streets last year — the most since we committed to Vision Zero in 2014 — and supporting this resolution

is the least we can do to address that crisis. The people of San Francisco need leadership on our roadway safety crisis, and this is a small but impactful thing you can do to help our city take action in addressing that crisis.

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

-Andrew Seigner
94102

From: [Kenneth Russell](mailto:Kenneth.Russell@sfmta.com)
To: mtaboard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](mailto:Breed.Mayor.London@sfmta.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfmta.com); [MOD. \(ADM\)](mailto:MOD.ADM@sfmta.com); cac@sfmta.com; clerk@sfcta.org; [MDC \(ADM\)](mailto:MDC.ADM@sfmta.com); [Youthcom. \(BOS\)](mailto:Youthcom@sfmta.com); sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; LukeBornheimer@gmail.com
Subject: Urging you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy at your next meeting
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:24:06 AM

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

Hi SFMTA Board of Directors,

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

In response to the citywide No Turn On Red campaign and overwhelmingly positive support from the public, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted Supervisor Preston's resolution urging you and SFMTA to approve a citywide NTOR policy now, and the people of San Francisco need you to take immediate action and lead on this issue for their safety, roadway safety generally in the city, and climate action, among other related matters.

SFMTA's own evaluation showed that 92% of drivers complied with No Turn On Red, close calls decreased by 80%, and drivers blocking crosswalks decreased 72% after SFMTA implemented NTOR at 50 intersections in the Tenderloin in 2021. No Turn On Red increases safety, access, and comfort for people, and an overwhelming majority of drivers comply with NTOR, even with traffic enforcement at historic lows. A citywide No Turn On Red policy is an easy win for roadway safety and having a citywide policy will only increase compliance. A citywide policy also has widespread public support, including from people who primarily drive, some of whom talk about how a citywide policy would make driving more intuitive and reduce stress from other drivers aggressing at them when the driver behind them wants to turn on red.

Furthermore, an analysis from Washington, DC showed that drivers failing to yield to people crossing the street on a green decreased by nearly 60% — No Turn On Red increases safety for people during green lights in addition red lights. That same analysis showed that No Turn On Red decreased conflicts between cars by 97% — No Turn On Red makes streets significantly safer for car drivers and passengers. Other studies found that allowing turns on red significantly increases crashes and injuries for people walking and people on bikes. The data is clear: Implementing a citywide No Turn On Red policy will make streets safer for all people, especially children, seniors, people living with disabilities, and people walking and on bikes.

You can find all of the information (and related sources) at NTORsf.com.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis, with nearly 40 people being killed on our streets last year — the most since we committed to Vision Zero in 2014 — and supporting this resolution is the least we can do to address that crisis. The people of San Francisco need leadership on our roadway safety crisis, and this is a small but impactful thing you can do to help our city take action in addressing that crisis.

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

From: [Neil Williams](mailto:Neil.Williams@sfmta.com)
To: mtaboard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MOD. \(ADM\)](#); cac@sfmta.com; clerk@sfcta.org; [MDC \(ADM\)](#); [Youthcom. \(BOS\)](#); sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; LukeBornheimer@gmail.com
Subject: Urging you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy at your next meeting
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:46:45 AM

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

Hi SFMTA Board of Directors,

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

In response to the citywide No Turn On Red campaign and overwhelmingly positive support from the public, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted Supervisor Preston's resolution urging you and SFMTA to approve a citywide NTOR policy now, and the people of San Francisco need you to take immediate action and lead on this issue for their safety, roadway safety generally in the city, and climate action, among other related matters.

SFMTA's own evaluation showed that 92% of drivers complied with No Turn On Red, close calls decreased by 80%, and drivers blocking crosswalks decreased 72% after SFMTA implemented NTOR at 50 intersections in the Tenderloin in 2021. No Turn On Red increases safety, access, and comfort for people, and an overwhelming majority of drivers comply with NTOR, even with traffic enforcement at historic lows. A citywide No Turn On Red policy is an easy win for roadway safety and having a citywide policy will only increase compliance. A citywide policy also has widespread public support, including from people who primarily drive, some of whom talk about how a citywide policy would make driving more intuitive and reduce stress from other drivers aggressing at them when the driver behind them wants to turn on red.

Furthermore, an analysis from Washington, DC showed that drivers failing to yield to people crossing the street on a green decreased by nearly 60% — No Turn On Red increases safety for people during green lights in addition red lights. That same analysis showed that No Turn On Red decreased conflicts between cars by 97% — No Turn On Red makes streets significantly safer for car drivers and passengers. Other studies found that allowing turns on red significantly increases crashes and injuries for people walking and people on bikes. The data is clear: Implementing a citywide No Turn On Red policy will make streets safer for all people, especially children, seniors, people living with disabilities, and people walking and on bikes.

You can find all of the information (and related sources) at [NTORSf.com](https://ntorsf.com).

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis, with nearly 40 people being killed on our streets last year — the most since we committed to Vision Zero in 2014 — and supporting this resolution

is the least we can do to address that crisis. The people of San Francisco need leadership on our roadway safety crisis, and this is a small but impactful thing you can do to help our city take action in addressing that crisis.

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

Thank you,
Neil Williams
(D10, Potrero Hill)

From: [Sean Burgess](#)
To: mtaboard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MOD. \(ADM\)](#); cac@sfmta.com; clerk@sfcta.org; [MDC \(ADM\)](#); [Youthcom. \(BOS\)](#); sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; LukeBornheimer@gmail.com
Subject: Urging you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy at your next meeting
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 1:59:53 PM

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

Hi SFMTA Board of Directors,

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

In response to the citywide No Turn On Red campaign and overwhelmingly positive support from the public, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted Supervisor Preston's resolution urging you and SFMTA to approve a citywide NTOR policy now, and the people of San Francisco need you to take immediate action and lead on this issue for their safety, roadway safety generally in the city, and climate action, among other related matters.

SFMTA's own evaluation showed that 92% of drivers complied with No Turn On Red, close calls decreased by 80%, and drivers blocking crosswalks decreased 72% after SFMTA implemented NTOR at 50 intersections in the Tenderloin in 2021. No Turn On Red increases safety, access, and comfort for people, and an overwhelming majority of drivers comply with NTOR, even with traffic enforcement at historic lows. A citywide No Turn On Red policy is an easy win for roadway safety and having a citywide policy will only increase compliance. A citywide policy also has widespread public support, including from people who primarily drive, some of whom talk about how a citywide policy would make driving more intuitive and reduce stress from other drivers aggressing at them when the driver behind them wants to turn on red.

Furthermore, an analysis from Washington, DC showed that drivers failing to yield to people crossing the street on a green decreased by nearly 60% — No Turn On Red increases safety for people during green lights in addition red lights. That same analysis showed that No Turn On Red decreased conflicts between cars by 97% — No Turn On Red makes streets significantly safer for car drivers and passengers. Other studies found that allowing turns on red significantly increases crashes and injuries for people walking and people on bikes. The data is clear: Implementing a citywide No Turn On Red policy will make streets safer for all people, especially children, seniors, people living with disabilities, and people walking and on bikes.

You can find all of the information (and related sources) at NTORsf.com.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis, with nearly 40 people being killed on our streets last year — the most since we committed to Vision Zero in 2014 — and supporting this resolution is the least we can do to address that crisis. The people of San Francisco need leadership on our roadway safety crisis, and this is a small but impactful thing you can do to help our city take action in addressing that crisis.

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

From: [Carlos Pulido](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 12:21:49 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Carlos Pulido
carlos.a.pulido@protonmail.com
1795 Ofarrell St Apt 202
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Seanna Vien](mailto:Seanna.Vien@sfmta.com)
To: mtaboard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](mailto:Breed.Mayor.London@sfmta.com); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfmta.com); [MOD. \(ADM\)](mailto:MOD.ADM@sfmta.com); cac@sfmta.com; clerk@sfcta.org; [MDC \(ADM\)](mailto:MDC.ADM@sfmta.com); [Youthcom. \(BOS\)](mailto:Youthcom@sfmta.com); sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; LukeBornheimer@gmail.com
Subject: Urging you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy at your next meeting
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:07:53 AM

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

Hi SFMTA Board of Directors,

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

In response to the citywide No Turn On Red campaign and overwhelmingly positive support from the public, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted Supervisor Preston's resolution urging you and SFMTA to approve a citywide NTOR policy now, and the people of San Francisco need you to take immediate action and lead on this issue for their safety, roadway safety generally in the city, and climate action, among other related matters.

SFMTA's own evaluation showed that 92% of drivers complied with No Turn On Red, close calls decreased by 80%, and drivers blocking crosswalks decreased 72% after SFMTA implemented NTOR at 50 intersections in the Tenderloin in 2021. No Turn On Red increases safety, access, and comfort for people, and an overwhelming majority of drivers comply with NTOR, even with traffic enforcement at historic lows. A citywide No Turn On Red policy is an easy win for roadway safety and having a citywide policy will only increase compliance. A citywide policy also has widespread public support, including from people who primarily drive, some of whom talk about how a citywide policy would make driving more intuitive and reduce stress from other drivers aggressing at them when the driver behind them wants to turn on red.

Furthermore, an analysis from Washington, DC showed that drivers failing to yield to people crossing the street on a green decreased by nearly 60% — No Turn On Red increases safety for people during green lights in addition red lights. That same analysis showed that No Turn On Red decreased conflicts between cars by 97% — No Turn On Red makes streets significantly safer for car drivers and passengers. Other studies found that allowing turns on red significantly increases crashes and injuries for people walking and people on bikes. The data is clear: Implementing a citywide No Turn On Red policy will make streets safer for all people, especially children, seniors, people living with disabilities, and people walking and on bikes.

You can find all of the information (and related sources) at NTORsf.com.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis, with nearly 40 people being killed on our streets last year — the most since we committed to Vision Zero in 2014 — and supporting this resolution is the least we can do to address that crisis. The people of San Francisco need leadership on our roadway safety crisis, and this is a small but impactful thing you can do to help our city take action in addressing that crisis.

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

From: [Timothy Green](#)
To: mtaboard@sfmta.com
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MOD. \(ADM\)](#); cac@sfmta.com; clerk@sfcta.org; [MDC \(ADM\)](#); [Youthcom. \(BOS\)](#); sfbicycleadvisorycommittee@gmail.com; LukeBornheimer@gmail.com
Subject: Urging you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy at your next meeting
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 2:20:21 AM

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

Hi SFMTA Board of Directors,

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

In response to the citywide No Turn On Red campaign and overwhelmingly positive support from the public, the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted Supervisor Preston’s resolution urging you and SFMTA to approve a citywide NTOR policy now, and the people of San Francisco need you to take immediate action and lead on this issue for their safety, roadway safety generally in the city, and climate action, among other related matters.

