BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

June 10, 2020

The Honorable Scott Wiener California State Senator California State Capitol, Room 5100 Sacramento, CA 95814-4900

Re: Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 217-20

Dear Senator Wiener:

On May 12, 2020, the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco adopted Resolution No. 217-20 (Opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261 (Chau) - Facial Recognition Technology), which was enacted on May 22, 2020.

The Board of Supervisors directs the Clerk of the Board to forward the following document to your attention:

One copy of Resolution No. 217-20 (File No. 200427)

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (415) 554-5184, or by e-mail: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board

c. Members of the Board of Supervisors, Supervisors Aaron Peskin, Ahsha Safai, Rafael Mandelman Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Liaison to the Board of Supervisors Eddie McCaffrey, Mayor's Manager of State and Federal Legislative Affairs Andres Power, Mayor's Policy Director Rebecca Peacock, Mayor's Office Paul Yoder, Karen Lange, Erica Smith, City Lobbyists - Shaw/Yoder/Antwih Inc.

1	[Opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261 (Chau) - Facial Recognition Technology]
2	
3	Resolution opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261, authored by Assembly
4	Member Edwin Chau, which would preempt San Francisco's precedent-setting
5	prohibition on government acquisition and use of facial recognition technology and
6	thereby imperil the public health and safety of San Francisco residents and visitors.
7	
8	WHEREAS, On May 21, 2019, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
9	overwhelmingly approved legislation to provide necessary oversight of local government's use
10	of surveillance technology, and to prohibit the acquisition and use of facial recognition
11	technology; and
12	WHEREAS, In prohibiting government acquisition and use of facial recognition
13	technology, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors stated that "the propensity for facial
14	recognition technology to endanger civil rights and civil liberties substantially outweighs its
15	purported benefits, and the technology will exacerbate racial injustice and threaten our ability
16	to live free of continuous government monitoring;" and
17	WHEREAS, San Francisco's prohibition on government acquisition or use of facial
18	recognition technology was soon followed by other Bay Area jurisdictions including the City of
19	Berkeley, the City of Oakland and the Bay Area Rapid Transit system; and
20	WHEREAS, San Francisco's prohibition on government acquisition or use of facial
21	recognition technology was a precedent-setting initiative which has sparked United States
22	Congressional Oversight Committee hearings and shifted the public discourse around the
23	acceptable and unacceptable level of intrusion of governmental entities into the private lives of
24	its citizens; and

25

1	WHEREAS, Facial recognition technology has nevertheless emerged as the
2	technology of choice for the federal deportation state, including being used by Immigration
3	and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to scan state driver's license databases and billions of facial
4	images scraped from the Internet by companies like Clearview AI to identify and track
5	immigrants and citizens across the country; and
6	WHEREAS, On February 14, 2020, Assembly Member Edwin Chau of California's 49th
7	Assembly District introduced Assembly Bill No. 2261 (AB 2261), which, in pertinent part, gives
8	free reign to governmental agencies across the state to acquire and use facial recognition
9	surveillance technology without a warrant and in a manner which would disproportionately
10	harm communities of color, religious minorities and other marginalized groups; and
11	WHEREAS, AB 2261 would also preempt and invalidate San Francisco's precedent-
12	setting prohibition on government acquisition and use of facial recognition technology, which
13	was based on widespread understanding that this technology disproportionately misidentifies
14	children, women and people of color, and – even if accurate – would unleash an
15	unprecedented and psychologically damaging mass surveillance state; and
16	WHEREAS, AB 2261 green lights the use of facial recognition to blacklist residents to
17	deny them health care services, housing, jobs and other basic necessities, without adequate
18	protections to prevent companies from selling face recognition systems that they know to be
19	biased; and
20	WHEREAS, AB 2261 is being peddled by big tech companies as a solution to real
21	problems that it will only exacerbate, at a time when the public health and safety of residents
22	and visitors must be guided by health experts and accurate science, not lobbyists for big tech
23	firms; and
24	
25	

