

File No. 220606

Committee Item No. 8

Board Item No. 14

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date Sept. 12, 2022

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date Sept. 20, 2022

Cmte Board

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

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

☐	☐	<u>Charter Amendment</u>
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Victor Young Date Sept 8, 2022

Completed by: _____ Date _____

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

Ordinance approving Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras and establishing a sunset date ~~one year~~ fifteen months after the effective date of the ordinance.

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

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

Section 1. Background.

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

1 (b) Under Administrative Code Section 19B.2(b), the Board of Supervisors may
2 approve a Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance under Section 19B.2(a) only if: (1) the
3 department seeking Board approval first submits to the Committee on Information Technology
4 (COIT) a Surveillance Impact Report for the Surveillance Technology to be acquired or used;
5 (2) based on the Surveillance Impact Report, COIT develops a Surveillance Technology
6 Policy for the Surveillance Technology to be acquired or used; and (3) at a public meeting at
7 which COIT considers the Surveillance Technology Policy, COIT recommends that the Board
8 adopt, adopt with modification, or decline to adopt the Surveillance Technology Policy for the
9 Surveillance Technology to be acquired or used.

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

17
18 Section 2. Surveillance Technology Policy Ordinance for Police Department Use of
19 Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras.

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

1 and review historical video footage for the purposes of an internal investigation regarding
2 officer misconduct.

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

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

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

17 (e) Findings. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the stated benefits of the
18 Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras outweigh the costs and risks
19 of use of such Surveillance Technology; that the SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras
20 Policy, as modified by the Board of Supervisors, will safeguard civil liberties and civil rights;
21 and that the uses and deployments of non-City entity surveillance cameras, as set forth in the
22 SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy, will not be based upon discriminatory or
23 viewpoint-based factors or have a disparate impact on any community or a protected class.
24
25

1 Section 3. Approval of Modified Policy.

2 The Board of Supervisors hereby approves the SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance
3 Cameras Policy for a one-year period, with the following modifications:-

4 (a) The section entitled, "Purpose and Scope," is amended to include the following
5 language as the last paragraph: "Absent a subpoena or search warrant, SFPD access to all
6 systems noted in this Policy will be obtained through the express consent of the individual or
7 entity managing the surveillance system at the time of request. SFPD does not and shall not
8 manage a surveillance camera registry, have public observation devices, or have a
9 Ring/Neighbors or similar partnership agreements."

10 (b) The section entitled, "Policy Statement," is amended as follows: (1) the second
11 bullet point under the second paragraph is amended to include "or memorandum of
12 understanding" after the words "contractual agreement"; and (2) the sentence, "These
13 exclusions shall be governed by a separate use policy compliant with the requirements of
14 Section 19B." shall be added as the final paragraph in that section.

15 (c) The section entitled "Authorizes Use(s)" is amended as follows: (1) paragraph
16 number 1 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following paragraph number 1:
17 "Temporary live monitoring (a) during an exigent circumstance as defined by Administrative
18 Code Section 19B; (b) during Significant Events with public safety concerns only for
19 placement of police personnel due to crowd sizes or other issues creating imminent public
20 safety hazards; or (c) in the course of a specific criminal investigation if an SFPD Captain or
21 member in rank above Captain confirms in writing that the department has credible
22 information of criminal activity and live monitoring is being requested in furtherance of that
23 criminal investigation. Temporary live monitoring will cease, and the connection will be
24 severed, within 24 hours after the non-city entity has provided access to SFPD. SFPD shall
25 not record or duplicate the live monitoring feed using any electronic device, including body

1 worn cameras or cell phones. If SFPD observes misdemeanor or felony violations on the live
2 monitoring feed, nothing in this policy ordinance prohibits SFPD from deferring to authorized
3 use No. 2 or No. 3 of this section.”; (2) in paragraph number 2, the word “specific” is inserted
4 before the words “criminal investigation.”

5 (d) The section entitled, “Prohibitions,” is amended as follows: (1) in the fifth bullet
6 point, the phrase “for reasons outside of redeployment needs,” is deleted and the phrase
7 “unless there are exigent circumstances or for placement of police personnel,” is inserted after
8 the words “First Amendment activities”; (2) in the fifth bullet point, the word “imminent” is
9 inserted before the phrase “public safety hazards”; and (3) the following paragraph shall be
10 added as the seventh bullet point, “SFPD is prohibited from seeking to obtain surveillance
11 footage for purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or interstate travel for
12 reproductive care. Except as required by law, SFPD shall not share surveillance footage with
13 any law enforcement agency for purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or
14 interstate travel for reproductive care. Unless legally required, SFPD will not share footage
15 with non-California law enforcement agencies.”

16 (e) In the section entitled, “Policy Requirements,” the last paragraph under the sub-
17 subsection “Data Security,” that begins with “Reporting,” is amended to insert the following
18 sentences after the sentence that ends with “Board of Supervisors” and before the sentence
19 that begins with “The reporting requirement shall commence . . . ”: “The quarterly report shall
20 identify whether each request was granted or denied by the Captain or member in rank above
21 Captain; the justification for granting the request if it was granted, including the reason(s) why
22 the Captain or member in rank above Captain found the information credible; whether the
23 request was granted by the non-City entity; whether the images were used to bring criminal
24 charges; the types of charges brought; and the results of the charges.”

1 (f) In the section entitled, "Policy Requirements," under the subsection, "Data Sharing,"
2 the second bullet point under "A. Internal (City Entity) Data Sharing," is amended to insert the
3 words "and federal" after the phrase "in accordance with California."

4 (g) In the section entitled, "Policy Requirement," the subsection "Data Retention," is
5 amended as follows: (1) the sentence "The Department's data retention period and
6 justification are as follows:" is amended to read: "The Department's data retention period is as
7 follows:"; (2) the paragraph after the first bullet point that begins with "Security Camera shared
8 with Department . . . " is deleted in its entirety and replaced with: "Security Camera data
9 shared with Department by a non-City entity will be stored only for the period necessary for
10 investigation, prosecution, or litigation following an incident. All historical footage is
11 associated with a specific criminal investigation and is tagged as evidence. This data shall be
12 retained as required by State evidence retention laws. Camera footage associated with an
13 officer misconduct or Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) investigation shall be maintained in
14 perpetuity."; (3) the paragraph after the second bullet point that begins with "Justification," is
15 deleted in its entirety and replaced with "Any historical video not tagged into evidence and
16 subject to the use requirements of Chapter 19B shall be deleted within 90 days."

17 (h) The Police Department shall place a copy of the modified policy in Board File No.
18 220606 within 30 days of the effective date of this ordinance.

19
20 Section 4. Sunset Provision. Unless reauthorized by ordinance, the SFPD Non-City
21 Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy, as modified herein, shall expire ~~one year~~ fifteen months
22 after the effective date of this ordinance. Upon expiration, the City Attorney is authorized to
23 remove the SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy ~~to be removed~~ from the
24 Appendix to Administrative Code Chapter 19B.

1 Section 45. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
2 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
3 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
4 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

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

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

10 n:\govern\as2022\1900636\01627144.docx

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

(Revised 9/12/2022)

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

Ordinance approving Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras and establishing a sunset date fifteen months after the effective date of the ordinance.

Background Information

Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 19B.2(b), the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) seeks Board of Supervisors approval of a surveillance technology policy regarding use of the Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras ("San Francisco Police Department Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy").

The ordinance makes numerous modifications to the proposed SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy and would approve the Policy, as modified, for fifteen months after the effective date of the ordinance. If the Board of Supervisors does not reauthorize the Policy by ordinance before the end of the fifteen-month period, the Policy will expire.

As modified, the proposed Policy would authorize the following uses:

1. Temporary live monitoring (a) during an exigent circumstance as defined by Administrative Code, Section 19B, (b) during Significant Events with public safety concerns only for placement of police personnel due to crowd sizes or other issues creating imminent public safety hazards, or (c) in the course of a specific criminal investigation if an SFPD Captain or member in rank above Captain confirms in writing that the department has credible information of criminal activity and live monitoring is being requested in furtherance of that criminal investigation.
2. Requesting, obtaining, and reviewing historical video footage for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to a specific criminal investigation.
3. Requesting, obtaining, and reviewing historical video footage for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to an internal investigation regarding officer misconduct.

As modified, the Policy contains the following prohibitions:

- Surveillance camera footage will not on its own identify an individual, confirm racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, or information concerning an individual person's sex life or sexual orientation.
- SFPD is prohibited from using biometric identification or facial recognition technology in connection with non-City entity surveillance cameras or associated data.
- SFPD is prohibited from live monitoring inside residential dwellings where homeowners/renters have a reasonable expectation of privacy unless one the following conditions exist: Exigency per SF Admin Code 19B.7; a homeowner/renter/individual with legal authority to do so provides consent; or a warrant is issued. If the conditions exist, SFPD shall adhere to the authorized use and reporting provisions relating to temporary live monitoring.
- SFPD is prohibited from monitoring any certain groups or individuals based, in whole or in part, on race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation. Race, color, ethnicity, or national origin may not be used as a motivating factor for initiating police enforcement action.
- SFPD is prohibited from accessing, requesting, or monitoring any surveillance camera live feed during First Amendment activities unless there are exigent circumstances or for placement of police personnel due to crowd sizes or other issues creating imminent public safety hazards. SFPD members are required to comply with SFPD Department General Order (DGO) 8.03 Crowd Control, DGO 8.10 Guidelines for First Amendment Activities and its annual audit requirements, and the SFPD Event Manual to ensure the safety of those attending planned or spontaneous events.
- SFPD members shall not acquire or use surveillance camera footage in cooperation with or assisting U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement or U.S. Customs and Border Protection in any investigation, detention, or arrest procedures, public or clandestine, where in any such instance the purpose is the enforcement of federal immigration laws. SFPD complies with SF Administrative Code Chapters 12H "Immigration Status" and 12I "Civil Immigration Detainers" and SFPD General Order (DGO) 5.15 "Enforcement of Immigration Laws."
- SFPD is prohibited from seeking to obtain surveillance footage for purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or interstate travel for reproductive care. Except as required by law, SFPD shall not share surveillance footage with any law enforcement agency for purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or

interstate travel for reproductive care. Unless legally required, SFPD will not share footage with non-California law enforcement agencies.

As modified, the Policy would require SFPD to submit an annual surveillance report as outlined in Administrative Code Sections 19B.1 and 19B.6. Additionally, as modified, the Policy would require SFPD to submit a quarterly report tracking live monitoring requests to the Police Commission, with a copy to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

n:\govern\as2022\1900636\01627152.docx



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CINDY ELIAS
Vice President

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Commissioner

September 8, 2022

VIA EMAIL: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Concerns Regarding the Scope and Impact of Proposed Surveillance Technology Policy for the San Francisco Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras**

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

We write as Board-appointed members of the San Francisco Police Commission to express significant concerns about the Proposed revisions to Administrative Code 19B, regarding “Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras,” (the “Proposed Policy”). The matter, which was first presented before the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Rules Committee on July 11, 2022, and continued several times since then, remains under consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

The Proposed Policy will have massive ramifications for the San Francisco Police Department (“SFPD” or “Department”), and even larger ramifications and impacts on the San Francisco community we serve, as it touches on issues of civil liberties, constitutional rights, and privacy. Recent events have reminded us of how fragile these rights can be and how we must, as public servants, ensure they are protected.

Given these concerns, we, the signatories of this letter in our individual capacity as Commissioners, ask the Board to ***refrain from final passage*** of the Proposed Policy until we can comprehensively and carefully analyze its impact on SFPD’s policies, procedures, and the community at large, while ensuring this policy aligns with police reform efforts.

We believe that the Proposed Policy will have a significant impact on the following areas currently being worked on by SFPD and the Police Commission:

1. **SFPD General Order on Search Warrants:** The Police Commission is currently in the process of revising Department General Order (“DGO”) 5.16, which governs SFPD’s procedures on obtaining and executing search warrants. This process has included multiple meetings with stakeholders and



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CINDY ELIAS
Vice President

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Commissioner

subject matter experts, including SFPD command staff and the District Attorney's office. This process is ongoing, and the Proposed Policy would have significant impacts on this DGO and related SFPD policies and procedures. If provided with the additional above-requested time, we would work closely to ensure that both SFPD and the Commission fully understand the impact the Proposed Policy will have on DGO 5.16.

2. **SFPD General Order on First Amendment Activities:** The Police Commission and SFPD are also currently in the process of updating DGO 8.10, which governs SFPD's policies and procedures relating to First Amendment Activities, such as protests and demonstrations. This is a critically important DGO that has not been updated in more than a decade. Concurrently, the Department of Police Accountability ("DPA") is in the fieldwork phase of an audit of SFPD's compliance with this DGO, with results of the audit expected before the end of 2022. Once again, the Proposed Policy will have significant ramifications on how the Department handles protected First Amendment activity. We believe that more time is needed to assess the Proposed Policy's impact on this DGO, and to incorporate the results of the forthcoming audit on SFPD's compliance with the order.
3. **Addressing Racial Disparities in Policing:** It has been well-documented, including as recently as the Police Commission meeting on September 7, 2022, that SFPD continues to confront unacceptable levels of racial disparity in its stops, searches, and arrests.¹ Despite years of positive progress in other areas of reform, these racial disparities persist, and in Q1 2022, the last quarter for which SFPD has data, the data shows that Black San Franciscans are still five times more likely to be stopped, and eight times more likely to be searched than White San Franciscans. The Commission and SFPD are hard at work on multiple fronts, including SFPD's Race and Reconciliation series and the Commission's ongoing work to revise SFPD's policy regarding traffic stops in DGO 9.01. Multiple experts, including Professor Andrew Guthrie Ferguson in his book, *The Rise of Big Data Policing: Surveillance, Race, and the Future of Law Enforcement*, have highlighted the fact that new surveillance technologies like the ones in the Proposed Policy are not silver bullets, and require careful study so that existing problems and disparities are not exacerbated. We believe that more time is needed to assess the Proposed Policy's impacts on the Department's ongoing efforts to reduce its racial disparities in stops, searches arrests, and uses of force.
4. **Other General Orders and Policies:** In addition to the examples provided above, the Proposed Policy may require both updates and revisions to any number of additional DGOs, and changes to SFPD policies and procedures that will require Commission review and action. We believe that a thorough review of the impact of the Proposed Policy is required before its passage.²

¹ September 7, 2022 Meeting of San Francisco Police Commission, <https://sf.gov/meeting/september-7-2022/september-7-2022-police-commission-meeting>

² The Commission is in the process of hiring a Policy Analyst, which we believe will significantly assist in a review and analysis of the Proposed Policy.



The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CINDY ELIAS
Vice President

KEVIN BENEDICTO
Commissioner

The Proposed Policy represents a significant shift in the SFPD's access to and use of surveillance technology and carries major ramifications for the Department and for the people of San Francisco. We were not provided a draft of the Proposed Policy before it was introduced to the Board and learned about this matter just as members of the public did, from news reports and the presentation to the Rules Committee of the Board of Supervisors. Given that the Proposed Policy will have major impacts and ramifications on the Department's policy, the Commission – as the policy and oversight body of the Department – should have been consulted.

We respectfully request that the Board of Supervisors continue this matter to allow us more time to conduct a thorough review of the policy and provide the Board a better view of its impacts on SFPD's policies and reform efforts.