SFMTA’s own evaluation showed that 92% of drivers complied with No Turn On Red, close calls decreased by 80%, and drivers blocking crosswalks decreased 72% after SFMTA implemented NTOR at 50 intersections in the Tenderloin in 2021. No Turn On Red increases safety, access, and comfort for people, and an overwhelming majority of drivers comply with NTOR, even with traffic enforcement at historic lows. A citywide No Turn On Red policy is an easy win for roadway safety and having a citywide policy will only increase compliance. A citywide policy also has widespread public support, including from people who primarily drive, some of whom talk about how a citywide policy would make driving more intuitive and reduce stress from other drivers aggressing at them when the driver behind them wants to turn on red.

Furthermore, an analysis from Washington, DC showed that drivers failing to yield to people crossing the street on a green decreased by nearly 60% — No Turn On Red increases safety for people during green lights in addition red lights. That same analysis showed that No Turn On Red decreased conflicts between cars by 97% — No Turn On Red makes streets significantly safer for car drivers and passengers. Other studies found that allowing turns on red significantly increases crashes and injuries for people walking and people on bikes. The data is clear: Implementing a citywide No Turn On Red policy will make streets safer for all people, especially children, seniors, people living with disabilities, and people walking and on bikes.

You can find all of the information (and related sources) at NTORSf.com.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis, with nearly 40 people being killed on our streets last year —

the most since we committed to Vision Zero in 2014 — and supporting this resolution is the least we can do to address that crisis. The people of San Francisco need leadership on our roadway safety crisis, and this is a small but impactful thing you can do to help our city take action in addressing that crisis.

I urge you to propose and approve a citywide No Turn On Red (NTOR) policy at your next board meeting — scheduled for October 17th — to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street, especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities, while making streets safer and more predictable for car drivers and safer for people on bikes, scooters, and other forms of active transportation.

Sincerely,
Timothy Green, AICP

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Michael Spring](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 8:30:46 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Michael Spring

Michael Spring
michael_spring@me.com
2078 33rd Avenue

San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Elliot Schwartz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 4:14:23 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Elliot Schwartz
elliot.schwartz@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94110-4810

From: [Leticia Colnago](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 6:56:43 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Leticia Colnago
kryptonkitty@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Carter Rogers](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 10:27:02 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to encourage you to support a citywide no turn on red policy. Benefits to cyclists and pedestrians are clear, and I'm sure you have received many letters highlighting these. I would like to add that this policy can benefit drivers, too.

That's because, as a driver, I wholeheartedly support a No Turn On Red Policy.

Such a policy can make driving a safer, less stressful activity. Drivers will no longer feel pressured to make unsafe maneuvers because drivers behind them are pressuring them to turn right into traffic when it might not be safe to do so.

No turn on red policies were created in the 70s as a response to concerns idling cars would increase gas consumption. However, these same considerations are far less applicable to modern vehicles, especially EVs. We now need to consider the current reality of far too many preventable roadside deaths and injuries.

California has led the way by banning the sale of new gas powered cars by 2035. Now, San Francisco should take the opportunity to be a leader in the area of road safety, and eliminate right on red.

Carter Rogers
carter.rog@gmail.com
360 Berry St, APT 423
San Francisco, California 94158

From: [Nathaniel Edwards](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:46:42 PM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Nathaniel

Nathaniel Edwards
nedwards@gmail.com
206 Steiner Street, Apt 6

San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Sweta Sanghavi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please approve a citywide No Turn On Red policy to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to cross the street...
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:35:15 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Sweta Sanghavi
swetagsanghavi@gmail.com

Oakland, California 94605

From: [Matthew Janes](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support a citywide No Turn On Red policy
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:47:10 AM

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve a citywide No Turn On Red to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco as well as make streets safer and more predictable for car drivers. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for children, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco (e.g. the 50 intersections in the Tenderloin). Now is the time to expand No Turn On Red citywide, so drivers know this unsafe behavior is no longer permitted throughout the city while people can feel safe crossing the street with easier and greater access.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to shift trips from cars to public transportation and active transportation (e.g. bikes, scooters, skateboards, mobility devices, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will increase roadway safety (decrease roadway injuries) and help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, making our city safer for people, especially people who are disproportionately negatively impacted by our roadway safety crisis and car-dominated transportation system (children, seniors, people living with disabilities, BIPOC). We need your leadership to make this street safety improvement now.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything in your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow SFMTA to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection — which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost and using significantly less staff time — and legislation to implement No Turn On Red statewide.

Thank you,

Matthew Janes
mjanes@gmail.com
3440 20th St, Apt 201
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 15 Letters Regarding File No. 231020
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 12:07:12 PM
Attachments: [15 Letters Regarding File No. 231020.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 15 letters regarding **File No. 231020:**

Motion amending the Board of Supervisors' Rules of Order by revising Rule 1.3.3 (In-Person and Remote Public Comment) to discontinue remote public comment by members of the public at meetings of the Board and its committees, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Britta Shoot](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please keep remote public comment at BoS meetings
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:39:20 AM

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

Hello all,

I have lived and worked in District 3 for over a decade and am writing to ask that you please keep remote public comment at Board of Supervisors meetings.

Remote access to city meetings has been one of the few beneficial changes to come about during the ongoing pandemic, and taking this away now punishes the very citizens who should be most heard: those with vulnerable health, the elderly, working parents, other carers, and folks of color. It's frustrating and frankly insulting to beg city leaders who self-identify as progressive to maintain inclusive practices for democracy.

This is much like how many of my healthcare providers, knowing I am at risk at Covid complications, will either not mask at all, or make me beg them for this accommodation. It is everyone's right to access basic services and engage with democratic processes, yet the lack of leadership in responding to the threat of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic prevents many of us from doing so.

Many San Franciscans are admittedly wary of public comment in the first place, as it prioritizes the voices and opinions of those who have the luxury of taking time in the middle of the day to weigh in on matters that impact us all. If we're going to keep up the somewhat farcical commitment to public comment that barely includes the full public body in the first place, the minimum best I ask that you do is to maintain remote access for all. This makes it possible to hear a wider diversity of voices, and it makes us all better, together.

Thank you,
Britta Shoot, D3 SF

From: [anastasia.Yovanopoulos](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Retain Remote Public comment
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 1:12:23 PM

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

Dear Supervisors

Retain Remote Public comment

Good Day Supervisors, I'm Anastasia Yovanopoulos, a District #8 senior

Supervisor Peskin's proposed legislation to restrict public comment to "in-person public comment" would stifle the voices of members of the public, and is therefore unfair and undemocratic.

I am opposed to **any** limitation of remote public access to meetings of the Board and its committees, or to any meetings of other San Francisco governmental commissions, committees, etc., including regional bodies the Supervisors may serve on.

I'm a senior SF resident, in my mid-seventies. It is now a hardship for me to come to City Hall to deliver my public comment. I appreciate the ability to "call-in" to the BOS and commissions to give public comment.

Let's preserve and expand participation from seniors, people with disabilities, working people, parents, and everyone.

We know now that remote participation is possible. Every public meeting **MUST** continue to have an option for all members of the public to make comments.

Requiring the disabled to publicly declare their disability to be able to testify remotely is reprehensible and should not be codified into city policy. Remote public access must continue to be equally available to all, without labeling, extra requirements, disability Oaths, or government certification.

I am asking you not to limit public comment to those physically present in the BOS and commission chambers or to unfairly call attention to disabled people.

Furthermore as a District # 8 Senior tenant, I share the sentiments expressed by the REP Coalition in our letter sent to the Rules committee to **urge retaining remote public comment**. It strikes the right balance between our concern and sensitivity and gives lawmakers concrete suggestions for screening out hate speech mongers.

" While REP-SF shares concerns about hateful and discriminatory remarks shared during remote public comment, we also have experienced that increased access has led to greater participation from historically marginalized communities throughout the City. Remote public comment has provided a critical opportunity for our communities to be involved and directly participate in the decision-making around important policies and issues that impact our daily lives. Allowing remote public comment promotes accessibility, equity, and the core values of a participatory democracy. Many disabled people, seniors, and low-income and working-class communities often are unable to travel to City Hall or cannot take time off from their day jobs to provide in-person public comment. **Remote public comment allows our most vulnerable communities to have the same access to our decision-makers as those who have the time and ability to attend meetings in-person.**"

Please to explore and implement solutions that screen out disruptors while retaining remote public comment to allow our communities access to these important discussions at the Board.

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos

From: [Kimberly Rohrbach](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Opposition to item 46 on tomorrow's agenda (motion to revise revising Rule 1.3.3)
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 4:32:43 PM

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

Board Members:

I understand that tomorrow the Board will be voting on Supervisor Peskin's motion to discontinue remote public comment by members of the public (except as legally required to provide accommodation for persons with disabilities). I write in opposition. A small minority of this city's residents have the luxury to take time out of their work day, or to take time away from other essential obligations, in order to physically attend Board meetings. Neither do they have broad access to lobbyists or consultants who will represent their interests. The remote comment option allows such people to periodically monitor the status of line items while otherwise going about their activities.

Regardsm

[Kimberly Rohrbach](#)
(415) 756-2896

From: [Kimberly Rohrbach](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: CORRECTED opposition to item 46 on tomorrow's agenda (motion to revise revising Rule 1.3.3)
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:45:20 PM

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

Board Members:

My email sent Oct 16 at 4:32 pm was written in haste and it contained typos (I was in the middle of handling separate time-sensitive matters when I heard about tomorrow's vote). What I meant to say was this:

A small minority of this city's residents have the luxury to take time out of their work day, or to take time away from other essential obligations, in order to physically attend Board meetings. Even a smaller minority have broad access to lobbyists or consultants who will represent their interests before the Board (although I believe that elected representatives need to quite literally hear from the voters firsthand). Retaining the remote comment option would allow at least a portion of the majority who are **NOT** able to physically attend meetings to have an opportunity to speak. This option allows a person to monitor the status of line items while waiting in queue--no matter where they are situated or what they are doing.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Kim Rohrbach

On Mon, Oct 16, 2023 at 4:32 PM Kimberly Rohrbach <kmrohrbach@gmail.com> wrote:
Board Members:

I understand that tomorrow the Board will be voting on Supervisor Peskin's motion to discontinue remote public comment by members of the public (except as legally required to provide accommodation for persons with disabilities). I write in opposition. A small minority of this city's residents have the luxury to take time out of their work day, or to take time away from other essential obligations, in order to physically attend Board meetings. Neither do they have broad access to lobbyists or consultants who will represent their interests. The remote comment option allows such people to periodically monitor the status of line items while otherwise going about their activities.

Regardsm

Kimberly Rohrbach
(415) 756-2896

From: [lgpetty](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Keep Remote Public Comment /Oppose 231020/ Add to File and Distribute to All Supervisors & Aides
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 12:22:20 AM

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

October 17, 2023

Dear Supervisors,

I oppose Pres. Peskin's proposal to eliminate remote public comment for all at Supervisors' Board and Committee meetings.

It would be a rashly-made mistake and a deliberate blow to a democratic San Francisco, as well as a gift to all who would like to operate in our city without restraint or scrutiny of the public.

Such a ban would most certainly allow the haters to win. It would exclude a great many genuinely concerned, civic-minded residents, including myself, from participating in government meetings where life-affecting decisions are made.