1	WHEREAS, San Francisco is a Charter City organized under the Constitution of the
2	State of California with supreme authority over the regulation of "municipal affairs;" now,
3	therefore, be it
4	RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco opposes Assembly Bill No.
5	2261, which is an attack on the public health and safety of all San Francisco residents and
6	visitors, and in particular on women, low-income communities, communities of color, religious
7	minorities and other marginalized individuals and groups in San Francisco; and, be it
8	FURTHER RESOLVED, That the record on AB 2261 is inadequate to warrant the
9	preemption of laws specifically designed to protect San Francisco and other Bay Area
10	residents and visitors from facial recognition technology and is an unwarranted and unlawful
11	intrusion on the City and County of San Francisco's supreme authority over municipal affairs;
12	and, be it
13	FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to San
14	Francisco's state delegation.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



City and County of San Francisco Tails

City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Resolution

File Number: 200427 Date Passed: May 12, 2020

Resolution opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261, authored by Assembly Member Edwin Chau, which would preempt San Francisco's precedent-setting prohibition on government acquisition and use of facial recognition technology and thereby imperil the public health and safety of San Francisco residents and visitors.

May 05, 2020 Board of Supervisors - CONTINUED

Ayes: 11 - Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Walton and Yee

May 12, 2020 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 10 - Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai,

Walton and Yee Noes: 1 - Stefani

File No. 200427

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 5/12/2020 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

(Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board

Unsigned	05/22/2020
London N. Breed Mayor	Date Approved

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, or time waived pursuant to Board Rule 2.14.2, became effective without her approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter or Board Rule 2.14.2.

And Cachialo	05/22/2020
Angela Calvillo	Date
Clerk of the Board	

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

June 10, 2020

The Honorable David Chiu California State Assembly Member California State Capitol, Room 4112 P.O. Box 942849 Sacramento, CA 94249-0017

Re: Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 217-20

Dear Assembly Member Chiu:

On May 12, 2020, the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco adopted Resolution No. 217-20 (Opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261 (Chau) - Facial Recognition Technology), which was enacted on May 22, 2020.

The Board of Supervisors directs the Clerk of the Board to forward the following document to your attention:

One copy of Resolution No. 217-20 (File No. 200427)

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (415) 554-5184, or by e-mail: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

c. Members of the Board of Supervisors, Supervisors Aaron Peskin, Ahsha Safai, Rafael Mandelman Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Liaison to the Board of Supervisors Eddie McCaffrey, Mayor's Manager of State and Federal Legislative Affairs Andres Power, Mayor's Policy Director Rebecca Peacock, Mayor's Office Paul Yoder, Karen Lange, Erica Smith, City Lobbyists - Shaw/Yoder/Antwih Inc.

1	[Opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261 (Chau) - Facial Recognition Technology]
2	
3	Resolution opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261, authored by Assembly
4	Member Edwin Chau, which would preempt San Francisco's precedent-setting
5	prohibition on government acquisition and use of facial recognition technology and
6	thereby imperil the public health and safety of San Francisco residents and visitors.
7	
8	WHEREAS, On May 21, 2019, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
9	overwhelmingly approved legislation to provide necessary oversight of local government's use
10	of surveillance technology, and to prohibit the acquisition and use of facial recognition
11	technology; and
12	WHEREAS, In prohibiting government acquisition and use of facial recognition
13	technology, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors stated that "the propensity for facial
14	recognition technology to endanger civil rights and civil liberties substantially outweighs its
15	purported benefits, and the technology will exacerbate racial injustice and threaten our ability
16	to live free of continuous government monitoring;" and
17	WHEREAS, San Francisco's prohibition on government acquisition or use of facial
18	recognition technology was soon followed by other Bay Area jurisdictions including the City of
19	Berkeley, the City of Oakland and the Bay Area Rapid Transit system; and
20	WHEREAS, San Francisco's prohibition on government acquisition or use of facial
21	recognition technology was a precedent-setting initiative which has sparked United States
22	Congressional Oversight Committee hearings and shifted the public discourse around the
23	acceptable and unacceptable level of intrusion of governmental entities into the private lives of
24	its citizens; and