Respectfully,

Cindy Elias, Vice-President
San Francisco Police Commission

Kevin Benedicto, Commissioner
San Francisco Police Commission

Cc: William Scott, Chief of Police
Paul Henderson, DPA Director



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT
HEADQUARTERS
1245 3RD Street
San Francisco, California 94158



WILLIAM SCOTT
CHIEF OF POLICE

September 9, 2022

Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: SFPD Response to the Bar Association of San Francisco's Opposition to the SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Camera Policy Proposal

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

The San Francisco Police Department and the Board of Supervisors received an opposition letter relating to [our proposed surveillance technology policy \(STP\)](#) from the Bar Association of San Francisco (BASF) on September 1, 2022. The Department is interested in clarifying areas outlined in the letter to provide clear understanding of our proposed policy.

Pursuant to SF Admin Code 19B.2, the Department is seeking BOS approval for one of the current ways in which we utilize surveillance technologies as defined by SF Admin Code 19B.1. The Department has presented our STP for non-city entity surveillance camera use at public hearings as required through the Privacy Surveillance Advisory Board (PSAB) who, after two hearings, recommended to move the STP to the Committee on Information Technology (COIT). After two public hearings in front of COIT, where additional amendments were accepted, COIT recommended the STP move forward to the Rules Committee for approval. We are now scheduled for our third hearing in front of the Rules Committee. The Department requests thoughtful review of our response and proposed STP.

BASF alleges that SFPD is promoting "mass surveillance".

Mass surveillance is indiscriminate surveillance that collects, processes, generates, analyzes, retains, or stores information about large numbers of people, without any regard to whether they are suspected of wrongdoing. SFPD has proposed an authorized use for temporary live monitoring of significant events with public safety concerns which includes a prohibition to record, store, or retain this data unless a misdemeanor or felony crime is witnessed. In those situations, SFPD would then request historical footage to aide in a criminal investigation, where it would be tagged as evidence. The only concern SFPD has is criminal activity and public safety.

BASF mistakenly conflates SF Administrative Code 19B requirements with the Collaborative Reform Initiatives by stating that the U.S. Department of Justice did not recommend a surveillance policy.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed SF Admin Code 19B in 2019. This ordinance requires all city departments to post their current inventory of surveillance tools, as defined by 19B.1, and present policies (STPs) and impact reports (SIRs) through a prescribed process to gain BOS approval for continued use or future procurement. This process is separate and apart from the 2016 U.S DOJ recommendations and reform measures taken on by SFPD. SFPD's STP proposal is a compliance measure relating to a City and County of San Francisco law. As far as we know, the U.S. DOJ has not submitted any concerns with how SFPD collects evidence during a criminal investigation.

BASF claims that "SFPD is proposing changes to SF Administrative Code 19B that may give rise to litigation and jeopardize criminal proceedings in certain cases."

SFPD is in no way proposing changes to SF Admin Code 19B through this policy. SF Admin Code 19B prescribes a public process for each city department to propose impact reports (SIRs) and policies (STPs) that coincide with SF Admin Code Sections 19B.1-19B.4. The non-city entity surveillance camera policy is a STP that was submitted and developed through the Privacy Surveillance Advisory Board (PSAB), the Committee of Information Technology (COIT) and the Rules Committee. This process will be replicated for each item listed here <https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/your-sfpd/policies/19b-surveillance-technology-policies>.

Several departments, including SFPD, received Board of Supervisor [approvals for several types of surveillance tools in July of 2021](#). None of these approvals amended SF Admin Code 19B and as this STP submission follows the same prescribed process, it does not have the authority to be used as a mechanism to propose changes to SF Admin Code 19B.

Separately, using video footage as an aide to criminal investigations has been a standard law enforcement practice since surveillance cameras became available. Specifically, SFPD has been utilizing video footage and systems via consent or warrant for over 20 years. Video footage provides objective, direct, and circumstantial evidence of the crime and notably, can contain exculpatory evidence in many cases. We are unaware of any case where the collection of historical or live footage has jeopardized criminal proceedings. In fact, failing to collect evidence of a crime often compromises the criminal proceedings. Finally, to the extent a defendant would want to challenge the collection of video footage, the defendant would need standing to do so and a judge would make that final determination.

BASF infers that SFPD's policy (STP) should depend on seeking expedited warrants in lieu of requesting consent from surveillance camera owners.

Consent is a recognized warrant exception. Individuals and business owners in San Francisco purchase their own surveillance systems for different reasons. One major reason is to provide footage of a crime to law enforcement to assist in the identification, investigation, arrest, or prosecution of an individual or individuals that commit misdemeanor or felony crimes in or around their home or place of business.

BASF's suggestion would remove the right of San Francisco victims or witnesses, whether they are business owners or residents, to consent or to volunteer video footage that contains evidence of a crime. Many businesses have policies prohibiting their employees from volunteering footage. Also, the Department has experienced individuals who do not consent to provide footage from their system when SFPD submits a request. In those cases, SFPD will and has sought a warrant. But more often, individuals and businesses do consent or volunteer to provide historical footage which allows SFPD to expedite an investigation.

To confirm, the SFPD STP stipulates that video footage will be received via "consent, search warrant or other court order." We are hopeful that BASF understands that San Franciscans should not be prohibited from having autonomy to utilize the surveillance equipment that they own or manage, the way the individual or business sees fit.

BASF states that this policy "radically expands SFPD surveillance capabilities."

Prior to SF Admin Code 19B, SFPD routinely requested access to live footage or historical footage relating to criminal activity from businesses and individuals throughout the city. This policy affirms and codifies this process, required by SF Admin Code 19B.2(a)(4) & (5), as well as implements new guardrails including Captain-rank approval, clear timeline limitations for temporary live monitoring and public reporting (not currently required as the STP has yet to be approved). The STP simply provides clear standardized processes for officers to comply with and provides a public policy allowing general public awareness of SFPD authorized uses and prohibitions. The benefit SF Admin Code 19B extends to the public is an awareness of all city department use of surveillance tools. The proposed STP does not radically expand SFPD's capabilities but instead radically expands the public's awareness of SFPD's use of technology during criminal investigations.

BASF claims that the proposed STP "encroaches on the rights of San Franciscans to all of their daily activities, whether to demonstrate in public, organize to do so, or visit their doctor, meet with a friend whether downtown or near public housing, attend school, or earn a paycheck, without fear of police surveillance."

This claim by BASF is irresponsible and misleading. The authorized uses proposed in the STP are clearly related to criminal activity and public safety concerns relating to significant events. To be clear, San Francisco law does not prohibit businesses and individuals from owning surveillance cameras that may capture residents and visitors on public streets where there is a decreased expectation of privacy. This SFPD STP does not include an authorized use to watch, track, retain or analyze peaceful and lawful activities carried out by San Francisco residents or visitors.

One of the prohibitions listed in the STP reads as follows: "SFPD is prohibited from accessing, requesting, or monitoring any surveillance camera live feed during First Amendment activities unless there are exigent circumstances or for placement of police personnel due to crowd sizes or other issues creating imminent public safety hazards. SFPD members are required to comply with SFPD Department General Order (DGO) 8.03 Crowd Control, DGO 8.10 Guidelines for First Amendment Activities and its annual audit requirements, and the SFPD Event Manual to

ensure the safety of those attending planned or spontaneous events.”

Another prohibition reads as follows: “SFPD is prohibited from seeking to obtain surveillance footage for purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or interstate travel for reproductive care. Except as required by law, SFPD shall not share surveillance footage with any law enforcement agency for purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or interstate travel for reproductive care. Unless legally required, SFPD will not share footage with non-California law enforcement agencies.”

SFPD authorized uses outlined in the STP only encroach on criminal activity either while taking place or after the fact. All the activities outlined by BASF are unrelated to the SFPD proposed authorized uses.

BASF claims that the STP “provides access to a network of cameras, from a central location, with no restrictions on, or even mention of, advanced software that will allow the government to track anyone, anywhere, so long as a camera has them in view.”

This is categorically false and has been publicly explained by SFPD at PSAB, COIT and Rules hearings. There is no central location or network for SFPD to access cameras that fall under this proposal. The requests SFPD will and have made to non-city entities or individuals, and as guided by the proposed STP, are incident based and as such require SFPD to make a request from the owner/operator/authorized user of the system, wait for consent or refusal (where SFPD may seek a warrant) to receive a copy of the footage or access to the system for temporary live monitoring from the authorized user. The STP clearly states that SFPD will present a “SFPD Form 468 consent to search form” to the owner/operator/authorized user of the system to confirm consent before receipt or access to any system and carves out many restrictions around the type of incident, occasion, monitoring time limitations, level of internal approvals required before a request can be made to a non-city entity, reporting requirements and a host of prohibitions around temporary live monitoring access and historical footage requests.

The STP does indeed mention advanced software and prohibitions around the use of facial recognition and biometric software. The data retained by SFPD is collected as evidence and is only shared with the entities identified in the STP data sharing section on p. 8 & 9 of the latest proposal. SFPD’s STP along with Evidence Code and other state and federal laws mandating evidence storage and retention, does not allow for sharing evidence of crimes to general government entities for purposes outside of criminal investigations or for tracking “anyone, anywhere, so long as a camera has them in view” as BASF suggests.

In conclusion, the SFPD is requesting to utilize video footage while still upholding the rights of individuals to ensure public safety for all. SFPD continues to make incident-based requests and does not and will not have a central location where SFPD officers can tap into a network of surveillance systems owned by non-city entities or individuals. The proposed STP simply affirms that individuals and businesses in San Francisco can choose to share their video footage relating to a criminal investigation with SFPD and assist the Department with addressing criminal activity in this city.

September 9, 2022

We are grateful to the members of PSAB, COIT, the Rules Committee and to the many members of the public who have called in to the hearings or have submitted letters in support or expressing concern. We look forward to the next Rules Committee hearing where the continued discussion directly relates to the actual content of our proposed STP.

Respectfully submitted,



WILLIAM SCOTT
Chief of Police

c: Police Commission

Non-City Entity Surveillance Camera Policy Ordinance

Pursuant to SF Admin Code 19B



CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Police Department

September 12, 2022

Public Hearings

March 25, 2022: Privacy Surveillance Advisory Board Hearing
March 31, 2022: Privacy Surveillance Advisory Board Hearing
April 7, 2022: Committee on Information Technology Hearing
April 21, 2022: Committee on Information Technology Hearing
July 11, 2022: Rules Committee Hearing
July 18, 2022: Rules Committee Hearing
July 20, 2022: Presentation to the Police Commission
July 25, 2022: Rules Committee Hearing
September 12, 2022 (today): Rules Committee Hearing

Non-City Entities

- Any entity that is not a City and County of SF agency, or does not have a financial agreement or MOU with SFPD
- Victims, witnesses, and businesses impacted by crime
- Individuals or businesses hosting or near major events where public safety may be impacted

SF Admin Code 19B not only addresses current inventory a Department has in their possession, but it also includes oral or written agreements to use or receive data on a regular basis from a non-city entity or individual's surveillance technology.

As "regular basis" is not defined in 19B, and SFPD receives video footage from non-city entities & individuals who may have been impacted by crime more than once, we submitted this STP to ensure robust compliance with 19B.



SFPD receives credible information about a planned sideshow

SFPD officer completes temp live monitoring form through chain of command for Captain-rank approval. Must articulate need, requested length of time, general location

Captain does not approve (in writing)

No

Officer may not make request to non-city entity

Captain approves request (in writing)

Yes

Officer may submit request to non-city entity on standardized SFPD form

SFPD submits request to non-city entity. Non-city entity approves.

SFPD submits request to non-city entity. Non-city entity declines. SFPD closes requests and documents outcome.

SFPD monitors no more than 24 hrs. SFPD not allowed to record. Documents outcome for auditing, tracking and reporting purposes.

If non-city entity provides footage, it is tagged as evidence and associated with investigative file.

SFPD officers may return to video custodian with a SFPD Form 468 and request historical footage that captures sideshow activities. may take footage. If video custodian declines to sign, SFPD may seek warrant.



Retention

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

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

Reminder: The footage is owned by the non-city entity. Their retention is not within the control of SFPD.



January 28, 2021
Consent for video led to
arrest of suspect two days
after this incident



July 31, 2022
Consent for video led
to capture of suspects
in this crime

Images from first brutal robbery



**A couple seconds later, suspects return to beat and
rob victim a second time as she tries to escape**

Concerns

- SFPD will track First Amendment and other peaceful activities
- Impacts SFPD Department General Orders (DGOs)
- Racial Disparities
- SFPD will have central location to monitor anyone at any time
- Stockpiled footage
- SFPD should only receive footage via warrant & should be prohibited from receiving consent/volunteered footage.
- Need more time to assess data and impacts

Response

- STP complies with SFPD **DGO** 8.10 “Guidelines for First Amendment Activities” and adds prohibitions around video footage (p. 3 of STP).
- This STP does not impact SFPD DGOs. Members are still required to comply with all Police Commission approved DGOs.
- Violent crime disproportionally impacts black and brown men and there has been an uptick in violent crimes in AAPI community. STP codifies ability to gather evidence in these crimes to prosecute offenders.
- SFPD will NOT have central location to monitor. Requests are incident-based and require consent or warrant (last para of purpose and scope of STP, p.1).
- This STP limits temp live monitoring to max of 24 hours, prohibits recording and includes multiple other restrictions(authorized use #1 on p. 2).
- SFPD does not believe victims , witnesses or impacted businesses should lose their right to volunteer their own surveillance footage .
- STP requires tracking historical and temp live mentoring instances & quarterly and annual reports (Audits & Reporting p. 8 of STP). There is no current requirement and as such no data readily available to assess.

Questions?

SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT



Surveillance Impact Report

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

As required by San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 19B ("19B"), departments must submit a Surveillance Impact Report for each surveillance technology to the Committee on Information Technology ("COIT") and the Board of Supervisors.

The Surveillance Impact Report details the benefits, costs, and potential impacts associated with the Department's use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras. (hereinafter referred to as "surveillance technology").

Absent a subpoena or search warrant, SFPD access to all systems noted in this Policy will be obtained through the express consent of the individual or entity managing the surveillance system at the time of request. SFPD does not and shall not manage a surveillance camera registry, have public observation devices, or have a Ring/Neighbors or similar partnership agreements.

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

PURPOSE OF THE TECHNOLOGY

The Department's mission is to protect life and property, prevent crime and reduce the fear of crime by providing service with understanding, response with compassion, performance with integrity and law enforcement with vision.

The Department shall use the surveillance technology only for the following authorized purposes:

Authorized Use(s):

- Temporary live monitoring (a) during an exigent circumstance as defined by San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 19B, (b) during Significant Events with public safety concerns only for placement of police personnel due to crowd sizes or other issues creating imminent public safety hazards, or (c) in the course of a specific criminal investigation if an SFPD Captain or member in rank above Captain confirms in writing that the department has credible information of criminal activity and live monitoring is being requested in furtherance of that criminal investigation. Temporary live monitoring will cease, and the connection will be severed within 24 hours after the non-city entity has provided access to SFPD. SFPD shall not record or duplicate the live monitoring feed using any electronic device, including body worn cameras or cell phones. If SFPD observes misdemeanor or felony violations on the live monitoring feed, nothing in this policy ordinance prohibits SFPD from deferring to authorized use No. 2 or No. 3 of this section.