I believe the solution lies in designating a staff person at each meeting to: within 7 seconds cut off abhorrent disruptors with a warning and then cut them off altogether within another 7 seconds if the warning isn't heeded. This would be a lot more efficient and definitely a lot less expensive than a \$10 million 7-second delay tech system.

I have myself heard some callers-- I can recognize in the first few seconds that they are a hate-caller-- being allowed to go on for a full minute or more, before they are cut off. In some cases they've been allowed to rant uninterrupted for a full 2-minute period.

Please—set some clear rules and strongly enforce them: no religious, racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, gender, age, class, or cultural slurs, no name-calling or Supervisor name calling-out. These would be widely-accepted as reasonable rules.

As to imposing a pre-registration process on people with disabilities: that would be discriminatory, as well as unworkable. Consider that it is widely predicted that by the year 2030, seniors (half of whom have disabilities) and younger folks with disabilities will comprise 30 per cent of San Francisco's population. Declaring themselves publicly as disabled is to mandate prejudicial forced-self-labeling. This exemption is not a solution for seniors and people with disabilities...it would be an instrument of insensitivity and exclusion.

The way forward is to continue allowing remote public comment. Issue a blanket warning that

spells out the rules at the beginning of each meeting. I believe this will work quickly to eliminate the hater-trolls. These calls come in cycles. A firmly-enforced policy will get the message out right away so that haters will move on to targeting another town that, alas, doesn't have, or enforce, clear rules.

Please don't punish all remote participants. Remote call-in technology has enabled 20th century full democratic participation at local government meetings.

To reverse it now would not appear an effort to stop haters; but rather, make it appear a politically- motivated removal of the public as an expendible inconvenience.

You would not...indeed you could not...ban all in-person public comment because of occasional hate-filled disruptors. It is just as unthinkable to do it for remote public comment.

Slow down. Applying wisdom is always better than speed.

Lorraine Petty

Advocate for seniors and people with disabilities

D2 Resident and Voting Senior

From: [Kathy Howard](#)
To: [Joel Engardio](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose eliminating call-in for public comment
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 8:26:15 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I oppose eliminating call-in for public comment for BOS meetings. Over 25 members of the public expressed this opinion at the Rules Committee meeting yesterday. Please note: **THERE WAS NOT EVEN ONE MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WHO SUPPORTED ELIMINATING PUBLIC COMMENT.** And yet the Rules Committee voted to support this effort to censor free speech by those who cannot travel to City Hall and spend four hours there waiting to speak for one or two minutes. The Rules Committee also ignored the pleas of the disabled community, who stated that they were offended that they would have to label themselves as disabled, in order to call in. As one caller said, "That is not who I am."

One of the few positive results of COVID-19 has been the forced modernization of public participation in City government, by allowing people to call in instead of having to come down to City to express an opinion on legislation before the Board.

Of course, insulting or derogatory language should not be permitted. However, I have heard this type of language at in-person meetings. The speaker was immediately cut off. No one at that time suggested that all public in-person comment should be eliminated because of a few obnoxious people.

Many of our residents are seniors or have children at home to care for or have disabilities – allowing them to phone in gives them an opportunity to participate that they would not otherwise have.

What might be some ways to contain derogatory comments?

- Have a time delay. In fact, there is a delay now between the phone call and the public broadcast. I always assumed the purpose was to be able to censor unpleasant language from being broadcast. Let's use the delay to cut off the public broadcast of derogatory comments.
- Cut off the caller immediately. The clerks already do that if someone is the slightest bit over their time limit; why not with bad actors? Yes, this will require a judgment call; to avoid misuse of this power by a clerk, perhaps the chair should confirm that the language required censorship.
- Find a way to identify or register callers ahead of time.
- If the City cannot require registration, then the order of speaking could be: in-person attendees, identified callers, and anonymous callers last. The clerk can then be ready to cut off a caller in that last group.

By eliminating remote public comment, the BOS is letting the 'haters' win. Please do not support this measure.

Thank you for your consideration.

Katherine Howard

Outer Sunset

From: [T.Flandrich](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Item 46 File # 231020 Limiting Remote Public Comment IN OPPOSITION
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 9:31:38 AM

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

Dear President Peskin and Board Supervisors,
I write to you today in opposition to this ordinance which would eliminate the participation of the many San Franciscans who have finally, and for some, for the first time been allowed to voice concerns impacting their lives via remote public comment.

Please—set some clear rules and strongly enforce them: no religious, racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, gender, age, class, or cultural slurs, no name-calling or Supervisor name calling-out. These would be widely-accepted as reasonable rules.

As to imposing a pre-registration process on people with disabilities: that would be discriminatory, as well as unworkable. Consider that it is widely predicted that by the year 2030, seniors (half of whom have disabilities) and younger folks with disabilities will comprise 30 per cent of San Francisco's population. Declaring themselves publicly as disabled is to mandate prejudicial forced-self-labeling. This exemption is not a solution for seniors and people with disabilities...it would be an instrument of insensitivity and

exclusion.

The way forward is to continue allowing remote public comment. Issue a blanket warning that spells out the rules at the beginning of each meeting. I believe this will work quickly to eliminate the hater-trolls. These calls come in cycles. A firmly-enforced policy will get the message out right away so that haters will move on to targeting another town that, alas, doesn't have, or enforce, clear rules.

Please don't punish all remote participants. To reverse access now would not appear as an effort to stop haters; but rather, make it appear as a politically- motivated removal of the public as an expendable inconvenience.

Thank you for your consideration and your vote in opposition to this ordinance.

Theresa Flandrich
North Beach Tenants Committee

From: [Steve Leeds](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Joel Engardio](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please keep public comment - very important!
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 10:46:43 AM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

Please don't end public comment before the BoS meetings and committees. Democracy in this country is under severe threat and it's imperative that the public be able to comment on issues of concern. This is particularly important for seniors and people with disabilities.

As a Jewish person who has faced anti-Jewish Semitism, those and racist comments are extremely disturbing. Please consider measures like adding a delay so that any racist or antisemitic comments can be filtered out.

Thank you.

Steve Leeds
Inner Sunset
District 7

From: [Art Persyko](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SAVE REMOTE PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE SF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & ITS COMMITTEE MEETINGS!
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 10:50:26 AM

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

Dear SF Board of Supervisors:

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end almost all remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.

Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

Alternatives exist to avoid this overly broad over reaction and they include but are not limited to:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
- 4) Updating the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote "NO" today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not "throw the baby out with the bathwater" by completely eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may for a great number of reasons not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by providing useful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

Thank you!

Sincerely, Art Persyko, San Francisco

From: [Maria Zamudio](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Save Remote Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:08:56 AM

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

Supervisors:

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.

Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

Alternatives exist to avoid this overly broad over reaction and they include but are not limited to:

1. cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
2. a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
3. expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
4. Updating the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote “NO” today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not “throw the baby out with the bathwater” by completely eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may for a great number of reasons not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by providing useful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

Thank you!

Our offices are currently closed to the public in response to public health recommendations regarding COVID-19. If you are contacting us regarding counseling: please call (415-703-8644) and provide your name, phone number, and we will have a counselor return your call as soon as possible. We will not be meeting tenants in person for the time being. We will announce any changes to our programming via our newsletter and [facebook](#) if you want to follow along. Thank you!

Maria I. Zamudio (she/her)
Organizing Director
(w): 415-703-8634
(c): 415-226-6438
Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco (HRCSF)
1212 Market St., Unit 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

www.hrcsf.org | <https://www.facebook.com/housingrightsSF/>

From: [Betty Traynor](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Retain Remote Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:20:47 AM

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

Hello S.F. Board of Supervisors,

We at Senior and Disability Action urge you to vote in favor of retaining remote public comment at the board meetings.

As you know there are many seniors, people with disabilities, people who work, people with childcare duties who want to speak out on issues before you and cannot attend the meetings in person.

We understand that a few people call with hateful words that none of us want to hear but thankfully these are rare occurrences. S.F. is one of the Tech Capitals of the world--Certainly we can figure a way to delay the calls a few seconds and eliminate such hateful speech.

I am confident you can find a solution and will continue to hear the voices of all your constituents whether in person or remotely.

Thank you very much.

Betty Traynor
SDA Board President

From: [Simone Manganeli](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Vote NO on Limiting Remote Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:22:02 AM

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

During an ongoing pandemic (one which most politicians in San Francisco are pretending doesn't exist anymore), it is vital that we preserve remote public comment for all San Francisco city government meetings.

The pandemic created an opportunity for all San Franciscans to be able to participate in public comment, instead of placing the onerous requirement that people must show up to meetings in person, and put their health at risk. Despite the exception for the legal requirement "to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings", I don't believe that City Hall is actually going to do that in any meaningful way, and it WILL impact people with disabilities or people who just want to preserve their health so that they DON'T become disabled because of COVID or long COVID.

It's unconscionable that the Board of Supervisors is getting ready to end remote public comment entirely, when all San Franciscans deserve to participate.

Please vote NO on ending remote public comment. There are so many better ways to accomplish making public comment better, including:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
- 4) Updatling the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

— Simone

From: [elissam68](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Remote Access
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:41:40 AM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please, please keep remote access available for those of us over 75 and for those of us taking care of disabled spouses and other vulnerable family. The ability to participate in public forums keeps us engaged in the vital business of the city. I realize bad actors intrude on public meetings; a time delay like they use on TV (see Oscar Awards, etc.) ought to be a good fix.

Thank you,

Elissa Matross

From: [Eihway Su](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: AVE REMOTE PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE SF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & ITS COMMITTEE MEETINGS
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 12:03:20 PM

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

DEAR SUPERVISOR,

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.

Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

Alternatives exist to avoid this overly broad over reaction and they include but are not limited to:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
- 4) Updatling the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote "NO" today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not "throw the baby out with the bathwater" by completely eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may for a great number of reasons not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by providing useful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

Thank you!

Eihway Su
170 Parnassus Avenue, #2
SF CA 94117

From: [Jeantelle Laberinto](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Letter re: File #231020, "Amending the Rules of Order - Limiting Remote Public Comment Opportunities"
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 5:53:34 PM
Attachments: [Letter re Remote Public Comment Oct132023.pdf](#)

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

Dear Chair Dorsey and the Rules Committee,

Please find the attached letter from the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP-SF) regarding File #231020, "Amending the Rules of Order - Limiting Remote Public Comment Opportunities," which is on the Rules Committee agenda this coming Monday, October 16th.

Respectfully,
Jeantelle Laberinto
on behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition



13 October 2023

Chair of the Rules Committee, Supervisor Dorsey
Rules Committee Members, Supervisors Walton and Safai

Re: [File #231020](#), "Amending the Rules of Order - Limiting Remote Public Comment Opportunities"

Dear Rules Committee Chair Dorsey and Supervisors Walton and Safai:

The Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition of San Francisco (REP-SF) strongly condemns the abusive, misogynistic, and anti-Semitic remarks directed at members of the Board of Supervisors through remote public comment during public meetings of the Board. Hate speech, in any form, is unacceptable. As a City, we must take a strong stand against allowing hate speech in any public forum and implement the necessary steps to ensure safety to both our elected officials and our communities, who have the right to voice their concerns and participate in important discussions during public meetings.