25

1	WHEREAS, Facial recognition technology has nevertheless emerged as the
2	technology of choice for the federal deportation state, including being used by Immigration
3	and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to scan state driver's license databases and billions of facial
4	images scraped from the Internet by companies like Clearview AI to identify and track
5	immigrants and citizens across the country; and
6	WHEREAS, On February 14, 2020, Assembly Member Edwin Chau of California's 49th
7	Assembly District introduced Assembly Bill No. 2261 (AB 2261), which, in pertinent part, gives
8	free reign to governmental agencies across the state to acquire and use facial recognition
9	surveillance technology without a warrant and in a manner which would disproportionately
10	harm communities of color, religious minorities and other marginalized groups; and
11	WHEREAS, AB 2261 would also preempt and invalidate San Francisco's precedent-
12	setting prohibition on government acquisition and use of facial recognition technology, which
13	was based on widespread understanding that this technology disproportionately misidentifies
14	children, women and people of color, and – even if accurate – would unleash an
15	unprecedented and psychologically damaging mass surveillance state; and
16	WHEREAS, AB 2261 green lights the use of facial recognition to blacklist residents to
17	deny them health care services, housing, jobs and other basic necessities, without adequate
18	protections to prevent companies from selling face recognition systems that they know to be
19	biased; and
20	WHEREAS, AB 2261 is being peddled by big tech companies as a solution to real
21	problems that it will only exacerbate, at a time when the public health and safety of residents
22	and visitors must be guided by health experts and accurate science, not lobbyists for big tech
23	firms; and
24	
25	

1	WHEREAS, San Francisco is a Charter City organized under the Constitution of the
2	State of California with supreme authority over the regulation of "municipal affairs;" now,
3	therefore, be it
4	RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco opposes Assembly Bill No.
5	2261, which is an attack on the public health and safety of all San Francisco residents and
6	visitors, and in particular on women, low-income communities, communities of color, religious
7	minorities and other marginalized individuals and groups in San Francisco; and, be it
8	FURTHER RESOLVED, That the record on AB 2261 is inadequate to warrant the
9	preemption of laws specifically designed to protect San Francisco and other Bay Area
10	residents and visitors from facial recognition technology and is an unwarranted and unlawful
11	intrusion on the City and County of San Francisco's supreme authority over municipal affairs;
12	and, be it
13	FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to San
14	Francisco's state delegation.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



City and County of San Francisco Tails

City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Resolution

File Number: 200427 Date Passed: May 12, 2020

Resolution opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261, authored by Assembly Member Edwin Chau, which would preempt San Francisco's precedent-setting prohibition on government acquisition and use of facial recognition technology and thereby imperil the public health and safety of San Francisco residents and visitors.

May 05, 2020 Board of Supervisors - CONTINUED

Ayes: 11 - Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Walton and Yee

May 12, 2020 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 10 - Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai,

Walton and Yee Noes: 1 - Stefani

File No. 200427

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 5/12/2020 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

(Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board

Unsigned	05/22/2020
London N. Breed Mayor	Date Approved

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, or time waived pursuant to Board Rule 2.14.2, became effective without her approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter or Board Rule 2.14.2.

And Cachialo	05/22/2020
Angela Calvillo	Date
Clerk of the Board	

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

June 10, 2020

The Honorable Phil Ting California State Assembly Member California State Capitol, Room 6026 P.O. Box 942849 Sacramento, CA 94249-0019

Re: Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 217-20

Dear Assembly Member Ting:

On May 12, 2020, the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco adopted Resolution No. 217-20 (Opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261 (Chau) - Facial Recognition Technology), which was enacted on May 22, 2020.

The Board of Supervisors directs the Clerk of the Board to forward the following document to your attention:

One copy of Resolution No. 217-20 (File No. 200427)

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (415) 554-5184, or by e-mail: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board

c. Members of the Board of Supervisors, Aaron Peskin, Ahsha Safai, Rafael Mandelman Sophia Kittler, Mayor's Liaison to the Board of Supervisors Eddie McCaffrey, Mayor's Manager of State and Federal Legislative Affairs Andres Power, Mayor's Policy Director Rebecca Peacock, Mayor's Office Paul Yoder, Karen Lange, Erica Smith, City Lobbyists - Shaw/Yoder/Antwih Inc.