Surveillance Oversight Review Dates

PSAB Review: March 25, 2022 & March 31, 2022

COIT Review: April 7, 2022 & April 21, 2022

Board of Supervisors Approval: TBD

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

Prohibitions:

- Surveillance camera footage will not on its own identify an individual, confirm racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, or information concerning an individual person's sex life or sexual orientation.
- SFPD is prohibited from using biometric identification or facial recognition technology in connection with non-City entity surveillance cameras or associated data.
- SFPD is prohibited from live monitoring inside residential dwellings where homeowners/renters have a reasonable expectation of privacy unless one the following conditions exist: Exigency per SF Admin Code 19b.7; a homeowner/renter/individual with legal authority to do so provides consent; or a warrant is issued. If the conditions exist, SFPD shall adhere to the authorized use and reporting provisions relating to temporary live monitoring.
- SFPD is prohibited from monitoring any certain groups or individuals based, in whole or in part, on race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation. Race, color, ethnicity, or national origin may not be used as a motivating factor for initiating police enforcement action.
- SFPD is prohibited from accessing, requesting, or monitoring any surveillance camera live feed during First Amendment activities unless there are exigent circumstances or for placement of police personnel due to crowd sizes or other issues creating imminent public safety hazards. SFPD members are required to comply with [SFPD Department General Order \(DGO\) 8.03 Crowd Control](#), [DGO 8.10 Guidelines for First Amendment Activities](#) and its annual audit requirements, and the SFPD Event Manual to ensure the safety of those attending planned or spontaneous events.
- SFPD members shall not acquire or use surveillance camera footage in cooperation with or assisting U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement or U.S. Customs and Border Protection in any investigation, detention, or arrest procedures, public or clandestine, where in any such instance the purpose is the enforcement of federal immigration laws. SFPD complies with SF Administrative Code Chapters 12H "Immigration Status" and 12I "Civil Immigration Detainers" and [SFPD General Order \(DGO\) 5.15 "Enforcement of Immigration Laws"](#).
- SFPD is prohibited from seeking to obtain surveillance footage for purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or interstate travel for reproductive care. Except as required by law, SFPD shall not share surveillance footage with any law enforcement agency for purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or interstate travel for reproductive care. Unless legally required, SFPD will not share footage with non-California law enforcement agencies.

Description of Technology

This is a product description of the technology:

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

Subcategories: Indoor, Outdoor

Typical Camera Types [Not vendor specific]:

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

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The impact assessment addresses the conditions for surveillance technology approval, as outlined by the Standards of Approval in San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 19B:

1. The benefits of the surveillance technology outweigh the costs.
2. The Department's Policy safeguards civil liberties and civil rights.
3. The uses and deployments of the surveillance technology are not based upon discriminatory or viewpoint-based factors and do not have a disparate impact on any community or Protected Class.

The Department's use of the surveillance technology is intended to support and benefit the residents of San Francisco while minimizing and mitigating all costs and potential civil rights and liberties impacts of residents.

A. Benefits

The Department's use of the surveillance technology has the following benefits for the residents of the City and County of San Francisco:

Benefit	Description
□ Education	

☐	Community Development	
☐	Health	Protect safety of residents, visitors of San Francisco.
☐	Environment	
☐	Criminal Justice	Review video footage after a crime has occurred; officer and community safety during live monitoring; corroborate witness statements; investigative tool; provide objective video evidence to the DA's office for prosecutorial functions or provide to the public upon request through a formal process, order, or subpoena.
☐	Jobs	
☐	Housing	
☐	Other	

Additional benefits include effective public-safety interventions to curb crime and improve livability and wellbeing of communities.

B. Civil Rights Impacts and Safeguards

The Department has considered the potential impacts and has identified the technical, administrative, and physical protections as mitigating measures:

Right to Privacy- Individuals retain certain rights to privacy when they leave private spaces and generally people do not expect or desire for law enforcement to monitor, record, without cause or as a consequence of participating in contemporary society. While SFPD may ask public organizations, private businesses, and individuals to share video that might help in the investigation of a crime, SFPD does not own or operate non-city entity surveillance cameras and as such does not determine placement of these cameras, what is captured or what is recorded. If invertedly provided, SFPD will not rely on facial recognition or biometric software to identify specific persons captured on video that has facial recognition as a component.

Patrons of businesses in this city generally accept that they are being recorded when in or around retail shops and many residents widely accept that they are being recorded by doorbell cameras in residential neighborhoods. While SFPD affirms that individuals have the Right to Privacy and freedom of expression, in conformance with and consistent with federal, state, and local law, officers will only request historical footage that relates to a specific criminal or internal investigation.

The Department will also limit temporary live footage to specific circumstances as not to impede on members of the public and their general desire to not be monitored. Requests for live footage access will be restricted to active criminal or internal investigations and significant events with public safety concerns. Examples include but are not limited to:

- Aircraft accident
- Homicide suspect location
- Active narcotic sales
- Missing/abducted person
- Riots/Looting/Arson

Requests for live footage must first receive Captain approval.

Another loss of the right to privacy concern relates to individuals or businesses who provide camera footage to the police but do not want to be identified for fear of retaliation from perpetrators. PII of individuals who provided video footage to SFPD for investigative purposes will not be provided to the public unless authorized pursuant to a court order or as authorized by state or federal law. If an individual's surveillance camera footage is included in videos displayed during Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) townhalls, SFPD will notify the individual beforehand.

Loss of Liberty- Surveillance footage could lead to false conclusions or misidentifications of a person as a perpetrator. To mitigate this, SFPD does not rely solely on camera footage to conclude a case or bring charges against a suspect. SFPD must do additional investigative work to understand the full context of a criminal incident by consulting with witnesses and residents, review booking photos, consulting with ALPR reads and reviewing any evidence left at the scene. Footage is a vital tool but cannot replace investigative processes necessary to solve a case.

Warrantless Searches- Surveillance cameras with views covering areas where people may have a reasonable expectation of privacy can pose a civil liberty concern. Absent a search warrant, or recognized warrant exception (e.g., valid consent, exigent circumstances), SFPD members will not monitor live footage or request historical footage from spaces where individuals have a reasonable expectation of privacy.

Equal Protection of the Law- SFPD may request video footage relating to specific criminal activity or incidents and will not request to monitor individuals or groups based on their race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation. SFPD has included specific prohibitions to this policy to ensure parameters around requests for historical footage and temporary live monitoring do not infringe on the rights of individuals.

C. Fiscal Analysis of Costs and Benefits

The Department's use of the surveillance technology yields the following business and operations benefits:

	Benefit	Description
X	Financial Savings	Non-city entity Security Camera Systems do not require Department operational funding and reduce reliance on first-hand accounts by patrol officers or fixed posts, making deployments more effective and efficient.
X	Time Savings	Investigating crimes by gathering evidence can be extremely time consuming. As there are thousands of cameras throughout the city, officers can quickly identify cameras in vicinity of an incident that could potentially aid in the apprehension of the suspect(s) responsible for the crime under investigation. This saves officers valuable time which they would otherwise spend going door-to-door attempting to locate witnesses and gathering witness statements.
X	Staff Safety	Non-city entity Security Camera Systems provide situational awareness and increase officer safety, particularly during live video reviews. Officers can approach an active crime scene more safely and determine a strategy to keep members of the public safe during live monitoring of

cameras. Officers can determine the precise location and time of the event and whether high-capacity weapons are being used.

X Data Quality Non-city entity camera footage provides an objective account of an incident and can corroborate or dispute witness statements, determine whether involved persons may have left the scene of the incident before first responder arrived.

X Other

Other benefits include accountability. SFPD Internal Affairs may request historical camera footage from a non-city entity during an officer misconduct investigation.

The total fiscal cost, including initial purchase, personnel and other ongoing costs is

FTE (new & existing)	N/A		
Classification	N/A		
	Annual Cost	Years	One-Time Cost
Total Salary & Fringe	\$0	-	-
Software	\$0	-	-
Hardware/Equipment	\$0	-	-
Professional Services	\$0		-
Training	\$0	-	-
Other	\$0	-	-
Total Cost [Auto-calculate]			
2.1 Please disclose any current or potential sources of funding (e.g., potential sources = prospective grant recipients, etc.). ^{SIR, ASR}			

No cost to the Department

COMPARISON TO OTHER JURISDICTIONS:

Surveillance Camera Registries: The following police departments manage local registry programs for private security cameras owned by individuals and businesses. The Police Departments do not have access to registered cameras but may request a copy of any video captured by registered cameras to assist in the investigation of a crime. Some jurisdictions offer signage noting that surveillance systems are registered with the police department. The registry also enables officers to quickly identify cameras that could potentially aid in the apprehension of the suspect(s) responsible for the crime under investigation. This saves officers valuable time which they would otherwise spend going door-to-door attempting to locate security footage that could help identify a suspect. Registration is completely voluntary and free of charge. Registrant's personal information is kept confidential by the Police Department and will only be accessed by law enforcement personnel who are investigating. Registration may

be withdrawn at any time.

- Albany Police Department: <https://www.albanyca.org/Home/Components/News/News/9888/>
- Berkely Police Department <https://www.cityofberkeley.info/police/security-camera-registry/>
- Dublin Police Department: <https://dublin.ca.gov/1815/Security-Camera-Registration>
- Hayward Police Department: <https://www.hayward-ca.gov/police-department/programs/hayward-eyes>
- Oakland Police Department: <https://www.oaklandca.gov/services/register-your-security-camera>
- Union City Police Department: <https://cityprotect.com/camera-registration#/agencies>

SFPD does not manage a camera registry, although the San Francisco District Attorney's office has information about their registry listed on their website, found here: <https://sfdistrictattorney.org/resources/register-your-camera/>

Ring/Neighbors Partnerships: Police Departments can sign an agreement with Amazon's home surveillance equipment company, Ring, to gain special access to the company's Neighbors app. Here is a partial list of Police Department's in surrounding cities/counties who have these agreements in place.

- Alameda County Sheriff's Office
- Daly City Police Department
- Dublin Police Department
- Elk Grove Police Department
- Hayward Police Department

SFPD does not have a Ring/Doorbell Camera Partnership. This is an example of how other jurisdictions manage doorbell/smart camera registries.

Public Surveillance Systems: These are a network of several cameras linked to a centralized monitor or location equipped to record the images that were captured. These systems may also be referred to as Police Observation Devices (POD) or Portable Overt Digital Surveillance Systems (PODSS). The benefits include public policy processes, public posting of locations of cameras and law enforcement having direct access to camera footage without third party.

- Sacramento Police Departments: Police Observation Devices (PODs) <https://apps.sacpd.org/Releases/liveview.aspx?reference=20161027-141>

SFPD does not have or manage PODS, PODSS or any other network of cameras. This is an example of how other law enforcement agencies manage surveillance cameras.

APPENDIX A: Mapped Crime Statistics

The general location(s) cameras be deployed and crime statistics for any location(s):

The SFPD does not have decision making authority for placement of non-city entity surveillance cameras and as such is unable to post general locations of cameras.

The SFPD submits requests through any non-city entity or individual throughout the city and county of San Francisco.

Please see below crime statistics for San Francisco:

<https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/stay-safe/crime-data/crime-dashboard>



Committee on Information Technology

Office of the City Administrator

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Carmen Chu, City Administrator

Jillian Johnson, Director, Committee of Information Technology

Date: May 18, 2021

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

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

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

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

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

Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras

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

Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Public Meeting Dates:

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

COIT recommends the following action be taken on the policy:

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



Brooke Jenkins
District Attorney

July 11, 2022

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

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

Dear Chair Peskin;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,



Brooke Jenkins
District Attorney

cc: Victor Young, Clerk

Non-City Entity Surveillance Camera Policy Ordinance

SF Admin Code 19B



CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Police Department

July 11, 2022

Public Hearings

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

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

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



SFPD Authorized Uses

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

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

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

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



—No

—Yes

Video custodian
consents to
request and emails
the file to officer or
officer can transfer
to USB or disk

Video custodian does not consent.
▶ Officer/Investigator may seek a warrant based on probable cause. When judge signs warrant, officer/investigator/video retrieval officer will gather the footage

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

Witness/Video Evidence Worksheet **Witness A (Video Custodian)**

Name of Firm (Video Interviewer) (Print)		Use X	
Incident Report #		Date of Firm (Video Interviewer)	
<u>WITNESS / VIDEO CUSTODIAN INFORMATION</u>			
Name of Video Custodian (Last, First, Middle)		Name of Business (Location of video recording device)	
Business Phone	Business Address	City	State
Home / Cell Phone	Home Address	City	State
DOB	Date of Identification	Identification #	Email address

VIDEO CUSTODIAN QUALIFICATIONS

NOTE: Under Custodian is the person who obtained or who has personal knowledge of the retrieval of the video evidence *(upon the recording device.)*


- a. What is the Video Custodian's Name and job title? _____
- b. Who is the Video Custodian's Employer? _____ How long employed? _____
(Name of business) (Date of hire/employment)
- c. Was the Video Custodian working on _____ (date of incident (MM/DD)) _____ (date of recording) ☐ Yes ☐ No
- d. Is the Video Custodian an authorized operator of the recording device? ☐ Yes ☐ No
(If "No" Video Custodian should be either the owner or someone the owner has authorized to control the device.)
- e. In part of the Video Custodian's duties, is he/she familiar with the operation of the recording device described in part of the incident report? (e.g. brand model number) (if yes/no, describe the process)? _____ ☐ Yes ☐ No
- f. How are recorded events stored and managed? _____
(e.g. recorded onto hard drive, DVD, network server, cloud storage, etc.)
- g. Does anyone (other than employees and authorized operators) of the business have access to the recording device? ☐ Yes ☐ No If "Yes" please explain who has access and why _____
- h. Does the recording device record events in the regular course of business and at the same time that the events occur? ☐ Yes ☐ No



Investigative File



Temporary Live Monitoring Requests



Retention

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

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

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

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

First Amendment

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prohibitions

Non-exhaustive list of prohibitions in STP

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

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

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

SFPD Training

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

CCSF & SFPD Training Courses

Cybersecurity Training

Critical Mindset Coordinated Response Training

DGO 8.10 Guidelines for First Amendment Activities

Video Retrieval Training (2 day)

Crowd Control Training

CLETS/CORI & CJIS Training

California Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Basic Courses

LD 15 Laws of Arrest

LD 16 Search and Seizure

LD 17 Presentation of Evidence

LD 23 Crimes in Progress

LD 26 Critical Incidents

LD 30 Crime Scenes, Evidence, and Forensics

LD 42 Cultural Diversity/Discrimination

LD 43 Terrorism Awareness

PC 872 (b) Hearsay Testimony

Impact Report

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

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

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

Questions?

SAN FRANCISCO
POLICE DEPARTMENT



Surveillance Technology Policy

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

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

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

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

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

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

Absent a subpoena or search warrant, SFPD access to all systems noted in this Policy will be obtained through the express consent of the individual or entity managing the surveillance system at the time of request. SFPD does not and shall not manage a surveillance camera registry, have public observation devices, or have a Ring/Neighbors or similar partnership agreements.

POLICY STATEMENT

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

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

Surveillance Oversight Review Dates

COIT Review: April 21, 2022

Board of Supervisors Review: TBD

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

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

These exclusions shall be governed by a separate use policy compliant with the requirements of Section 19B.

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

Authorized Use(s):

1. ~~Temporary live monitoring during an exigency as defined by San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 19B, or Significant Events with public safety concerns, or investigations relating to active misdemeanor and felony violations. Temporary live monitoring will cease, and the connection will be severed within 24 hours after the non-city entity has provided access to SFPD. SFPD shall not record live monitoring however, if misdemeanor or felony violations are observed, nothing in this policy ordinance prohibits SFPD from deferring to authorized use No. 2 or No. 3 of this section.~~ Temporary live monitoring (a) during an exigent circumstance as defined by Administrative Code, Section 19B, (b) during Significant Events with public safety concerns only for placement of police personnel due to crowd sizes or other issues creating imminent public safety hazards, or (c) in the course of a specific criminal investigation if an SFPD Captain or member in rank above Captain confirms in writing that the department has credible information of criminal activity and live monitoring is being requested in furtherance of that criminal investigation. Temporary live monitoring will cease, and the connection will be severed, within 24 hours after the non-city entity has provided access to SFPD. SFPD shall not record or duplicate the live monitoring feed using any electronic device, including body worn cameras or cell phones. If SFPD observes misdemeanor or felony violations on the live monitoring feed, nothing in this policy ordinance prohibits SFPD from deferring to authorized use No. 2 or No. 3 of this section.
2. Requesting, obtaining, and reviewing historical video footage for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to a specific criminal investigation.
3. Requesting, obtaining, and reviewing historical video footage for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to an internal investigation regarding officer misconduct.