While REP-SF shares concerns about hateful and discriminatory remarks shared during remote public comment, we also have experienced that increased access has led to greater participation from historically marginalized communities throughout the City. Remote public comment has provided a critical opportunity for our communities to be involved and directly participate in the decision-making around important policies and issues that impact our daily lives. Allowing remote public comment promotes accessibility, equity, and the core values of a participatory democracy. Many disabled people, seniors, and low-income and working-class communities often are unable to travel to City Hall or cannot take time off from their day jobs to provide in-person public comment. Remote public comment allows our most vulnerable communities to have the same access to our decision-makers as those who have the time and ability to attend meetings in-person.

Therefore, we urge the Rules Committee to explore and implement solutions that screen out disruptors while retaining remote public comment to allow our communities access to these important discussions at the Board.

REP-SF recommends exploring the following solutions:

- Develop a system to register and submit caller information and phone numbers prior to public meetings, and maintain this registration list for future public meetings. Only people who have previously registered their numbers with the Clerk of the Board would be allowed to call in for remote public comment.

- Designate City staff members to immediately cut off members of the public who share hateful or discriminatory remarks; and limit or deny their future access to remote public comment (via the registration list).
- Implement a 1 minute delay on streaming to ensure ample time to cut out speech from disruptors.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeantelle Laberinto

on behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition, San Francisco

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 16 Letters Regarding File No. 231020
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:35:54 PM
Attachments: [16 Letters Regarding File No. 231020.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 16 Letters Regarding File No. 231020:

Motion amending the Board of Supervisors' Rules of Order by revising Rule 1.3.3 (In-Person and Remote Public Comment) to discontinue remote public comment by members of the public at meetings of the Board and its committees, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Melanie Grossman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 12:21:34 PM

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

DEAR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.

Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

Alternatives exist:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
- 4) Updating the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote "NO" today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited. Elderly people and San Franciscan's with disabilities will be particularly hurt by this!

Melanie Grossman, PhD, MSW

1

Thank you!

--



Melanie Durand Grossman, PhD, LCSW

Author and Speaker: [Crossing Bayou Teche](#), A memoir about growing up in southern Louisiana in the 1940s and 50s.

Book, Ebook, & Audio available on [Amazon](#).

From: [Michael Stoutmire](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SAVE REMOTE PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE SF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETINGS AND COMMITTEES
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 12:33:23 PM

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

DEAR SF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment at the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.

Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

Alternatives exist to avoid this overly broad overreaction, and they include but are not limited to:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments.
- 2) a 7-second delay (as used in radio call-in broadcasts).
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several-second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV.
- 4) Updating the cost estimate of an audio delay system and exploring philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote “NO” today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to investigate alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not “throw the baby out with the bathwater” by

eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may, for a significant number of reasons, not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by giving helpful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

Thank you!

Michael O. Stoutmire
San Francisco, CA, 94115
m. 404-904-3009
e. stoutmire@outlook.com

From: [Serena Hughes](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: STOP TAKING OUR DEMOCRACY AWAY!!!
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:10:56 PM

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

DEAR SUPERVISOR _____

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.

Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

Alternatives exist to avoid this overly broad over reaction and they include but are not limited to:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
- 4) Updatling the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote "NO" today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not "throw the baby out with the bathwater" by completely eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may for a great number of reasons not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by providing useful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

Thank You & Wishing You Excellent Health!

Pissed Off Taxpayer,

Serena Hughes
Pronouns: she/her/hers
Main: 415.728.5026

From: [Mikiko Huang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Mikiko Huang](#)
Subject: "SAVE REMOTE PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE SF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETINGS AND ITS COMMITTEES."
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:11:08 PM

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

DEAR SF Board of Supervisors:

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.

Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

ALTERNATIVES exist to avoid this overly broad over reaction and they include but are not limited to:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;**
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);**
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;**
- 4) Updating the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.**

Please vote "NO" today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not "throw the baby out with the bathwater" by completely eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may for a great number of reasons not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by providing useful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

Thank you!

Helen Mikiko Huang
Resident of District 7

From: [David C](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Remote comment during Public hearings.
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:12:30 PM

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

SAVE REMOTE PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE SF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETINGS AND ITS COMMITTEES. FIND ANY OR ALL SF BOARD MEMBERS' PHONE NUMBERS HERE

Please please save remote public comments to the SF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETINGS and its' committees. I implore you to do the right thing and protect the constitutional right of peaceful assembly both offline and online. Not doing so is not only immoral but will also end up costing San Francisco the expense of litigation that will inevitably result if the banning of online commenting goes through. With our tight budget we can ill afford to do so. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

**David Counts
810 Eddy Street, #602
SF, 94109
415-875-0910**

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Justice Dumlao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SAVE REMOTE PUBLIC COMMENT
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:19:10 PM

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

Hi Supervisors,

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee. Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it. If remote public comment were to be removed then the type of people who would have access to public comment would be extremely limited and thus creating an even more stringent echo chamber. Only people who have the ability to leave their jobs/caretaking responsibilities would have this option.

Alternatives exist to avoid this overly broad over reaction and they include but are not limited to:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
- 4) Updating the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote “NO” today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not “throw the baby out with the bathwater” by completely eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may for a great number of reasons not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by providing useful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

Kindly,

Justice Dumlao (Resident of District 1)

University of California Santa Barbara Alumnus, Class of 2020

Genentech

Pronouns: He/Him/They/Them

C:650-576-5669

From: [Janea Jackson](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Sara Shortt](#)
Subject: Save remote public comment – Vote No on agenda item #46
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:28:34 PM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment at meetings of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and its Committees.

Remote public comment has been an improvement to accessible democracy that promotes equity, inclusion and civic engagement by ensuring that all San Franciscans – not just those with resources and privilege – can participate. Limiting public comment to in-person testimony excludes working people, parents, seniors, caregivers, people without transportation, and many others, with the greatest impact on communities of color.

We respectfully urge you to vote “NO” today, and to explore alternative legal and functional measures to mitigate the risk of abusive and discriminatory comments.

Thank you!

Regards,
Janéa Jackson | CEO
HomeRise

From: [David C](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Remote commenting during public hearing
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:28:41 PM

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

A point that I left out is the specific harm that will come to people with disabilities if remote commenting is disallowed. I work with friends who have disabilities that are simply not able to physically be present during hearing. However they can be present online. Again to take the right away from me, my friends, and a multitude of San Franciscans will be immoral. It to will be grounds for costly litigation because its' an affront to the ADA. Myself, my friend, and the multitude will act both with civic demonstrations and legal action. Please do the right thing.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,

David Counts
810 Eddy st. 602
San Francisco, 94109
415-875-0910

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: helainesf@aol.com
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: alternatives to ending remote public comments
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:42:46 PM

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

DEAR SUPERVISOR Mandelman and all others:

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.

Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

Alternatives exist to avoid this overly broad over reaction and they include but are not limited to:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
- 4) Updatlng the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote "NO" today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not "throw the baby out with the bathwater" by completely eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may for a great number of reasons not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by providing useful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

From: [Evelyn Posamentier](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); aaron.peskin@sfgov.org; [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: PLEASE SAVE REMOTE PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE SF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETINGS AND ITS COMMITTEES
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:51:24 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.

Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

Alternatives exist to avoid this overly broad over reaction and they include but are not limited to:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
- 4) Updatling the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote "NO" today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not "throw the baby out with the bathwater" by completely eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may for a great number of reasons not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by providing useful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

Thank you very much for listening,

Evelyn Posamentier
District 8

From: [Eleana Binder](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Preserve Remote Public Comment – Vote No on Agenda Item #46
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:57:04 PM

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

Dear President Peskin and Board of Supervisors,

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment at meetings of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and its Committees. Discontinuing remote public comment for everyone except for people with recognized disabilities would be an unacceptable obstacle to community participation in democracy. There are ways to address recent unacceptable incidents, without discontinuing access to everyone.

Remote public comment has made it possible for some community members to participate in meetings for the first time, and it should be allowed for all, rather than only as a “reasonable accommodation.” Government should desire and encourage more participation from constituents — not less — and be looking at ways to promote equity and inclusion, and remove barriers to access. Working people, parents, and people with immunocompromised household members all have legitimate reasons that make it difficult for them to come to City Hall in the middle of a weekday, including: work schedules, transportation challenges, childcare responsibilities, and risk of exposure to COVID-19. GLIDE serves many of these populations, and it is already difficult for them to call in for public comment, but it is nearly impossible for some of them to come in person. GLIDE also works with survivors of domestic violence, and they deserve a safe, secure, and private way to engage in meetings.

During a time when we need to increase connections and trust in government, ending remote public comment will only widen the divide between the community and its elected leaders. Eliminating this avenue to participate in our government would effectively shut down the voices of those who are unable to participate in person at City Hall. We respectfully request a NO vote on this motion.

Thank you,

Eleana Binder

--

Eleana Binder

Policy Manager

Center for Social Justice

GLIDE 330 Ellis Street, Room 511, San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICE (415) 674-6162 | **MOBILE** (510) 926-2834 | **PRONOUNS** She/Her

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Glide. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. GLIDE accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

From: [Calder Lorenz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Item #46: Vote No on Limiting Remote Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 1:57:48 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I live and work in San Francisco and regularly use remote public comment in order to participate in our democracy. I am writing to ask that you please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.

Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

Alternatives exist to avoid this overly broad over reaction and they include but are not limited to:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
- 4) UpdatIng the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote "NO" today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not diminish our democratic public comment system by completely eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may for a great number of reasons not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by providing useful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

In Community, Calder

--

Calder G. Lorenz

calderlorenz.com

(415)-571-6391

From: [Alisha Zhao](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Save remote public comment – Vote No on agenda item #46
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 2:23:49 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-cov4cuba.png](#)
[Outlook-s4ezqs42.png](#)
[Outlook-uqq45jzr.png](#)
[Outlook-ogolskua.png](#)
[Outlook-cvmyva0v.png](#)
[Outlook-zn3h134o.png](#)

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

To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment at meetings of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and its Committees.

Remote public comment has been an improvement to accessible democracy that promotes equity, inclusion and civic engagement by ensuring that all San Franciscans – not just those with resources and privilege – can participate. Limiting public comment to in-person testimony excludes working people, parents, seniors, caregivers, people without transportation, and many others, with the greatest impact on communities of color.

We respectfully urge you to vote “NO” today, and to explore alternative legal and functional measures to mitigate the risk of abusive and discriminatory comments.



Alisha Zhao
She/Her ([Why pronouns?](#))
Policy and Organizing Manager
Compass Family Services
37 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 | tel 415-644-0504 x 1134
www.compass-sf.org



From: [William R. Alschuler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please don't end remote connections to Supes meetings
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 2:56:36 PM

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

Please don't end remote connections to Supervisors and other public meetings.
They are really valuable!