1	[Opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261 (Chau) - Facial Recognition Technology]
2	
3	Resolution opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261, authored by Assembly
4	Member Edwin Chau, which would preempt San Francisco's precedent-setting
5	prohibition on government acquisition and use of facial recognition technology and
6	thereby imperil the public health and safety of San Francisco residents and visitors.
7	
8	WHEREAS, On May 21, 2019, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
9	overwhelmingly approved legislation to provide necessary oversight of local government's use
10	of surveillance technology, and to prohibit the acquisition and use of facial recognition
11	technology; and
12	WHEREAS, In prohibiting government acquisition and use of facial recognition
13	technology, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors stated that "the propensity for facial
14	recognition technology to endanger civil rights and civil liberties substantially outweighs its
15	purported benefits, and the technology will exacerbate racial injustice and threaten our ability
16	to live free of continuous government monitoring;" and
17	WHEREAS, San Francisco's prohibition on government acquisition or use of facial
18	recognition technology was soon followed by other Bay Area jurisdictions including the City of
19	Berkeley, the City of Oakland and the Bay Area Rapid Transit system; and
20	WHEREAS, San Francisco's prohibition on government acquisition or use of facial
21	recognition technology was a precedent-setting initiative which has sparked United States
22	Congressional Oversight Committee hearings and shifted the public discourse around the
23	acceptable and unacceptable level of intrusion of governmental entities into the private lives of
24	its citizens; and

25

1	WHEREAS, Facial recognition technology has nevertheless emerged as the
2	technology of choice for the federal deportation state, including being used by Immigration
3	and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to scan state driver's license databases and billions of facial
4	images scraped from the Internet by companies like Clearview AI to identify and track
5	immigrants and citizens across the country; and
6	WHEREAS, On February 14, 2020, Assembly Member Edwin Chau of California's 49th
7	Assembly District introduced Assembly Bill No. 2261 (AB 2261), which, in pertinent part, gives
8	free reign to governmental agencies across the state to acquire and use facial recognition
9	surveillance technology without a warrant and in a manner which would disproportionately
10	harm communities of color, religious minorities and other marginalized groups; and
11	WHEREAS, AB 2261 would also preempt and invalidate San Francisco's precedent-
12	setting prohibition on government acquisition and use of facial recognition technology, which
13	was based on widespread understanding that this technology disproportionately misidentifies
14	children, women and people of color, and – even if accurate – would unleash an
15	unprecedented and psychologically damaging mass surveillance state; and
16	WHEREAS, AB 2261 green lights the use of facial recognition to blacklist residents to
17	deny them health care services, housing, jobs and other basic necessities, without adequate
18	protections to prevent companies from selling face recognition systems that they know to be
19	biased; and
20	WHEREAS, AB 2261 is being peddled by big tech companies as a solution to real
21	problems that it will only exacerbate, at a time when the public health and safety of residents
22	and visitors must be guided by health experts and accurate science, not lobbyists for big tech
23	firms; and
24	
25	

1	WHEREAS, San Francisco is a Charter City organized under the Constitution of the
2	State of California with supreme authority over the regulation of "municipal affairs;" now,
3	therefore, be it
4	RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco opposes Assembly Bill No.
5	2261, which is an attack on the public health and safety of all San Francisco residents and
6	visitors, and in particular on women, low-income communities, communities of color, religious
7	minorities and other marginalized individuals and groups in San Francisco; and, be it
8	FURTHER RESOLVED, That the record on AB 2261 is inadequate to warrant the
9	preemption of laws specifically designed to protect San Francisco and other Bay Area
10	residents and visitors from facial recognition technology and is an unwarranted and unlawful
11	intrusion on the City and County of San Francisco's supreme authority over municipal affairs;
12	and, be it
13	FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to San
14	Francisco's state delegation.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



City and County of San Francisco Tails

City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Resolution

File Number: 200427 Date Passed: May 12, 2020

Resolution opposing California State Assembly Bill No. 2261, authored by Assembly Member Edwin Chau, which would preempt San Francisco's precedent-setting prohibition on government acquisition and use of facial recognition technology and thereby imperil the public health and safety of San Francisco residents and visitors.

May 05, 2020 Board of Supervisors - CONTINUED

Ayes: 11 - Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Walton and Yee

May 12, 2020 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 10 - Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai,

Walton and Yee Noes: 1 - Stefani

File No. 200427

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 5/12/2020 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

(Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board

Unsigned	05/22/2020
London N. Breed Mayor	Date Approved

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, or time waived pursuant to Board Rule 2.14.2, became effective without her approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter or Board Rule 2.14.2.

And Cachialo	05/22/2020
Angela Calvillo	Date
Clerk of the Board	