Prohibitions:

- Surveillance camera footage will not on its own identify an individual, confirm racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, or information concerning an individual person's sex life or sexual orientation.

- SFPD is prohibited from using biometric identification or facial recognition technology in connection with non-City entity surveillance cameras or associated data.
- SFPD is prohibited from live monitoring inside residential dwellings where homeowners/renters have a reasonable expectation of privacy unless one the following conditions exist: Exigency per SF Admin Code 19b.7; a homeowner/renter/individual with legal authority to do so provides consent; or a warrant is issued. If the conditions exist, SFPD shall adhere to the authorized use and reporting provisions relating to temporary live monitoring.
- SFPD is prohibited from monitoring any certain groups or individuals based, in whole or in part, on race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation. Race, color, ethnicity, or national origin may not be used as a motivating factor for initiating police enforcement action.
- SFPD is prohibited from accessing, requesting, or monitoring any surveillance camera live feed during First Amendment activities unless there are exigent circumstances or for placement of police personnel for reasons outside of redeployment needs due to crowd sizes or other issues creating imminent public safety hazards. SFPD members are required to comply with SFPD Department General Order (DGO) 8.03 Crowd Control, DGO 8.10 Guidelines for First Amendment Activities and its annual audit requirements, and the SFPD Event Manual to ensure the safety of those attending planned or spontaneous events.
- SFPD members shall not acquire or use surveillance camera footage in cooperation with or assisting U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement or U.S. Customs and Border Protection in any investigation, detention, or arrest procedures, public or clandestine, where in any such instance the purpose is the enforcement of federal immigration laws. SFPD complies with SF Administrative Code Chapters 12H "Immigration Status" and 12I "Civil Immigration Detainers" and SFPD General Order (DGO) 5.15 "Enforcement of Immigration Laws".
- SFPD is prohibited from seeking to obtain surveillance footage for purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or interstate travel for reproductive care. Except as required by law, SFPD shall not share surveillance footage with any law enforcement agency for purposes of enforcing prohibitions on reproductive care or interstate travel for reproductive care. Unless legally required, SFPD will not share footage with non-California law enforcement agencies.

BUSINESS JUSTIFICATION

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

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

Subcategories: Indoor, Outdoor

Typical Camera Types [Not vendor specific]:

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

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

X	Health	Protect safety of visitors and residents of San Francisco.
□	Environment	
X	Criminal Justice	Review video footage after a crime has occurred; officer and community safety during live monitoring; corroborate witness statements; investigative tool; provide objective video evidence to the DA's office for prosecutorial functions or provide to the public upon request through a formal process, order, or subpoena.
□	Housing	
X	Other	Effective public-safety interventions to curb crime and improve livability and wellbeing of communities.

In addition, the following benefits are obtained:

Benefit	Description
---------	-------------

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

POLICY REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. *Department employees*

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

- Non-sworn members, at the direction of Officer in Charge. The Officer in Charge (OIC) is any member working in a supervisory capacity over a unit, group, or team. The OIC is not rank specific.
- Q2-Q4, Police Officer
- Q35-Q37, Assistant Inspector
- Q0380- Q0382, Inspector
- Q50-Q-52, Sergeant
- Q60-Q62, Lieutenant
- Q80-Q82, Captain
- 0488-0490, Commander
- 0400-0402, Deputy Chief
- 0395, Assistant Chief
- 0390, Chief of Police

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

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

The approving Captain shall use good faith belief or objectively reasonable reliance on information confirming exigency or misdemeanor or felony violations for the basis of approving or denying live monitoring requests. Upon Board of

Supervisors approval of this policy ordinance, the Department will determine a mechanism for the ranks Q2 – Q62 to receive Captain rank approval. The Department's Written Directives Unit shall update the "Permission to Search -Form 468" that may be provided to the non-city entity or individual to substantiate the consent for SFPD live monitoring request. The non-city entity or individual retains the right to refuse the request.

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

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

B. Members of the public

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

Data
Security:

Department shall secure any PII received from non-city entity or individuals (or shared by non-city entity) against unauthorized or unlawful processing or disclosure; unwarranted access, manipulation, or misuse; and accidental loss, destruction, or damage. Surveillance technology data collected and retained by the Department shall be protected by the safeguards appropriate for its classification level(s) as defined by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) security framework 800-53, or equivalent requirements from other major cybersecurity framework selected by the department.

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

- Storage: Any storage of a non-city entity's camera footage must reside in a SFPD specified repository that meets the City's cyber security requirements as well as Department of Justice California Law Enforcement Telecommunications Systems (CLETS) and Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) requirements. Video Retrieval Officers may initially store footage provided by a business or individual on a USB or CD. Upon the

execution of a city contract with a digital evidence management system vendor, members shall transfer the footage to this system that requires an agency domain and log in. The evidence management system will have a platform that is auditable and can track the source of upload and number of views. This platform will not be accessible to members of the public or anyone without an approved log-in. This platform will meet the requirements of the Office of Contract Administration ("OCA") who promulgates rules and regulations pursuant to Chapter 21 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The SFPD Contracting Department shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 21 and cooperate to the fullest extent with OCA in the Acquisition of Commodities and Services.

- Audits: SFPD members shall note in the chronological record of investigation ("chron") time/date surveillance footage was requested, approved, or denied by non-city entity, and in the case of live monitoring requests, SFPD members shall note in an incident report and/or the chron the captain's approval, date/time of access, duration of access and outcome of access. Upon implementation of the internal records management system, SFPD members shall note this information in this system. This data will serve as the Department's audit log, which is electronically accessible for on-demand audits
- Reporting: SFPD shall submit an annual surveillance report as outlined in SF Administrative Code Sections 19B.1 and 19B.6. Upon adoption of the non-city entity surveillance camera policy ordinance, SFPD shall submit a quarterly report tracking live monitoring requests to the Police Commission, copying the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. The quarterly report shall identify whether each request was granted or denied by the Captain or member in rank above Captain; the justification for granting the request if it was granted, including the reason(s) why the Captain or member in rank above Captain found the information credible; whether the request was granted by the non-City entity; whether the images were used to bring criminal charges; the types of charges brought; and the results of the charges. The reporting requirement shall commence 60 days after the first full quarter following adoption and every quarter thereafter. After the first two years of quarterly reports to the Commission, the Department will thereafter submit a bi-annual report.

Data
Sharing:

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

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

- X Upon Request
- X As needed

Weekly
Monthly
Other:

A. Internal (City Entity) Data Sharing

Department shares the following data with the recipients:

- District Attorney's Office for use as evidence to aid in prosecution, in accordance with laws governing evidence.
 - Public Defender's Office or criminal defense attorney via the District Attorney's Office in accordance with California [and federal](#) discovery laws.
 - The Department of Police Accountability per Section 4.136(j) of the San Francisco Charter
 - Other City agencies impacted by a criminal incident captured by the surveillance camera footage.
- Data sharing occurs at the following frequency: As needed

B. External (Non-City Entity) Data Sharing

Department shares the following data with the recipients:

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

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

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

Data sharing occurs at the following frequency: As needed

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

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

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

- ~~Security Camera data shared with Department by Non-city entity will be stored only for the period necessary for investigation or litigation following an incident. As the data is associated with a criminal investigation, the data is retained for a minimum of two years, or as required by State evidence retention laws. Camera footage associated with an officer misconduct or Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) investigation will be maintained in perpetuity. Security Camera data shared with Department by a non-City entity will be stored only for the period necessary for investigation, prosecution, or litigation following an incident. All historical footage is associated with a specific criminal investigation and is tagged as evidence. This data shall be retained as required by State evidence retention laws. Camera footage associated with an officer misconduct or Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) investigation shall be maintained in perpetuity.~~
- ~~Justification: A shorter retention period safeguards PII from inappropriate or unauthorized use by minimizing the period and purposes for which it may be retained. For data affiliated with criminal investigation, two years allows adequate time for the Department and partner departments to access footage to determine whether it constitutes meaningful evidence. If so determined, the SFPD will retain data in a safe environment as required by relevant evidence laws to ensure access for legal discovery. Any historical video not tagged into evidence and subject to the use requirements of Chapter 19B shall be deleted within 90 days.~~

Data may be stored in the following location:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SF City & County Employee Portal

- Cybersecurity Training

SFPD Training

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

COMPLIANCE

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

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

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

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

Sanctions for violations of this Policy include the following:

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

DEFINITIONS

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

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

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

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

AUTHORIZATION

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

QUESTIONS & CONCERNS

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

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

City and County of San Francisco Employees:

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



BARBARY COAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

BCNA
P.O. Box 2045
San Francisco, CA 94126
www.bcnasf.org

August 15, 2022

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

David Albert
Bill Hannan
Karen Scarr
Diana Taylor

MEMBERS AT LARGE

Bob Harrer
Michele Hennessey
Karen Keese
Lee Robbins
James Seff
Philippe Sonne
Michael Velzo

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Rules Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Rules Committee Clerk Victor.Young@sfgov.org

Re: San Francisco Police Department Surveillance Technology Policy: **STRONG SUPPORT**

Dear Committee and Staff:

The Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA) **strongly supports adoption of the recently amended legislation approving San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Surveillance Technology Policy**. This legislation and policy grants SFPD an ability to utilize privately owned video cameras and should be adopted for the following reasons:

1. More effective law enforcement: Anyone who is a fan of BBC shows such as Morse, Lewis, etc., knows that cameras are often the key to solving crimes. And here in San Francisco, individual citizens, business owners, and apartment buildings are already using cameras to monitor their property in hopes of improving their security and safety. In most cases, they are eager to voluntarily share video captured by those camera systems with law enforcement officials, if it helps to enforce laws against crime and/or deter those crimes from being committed. In addition, we know that cameras can be, and already are, a proven non-confrontational method for enforcement of many laws such as those that require stopping at a red light and for payment of tolls.

2. More efficient law enforcement and a reduced likelihood of physical violence: The use of video camera technology as a tool for law enforcement tool will allow for more efficient and effective deployment of scarce police resources and will reduce, and in some cases, eliminate potentially dangerous, even life threatening, confrontations between police officers and the public. We should be encouraging the use of these non-confrontational approaches to law enforcement, rather than discouraging them.

3. Extensive privacy and equity protections: The amended version of the Surveillance Technology Policy contains extensive protections for individual privacy rights in the form of seven (7) different prohibitions, among which are strict prohibitions in the technology's use for monitoring groups or individuals based on race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, national origin; prohibitions on use in enforcing laws related to reproductive care; and immigration and/or customs enforcement. Additional restrictions protect individuals from use of this technology during First Amendment activities. The Policy's requirements on storage and retention of data are also stringent.

4. Increased police accountability: The use of modern video surveillance technologies not only can alert our law enforcement system of criminal acts, but can also provide a record of illegal activities, that might be perpetrated by police officers. The George Floyd tragedy is an example of this aspect of video surveillance. If it were not for a video that a private citizen captured of the killing of George Floyd, it's possible that the police officers who murdered, or abetted in the murder of, George Floyd would never have been brought to justice.

Finally, note that the amended legislation must be renewed or amended by the end of one year. During that time, San Francisco's public and its representatives will have ample opportunity to determine if the Policy's restrictions on the use of Surveillance Technology should be modified.

BCNA strongly urges the Board of Supervisors and its Rules Committee to help ensure the safety and security of the residents and businesses of San Francisco by adopting this legislation without delay.

Sincerely Yours,

Diana Taylor

Diana Taylor, President

Cc: City Attorney David Chiu, Supervisor Aaron Peskin, Acting SFPD Capt. Farmer, DA Brooke Jenkins

From: [Ana Elisa Fuentes](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)
Cc: [mcagle](#)
Subject: Re: Live Monitoring, Surveillance Technology
Date: Monday, July 25, 2022 1:30:48 PM
Importance: High

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

Monday July 25, 2022

The following is my prepared statement for the Rules Committee public comment for item 6; the proposed use of SFPD Surveillance Technology

Good Afternoon --

my name is Ana Elisa Fuentes. I am a resident of San Francisco. I called in today to voice opposition and to ask the SF Board of Supervisors not to capitulate to the SFPD's demand to increase and expand surveillance technology.

My seven main concerns are discoveries revealed by MIT, UC Berkeley; the Algorithmic Justice League; Google, the ACLU; and the Washington Post, for example. My concerns are these:

1. The use of live monitoring or spying technology violates our fourth and first amendments - that is freedom to assemble, freedom of speech, and in potential breach in the gathering evidence without a warrant.
2. The police will conduct its own oversight which means there will be no one *live monitoring* their misconduct or abuse of this technology. There will not be impartial accountability for breach, abuse, or misconduct in the employment of surveillance, live monitoring technology.
3. ***This technology benefits white, middle-aged men only, in it's accuracy. This enjoyment of this privilege and protection by this demographic translates to mean:

4. Everyone else is vulnerable to the inaccuracies; the false positives, and other algorithmic biases inherent in this unregulated technology.

5. This technology will render vulnerable, African Americans, Asian Americans, and especially women, specifically black women and children. This technology will amplify the harm already suffered by our Asian American communities through false identification and algorithmic bias.

6. False identification through a biased technology leads to false arrests; increased mistrust; false interrogations; and the potential loss of life due. All due to the counterproductive racial and algorithmic biases inherent in surveillance, facial recognition technologies.

7. Lastly, all together these facts, unfortunately, in the false identification of children intersects with the current appointed DA's mandate to punish and try children as adults. This maneuver is right out of the authoritarian playbook-- a maneuver which targets vulnerable communities; of which children are a specified target. Much in the same way John Porter fraudulently used a foundation to "help" underprivileged children as a front to funnel bribery funds to Mohammed Nuru.

I encourage the San Francisco Board of Supervisors not to capitulate to the demands by SFPD. Surveillance will not make us safer. The voters have voted in opposition. Please act accordingly. Thank you.

***Please do not be angry. Please do not hate me regarding #3. I do not make up facts.

I do not make up facts unlike the former president who labeled and falsely identified all Mexicans, brown people, or persons from south of the border as "rapists and drug dealers." Statements like this hurt. They hurt and become unjust and/or unconstitutional when they reflect in public policy(ies)

Broad and unjustified comments made by the former president are hurtful and unfactual said to effect injury and harm.

His statements are biased, hateful, discriminatory, unjust but more importantly unproven by scientific fact.

In #3 I am just citing a fact determined by MIT; a university with long standing commitment to the sciences.

Ana Elisa Fuentes

<http://anaelisafoto.wordpress.com>

From: [Elliot Helman](#)
To: [MandelmanStaff. \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: oppose SFPD's efforts to increase surveillance
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 10:24:38 AM

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

SFPD's proposal would be an extreme escalation in the police's surveillance powers and is a threat to our fundamental rights that would lead to over-policing, abuse, and discrimination. SFPD has a history of racist, sexist, and abusive activity and should not be given greater power to intrude in citizen's lives.