William R. Alschuler
San Francisco, Ca.
415-725-3800 mobile

From: [Herman \(Homer,Mort\) Hobi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please do not end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 10:19:56 AM

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

DEAR SUPERVISORS

Please reject or at least delay any decision to end remote public comment to the SF Board of Supervisors meetings (and meetings of its committees) as recommended by the Rules Committee.
Remote public comment during the pandemic was an improvement in SF democracy that we should not so easily toss aside because a small number of individuals abused it.

Alternatives exist to avoid this overly broad over reaction and they include but are not limited to:

- 1) cutting off a person who makes inappropriate comments;
- 2) a 7 second delay (as is used in radio call in broadcasts);
- 3) expanding the capacity of a several second delay that already exists in audio of SF Board and committee hearings by SF GOV TV;
- 4) Updatling the estimate of the cost of an audio delay system and explore philanthropic options and technical assistance from San Francisco tech companies.

Please vote "NO" today on this matter and/or at least ask for a delay to look into alternatives more carefully. If all else fails, please sunset this decision so it is not permanent and can be revisited.

We should not "throw the baby out with the bathwater" by completely eliminating (with few exceptions) remote public comment that would disempower many members of the public who may for a great number of reasons not be able to come to City Hall in person and are currently providing a public service to SF by providing useful feedback to the SF Board of Supervisors and its committees.

Thank you!

--

Herman (Homer, Mort) Hobi

"Life is Life, Fun is fun, but it's all so quiet when the goldfish dies and ever so peaceful." "
West with the Night" by Beryl Markham

"So potent was religion in persuading to do wrong." Lucretius died 50BC

Doing my part to help people in the world. www.rampusa.org

415 531-6158 cell

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SF Police Full Staffing charter amendment
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:24:22 AM
Attachments: [image022174.png](#)

Hello,

Please see below message regarding public safety.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Shadd Newman <Shadd.Newman@trinitysf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 5:41 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: SF Police Full Staffing charter amendment

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

Boad of Supervisors,

I both live and work in District 6. I strongly support Supervisor Dorsey's proposed charter amendment to ensure San Franciscan's have the police resources we need to feel safe in our City.

Many of my neighbors that I have spoken with agree with me and share a strong concern for public safety. I encourage you to support the charter amendment and let the residents of San Francisco vote on it this coming March.

Thank you,

Shadd Newman
SVP Asset Management
[\(415\) 575-3356](tel:4155753356)



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.

trinitysf.com

[Email Disclaimer](#)

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 176 Letters Regarding File No. 230985
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:44:21 PM
Attachments: [176 Letters Regarding File No. 230985.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 176 Letters Regarding File No. 230985:

Charter Amendment (First Draft) to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to establish minimum staffing levels for sworn officers of the Police Department.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Sean Stenstrom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for Full Staffing Charter Amendment - File #230985
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:26:56 AM

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I hope this email finds you in good health and high spirits. My name is Sean Stenstrom, and I am a parent proudly residing within the San Francisco community. I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed Full Staffing Charter Amendment which would re-establish a minimum police staffing level within our city.

As a concerned parent, I believe it is crucial for our City government to prioritize public safety as a key issue for all San Franciscans. The Full Staffing Charter Amendment aims to ensure precisely that, by focusing on maintaining an effective police presence. This, in turn, will contribute to a safer and more secure environment for our children, families, and all citizens who call San Francisco home.

This proposed amendment also carries significant democratic value, as it seeks to provide the voters with an opportunity to weigh in on such a critical measure. With the health and safety of our city at stake, it is essential that the San Francisco community has a chance to participate in deciding the outcome of this amendment. By placing this issue on the ballot for next March, you will empower our voices and facilitate a more engaged and collaborative approach to public safety policy in our city.

I respectfully submit my support for the Full Staffing Charter Amendment and encourage you, our elected representatives, to prioritize this policy in the best interests of our community's safety. Let us work together towards a brighter future for San Francisco and uphold the values that make our city a thriving and welcoming place to live.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. I look forward to your response and the Board of Supervisors' actions to address the pressing need for full police staffing in our communities.

Sincerely,

Sean Stenstrom
District 6

From: [Rana Chang](#)
To: [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support File #230985 (Police Full Staffing Charter Amendment) in the subject heading, sent
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 10:39:51 AM

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

To whom it may concern

I am a homeowner on 520 Natoma St, SF. I would like to encourage support for the amendment for full staffing of the police. The city has always claimed to be short staffed and the drug and street situation has gotten so bad we cannot afford to be understaffed. The crime has attracted more crime so under staffing costs us more and more in the long run.

Much thanks for your service

Rana

1. ***Support File #230985 (Police Full Staffing Charter Amendment)*** in the subject heading, sent

From: [Linda Mathews](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:04:39 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Linda Mathews , Linda.mathews@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Ashley Wessinger](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:09:19 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ashley Wessinger, ashleywessinger@mac.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

Ashley Wessinger

From: [Victoria Barret](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:09:30 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Victoria Barret, vbarret@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Alison Fong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:09:31 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Alison Fong , ayfong1@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Andrew Wynn](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:15:28 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Andrew Wynn, wynnandrewj@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Teresa Shaw](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:24:27 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Teresa Shaw, tawny.sapient0c@icloud.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Andrew Homan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:24:29 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Andrew Homan , andrewhoman@mac.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Duncan Kennedy](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:50:53 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Duncan Kennedy, dunkennedy@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Christian Foster](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:00:34 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Christian Foster, fosterchristianj@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Bonnie Kalbrosky](#)
To: [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [David Harrison](#); [John Bryant](#)
Subject: SFPD Full Staffing Act
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:01:08 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I have been a San Francisco resident and worked in the Financial and SOMA districts managing office buildings for over 30 years. I currently live in the Sunset District for now over 20 years and have seen the increase in crime in what used to be a really nice area. I was never concerned about walking around my neighborhood or West Portal, but have seen drug deals on the corners, unattractive cars slowly cruising up and down streets, and won't go to Stonestown unless my husband drops me off right in front of an entrance – I'm not going to risk having my car broken into or someone attacking me in those parking lots. But I've also visibly seen the decline in police officers in the Sunset as well as Downtown. It doesn't feel good. I am always on alert for who/what is around me.

I am writing to ask you to support the SFPD Full Staffing Act because:

- SFPD faces a staffing shortage of over 30%, and up to 50% with upcoming retirements. We must act now to solve this generational issue.
- The national reputation for lack of public safety resources that San Francisco has earned is undercutting our potential revenue sources for the City, from office leasing to tourism. We must send a signal that we are willing to address this.
- We support more proactive community policing activities, including foot-patrols, which cannot be accomplished without more adequate staffing.
- Crime disproportionately impacts our most vulnerable residents, including service workers and other front-line workers that work uncommon hours.

We have GOT to literally make this City safer for its full-time residents as well as for those who commute in to work or travel here from all over the world to visit. And we can't turn around our reputation or the crime statistics without additional police officers.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,
Bonnie Kalbrosky

Bonnie Kalbrosky, RPA, FMA
General Manager

-
Seagate Properties, Inc.

San Francisco, CA

DRE# 01208191

DIRECT LANDLINE: 415-508-4570

MOBILE: 415-412-4067

www.seagateproperties.com

Seagate Properties provides real estate property management, asset management and receivership services to sophisticated clients throughout California.



 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: [Liz Farrell](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:09:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Liz Farrell, lizbriggsfarrell@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Lee Hsu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:09:32 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Lee Hsu, lee@leehsu.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Michelle Hughes](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:12:17 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Michelle Hughes, mawindisch@hotmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [William Brega](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:12:20 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: William Brega, willbrega36@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Jennifer Z Yan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:24:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jennifer Z Yan, jennifer.yan@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Michelle Raczek](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:24:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Michelle Raczek, raczekme@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Dirk Probstel](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:27:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Dirk Probstel, didirkprobstel@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Gnarity Burke](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 12:45:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Gnarity Burke, urban42n81@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Julianne Hopkins](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:15:20 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Julianne Hopkins, juliehopkins@comcast.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Marianne Hesse](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:27:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Marianne Hesse, mhesse@pacbell.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [susan_sangiaco](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:51:20 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: susan sangiacomo, susan333s@outlook.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Natalie Jamison Tiret](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:51:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Natalie Jamison Tiret, nsjamison@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Ryan Tiret](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:54:18 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ryan Tiret, rtiret@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Fred Medick](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:54:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Fred Medick, fredm04@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [michael bradley](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:54:22 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: michael bradley, mbradley@mpbf.co

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Sherry Lau](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:57:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Sherry Lau, slaufu@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Russell Notides](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:57:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Russell Notides, rnotides@mac.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

This is incredibly important for all of San Francisco. All Supervisors should be squirting full staffing of the police!

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [William Evers](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:57:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: William Evers, wevers@tiedemannadvisors.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Brian Mullin](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:57:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Brian Mullin, mulls@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Forrest Liu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:57:32 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Forrest Liu, forrest.liu@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Christopher Nalen](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:00:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Christopher Nalen, christophernalen@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [jeremy.liew](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:00:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: jeremy liew, jeremy@liew.vc

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Andrew Woeber](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:00:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Andrew Woeber, andrew.woeber@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Lee Wittlinger](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:00:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Lee Wittlinger, lee.wittlinger@silverlake.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Jaclyn Safier](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:00:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jaclyn Safier, jsafier@prometheusreg.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Helen Spalding](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:00:34 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Helen Spalding, helenmspalding@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Lindsey Millikan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:00:35 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Lindsey Millikan, lindseymillikan@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Kit Chong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:03:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kit Chong, kittsechong@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Mindy Henderson](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:06:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Mindy Henderson, melinda@hendersonsf.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Nick Podell](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:12:34 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Nick Podell, nick@podell.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Tamara Greenberg](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:15:19 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Tamara Greenberg, tamaragreenberg@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Sandy Tom](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:15:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Sandy Tom, mootomtom@gamil.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Holly Peterson](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:24:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Holly Peterson, holly.peterson@me.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Betsy Blumenthal](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:24:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Betsy Blumenthal, bsq1028@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Barry Baron](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:27:20 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Barry Baron, bbaronmd@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Elliot Evers](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:27:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Elliot Evers , eevers@hl.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Carl Kawaja](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:30:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Carl Kawaja, cmkawaja@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Greg Vilkin](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:30:42 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Greg Vilkin, gvilkin@thebaylands.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Hillary Murphy](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:39:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Hillary Murphy, hillaryjeanette@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Emily Martin](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:42:18 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Emily Martin, emilymartin@me.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Perry Klebahn](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:42:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Perry Klebahn, perry_k2003@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Irina Khait](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:45:18 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Irina Khait, irinakhait27@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Roberta Baron](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:48:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Roberta Baron, robertalbaron@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Katherine August](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:54:17 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Katherine August, kdewildesf@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Katherine August](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:54:18 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Katherine August, kdewildesf@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Katherine August](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:54:19 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Katherine August, kdewildesf@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Julie Purnell](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:54:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Julie Purnell, juliehpurnell@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Katherine August](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:54:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Katherine August, kdewildesf@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [David deWilde](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:54:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: David deWilde, davidde wilde2650@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Lev Kling-Bronstein](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:57:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Lev Kling-Bronstein, lklingbronstein531@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Jennifer Biederbeck](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:57:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jennifer Biederbeck, jbiederbeck@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Laura Kline](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:57:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Laura Kline, lfklaz@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Daphne Alden](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:00:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Daphne Alden, daphne@cal.berkeley.edu

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Timothy Johnson](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:03:17 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Timothy Johnson, tim@timjohnsondesign.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Susan Mackowski](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:03:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Susan Mackowski, susnamackowski@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Ryan Jones](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:03:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ryan Jones, RYAN.J.JONES10@GMAIL.COM

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [David Young](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:03:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: David Young, dave@artichokelabs.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Cassriel, Will](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I support the SFPD Full Staffing Act
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:08:06 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you to support the SFPD Full Staffing Act because:

- SFPD faces a staffing shortage of over 30%, and up to 50% with upcoming retirements. We must act now to solve this generational issue.
- The national reputation for lack of public safety resources that San Francisco has earned is undercutting our potential revenue sources for the City, from office leasing to tourism. We must send a signal that we are willing to address this.
- Share a personal story about how crime has impacted you at work or in your community.
- We support more proactive community policing activities, including foot-patrols, which cannot be accomplished without more adequate staffing.
- Crime disproportionately impacts our most vulnerable residents, including service workers and other front-line workers that work uncommon hours.

Will Cassriel
Tenant Representation
JLL San Francisco
+1 925 876 3602
RE Lic. #02150662



[One of the 2023 World's Most Ethical Companies®](#)

Jones Lang LaSalle

For more information about how JLL processes your personal data, please click [here](#)

This email is for the use of the intended recipient(s) only. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and then delete it. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not keep, use, disclose, copy or distribute this email without the author's prior permission. We have taken precautions to minimize the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks on any attachment to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses. The information contained in this communication may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege. If you are the intended recipient and you do not wish to receive similar electronic messages from us in the future then please respond to the sender to this effect.

From: [Jack Sesto](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Full Staffing ACT
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:14:47 PM

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 support the SFPD Full Staffing Act because:

- SFPD faces a staffing shortage of over 30%, and up to 50% with upcoming retirements. We must act now to solve this generational issue.
- The national reputation for lack of public safety resources that San Francisco has earned is undercutting our potential revenue sources for the City, from office leasing to tourism. We must send a signal that we are willing to address this.
- Share a personal story about how crime has impacted you at work or in your community.
- We support more proactive community policing activities, including foot-patrols, which cannot be accomplished without more adequate staffing.
- Crime disproportionately impacts our most vulnerable residents, including service workers and other front-line workers that work uncommon hours.

Jack Sesto

Engineering Manager

ABM | Business & Industry

600 Harrison Street, 6th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94107
415-351-4332 EXT: 111332 (Office)
415-419-9894 (Cell)

Jack.Sesto@abm.com

Interested in joining our team?

We're looking for people who want to make a difference every day. Visit [ABM.com/Careers](https://abm.com/Careers) for opportunities in your area.

ABM's Mission: To make a difference, every person, every day.

The information transmitted is the property of ABM and is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Statements and opinions expressed in this e-mail may not represent those of the company. Any review, retransmission, dissemination and other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete the material from any computer. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secured or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, received late or incomplete, or

could contain viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any error or omission in the contents of this message, which arises as a result of e-mail transmission. www.abm.com

From: [Faizan Ali](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:15:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Faizan Ali, faizanali619@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Sandra Bley](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:15:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Sandra Bley, sandybley@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Roberta Economidis](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:15:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Roberta Economidis, reconomidis@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Richard Leider](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:18:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Richard Leider, rleider@leidergroup.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Josh McHugh](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:18:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Josh McHugh, joshmchugh@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Christine Segalas](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:18:33 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Christine Segalas, lemartinet1@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Pat Houden](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:21:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Pat Houden, phouden@mac.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Kenneth Camp](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:24:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kenneth Camp, kennycamp@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Josh Hartley](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:30:32 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Josh Hartley, joshuahartley92@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Michael Puccinelli](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:39:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Michael Puccinelli , michaelpooch@comcast.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Adam Segall](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:39:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Adam Segall, amsegall1995@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Richard Thieriot](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:39:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Richard Thieriot, rtt@rthieriot.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Christopher Alden](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:45:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Christopher Alden, calden@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Marina Roche](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:48:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Marina Roche, marinaroche@icloud.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Leanna Louie](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:48:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Leanna Louie, leannalouie28@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Jimmy O'sullivan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:51:19 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jimmy O'sullivan , dblbirdy@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Kevin Roche](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:51:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kevin Roche, krochemusic@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Rosemary Mckay](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 3:54:19 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Rosemary Mckay, siobhanorford@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Joyce Yun](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:00:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Joyce Yun, joyce.yun@hotelzephyrsf.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Caroline Pougner](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:03:48 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Caroline Pougner, pougner@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [brad shafer](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:18:18 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: brad shafer, bshafer442@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [olivia.ryan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support of the SFPD Full Staffing Act
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:21:29 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you to support the SFPD Full Staffing Act because:

- SFPD faces a staffing shortage of over 30%, and up to 50% with upcoming retirements. We must act now to solve this generational issue.
- The national reputation for lack of public safety resources that San Francisco has earned is undercutting our potential revenue sources for the City, from office leasing to tourism. We must send a signal that we are willing to address this.
- We support more proactive community policing activities, including foot-patrols, which cannot be accomplished without more adequate staffing.
- Crime disproportionately impacts our most vulnerable residents, including service workers and other front-line workers that work uncommon hours.

Thanks,

District 3 Resident

Olivia Ryan
Assistant Website Merchant | Wall, Lighting, Gear, Seasonal

pottery barn [kids](#)

From: [Emma Casey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Support the SFPD Full Staffing Act
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:21:33 PM

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

Good afternoon Board of Supervisors ,

I am writing to ask you to support the SFPD Full Staffing Act because:

- SFPD faces a staffing shortage of over 30% and up to 50% with upcoming retirements. We must act to solve this generational issue.
- The national reputation for lack of public safety resources that San Francisco has earned is undercutting our potential revenue sources for the City, for office leasing to tourism. We must send signal that we are willing to address this.
- Crime disproportionality impacts our most vulnerable residents, including service workers and other front-line workers that work uncommon hours.

Thank you,
Emma Casey, a District 2 Resident

From: [Julia Baron](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:27:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Julia Baron, juliaebaron@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Mike Ruiz](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:38:06 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Mike Ruiz, mik2ru@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Chris Lehman](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:38:46 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Chris Lehman, crlehman18@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Josh McHugh](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:48:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Josh McHugh, joshmchugh@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Michael Morandi](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:51:22 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Michael Morandi, michaelmorandi@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Winnie Fung](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 4:51:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Winnie Fung, wfung94122@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Lily Tong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 5:03:32 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Lily Tong, lilyytong@gamil.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Kenneth So](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 5:09:42 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kenneth So , kennethso53@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Annie Klebahn](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 5:12:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Annie Klebahn, anniebdk@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Richard Pellegrini](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 5:12:30 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Richard Pellegrini , rpp7575@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Rex Ridgeway](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 5:24:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Rex Ridgeway, chivis.bris71@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Matt Hayes](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support Full Staffing of Police
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 5:33:39 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern:

Lawlessness is on full display every day on the 500 block of Natoma Street in the South of Market neighborhood. I own a condominium there and moved out because of crime.

Captain Martin and the police officers in our district constantly say they need more help. Please support the full police staffing initiative.

Thank you,

Matt Hayes
520 Natoma Street

From: [Elizabeth Townsend](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 5:49:16 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Elizabeth Townsend, inclinebeth@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Anthony Roumph](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 5:50:11 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Anthony Roumph, troumph@noblehousehotels.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Ed Wang](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:03:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ed Wang, lined065@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Jan Diamond](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:09:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jan Diamond, janmdiamond@pacbell.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Annette Perry](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:12:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Annette Perry, ablf@cmcast.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

Having more police will solve many problems.

1. Citizen safety
2. Tourist safety
3. Lower smash and grabs
4. Help small mom and pop businesses being robbed

I am not asking for nasty racist police . That does NOT have to happen.

Therefore I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Anne Boswell](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:18:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Anne Boswell, annebos@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Bette Wadsworth](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:18:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Bette Wadsworth , SusyWadsworth@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Ellen Grantz](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:21:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ellen Grantz, ellen@mothersagainstdrugdeaths.org

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Viktoria Kolesnikova](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:27:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Viktoria Kolesnikova, vxk.viktoria@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [David Thompson](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:43:39 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: David Thompson, davidtsf1170@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Susan Coveleski](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:51:13 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Susan Coveleski, Coveleskisusan59@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Jennifer Li](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:10:55 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Jennifer Li, jenniferl7367@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Karina Velasquez](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:15:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Karina Velasquez , Karinawinder@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Courtney Dickson](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:21:19 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Courtney Dickson, dicksonc85@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Sandra Jeong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:21:22 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Sandra Jeong, snjeong@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [JOAN WAKEFIELD](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:21:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: JOAN WAKEFIELD, joansenz@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [LAURA WAKEFIELD](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:24:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: LAURA WAKEFIELD, laurawake23@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Gloria Leung](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:30:39 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Gloria Leung , leungg11@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Calum Mackay](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:36:28 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Calum Mackay, calumlmackay@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Mabel Mar](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 7:45:27 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Mabel Mar, bearyblondie@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Carol Vistnes](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:04:01 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Carol Vistnes, carolvistnes@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [David Archibeque](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:18:32 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: David Archibeque, davidarchibeque@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Braden Edwards](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:28:51 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Braden Edwards, bradenedwards@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Anthony Fox](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:33:21 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Anthony Fox, sftonyfox@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Silvia Dziurzynski](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:36:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Silvia Dziurzynski, silvianayaa95@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Claire Mills](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:48:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Claire Mills, clarable@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Amy Yu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:51:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Amy Yu, Amylalyu@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Maria Dela Cruz](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:54:23 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Maria Dela Cruz, monica_dnc@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Robin Donohoe](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:57:18 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Robin Donohoe, robin@draperrichards.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Nate Pola](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:06:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Nate Pola, natepola@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Liz Karr](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:06:25 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Liz Karr, polacrew@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Liz Karr](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:06:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Liz Karr, michael.pola@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Kristin Morse](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:06:31 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kristin Morse, kristin.morse@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Matthew Wyndowe](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:18:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Matthew Wyndowe, wyndowe@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Ann Poletti](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:18:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ann Poletti, annpoletti@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Michael Briganti](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:24:17 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Michael Briganti , artfulhammer@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Margaret de Clercq](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:46:49 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Margaret de Clercq, ninadeclercq@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Margaret Jacobsen](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:47:42 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Margaret Jacobsen, majacobsen1@live.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Maria Pasos](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 9:54:29 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Maria Pasos, mariapasos@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Steele Davidoff](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 10:06:20 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Steele Davidoff, steele.davidoff@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Andrea Candell](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 10:06:20 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Andrea Candell, andracandell@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [RICHARD GOSS](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 10:31:54 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: RICHARD GOSS, rwgoss@pacbell.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Karen Goss](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 10:32:35 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Karen Goss, kgoss@pacbell.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Anjali Billa](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 10:42:18 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Anjali Billa, anjaliBILLA@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Yana Rathman](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 10:45:26 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Yana Rathman, yana_rathman@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Steven Callow](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 10:54:24 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Steven Callow, sdcallow@pacbell.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Phyllis Lim](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:07:48 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Phyllis Lim, kwidoy@sbcglobal.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Yuanda Zhang](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:11:59 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Yuanda Zhang, yuandazhang@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Kathryn Kimball](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 11:22:38 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Kathryn Kimball, kathykinsf@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Robert Chan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:19:27 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Robert Chan, RobertYChan@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Stefan Muhle](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:19:38 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Stefan Muhle, smuhle@hotmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Dorothy Chan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:20:08 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Dorothy Chan, dorothywaichan@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Amy Chan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:21:30 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Amy Chan, AmyRchan@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Ryan Chan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:24:29 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Ryan Chan, ryanjchan@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Isaiah Lan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:36:21 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Isaiah Lan, isaiahluan@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Barbara Heffernan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 6:03:46 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Barbara Heffernan, barbarajheffernan@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Nikhil Sachdev](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 6:27:48 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Nikhil Sachdev, nsachdev@insightpartners.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Sophie Edwards](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 6:53:54 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Sophie Edwards, sophieedwardslax@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Sandra Jadallah](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 6:54:30 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Sandra Jadallah, sjadalla@pacbell.net