Elliot Helman
626 Mission Bay Blvd, N #210
94158

From: [Bill Alvarado](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Monday, July 25, 2022 7:40:15 PM

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Bill Alvarado

Email billalvarado@comcast.net

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

From: [Paul Liao](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Cityattorney](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD Surveillance Technology Policy
Date: Monday, August 1, 2022 12:39:29 PM

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

Supervisor Peskin
Supervisor Chan
Supervisor Mandelman:
City Attorney David Chiu:

As in my previous messages on this topic (see below) I was disappointed that the Rules Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors was once again unable to pass the SFPD Surveillance Technology Policy at its last meeting. However, I was pleased to see the amendments that have been adopted by the Committee. And trust that the Policy will be reviewed by the City Attorney's office such that it can be adopted at the next meeting of the Rules Committee.

Although I would have preferred the policy to NOT have an expiration date because presumably the BOS can always ask for a revision, or even rescind, the policy if it wishes, I also see benefits of assuring the public that San Francisco is taking steps toward assuring public privacy rights are protected. Therefore, I call to your attention that one of the public commentators proposed some useful ideas that could assure that ongoing reviews of this policy leading to a renewal of this policy are done expeditiously.

This SFPD policy is just one step toward what I hope will be increased usage of non-confrontational approaches to law enforcement. Our city should be encouraging the use of these technology, not discouraging them

Paul Liao

On Tue, Jul 12, 2022 at 10:20 PM Paul Liao <pliao.gml@gmail.com> wrote:

Supervisor Peskin
Supervisor Chan
Supervisor Mandelman:

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

Before discussing that one issue, I wish to thank the Committee for its patience in listening to the many ill informed, and truly outrageous, public comments about the proposed policy. Despite the fact that Supervisor Peskin noted that this policy is NOT an expansion of current police department practices, most public comments continued an unreasonable harangue that

the policy will rob people of their civil rights. The truth is that a properly designed policy, not only protects the privacy of individuals, but recognizes that modern video surveillance technologies provide the information necessary for law enforcement to better protect people and property in San Francisco. And we know that these same surveillance technologies assure improved police accountability.

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

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

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

Paul Liao

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

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

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

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

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

Consider also how enforcement of traffic safety violations using information captured by cameras would virtually eliminate potentially dangerous, even life threatening, confrontations between police officers and the public. **We should be encouraging the use**

of these non-confrontational approaches to law enforcement, rather than discouraging them

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

ON MONDAY, PLEASE SUPPORT SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY POLICY
Paul Liao

From: [Jenya Kaufman](#)
To: [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPD's Surveillance Proposal
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 10:52:09 AM

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

To the Committee,

I am strongly opposed to the proposal from SFPD on surveillance. I value my privacy and that of my fellow citizens. I too worry about crime in this city, but as the video footage from the vandalism and robbery of Black Cat showed there is a lot that needs to be done better, video footage won't help.

Thank you,
Jenya Kaufman

--

Jenya A. Kaufman, M.D.

4111 18th St, Suite 7
San Francisco, CA 94114
T 415-644-8275
F 888-780-2544

If you would prefer not to exchange personal health information via email, please contact me at the above phone number. By replying to this email, you acknowledge that you are aware that email is not considered a secure method of communication, and that you agree to the risks.

For any time-sensitive issues--including scheduling issues, prescription refills, or medication questions--do not use email; please call me directly.

If there is a life-threatening emergency, please call 911.

From: [Sanford Forte](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 220606 - Ordinance approving Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras
Date: Friday, July 29, 2022 2:50:12 PM

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

Dear Mr. Young,

I hope this finds you well. I have been watching the progression of the "Ordinance approving Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras" with great interest. Having some experience in the deployment of security technologies (namely, Radio Frequency Identification Technology - RFID) as well as issues surrounding the deployment of universal technologies for public safety reasons, we would like to suggest the following for consideration to the present, aforementioned ordinance:

1) There appears to be no stated policy in any amendment (as far as I can see) for penalties resulting from any group or individual using surveillance obtained by legal means to violate the reasonable expectations of the privacy of any individual. Suggest referencing [this link](#) if you want to know more about what current penalties are in place in Federal Law. [Here is California Penal Code 652](#), mandating penalties for abuse of surveillance. I think current penalties for any public official violating the rights of any citizen or groups of citizens (including non-citizens protected by local legislation) should be far more harsh than those mandated by Code 652. There is an **absolute** necessity for private citizens to be assured and expect that their rights are protected if/when government deploys surveillance systems, or accesses private surveillance. Also required should be citizen-controlled/staffed monitoring of public surveillance officials. Governments who deploy surveillance systems **must** create and build trust, into perpetuity; it's imperative that the public trust those who are deploying public surveillance.

I suggest that the penalties for violating the rights of any citizen or groups of citizens (including non-citizens protected by local legislation) should be far more harsh than those mandated by Code 652. There is an **absolute** necessity for individuals to be assured that their rights are protected - and, that said penalties should be enunciated in an amendment to the proposed policy

3) There appears to be no stated policy that will give any one or group of citizens to review private surveillance used by public officials, on demand. In a fully transparent universal surveillance system present in any democratic culture, a citizen should have the right - on demand - to know 1) when s/he was surveilled; 2) how s/he was surveilled; 3) for what reason was s/he surveilled; 4) for what length of time s/he was surveilled; 5) where/s/he was surveilled; 6) by whom s/he was surveilled (may be kept private to protect surveillance operators, but should include identifying codes where surveillance officials can be identified by superiors). One of the great challenges to transparency within surveillance systems in a democratic culture is that the mandate for transparency can be used by individuals who are known to be up to no good, but are being surveilled. How do we keep the latter group from

on-demand access to the system. This is a difficult problem.

Summarizing: I suggest that any and all committees assigned to refine the proposed policy consider the foregoing: 1) increased penalties for violation of privacy by any public official(s); and, 2) consideration of transparent private citizen access to surveillance as potential candidates for inclusion in amendments to the proposed policy.

Last, I want to congratulate the Board of Supervisors for including (by default) the following in the proposed surveillance policy.

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

Very Best Regards,
Sanford Forte
San Francisco, CA
650-888-0077

From: [Ana Elisa Fuentes](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)
Cc: [mcagle](#)
Subject: Re: Ordinance approving Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City entity surveillance cameras
Date: Monday, July 11, 2022 12:47:36 PM
Importance: High

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

Monday July 11, 2022

Dear Board of Supervisors, Chan, Reskin, and Mandelman; Mr. Young and Mr. Cagle -

I am writing with concern regarding the San Francisco Police Department's proposed policy for the extended use of non-city entity cameras as a surveillance technology tool. A policy proposal sponsored by Mayor Breed.

First, from this morning's meeting it sounds as if this policy has already been decided. Yet, in the same breath you (SFPD and the BoS) ask for public trust - a trust breached and made apparent by Chief Scott's early departure from the meeting. If he really cared about public trust, he would have stayed to listen to public comments. This is meeting was pro forma not pro fiducia.

All parties represented in the meeting this morning are already keenly aware that the SFPD has breached the public trust on many matters, including the matter held this morning. Nothing was said about BUILDING PUBLIC TRUST.

I do not understand for the life of me, how the latitude and extended use of surveillance technology will repair or assuage *building* public trust.? Are you really listening to your constituents? You keep asking for more and more public trust without earning it; asking for more and more without the conduct that earns it.

Question, please explain how will the expanded, increased, and extended use of surveillance technology will BUILD public trust?

It pains me to express that our police department has done more to violate public trust than it has to earn or build it. For me personally, I over the last few years experienced an egregious violation of identity theft. Upon learning of the violation, I acted promptly and responsibly which included filing a complaint with the SFPD.

San Francisco Police Department made the violations against me worse. Rather than acting to protect me and to investigate the crime against me; they exacerbated the violation; conflated it with another case; confused me with someone else entirely different; and then tried to make me the perpetrator.

It took me, contacting federal authorities and the CA DoJ to motivate SFPD, well over a year later, to send me a stamped investigation copy. At a later date, I personally, went to the SFPD station to update my file with a document of verification by the IRS and the police officer at the station **would not** accept the IRS document. SHE REFUSED TO ACCEPT A ONE PAGE PIECE OF PAPER FROM THE IRS TO UPDATE MY FILE ON MY BEHALF, TO PROTECT ME. How does this build trust?

This breach and violation of my identity impacted my Paralegal studies at SFSU which impacted my tuition and reimbursements and of course my banking; this violation furthers impacts me currently in my housing and employment choices.

If this is happening to me, it is happening to many others. Recently the Journal of the American Medical Association concluded that out of 52 California counties San Francisco had the highest injury rate for Black residents. It is a well known fact that video surveillance, Artificial Intelligence technologies are imperfect and often lead in the mis-identification of darker skinned people. This is common knowledge.

With this awareness, what audacity you have to ask for public trust. Do you really take your constituents for fools? Are we suppose to forget that this same surveillance technology was used to spy on protesters at the Black Lives Matters protesters at Union Square?

Why do you continue to conduct yourselves and make decisions counter to your constituents, pitting us against each other; then demand more public trust? Your job is to listen and to act upon the recommendations of your constituents. Are you listening?

This will be a technology used by a police force that consistently demonstrates corruption; use of force; and a conduct that blurs the lines between police, criminals and criminal conduct. Used by a police force whose officers held up a pharmacy to obtain drugs for their personal use (maybe to sell); officer involved in forgery schemes and identity theft; police officers who employ thugs to frame others; police officers who STORED THE DNA OF RAPE VICTIMS for their personal database.

And we are suppose to believe that SFPD will not abuse the surveillance technology?

Do you really take your constituents for fools?

Are we really suppose to trust that any future breach of trust by police will be governed by fair oversight?

This very lack of oversight is the hallmark of corruption that is the hallmark of this city.

I strongly oppose the latitude the BoS has delivered to the police department.

Most sincerely,

Ana Elisa Fuentes

My concerns on the employment of surveillance technology

Ana Elisa Fuentes

<http://anaelisafoto.wordpress.com>

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

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

Supervisor Peskin

Supervisor Chan

Supervisor Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

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

Paul Liao

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ON MONDAY, PLEASE SUPPORT SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY POLICY
Paul Liao

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,

Shadd Newman

Shadd Newman
Vice President
(415) 575-3356



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.

trinitysf.com

Email Disclaimer

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

Best regards,



Helene Sautou

Project Director

Mid Market Community Benefit District

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

hsautou@midmarketcbd.org

midmarketcbd.org

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

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

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

Support for Police Department of non-City entity surveillance cameras



Helene Sautou

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

Best regards,



Helene Sautou

Project Director

Mid Market Community Benefit District

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

hsautou@midmarketcbd.org

midmarketcbd.org

--



Tracy Everwine

Executive Director

Mid Market Community Benefit District

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

teverwine@midmarketcbd.org

midmarketcbd.org

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

Please support this legislation.

Thank you

Sincerely,
Dennis Crowe

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

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,

David Harrison

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

[Please add any personal anecdotes]

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Tina Lauchengco

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Joe Ching

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Nate Haas

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Jack H Sinow, OD
71 6th Street

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

As a homeowner overlooking the troubled corner of Mission & 8th, I want SFPD to have all tools available to keep us safe from the open drug dealing and criminals who hang out all around us. Help us PLEASE!

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

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

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Rainier Koeners, Managing Director

Ambassador Theatre Group

Sensitivity: Internal Use

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Paulina Fayer

Email plfayer@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Robert Chan

Email RobertYChan@aol.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Dorothy Chan

Email dorothywaichan@aol.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Marina Roche

Email marinaroche@icloud.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Amy Chan

Email amyrchan@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Ryan Chan

Email ryanjchan@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Stephanie Lehman

Email slehman21@yahoo.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.
Stephanie Lehman
Elected delegate AD 19

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Kevin Roche

Email krochemusic@aol.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent KEVIN OSHEA

Email osheakw@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent William Palladino
Email wetwilly17@hotmail.com
I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Fiona Montgomery

Email fiona.thomas@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you, Fiona

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jerry Connolly

Email jerconsf@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mike Jones

Email mj357@comcast.net

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Monthanus Ratanapakdee

Email monthanusr@yahoo.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Charna Ball

Email genteel-slots.0j@icloud.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Ebert Kan

Email Nomad627@juno.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Karen Wong

Email cloudsrest789@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 3

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Arthur Hubbard

Email amhsf@att.net

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Al Sargent

Email al.sargent@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Holland Ja

Email hollandyja@comcast.net

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Michael Coll

Email kellsconstructioninc@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Cynthia Kass

Email cindikass3@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Laurie Dolly

Email lauriedolly@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 11](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent jennifer.yan

Email jennifer.yan@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent dirk probstel

Email dirkprobstel@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jeff Ricker

Email the_dreadnought@yahoo.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Steven Wong

Email steven4274@yahoo.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Dena Aslanian-Williams

Email denawilliams@msn.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Yasmin Staton

Email ydmello@yahoo.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent kaaren alvarado

Email kaaren25@att.net

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Matthew Faliano

Email Faliano3342@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jamie O'Keefe

Email jokeefe415@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Howard Lee

Email howard.lee90@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 7

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan, Mandelman, and Melgar:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Diane Sargent

Email diane.sargent@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Tad Sky

Email tadsky7@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Meredith Serra

Email meredithserra@outlook.com

I am a resident of District 7

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Marjorie Tang

Email shibapaws@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Una Werner

Email unahlp@aol.com

I am a resident of District 7

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Daniel Langford

Email langford987@hotmail.com

I am a resident of District 3

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent John Cowan

Email apollofix.24@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Teresa Shaw

Email terishaw@pacbell.net

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Keith Kandarian

Email kkandarian@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Aisling Ferguson

Email aferguson@gmwest.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Stephanie McKnight

Email tatummq@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 8

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Robin Adler

Email robin@robinadler.me

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Norah Uyeda

Email yuenuyeda@hotmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Susan OHara

Email sj_ohara@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 5

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Frank Noto

Email frank@fnstrategy.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Samuel Hom

Email samhom1958@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Youn Lee

Email collin@kobuksan.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Assunta Young

Email assuntayoung46@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent John Ng

Email JohnNgSF@aol.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Erin O'Connor

Email oconnorstl@yahoo.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Nathan Bass

Email nathan.bass@ucsf.edu

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Dona Crowder

Email dona@donacrowder.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Amy Chen

Email amy080chen@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Teresa Silva

Email teri.esalon@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Josephine Zhao

Email josephine_zhao@yahoo.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent kelvin yip

Email kelvinkyip@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 5](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent dennis dunne

Email dunnedf@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Oleg Tomillo

Email otomillo@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 11](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.
Oleg

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mark Clark

Email mpclark704@icloud.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Victor Belfor

Email vbelfor@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 9

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Selena Chu

Email selenachu10@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Raymond Wong

Email raymondwong4u@yahoo.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mei Chen

Email meichensf@icloud.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jon Chu

Email zdaiying1@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent MARIA Ditico

Email match94107@yahoo.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Gina Tse-Louie

Email Informed168@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Kaihua Kong

Email khzy1997@yahoo.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Wen Zhu

Email wuminghua@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 6

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Kent Tran

Email kayjaig@hotmail.com

I am a resident of [District10](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,

Shadd Newman

Shadd Newman
Vice President
(415) 575-3356



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.

trinitysf.com

Email Disclaimer

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

Best regards,



Helene Sautou

Project Director

Mid Market Community Benefit District

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

hsautou@midmarketcbd.org

midmarketcbd.org

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

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

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

Support for Police Department of non-City entity surveillance cameras



Helene Sautou

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

Best regards,



Helene Sautou

Project Director

Mid Market Community Benefit District

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

hsautou@midmarketcbd.org

midmarketcbd.org

--



Tracy Everwine

Executive Director

Mid Market Community Benefit District

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

teverwine@midmarketcbd.org

midmarketcbd.org

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

Please support this legislation.