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Grace Monares](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 7:13:53 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Grace Monares, gmonares67@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Eileen Michael](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 7:18:34 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Eileen Michael , eemmichael@aol.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Steve Avigian](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 7:52:02 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Steve Avigian, montgomerybush@hotmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Chris Conroy](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 7:56:17 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Chris Conroy, topherc1023@yahoo.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Jack Duboff](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Full Staffing Act
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 8:20:20 AM

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

Dear Catherine/Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you to support the SFPD Full Staffing Act because:

- SFPD faces a staffing shortage of over 30%, and up to 50% with upcoming retirements. We must act now to solve this generational issue.
- The national reputation for lack of public safety resources that San Francisco has earned is undercutting our potential revenue sources for the City, from office leasing to tourism. We must send a signal that we are willing to address this.
- We support more proactive community policing activities, including foot-patrols, which cannot be accomplished without more adequate staffing.
- Crime disproportionately impacts our most vulnerable residents, including service workers and other front-line workers that work uncommon hours.

Thanks,

District 2 Resident

Jack Duboff
Analyst, Investments
415.609.7474
jduboff@eqr.com

Equity Residential
135 Main Street, Suite 1600
San Francisco, CA 94105
[EquityResidential.com](https://www.EquityResidential.com) | *live remarkably*

From: [Steven Marais](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 8:45:33 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Steven Marais, smarais@noblehousehotels.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Amy Caho](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 8:48:19 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Amy Caho, amycacho@gmail.comn

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Linda Howell](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 9:39:16 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Linda Howell, linda@lindahowell.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [William Schutte](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 10:47:39 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: William Schutte, schuttewr@gmail.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Russell Keil](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 10:54:35 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Russell Keil, rkeil@keilcompanies.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Vicky He](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 11:12:28 AM

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

Message to the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent: Vicky He, vicky.he@harborcourthotel.com

Message: I Support Supervisor Dorsey's Full Staffing Amendment, and You Should Too.

Dear Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Dorsey's full staffing amendment for SFPD and hope you will vote to put it on the ballot in March 2024. We cannot regain the city's reputation as a safe destination to live, work, visit, and shop if we do not have a fully staffed police force. Supervisor Dorsey's plan has short-, medium-, and long-range solutions to quickly fill the current gaps in personnel while making retention and recruitment possible and probable.

San Franciscans have prioritized public safety because we understand how vital it is to the success and achievement of every other industry and quality of life metric. Having our officers live in the neighborhoods they serve strengthens each community and the entire city. It is time to show our SFPD we value each and every officer, and it is long overdue that we take steps to help our officers live in the city they patrol each day. Please listen to your constituents who have repeatedly requested more funding for the police and more staffing of SFPD.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 61 Letters Regarding DGO 5.25
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:40:41 PM
Attachments: [61 Letters Regarding DGO 5.25.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 22 Letter From Julien Defrance Regarding Homelessness.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Joseph McFadden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Saturday, October 14, 2023 1:33:20 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Joseph McFadden
Email fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com
I live in District District 4

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Mary McFadden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Saturday, October 14, 2023 2:44:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Mary McFadden
Email mmcfadden9614@gmail.com
I live in District District 4

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Charlotte Worcester](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Saturday, October 14, 2023 7:37:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent **Charlotte Worcester**

Email **beubarlotte@yahoo.com**

I live in District **District 8**

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Cynthia CRAVENS](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 8:46:11 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Cynthia CRAVENS
Email yarewe_sf@yahoo.com
I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Arthur Hubbard](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 9:32:28 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Arthur Hubbard

Email amhsf@att.net

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Jason Jungreis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 10:02:57 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Jason Jungreis
Email jasonjungreis@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [ari Kanter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 10:51:38 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent ari Kanter

Email arikanter@gmail.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Ann Poletti](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:10:56 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Ann Poletti

Email annpoletti@gmail.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Melissa Ippolito](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 1:57:19 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent **Melissa Ippolito**

Email melissaippo@gmail.com

I live in District **District 1**

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Patti McMahon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:19:01 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Patti McMahon
Email pattired12@gmail.com
I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Chris Lehman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 5:27:35 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Chris Lehman
Email crlehman18@yahoo.com
I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Perry Klebahn](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:04:23 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Perry Klebahn
Email perry_k2003@yahoo.com
I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Yedi Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:09:55 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Yedi Wong
Email wongye@yahoo.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Michael Puccinelli](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:18:22 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Michael Puccinelli
Email michaelpooch@comcast.net
I live in District District10

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Kevin Clifford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:33:30 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Kevin Clifford
Email kevinclifford@yahoo.com
I live in District [District 3](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

When people commit a crime, track them down and arrest them.

From: [Pat Stanton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:33:31 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent **Pat Stanton**

Email pstanton1224@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Mitchell Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:54:29 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Mitchell Smith
Email htimsm1@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Rebecca Saroyan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:00:34 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Rebecca Saroyan

Email rebecca.saroyan@gmail.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Ian Beed](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:10:08 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Ian Beed
Email ian.beed@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Cindy O'Neill](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:15:21 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Cindy O'Neill
Email drmcop@gmail.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

Are you people serious? So now when someone commits a crime and runs away, as criminals do, you want to handcuff the police department's ability to get these people off of the streets?

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for "officer safety" is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data. Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It's the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our

officers' personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Richard Parina](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:21:30 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Richard Parina
Email parinarichard8@gmail.com
I live in District District 3

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

Respectfully Submitted,
Richard Parina
Iconic D3, Steering Committee

From: [Garrett Hoffman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:27:28 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Garrett Hoffman

Email garrett.z.hoffman@gmail.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Suzanne Brais](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:41:35 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Suzanne Brais

Email susanne_brais@yahoo.com

I live in District District 5

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Sharon Soong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:51:23 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Sharon Soong
Email soong.sharon@gmail.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Tris Thomson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:18:36 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Tris Thomson

Email tris.thomson@comcast.net

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Laura Higbie](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:21:17 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Laura Higbie

Email lhigbie@hotmail.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [james spinelli](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:24:20 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent james spinelli

Email jspinellijims@aol.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Saw Lim-Skain](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:40:27 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Saw Lim-Skain

Email sawlim@att.net

I live in District [District 4](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need the Police Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Philip healy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:45:21 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Philip healy
Email Ifchere@yahoo.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Jennifer Vataru](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:03:58 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Jennifer Vataru

Email jennifervataru@gmail.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Jacqueline Murphy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:09:18 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Jacqueline Murphy

Email jaxsonbrwn@yahoo.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Kenneth Camp](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:15:33 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Kenneth Camp
Email kennycamp@gmail.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Vivien MacDonald](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:39:24 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Vivien MacDonald
Email bebemacd@aol.com
I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Nicole Iantuono](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:42:31 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Nicole Iantuono
Email niantuono@gmail.com
I live in District District 8

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Karina Velasquez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:42:31 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Karina Velasquez

Email Kv@kvvllaw.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Aaron VanDevender](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:48:30 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Aaron VanDevender

Email sig@netdot.net

I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Gene Dea](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:51:34 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent **Gene Dea**

Email gene.dea@yahoo.com

I live in District **District 4**

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [sean kim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 11:00:36 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent sean kim

Email seankim4@gmail.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Thomas Henderson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:02:15 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Thomas Henderson
Email tshend1949@gmail.com
I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Charlotte Shropshire](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:09:25 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Charlotte Shropshire
Email cfshropshire@comcast.net
I live in District District 7

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Anthony Villa](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:30:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Anthony Villa

Email tvobsf@gmail.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Richard Higson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:30:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Richard Higson

Email rhigson1@gmail.com

I live in District District 3

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Christina Pappas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 1:19:08 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Christina Pappas
Email scoutca66@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Nalin Balan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 1:29:45 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Nalin Balan
Email nbalan@gmail.com
I live in District District 6

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [David Nolley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 3:05:28 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent David Nolley
Email danolley@aol.com
I live in District District 4

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Eileen Sullivan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 3:31:51 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Eileen Sullivan
Email easulliva@comcast.net
I live in District [District 5](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Ellen Haude](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 3:45:20 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Ellen Haude

Email ELLEN.HAUDE@GMAIL.COM

I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Tom Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 4:18:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Tom Lee
Email thl001@gmail.com
I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Christine Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 4:21:17 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent **Christine Lee**

Email christinelcl@gmail.com

I live in District **District 7**

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Michael H. Samson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 4:54:39 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Michael H. Samson
Email michaelhsamsin@comcast.net
I live in District District 1

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Jane Day](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:15:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Jane Day

Email janeday@earthlink.net

I live in District District 6

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Anthony Day](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:26:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Anthony Day

Email tonyday@earthlink.net

I live in District District 6

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data. It is absolutely insane that you are essentially blocking law enforcement in this city. If police cannot apprehend criminals, it will lead to vigilantism, and the wealthy hiring private security, Further increasing disparity in this City. I can only believe that this is your hidden agenda.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It's the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their

desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers' personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [victor.mezhvinsky](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:33:22 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent victor mezhvinsky
Email vmezhvinsky@me.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Daniel Bowermaster](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:38:01 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Daniel Bowermaster
Email scrambleer@yahoo.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Stephen Ernst](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 11:27:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent **Stephen Ernst**

Email steve.ernst@yahoo.com

I live in District **District 6**

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Julianne Okeefe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:26:06 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Julianne Okeefe
Email jnokeefe@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Sara Roepke](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:42:38 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Sara Roepke
Email roepke@adobe.com
I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [William Deegan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 3:56:55 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent William Deegan
Email bdbaddog@gmail.com
I live in District [District 3](#)

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Peter Richen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 5:03:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Peter Richen
Email richenpeter@yahoo.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Brett Ortiz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:48:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent **Brett Ortiz**

Email ortizbrett@yahoo.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

Thank you,

Brett Ortiz

From: [William Hall](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 8:14:39 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent William Hall

Email wiliamhall2020@icloud.com

I live in District District 3

I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 70 Letters Regarding DGO 6.21
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:41:42 PM
Attachments: [70 Letters Regarding DGO 6.21.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see attached 70 Letters Regarding DGO 6.21.