Thank you

Sincerely,
Dennis Crowe

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

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,

David Harrison

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

[Please add any personal anecdotes]

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Tina Lauchengco

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Joe Ching

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Nate Haas

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Jack H Sinow, OD
71 6th Street

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

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

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

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

Dear Supervisors,

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

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

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

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,
Rainier Koeners, Managing Director

Ambassador Theatre Group

Sensitivity: Internal Use

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Paulina Fayer

Email plfayer@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Robert Chan

Email RobertYChan@aol.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Dorothy Chan

Email dorothywaichan@aol.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Marina Roche

Email marinaroche@icloud.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Amy Chan

Email amyrchan@gmail.com

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

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

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

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

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Ryan Chan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 5:36:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Ryan Chan

Email ryanjchan@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 9](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Stephanie Lehman](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 5:57:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Stephanie Lehman

Email slehman21@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.
Stephanie Lehman
Elected delegate AD 19

From: [Kevin Roche](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 6:07:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Kevin Roche

Email krochemusic@aol.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [KEVIN OSHEA](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 6:17:40 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent KEVIN OSHEA

Email osheakw@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [William Palladino](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 6:31:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent William Palladino

Email wetwilly17@hotmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Fiona Montgomery](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 6:34:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Fiona Montgomery

Email fiona.thomas@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you, Fiona

From: [Jerry Connolly](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 7:17:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jerry Connolly

Email jerconsf@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Mike Jones](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 7:24:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mike Jones

Email mj357@comcast.net

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Monthanus Ratanapakdee](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 7:31:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Monthanus Ratanapakdee

Email monthanusr@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Charna Ball](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 7:48:19 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Charna Ball

Email genteel-slots.0j@icloud.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Ebert Kan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 8:47:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Ebert Kan

Email Nomad627@juno.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Karen Wong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 9:21:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Karen Wong

Email cloudsrest789@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 3

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Arthur Hubbard](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 9:49:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Arthur Hubbard

Email amhsf@att.net

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Al Sargent](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 9:51:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Al Sargent

Email al.sargent@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Holland Ja](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:12:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Holland Ja

Email hollandyja@comcast.net

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Michael Coll](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:23:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Michael Coll

Email kellsconstructioninc@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Cynthia Kass](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:41:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Cynthia Kass

Email cindikass3@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 3](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Laurie Dolly](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, July 15, 2022 11:57:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Laurie Dolly

Email lauriedolly@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 11](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [jennifer.yan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:45:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent jennifer.yan

Email jennifer.yan@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [dirk probstel](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:46:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent dirk probstel

Email dirkprobstel@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jeff Ricker](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 5:41:10 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jeff Ricker

Email the_dreadnought@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Steven Wong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 6:18:08 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Steven Wong

Email steven4274@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 3](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Dena Aslanian-Williams](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 7:26:41 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Dena Aslanian-Williams

Email denawilliams@msn.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Yasmin Staton](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 7:46:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Yasmin Staton

Email ydmello@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [kaaren alvarado](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:02:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent kaaren alvarado

Email kaaren25@att.net

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Matthew Faliano](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:06:44 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Matthew Faliano

Email Faliano3342@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jamie O'Keefe](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:24:44 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jamie O'Keefe

Email jokeefe415@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Howard Lee](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 9:01:54 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Howard Lee

Email howard.lee90@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 7

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan, Mandelman, and Melgar:

With the ever-increasing in property theft, we need to give another tool to the police to fight crime. I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Diane Sargent](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 9:05:43 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Diane Sargent

Email diane.sargent@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Tad Sky](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 9:23:49 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Tad Sky

Email tadsky7@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Meredith Serra](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 9:51:36 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Meredith Serra

Email meredithserra@outlook.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Marjorie Tang](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 10:00:14 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Marjorie Tang

Email shibapaws@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Una Werner](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 10:46:05 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Una Werner

Email unahlp@aol.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Daniel Langford](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 11:09:15 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Daniel Langford

Email langford987@hotmail.com

I am a resident of District 3

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [John Cowan](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 11:30:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent John Cowan

Email apollofix.24@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

As you know, crime is out of control in San Francisco. Our building was burglarized at least five times. Thanks for listening.

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Teresa Shaw](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:21:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Teresa Shaw

Email terishaw@pacbell.net

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Keith Kandarian](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:23:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Keith Kandarian

Email kkandarian@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Aisling Ferguson](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:50:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Aisling Ferguson

Email aferguson@gmwest.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Stephanie McKnight](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 12:51:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Stephanie McKnight

Email tatummq@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 8

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Robin Adler](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 1:12:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Robin Adler

Email robin@robinadler.me

I am a resident of [District 6](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Norah Uyeda](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 4:28:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Norah Uyeda

Email yuenuyeda@hotmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Susan OHara](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 5:02:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Susan OHara

Email sj_ohara@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 5

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

Please support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras. This is a reasonable tool for safety and fair treatment.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

There are too few tools to allow innocent citizens to protect themselves, and the balance of protections favors criminals and those with mental health issues who harm neighbors and families. Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Frank Noto](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 6:19:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Frank Noto

Email frank@fnstrategy.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors:

I urge you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras. This corrects the original ordinance in a way we advocated for years ago.

The revised ordinance balances our rights and public safety. Homeowners, nonprofits or business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Samuel Hom](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 6:42:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Samuel Hom

Email samhom1958@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Youn Lee](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 7:33:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Youn Lee

Email collin@kobuksan.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Assunta Young](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:18:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Assunta Young

Email assuntayoung46@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [John Ng](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:54:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent John Ng

Email JohnNgSF@aol.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Erin O'Connor](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 8:55:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Erin O'Connor

Email oconnorstl@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Nathan Bass](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2022 10:14:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Nathan Bass

Email nathan.bass@ucsf.edu

I am a resident of District 8

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Dona Crowder](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 7:30:51 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Dona Crowder

Email dona@donacrowder.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Amy Chen](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:21:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Amy Chen

Email amy080chen@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Teresa Silva](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:22:53 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Teresa Silva

Email teri.esalon@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Josephine Zhao](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:23:16 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Josephine Zhao

Email josephine_zhao@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [kelvin yip](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:31:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent kelvin yip

Email kelvinkyip@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 5](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [dennis dunne](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:39:42 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent dennis dunne

Email dunnedf@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Oleg Tomillo](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 8:59:27 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Oleg Tomillo

Email otomillo@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 11](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.
Oleg

From: [Mark Clark](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 11:57:06 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mark Clark

Email mpclark704@icloud.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Victor Belfor](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:04:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Victor Belfor

Email vbelfor@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 9

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Selena Chu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:51:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Selena Chu

Email selenachu10@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Raymond Wong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:52:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Raymond Wong

Email raymondwong4u@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Mei Chen](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:52:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mei Chen

Email meichensf@icloud.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jon Chu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:53:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jon Chu

Email zdaiying1@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [MARIA Ditico](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:55:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent MARIA Ditico

Email match94107@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 6](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Gina Tse-Louie](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 1:06:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Gina Tse-Louie

Email Informed168@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I find people don't want to be caught on camera doing bad things... the more cameras the more conscientious people will be which is not a bad thing!

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Kaihua Kong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 1:32:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Kaihua Kong

Email khzy1997@yahoo.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Wen Zhu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 1:38:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Wen Zhu

Email wuminghua@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 6

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Kent Tran](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 2:02:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Kent Tran

Email kayjaig@hotmail.com

I am a resident of [District10](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Kelly Powers](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Kevin Carroll](#)
Subject: Surveillance Cameras
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 11:32:10 AM
Attachments: [Surveillance Cameras.docx](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Members of the Rules Committee,

Please see our letter of support for Legislation supporting responsible policies related to access of Surveillance Camera usage as a tool to keep Residents and Visitors safe.

Sincerely,

Kelly Powers

From: [Fullmore, Nany](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Camera Surveillance Legislation
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 2:24:50 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am writing to ask you to please allow SFPD access or the ability to monitor even temporarily, live video that is owned or operated by third parties. Blinding of law enforcement does not make sense and it does not make us safer.

Several weeks ago, gunshot took place in the alley way of Clementine street late at night The hotel's camara was able to captured the evidence and called the police to view however they were not able to view it as it is owned by third party. This street is hotel's only employees entrance. My employees having witnessed or hearing about what happened and how the police were not able to follow lead to preventing it from happening again made me and my employees feel very unsafe.

Low enforcement need every resources avaiailbe to them to solve crime and deter possible future crime. Organized crime, whether it's mass looting in Union Square or drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, or retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside -- these are all criminal activities that law enforcement can address more effectively if they have their eyes open. This legislation will allow police to use non-City cameras and camera networks during large scale events with public safety concerns; for investigations of active misdemeanor and felony violations; and investigations into officer misconduct. Video footage can be used as evidence as well to exonerate individuals who may be wrongly accused and help police and prosecutors ensure that they are holding the correct persons responsible

Thank you for your support. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Best,

Nany Fullmore

General Manager

Bring your best to the moment

O: 415-486-6401

The Clancy, Autograph Collection

299 2ND St.

San Francisco, CA 94105

www.marriott.com/sfoaw | [Instagram](#)

The Clancy, a member of Marriott International's extraordinary Autograph Collection.



This communication contains information from Marriott International, Inc. that may be confidential. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law.

From: [Richard Leider](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Support of Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD use of Non City Entity Surveillance Cameras
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 5:56:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing in support of the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras. This legislation is a critical step towards improving safety for small business owners, employees, and all San Franciscans. It strategically uses technological advances to strengthen City services and provide the necessary tools for SFPD to solve our most violent, harmful, and persistent crimes. I support improving and clarifying local laws governing the use of cameras during situations with serious public safety impacts.

Our businesses community has suffered incredible financial loss due to organized retail theft, on top of the pandemic economic conditions, and this legislation provides a desperately needed tool for SFPD to better support our merchant corridors and neighborhoods facing critical public safety challenges. San Francisco businesses have storefronts, employees, and customers here and are deeply invested in creating a safer San Francisco.

Please pass this critical public safety legislation.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Leider

1523 Baker Street

San Francisco, CA 94115

Richard J. Leider
D) 415-947-7230
O) 415-285-5000
C) 415-672-2160
RLeider@Leidergroup.com

From: [Tracy Thompson](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [Maquire, Tom \(MTA\)](#)
Subject: Disappointment in your decision regarding Slow Lake Street
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 6:15:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mayor Breed,

Your decision to abandon Slow Lake and its countless benefits to our city is extremely disappointing and suggests a lack of forward and visionary thinking on your part. Slow Lake has been an amazing benefit to SF residents, and one of the few bright spots over the last two and a half demoralizing years of the Covid era. Your seemingly cavalier decision to reject the concept of Slow Lake and presumably return the street to its preexisting traffic flow, despite the wishes of the thousands of city residents who provided input, is baffling to say the least, and represents a genuine loss for the city as a whole.

You say you care about Vision Zero, Climate Action, sustainability, building positive community, and keeping families in our city—all of which Slow Lake does—but your decision to reject Slow Lake is in conflict with those goals.

I respectfully request that you reconsider your decision and that you take appropriate and prompt action to move our city towards the Vision Zero and Climate Action goals you claim to uphold by supporting Slow Lake.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tracy Thompson

From: [Nancy Jodaitis](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); MTABoard@sfmta.com; [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maquire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); SlowStreets@sfmta.com; LakeStreet@sfmta.com; Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov; Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov; Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov; [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Slow Lake](#)
Subject: Importance of keeping Lake Street SLOW
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:40:53 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mayor Breed,

I was really disappointed to hear of your pressure and influence on the SFMTA board to reverse the community's consensus to keep Lake Street slow.

Thousands of people who love Slow Lake and have participated in all of the community meetings, surveys, and letter-writing campaigns were shocked and really disappointed by this reversal. It is frustrating to have gone through this process and heard from the SFMTA community engagement employees that the decision was made to move forward with a slow Street, only to have that abandoned at the last hour. This sudden change is disappointing and demoralizing for all the engaged residents of Lake Street and surrounding communities who participated in good faith.

This sends a clear message of whom and what you value in our city -- and how the process really works. I don't believe this is what you intended to do. I have been told that you stated that slowly "smacks of privilege". However, this was one of the streets that had the highest density during the pandemic and built community in a way that the enrichment has never seen.

You have stated that you care about Vision Zero, Climate Action, sustainability, building positive community, and keeping families in our city—all of which Slow Lake does—but your decision to destroy Slow Lake as we know it contradicts your claimed priorities. We need bold vision and fearless leadership to reach our goals, and you are the person who must lead us.

Please take immediate action to reverse your decision to eradicate slow Lake. And move our city towards the Vision Zero and Climate Action goals you claim to uphold.

ACT QUICKLY to demonstrate you DO VALUE the OPINIONS of the MAJORITY of SF residents-- not just the few off-the-bridge drivers and car-committed SF residents who wish to speed through our neighborhood, destroying the community bonds we have built.

Sincerely,
Nancy Jodaitis
720 Lake St., #5
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: [Wes Tyler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Camera Surveillance Legislation
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:59:00 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Attention Rules Committee

Please approve the legislation that will allow law enforcement limited, temporary authority to use video footage to help deter, investigate, and solve crime.

Crime and safety are key to our recovery and San Francisco's rebound from the pandemic. This moves us toward that goal.

Thank you.

Wes Tyler, CHA
General Manager
Chancellor Hotel on Union Square
"Where the Cable Cars stop at the doorstep"
433 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Ph. 415.362.2004 Fax 415.395.9476
www.chancellorhotel.com





July 12, 2022

Rules Committee
Supervisor Peskin
Supervisor Mandelman
Supervisor Chan
SF Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Hotel Council Support for File # 220606 Surveillance Camera Policy for SFPD

Dear Supervisors, Peskin, Mandelman and Chan,

On behalf of the Hotel Council of San Francisco, I am writing to express our support for the prescribed use of video surveillance access when crimes are in progress.

Currently, The San Francisco Police Department is barred from accessing any live video to solve or prevent crime except if there is imminent danger of serious injury or death. This leaves neighborhoods across the city vulnerable to organized criminal activity, such as the mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries that have happened in the city over the past several years.

We acknowledge the valid and appropriate concerns around the issue of privacy and potential misuse of this video information. However, there are protective measures and safeguards that address this concern, and we believe the benefits derived from protecting citizens and residents in the “real time” involvement of a crime, and the opportunity to reduce the risk of further escalation of criminal activity is paramount. Many cities across the U.S. have seen a rise in gun violence and it allows communities the opportunity to examine the tools they have in place if such a crisis were to occur in their cities. We believe this tool is needed to prevent the escalation of certain threats and dangers when criminal activity is happening in San Francisco.

Again, on behalf of our 22,000 Hotel Employees in San Francisco, our visitors, and guests, we ask you to support this policy proposal to further safeguard our residents and visitors from potential acceleration of criminal activity or violence that might occur because this vital tool was not available to our officers.

Sincerely,

Kelly Powers
Director
Hotel Council of San Francisco

From: [Robert G Brown](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Policy allowing Police Authority to use Private Cameras for Policing
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 10:32:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Board of Supervisors, per the article in 48 hills you are coming back next week with a proposed amended policy to provide authority for the sfpd to use private cameras for policing.

No, No, No, No, NO!

NOT EVER in our lifetime should we give the SFPD any more authority to spy on San Franciscans.

There would NEVER be enough safeguards that any human could think of and impose that make this policy viable.

San Francisco would literally be a "Police State."

Please abolish this policy from our public discussion while enacting policies that make it impossible for it to ever be considered again.

Thank you

Robert G Brown
1656 Leavenworth St, San Francisco, CA 94109
415.806.0561

From: churbert@outlook.com
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: NO to SF becoming a Police State!
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 1:35:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Connie and BoS,

This is an obscene police overreach and frankly a crass violation of citizen's civil liberty. Anything but a resounding, 'HELL, NO!' is akin to your tacit support of a dystopian police state. This is NOT who we are.

<https://missionlocal.org/2022/07/surveillance-critics-blast-police-private-cameras/>

Meanwhile the SFPD literally abdicated their responsibilities and duties while attempting to enact retribution against a DA who for once actually sought to hold "bad apples" accountable. Not surprisingly, the Mayor who remained silent on the recall put in Budin's place an inexperienced, uncouth, hack with her sights on regressive, broken window policies and no accountability for the police. Really???

The Board needs to reign in this out of control Mayor and her SFPD pals or there will be consequences at the ballot box next election.

Again, this is NOT who we are.

Sincerely,

Charles Hurbert, D1

From: [Judith Beck](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No SFPD access to private cameras!!!
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 11:01:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

Do not allow SF police access to private cameras on homes and businesses. They have no right to our personal doings in this sweeping, indiscriminate, unwarranted (as in "search warrant") way. Our police have earned no such privilege and should be reined in rather than let loose with surveillance.

Sincerely,

Judy Beck - D5

From: [Kelly Powers](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Kevin Carroll](#)
Subject: Surveillance Cameras
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 11:32:10 AM
Attachments: [Surveillance Cameras.docx](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Members of the Rules Committee,

Please see our letter of support for Legislation supporting responsible policies related to access of Surveillance Camera usage as a tool to keep Residents and Visitors safe.

Sincerely,

Kelly Powers

From: [Fullmore, Nany](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Camera Surveillance Legislation
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 2:24:50 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am writing to ask you to please allow SFPD access or the ability to monitor even temporarily, live video that is owned or operated by third parties. Blinding of law enforcement does not make sense and it does not make us safer.

Several weeks ago, gunshot took place in the alley way of Clementine street late at night. The hotel's camera was able to capture the evidence and called the police to view however they were not able to view it as it is owned by third party. This street is hotel's only employees entrance. My employees having witnessed or hearing about what happened and how the police were not able to follow lead to preventing it from happening again made me and my employees feel very unsafe.

Law enforcement needs every resource available to them to solve crime and deter possible future crime. Organized crime, whether it's mass looting in Union Square or drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, or retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside -- these are all criminal activities that law enforcement can address more effectively if they have their eyes open. This legislation will allow police to use non-City cameras and camera networks during large scale events with public safety concerns; for investigations of active misdemeanor and felony violations; and investigations into officer misconduct. Video footage can be used as evidence as well to exonerate individuals who may be wrongly accused and help police and prosecutors ensure that they are holding the correct persons responsible.

Thank you for your support. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Best,

Nany Fullmore

General Manager

Bring your best to the moment

O: 415-486-6401

The Clancy, Autograph Collection

299 2ND St.

San Francisco, CA 94105

www.marriott.com/sfoaw | [Instagram](#)

The Clancy, a member of Marriott International's extraordinary Autograph Collection.



This communication contains information from Marriott International, Inc. that may be confidential. Except for personal use by the intended recipient, or as expressly authorized by the sender, any person who receives this information is prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing, and/or using it. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately delete it and all copies, and promptly notify the sender. Nothing in this communication is intended to operate as an electronic signature under applicable law.

From: [Richard Leider](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: Support of Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD use of Non City Entity Surveillance Cameras
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 5:56:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing in support of the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras. This legislation is a critical step towards improving safety for small business owners, employees, and all San Franciscans. It strategically uses technological advances to strengthen City services and provide the necessary tools for SFPD to solve our most violent, harmful, and persistent crimes. I support improving and clarifying local laws governing the use of cameras during situations with serious public safety impacts.

Our businesses community has suffered incredible financial loss due to organized retail theft, on top of the pandemic economic conditions, and this legislation provides a desperately needed tool for SFPD to better support our merchant corridors and neighborhoods facing critical public safety challenges. San Francisco businesses have storefronts, employees, and customers here and are deeply invested in creating a safer San Francisco.

Please pass this critical public safety legislation.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Leider

1523 Baker Street

San Francisco, CA 94115

Richard J. Leider

D) 415-947-7230

O) 415-285-5000

C) 415-672-2160

RLeider@Leidergroup.com

From: [Tracy Thompson](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [Maquire, Tom \(MTA\)](#)
Subject: Disappointment in your decision regarding Slow Lake Street
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 6:15:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mayor Breed,

Your decision to abandon Slow Lake and its countless benefits to our city is extremely disappointing and suggests a lack of forward and visionary thinking on your part. Slow Lake has been an amazing benefit to SF residents, and one of the few bright spots over the last two and a half demoralizing years of the Covid era. Your seemingly cavalier decision to reject the concept of Slow Lake and presumably return the street to its preexisting traffic flow, despite the wishes of the thousands of city residents who provided input, is baffling to say the least, and represents a genuine loss for the city as a whole.

You say you care about Vision Zero, Climate Action, sustainability, building positive community, and keeping families in our city—all of which Slow Lake does—but your decision to reject Slow Lake is in conflict with those goals.

I respectfully request that you reconsider your decision and that you take appropriate and prompt action to move our city towards the Vision Zero and Climate Action goals you claim to uphold by supporting Slow Lake.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tracy Thompson

From: [Nancy Jodaitis](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); MTABoard@sfmta.com; [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maquire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); SlowStreets@sfmta.com; LakeStreet@sfmta.com; Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov; Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov; Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov; [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Slow Lake](#)
Subject: Importance of keeping Lake Street SLOW
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:40:53 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mayor Breed,

I was really disappointed to hear of your pressure and influence on the SFMTA board to reverse the community's consensus to keep Lake Street slow.

Thousands of people who love Slow Lake and have participated in all of the community meetings, surveys, and letter-writing campaigns were shocked and really disappointed by this reversal. It is frustrating to have gone through this process and heard from the SFMTA community engagement employees that the decision was made to move forward with a slow Street, only to have that abandoned at the last hour. This sudden change is disappointing and demoralizing for all the engaged residents of Lake Street and surrounding communities who participated in good faith.

This sends a clear message of whom and what you value in our city -- and how the process really works. I don't believe this is what you intended to do. I have been told that you stated that slowly "smacks of privilege". However, this was one of the streets that had the highest density during the pandemic and built community in a way that the enrichment has never seen.

You have stated that you care about Vision Zero, Climate Action, sustainability, building positive community, and keeping families in our city—all of which Slow Lake does—but your decision to destroy Slow Lake as we know it contradicts your claimed priorities. We need bold vision and fearless leadership to reach our goals, and you are the person who must lead us.

Please take immediate action to reverse your decision to eradicate slow Lake. And move our city towards the Vision Zero and Climate Action goals you claim to uphold.

ACT QUICKLY to demonstrate you DO VALUE the OPINIONS of the MAJORITY of SF residents-- not just the few off-the-bridge drivers and car-committed SF residents who wish to speed through our neighborhood, destroying the community bonds we have built.

Sincerely,
Nancy Jodaitis
720 Lake St., #5
San Francisco, CA 94118

From: [Wes Tyler](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Camera Surveillance Legislation
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:59:00 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Attention Rules Committee

Please approve the legislation that will allow law enforcement limited, temporary authority to use video footage to help deter, investigate, and solve crime.

Crime and safety are key to our recovery and San Francisco's rebound from the pandemic. This moves us toward that goal.

Thank you.

Wes Tyler, CHA
General Manager
Chancellor Hotel on Union Square
"Where the Cable Cars stop at the doorstep"
433 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Ph. 415.362.2004 Fax 415.395.9476
www.chancellorhotel.com





July 12, 2022

Rules Committee
Supervisor Peskin
Supervisor Mandelman
Supervisor Chan
SF Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Hotel Council Support for File # 220606 Surveillance Camera Policy for SFPD

Dear Supervisors, Peskin, Mandelman and Chan,

On behalf of the Hotel Council of San Francisco, I am writing to express our support for the prescribed use of video surveillance access when crimes are in progress.

Currently, The San Francisco Police Department is barred from accessing any live video to solve or prevent crime except if there is imminent danger of serious injury or death. This leaves neighborhoods across the city vulnerable to organized criminal activity, such as the mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries that have happened in the city over the past several years.

We acknowledge the valid and appropriate concerns around the issue of privacy and potential misuse of this video information. However, there are protective measures and safeguards that address this concern, and we believe the benefits derived from protecting citizens and residents in the “real time” involvement of a crime, and the opportunity to reduce the risk of further escalation of criminal activity is paramount. Many cities across the U.S. have seen a rise in gun violence and it allows communities the opportunity to examine the tools they have in place if such a crisis were to occur in their cities. We believe this tool is needed to prevent the escalation of certain threats and dangers when criminal activity is happening in San Francisco.

Again, on behalf of our 22,000 Hotel Employees in San Francisco, our visitors, and guests, we ask you to support this policy proposal to further safeguard our residents and visitors from potential acceleration of criminal activity or violence that might occur because this vital tool was not available to our officers.

Sincerely,

Kelly Powers
Director
Hotel Council of San Francisco

From: [Robert G Brown](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Policy allowing Police Authority to use Private Cameras for Policing
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 10:32:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Board of Supervisors, per the article in 48 hills you are coming back next week with a proposed amended policy to provide authority for the sfpd to use private cameras for policing.

No, No, No, No, NO!

NOT EVER in our lifetime should we give the SFPD any more authority to spy on San Franciscans.

There would NEVER be enough safeguards that any human could think of and impose that make this policy viable.

San Francisco would literally be a "Police State."

Please abolish this policy from our public discussion while enacting policies that make it impossible for it to ever be considered again.

Thank you

Robert G Brown
1656 Leavenworth St, San Francisco, CA 94109
415.806.0561

From: churbert@outlook.com
To: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: NO to SF becoming a Police State!
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 1:35:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Connie and BoS,

This is an obscene police overreach and frankly a crass violation of citizen's civil liberty. Anything but a resounding, 'HELL, NO!' is akin to your tacit support of a dystopian police state. This is NOT who we are.

<https://missionlocal.org/2022/07/surveillance-critics-blast-police-private-cameras/>

Meanwhile the SFPD literally abdicated their responsibilities and duties while attempting to enact retribution against a DA who for once actually sought to hold "bad apples" accountable. Not surprisingly, the Mayor who remained silent on the recall put in Budin's place an inexperienced, uncouth, hack with her sights on regressive, broken window policies and no accountability for the police. Really???

The Board needs to reign in this out of control Mayor and her SFPD pals or there will be consequences at the ballot box next election.

Again, this is NOT who we are.

Sincerely,

Charles Hurbert, D1

From: [Judith Beck](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No SFPD access to private cameras!!!
Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 11:01:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

Do not allow SF police access to private cameras on homes and businesses. They have no right to our personal doings in this sweeping, indiscriminate, unwarranted (as in "search warrant") way. Our police have earned no such privilege and should be reined in rather than let loose with surveillance.

Sincerely,

Judy Beck - D5

From: [Lily Ho](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 4:35:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Lily Ho

Email lily.ho@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Iris Biblowitz](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose the Mayor's proposal to increase SFPD's access to surveillance technology from private cameras
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2022 6:34:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors on the Rules Committee - I'm a nurse who's more and more alarmed by San Francisco's proposals giving SFPD more power without more accountability. Please strongly oppose the proposal to give SFPD the right to access private surveillance cameras in certain neighborhoods if they determine there's a "possibility of a shooting." This is outrageous and frightening. The current law (from 2019) gives SFPD access to private security cameras only if there's serious risk of physical injury or death. I'm asking you to fight any expansion of the current law and practise. We already have the statistics that show that Black and Latinx communities are targeted much more than white and Asian communities in the city. In today's Chronicle, the numbers are revealing of the great inequities here: In 2020, stop rates by SFPD show 2,313 for Black, 552 for Latinx, 389 for Whites, and 131 for Asians. UCSF's recent study in JAMA revealed that San Francisco had the highest injury rate for Black residents (SF Chronicle 7/3/22). To address these damning inequities, we need to go in the opposite direction of this proposed surveillance policy, and focus on holding SFPD accountable for their actions and violence against communities of color. Since Nov. 2021 (unless I'm forgetting a victim), SFPD has killed 4 people, Ajmal Amani, Nelson Szeto, Rafael Mendoza, and Michael MacFhiongham.

As the city give lip service to treatment for people using drugs (while waiting lists make this very difficult for most people), the possibility of increasing surveillance from private cameras (which would include drug dealing as well as drug use) are terrifying and certainly a violation of First Amendment rights. At a time when San Francisco is supposed to be working on reforming police tactics and policies, we're going in the opposite direction.

As a nurse who cares about the well-being of all San Franciscans, and who's cared for people in their homes as well as people living in the streets as well as people in the hospital and clinics, I'm shocked at this hypocritical and dangerous proposal. Those of us who truly believe in racial and social justice will be out in the streets and at City Hall, fighting.

Sincerely - Iris Biblowitz, RN

From: [Jan Diamond](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 9:24:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Jan Diamond

Email janmdiamond@pacbell.net

I am a resident of [District 2](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 11:36:26 AM
Attachments: [image064799.png](#)

For 220606

From: Amy Hull <Amy.Hull@trinitysf.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2022 7:05 AM
To: Shadd Newman <Shadd.Newman@trinitysf.com>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; 'info@midmarketcbd.org' <info@midmarketcbd.org>
Subject: Re: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I also support making this provision for access to SFPD.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Amy Hull
Chief Operating Officer
(415) 433-3333



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.
trinitysf.com
[Email Disclaimer](#)

From: Shadd Newman <Shadd.Newman@trinitysf.com>

Sent: Friday, July 15, 2022 12:44:39 PM

To: 'Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org' <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>; 'Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org' <Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org>; 'Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org' <Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org>; 'Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org' <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; 'Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org' <Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org>; 'Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org' <Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org>; 'Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org' <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>; 'Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org' <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>; 'Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org' <Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org>; 'Connie.Chan@sfgov.org' <Connie.Chan@sfgov.org>; 'Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org' <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>; 'Dean.Preston@sfgov.org' <Dean.Preston@sfgov.org>; 'Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org' <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>; 'info@midmarketcbd.org' <info@midmarketcbd.org>

Cc: Amy Hull <Amy.Hull@trinitysf.com>

Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras

Dear Supervisors,

Please support the legislation for allowing San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

Residents and prospective tenants at Trinity Place in mid-Market lament the crime and lack of safety in the neighborhood, expressing concern about open air drug dealing. Providing SFPD access to already existing tools to help them do their job is an important step in addressing these concerns and making our streets safer for all members of the community.

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,

Shadd Newman

Shadd Newman
Vice President

(415) 575-3356



The premier source of furnished and unfurnished apartments.

trinitysf.com

[Email Disclaimer](#)

From: [Roger Wong](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 12:08:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Roger Wong

Email outersunsetresi@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: More 220606 PC
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 2:11:18 PM
Attachments: [Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras.msg](#)
[Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras.msg](#)
[Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras.msg](#)
[Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras.msg](#)

Attached

Brent Jalipa

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

From: [Mary Liang](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 6:02:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mary Liang

Email mkenny1357@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras
Date: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 9:44:36 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

From: Mark Meier <mark@starboardnet.com>
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 4:00 PM
To: Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; info@midmarketcbd.org
Subject: Support for ordinance approving the Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department use of non-City Private Security Cameras

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

Please support the legislation allowing the San Francisco Police Department to access live video footage of private (non-City owned) security cameras to deter and prosecute criminal activity, such as: mass looting, gun violence, drug dealing, and burglaries.