Regards,

John Bullock

Office of the Clerk of the Board

San Francisco Board of Supervisor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-5184

BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Joseph McFadden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, October 14, 2023 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 Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Joseph McFadden
Email fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com
I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Charlotte Worcester](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, October 14, 2023 1:48:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Charlotte Worcester
Email beubarlotte@yahoo.com
I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

Heed the pleas of everyday, hard-working taxpaying residents and business owners. We want the hindering of the SFPD to stop. The Police Commission is playing a direct role in the lawlessness of San Francisco. KNOCK IT OFF!!!!

From: [John Grauel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, October 14, 2023 2:05:44 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent John Grauel
Email john@carbonrose.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 is a serious mistake. Crime is way up because criminals know we will take no action against them. DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act

on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our City Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Mary McFadden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, October 14, 2023 2:43:07 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mary McFadden
Email mmcfadden9614@gmail.com
I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Arthur Hubbard](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 9:33:55 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Arthur Hubbard

Email amhsf@att.net

I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jason Jungreis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 10:02:37 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jason Jungreis
Email jasonjungreis@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Karen Schwartz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 10:15:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Karen Schwartz
Email kielygomes@yahoo.com
I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Ari Kanter](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 10:49:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Ari Kanter
Email arikanter@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Ronald Mungai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 11:15:25 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Ronald Mungai
Email limo4usf@gmail.com
I live in District [District 3](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Ann Poletti](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:10:25 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Ann Poletti
Email annpoletti@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Melissa Ippolito](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:59:31 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Melissa Ippolito
Email melissaippo@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Patti McMahon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 2:20:13 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Patti McMahon
Email pattired12@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Perry Klebahn](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:00:26 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Perry Klebahn
Email perry_k2003@yahoo.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Yedi Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:09:54 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Yedi Wong
Email wongye@yahoo.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Michael Puccinelli](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:18:27 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Michael Puccinelli
Email michaelpooch@comcast.net
I live in District [District10](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Pat Stanton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:33:18 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Pat Stanton
Email pstanton1224@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Kevin Clifford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:36:27 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Kevin Clifford
Email kevinclifford@yahoo.com
I live in District District 3

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Mitchell Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:51:32 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mitchell Smith
Email htimsm1@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Rebecca Saroyan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:00:40 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Rebecca Saroyan
Email rebecca.saroyan@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Calvin Lau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:04:35 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Calvin Lau
Email calvinlau@comcast.net
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Ian Beed](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:07:46 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Ian Beed
Email ian.beed@gmail.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Cindy O'Neill](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:12:30 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Cindy O'Neill
Email drmcop@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

I do not understand how you folks think? Do you ever watch police procedural shows? Do you live among us? Do you not know that criminals like to brag about their crimes and post pictures of themselves with their guns, with geolocation information about their whereabouts and that we have no expectation of privacy on the internet?! With the way that crime is trending, officers need all means at their disposal to assist them in keeping predators out of the sheep pen.

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's

investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP
jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our
children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Richard Parina](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:21:29 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Richard Parina
Email parinarichard8@gmail.com
I live in District District 3

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard Parina
Iconic D3, Steering Committee

From: [Laura Fagan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:27:31 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Laura Fagan
Email laurajofagan@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Suzanne Brais](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:45:22 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Suzanne Brais
Email susanne_brais@yahoo.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Steven Merrill](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:48:26 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Steven Merrill
Email smerrill@benchmark.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Sharon Soong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:48:33 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Sharon Soong
Email soong.sharon@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Danielle Wang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:51:23 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Danielle Wang
Email daniellewy2012@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [ANNIE WONG](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 7:54:42 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent ANNIE WONG
Email anniewong29@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Tris Thomson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:16:43 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Tris Thomson
Email tris.thomson@comcast.net
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Laura Higbie](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:17:34 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Laura Higbie
Email lhigbie@hotmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Philip healy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:41:56 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Philip healy
Email Ifchere@yahoo.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Meredith Serra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:51:21 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Meredith Serra
Email meredithserra@outlook.com
I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jiyeon Kim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:54:19 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jiyeon Kim
Email nickkennedy112@gmail.com
I live in District [District 5](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Patrick Skain](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:07:08 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Patrick Skain

Email patskain@att.net

I live in District [District 4](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 is an affront to our democracy. There are many issues with DGO 6.21. The most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual

predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. Assumptions are not a valid basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our City Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Christina Pappas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:15:35 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Christina Pappas
Email scoutca66@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Kieran Manning](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:28:19 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Kieran Manning
Email kman6@berkeley.edu
I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Gail Rutherford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:39:26 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Gail Rutherford
Email gail_rutherford@yahoo.com
I live in District [District 4](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jennifer Vataru](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:03:31 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jennifer Vataru
Email jennifervataru@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jacqueline Murphy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:06:25 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jacqueline Murphy
Email jaxsonbrwn@yahoo.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Kenneth Camp](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:15:30 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Kenneth Camp
Email kennycamp@gmail.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Vivien MacDonald](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:39:24 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Vivien MacDonald
Email bebemacd@aol.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Karina Velasquez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:42:31 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Karina Velasquez

Email kv@kvvlaw.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Gene Dea](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:51:34 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Gene Dea
Email gene.dea@yahoo.com
I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Randy Tenant](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Soft Story Code Enforcement Questions
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 11:24:53 AM

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

Good day.

I have been directed here by the DBI Code Enforcement Section regarding my questions about properties still violating the Mandatory Soft Story Program as required by S.F.E.B.C. 405D with the final deadline for the completion of work and issuance of CFC being September 2020.

If a building in violation of the Mandatory Soft Story Retrofit Ordinance has:

- received a Notice of Violation
- had a Director's Hearing
- received an Order of Abatement

Are there any other penalties or restrictions on the building owners to enforce compliance?

For example, are they allowed to impose new rent increases (yearly, banked, pass-throughs) on rent-control tenants while the building has an active DBI Notice of Violation, Order of Abatement and violates SF Building Code?

Thanks for any information you can provide.

Cheers,
Randy

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

From: **DBICodeEnforcement, DBI (DBI)** <dbi.codeenforcement@sfgov.org>
Date: Thu, Oct 12, 2023 at 4:20 PM
Subject: RE: Soft Story Code Enforcement Questions
To: Randy Tenant <lingslo170@gmail.com>

Hi Randy,

The Order of Abatement would be the end of action for Code Enforcement with exception to reporting any outstanding fees to the Board of Supervisors whom would then send the fees toward a lien against the property. Anything beyond that, you should contact the Board of Supervisors or the Assessor Office to find out what other actions would be taken.



Charles Robinson

Permit Technician Supervisor

Code Enforcement Section

Department of Building Inspection

City and County of San Francisco

49 South Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, Ca 94103

E: Charles.Robinson@SFGov.Org

P: 628.652.3695

SF.gov/DBI

[Sign up](#) for customer updates

From: Randy Tenant <lingslo170@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 11:17 AM
To: DBICodeEnforcement, DBI (DBI) <dbi.codeenforcement@sfgov.org>
Subject: Soft Story Code Enforcement Questions

Good day.

I hope you can help me with a few questions.

If a building is classified as Tier III and

- still has not complied with the Mandatory Soft Story Program as required by S.F.E.B.C. 405D
- has already had a director's hearing
- been issued an OOA

What are the next steps from the DBI CES department?

In cases of soft story violations, is a referral made to the State Franchise Tax Board when code violations have not achieved compliance after six (6) months from the Notice of Violation completion date?

Are there any other penalties or restrictions on the building owner while they have an active NOV for Soft Story Compliance?

Thanks for your help,

Randy

From: [Thomas Henderson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:01:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Thomas Henderson
Email tshend1949@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Charlotte Shropshire](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:09:22 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Charlotte Shropshire
Email cfshropshire@comcast.net
I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Anthony Villa](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:26:36 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Anthony Villa
Email tvobsf@gmail.com
I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Richard Higson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 12:33:22 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Richard Higson
Email rhigson1@gmail.com
I live in District District 3

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Nalin Balan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 1:30:27 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Nalin Balan
Email nbalan@gmail.com
I live in District [District 6](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [David Nolley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 3:04:00 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent David Nolley
Email danolley@aol.com
I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Eileen Sullivan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 3:32:59 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Eileen Sullivan
Email easulliva@comcast.net
I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Ellen Haude](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 3:45:23 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Ellen Haude
Email ELLEN.HAUDE@GMAIL.COM
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Tom Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 4:16:51 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Tom Lee
Email thl001@gmail.com
I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Christine Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 4:21:23 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Christine Lee
Email christinelcl@gmail.com
I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [wincy wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 5:59:11 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent wincy wong
Email wincywong9@gmail.com
I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jane Day](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:12:28 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jane Day
Email janeday@earthlink.net
I live in District District 6

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Anthony Day](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:30:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Anthony Day
Email tonyday@earthlink.net
I live in District District 6

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [victor.mezhvinsky](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:30:53 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent victor mezhvinsky
Email vmezhvinsky@me.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Daniel Bowermaster](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 10:38:12 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Daniel Bowermaster
Email scrambleer@yahoo.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Stephen Ernst](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 11:22:47 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Stephen Ernst
Email steve.ernst@yahoo.com
I live in District District 6

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Linda Miller](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 5:22:13 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Linda Miller
Email miller.iaap@gmail.com
I live in District District 3

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Mary Frost](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 5:31:14 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mary Frost
Email marbear43@gmail.com
I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Julianne Okeefe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:23:53 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Julianne Okeefe
Email jnokeefe@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Sara Roepke](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 11:40:17 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Sara Roepke
Email roepke@adobe.com
I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Peter Richen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 4:57:25 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Peter Richen
Email richenpeter@yahoo.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Christina Vartanian](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 8:40:44 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Christina Vartanian

Email cvrn99@msn.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Lauren Virgen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 6:33:22 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Lauren Virgen
Email cheerios1803@yahoo.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Brett Ortiz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:48:17 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent **Brett Ortiz**

Email ortizbrett@yahoo.com

I live in District **District 2**

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

Thank you,

Brett Ortiz

From: [William Hall](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 8:14:32 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent William Hall
Email wiliamhall2020@icloud.com
I live in District [District 3](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.