With guardrails in place for protecting First Amendment Rights, and training for officers accessing the cameras, the cameras will allow police to deter and prosecute the organized crimes plaguing our City: be it mass looting in Union Square, drug dealing rings in the Tenderloin, retail theft in Chinatown or brazen home burglaries on the Westside.

Cameras such as those currently available through the Mid Market Community Benefit District, and many other CBDs, are an invaluable tool, available now to help make San Francisco safer.

Thank you for approving the Surveillance Technology Policy ordinance.

Sincerely,

Mark Meier



Mark Meier
Senior Sales & Leasing Associate

Office 415.765.6900
Direct 415.299.7042
Email mark@starboardnet.com

CA BRE# 02047169

Starboard CRE
49 Powell Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

starboardcre.com



From: [Mimi Wu](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 10:08:13 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Mimi Wu

Email ms_mimi@hotmail.com

I am a resident of [District 4](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Barbara Pletz](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 7:14:29 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Barbara Pletz

Email barbarapletz4@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 8](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules
Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Allen Jones](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Enhanced use of surveillance cameras
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 3:27:29 PM

Looping in the clerk, Victor Young, so he can distribute.
Aaron

From: Allen Jones <jones-allen@att.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 2:03:51 PM
To: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Enhanced use of surveillance cameras

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisor Peskin,
Many years ago, I was outraged by something, then former Supervisor Scott Wiener did, when former Police Chief Greg Suhr tried enhance use of surveillance cameras.

Chief Suhr wanted to require all new bars to have surveillance cameras. Wiener objected based on what I thought was a ridiculous excuse: some men still in the closet might be exposed. HONEST. This killed that plan in committee or full board. I can't remember which one.

To think someone would place privacy over solving a crime is a tough call in my opinion. Why? I can't always trust SFPD to do the right thing. Personally, I would gladly give up might right to privacy if it will solve a crime against me or anyone.

I also recall, you being opposed to facial recognition based on in part, not being reliable or mis-identifying Black people I think. And I am aware of the breach of agreement for use of the cameras around the BLM protest at Union Square.

Fast forward to today:

I just read of the plan being pushed by Breed and Jenkins to allow SFPD use surveillance cameras from private property (RING etc.) And "share" with the feds.

This to me is a laughable, give them an inch they will take a mile approach to policing in San Francisco.

Pardon my language, but I said all that to suggest another idea: Get your own damn cameras SFPD.

I am not dumb enough to believe San Francisco Police Department will be so willing to share any of the video that captures its own officers going rogue, despite the claims made by our new DA.

Defunding the police, in my opinion, was dead on arrival. But I sure do believe that a \$700+ million police budget could include a video surveillance program to help solve/prevent crime here.

To be clear, I am not opposed to using cameras on businesses for police purposes. But to not get permission from private residents and sharing with the feds is good intentions run amok.

Please share my views with your committee.

Allen Jones
(415) 756-7733
jones-allen@att.net
Californiaclemency.org

The Only thing I love more than justice is the freedom to fight for it.



THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO

2022 OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mary McNamara
President

Vidhya Prabhakaran
President-Elect

Teresa Johnson
Treasurer

Charles Jung
Secretary

Ashley Breakfield

Allison Wang

Erin Connell

Cristine Soto Deberry

Jamie Dupree

Holly Gaudreau

Matthew Gluck

Laura Hurtado

David Kelly

Elinor Leary

Katherine Lubin Benson

Paul Moore

Catherine Ongiri

David Rizk

Karen Scarr

Tony Schoenberg

Charles (Chuck) Thompson

Khari Tillery

Demetria Vong-Spillan

BARRISTERS CLUB OFFICERS

Linsley Mignano
President

Courtney Brown
President-Elect

Sydney Allen
Treasurer

Sarah Hoffman
Secretary

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND GENERAL COUNSEL

Yolanda M. Jackson

September 1, 2022

VIA EMAIL

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Re: The Bar Association of San Francisco's Opposition to the San Francisco Police Department's Live-Surveillance and Historical Review Surveillance Cameras

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

The Bar Association of San Francisco (BASF), representing nearly 8,000 members, writes to express its opposition to the San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD) Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras Policy (Policy), given the serious Fourth and First Amendment implications of the Policy. BASF is the largest legal organization in Northern California dedicated to criminal justice reform. In 2015, BASF established the Criminal Justice Task Force (CJTF), consisting of judges, prosecutors, public defenders, law enforcement (police and sheriff), private counsel, civil liberties advocates, and others, to advance systemic criminal justice reforms in San Francisco. BASF has a long history of undertaking legal research, supporting best practices and innovative ideas in the area of criminal justice reform, and has been deeply involved with modernizing and improving policing by SFPD.

We encourage and strongly support effective law enforcement and agree that public safety is a serious concern to San Franciscans, and we understand why SFPD might view increased surveillance as part of the solution to the current challenges in San Francisco. BASF believes that the better approach to public safety challenges is improved policing services, not the sort of mass surveillance proposed here. BASF and CJTF have been proud to assist SFPD in modernizing its policies and practices over the course of the past years, following the recommendations made by the U.S. Department of Justice in 2016. Notably, none of those federally-recommended reforms included a recommendation of mass surveillance.

Our legal research further makes clear that the proposed changes to Administrative Code 19B may give rise to litigation and jeopardize criminal



proceedings in certain cases. It does not appear to be unduly burdensome to require SFPD to seek an expedited warrant should it become necessary to gain access to desired camera footage. Failure to seek a warrant will invite civil lawsuits against San Francisco and, if footage is gathered as proposed, the evidence will likely be subject to suppression litigation in a criminal proceeding, jeopardizing any prosecution on which it relies. A warrant should be necessary to set forth the need for an extraordinary measure like live surveillance. Legal process and the approval of a judicial officer is readily available to law enforcement and has always protected the rights of San Franciscans as well as the integrity of criminal prosecutions.

Apart from these concerns, it is not clear the Policy will result in greater public safety given the absence of any evidence or data suggesting that SFPD needs radically expanded surveillance capabilities to do its job. Law enforcement agencies in this country have always been capable of ensuring public safety while also respecting Americans' civil liberties and we see no reason for a departure from traditional techniques. Should limited and exigent circumstances so require, the SFPD should seek a warrant to protect itself, the investigation, and the citizens of this City for the reasons set out above. Along those lines, BASF suggests that SFPD review its General Orders on Search Warrants (DGO 5.16)¹ and the Guidelines on First Amendment Activities (DGO 8.10)² and work with the Police Commission to assure their General Orders reflect the most recent legal decisions implicating the Fourth and First Amendments.

We therefore urge you to reject the proposed Policy unless it is substantially amended to respect the privacy and First Amendment rights of San Francisco's residents and visitors.

The Proposed Policy is Vague and Overreaching

The proposed Policy encroaches on the rights of San Franciscans to all of their daily activities, whether to demonstrate in public, organize to do so, or visit their doctor, meet with a friend whether downtown or near public housing, attend school, or earn a paycheck, without fear of police surveillance. The Board should not implement it and should instead refocus SFPD on traditional and modern community policing techniques that fall well within the limits of the law.

The proposed Policy would permit without a search warrant, SFPD access to "live monitoring during an exigency, or *significant events with public safety concerns*, or *investigations relating to active misdemeanor and felony violation*" for periods

¹ DGO 5.16 (Search Warrants) is currently under revision.

² DGO 8.10 (Guidelines on First Amendment Activities) has not been updated since 2008 to reflect recent case law.



up to 24 hours of privately owned cameras throughout the City.³ It also would permit, again in the absence of a warrant or subpoena, SFPD to review historical footage of privately owned cameras for purposes of “gathering evidence relevant to an investigation.” As we learned at the presentation before the Rules Committee of the Board of Supervisors, many privately owned cameras throughout San Francisco now provide highly developed technology, capable of zooming in closely enough to read the text on an individual’s cell phone, an otherwise private and constitutionally protected activity.

The proposed Policy as drafted does not impose any meaningful limitation on invasive police surveillance. It would permit SFPD to access thousands of private cameras throughout San Francisco to live-monitor anyone when there is a “Significant Event with public safety concerns” or an “investigation[] relating to active misdemeanor and felony violations.” A “Significant Event,” as the policy defines it, is any “large or high-profile event.” That captures most of San Francisco’s most celebrated gatherings, such as the Pride Parade, the Folsom Street Fair, Outside Lands, the Chinese New Year parade, the Cherry Blossom Festival in Japantown, the Ghirardelli Square Tree-Lighting Ceremony and other important opportunities for San Franciscans to exercise their First Amendment rights, whether demonstrating in support of Black Lives Matter, the right of a woman to choose, or to engage in labor action against an employer. There is no meaningful or clear limitation on the over-inclusive language, and as such, the proposed Policy is vulnerable to Constitutional challenge. Even a craft brew festival or a Giant’s game qualifies as a “high-profile event,” as written, subjecting large swaths of San Francisco to invasive police surveillance with no commensurate public safety justification.

The proposed Policy’s “investigation” prong permits even broader surveillance, posing especially problematic complications should criminal prosecutions result from the surveillance. Misdemeanor violations include trespassing, vandalism, fare evasion, petty theft, and many other low-level crimes. Those occur with regularity nearly everywhere, and investigations can remain open for years. Moreover, the time limits the proposed Policy imposes are illusory. It provides that “temporary live monitoring will cease ... within 24 hours after” SFPD gains access to a camera, but it fails to limit the number of times access can be renewed.⁴ The proposed language is neither narrow nor targeted, as would be required for any warrant application.

³ Presentation by SFPD to San Francisco Board of Supervisors Rules Committee, Presentation dated July 11, 2022 (Emphasis added.)

⁴ San Francisco Administrative Code § 19B.7(a)(2) provides that “surveillance technology” must “cease ... within seven days.” However, that limitation applies only to cameras SFPD has accessed to address “exigent circumstances,” as defined in the Code, and the policy does not incorporate it by reference.



The proposed Policy's treatment of "historical video" is no less concerning. Under the proposed Policy, SFPD may request, obtain, and review historical video footage "for purposes of gathering evidence relevant to a criminal investigation." SFPD may then keep that footage for two years, or, if it is part of an "ongoing investigation," indefinitely. This vague language is exceedingly permissive. Setting aside that content from nearly any camera in San Francisco may be "relevant to" some criminal investigation, the proposed Policy does not explain what separates "live" from "historical" footage. If SFPD reviews a video feed with a two-minute delay, is the content "live" (in which case the investigation must be relevant to an "active" criminal violation and cannot be recorded) or "historical" (in which case those conditions do not apply)? The proposed Policy does not say.

Critically, while the proposed Policy prohibits SFPD from using biometric identification and facial recognition technology, the changes sought by SFPD fail to limit, or even address, other advanced applications modern surveillance networks provide. As noted, many of the private cameras SFPD would be able to have access to have high-definition resolution, night vision, or zoom capabilities so powerful they can observe otherwise highly private and protected activity. Moreover, by linking together the thousands of cameras to which it would have access, and dumping the disparate footage into a single database, SFPD would have the power to comprehensively track any person in the city from the time she leaves her house in the morning to the moment she clicks off her reading light at night. *See, e.g., Lee Dye, Surveillance Systems Are Getting Smarter, ABC NEWS (Nov. 30, 2014, 3:20 AM) (describing eight-year-old technology that allows "multiple cameras to follow an individual as she moves through a crowd, switching seamlessly from one camera to the next as the target moves from one field of view to another," even if "the target disappears for a while and then reappears in a different area").*⁵ Whether it is a commute to work, a walk to conduct banking, a bike ride to meet a friend, or an evening stroll with a date or an intimate or sexual exchange, the Policy would give SFPD the power to weave together an unbroken chain of observation.

The proposed Policy is incomplete or misguided in other ways, too. It does not explain how a request for either live or historical footage is made, what documentation is required before a request is approved, where that documentation will be maintained, how each camera will be accessed, or whether and how access is terminated when justification for a video feed ends. It also allows SFPD to seek blanket consent from private citizens for access to their cameras, a potential path

⁵ <http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/surveillance-systems-smarter/story?id=27242336&singlePage=true>.



for mischief - residents might not be prepared to resist. All of these defects are likely to invite legal challenges.

The Proposed Policy Violates Residents' Privacy Rights

In addition to the problems above, the Policy's broad authorizations enabling police viewing of live and/or collect may violate the Fourth Amendment rights of San Francisco's visitors and residents, and therefore cannot serve one of the primary purposes for which the policy was intended. For the same reason, the proposed Policy may also subject San Francisco to expensive lawsuits for violating residents' First Amendment rights.

The Fourth Amendment requires that police obtain a warrant, supported by probable cause, before conducting a search. The "basic purpose" of that requirement "is to safeguard the privacy and security of individuals against arbitrary invasions by governmental officials." *Camara v. Municipal Court of City and County of San Francisco*, 387 U.S. 523, 528 (1967). Historically, the Fourth Amendment guarded against the government's physical trespass onto private property. But "innovations in surveillance tools"—particularly those used in public spaces, like the cameras at issue here—have pushed the Supreme Court to re-conceptualize the Amendment's protections. *Carpenter v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 2206, 2214 (2018). Today, "the Fourth Amendment protects people, not places." *Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347, 351 (1967).

While "no single rubric definitely resolves" which activities the Fourth Amendment safeguards, the Court has provided some "basic guideposts." *Carpenter*, 138 S. Ct. at 2214. Those ensure that the Fourth Amendment "secure[s] the privacies of life against arbitrary power" and "place[s] obstacles in the way of a too permeating police surveillance," particularly where individuals will otherwise find themselves "at the mercy of advancing technology." *Id.* (quotations and citations omitted). Government surveillance violates these principles when it transgresses "a person's expectation of privacy in his physical location and movements"—something that is most likely to occur when advancing technology permits police to surveil in a manner that previously was "difficult and costly and therefore rare[]," or to collect information that is "detailed, encyclopedic, and effortlessly compiled," *id.* at 2216, 2217, particularly when that technology enhances the senses on which police traditionally relied.

The proposed Policy does exactly that. It allows police to turn any street into a stakeout at the click of a button. Like other modes of warrantless surveillance that the Supreme Court has held violate the Fourth Amendment, commandeering thousands of cameras from a central location "is remarkably easy, cheap, and efficient compared to traditional investigative tools." *Carpenter*, 138 S. Ct. at 2218. It also allows police to "travel back in time to retrace a person's



whereabouts, subject only to the retention policies of [a camera's owner]." *Id.* "Whoever the suspect turns out to be, he [may] effectively [have] been tailed every moment of every day" so long as some camera, somewhere in San Francisco, had him in view. *Id.* The problem, moreover, will only get worse as cameras become cheaper and easier to install and operate—as they will—allowing anyone to attach one (or many) to their homes, shops, cars, and bikes.

It does not matter, for Fourth Amendment purposes, that the cameras at issue are privately owned and (mostly) capture people as they move around out in the open. Fourth Amendment protections extend to information "held by a third party," *id.* at 2217, and to "movements ... disclosed to the public at large," *id.* at 2215 (citing at *United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400, 430 (2021) (opinion of Alito, J.)). Nor does it matter that surveillance cameras are hardly new technology. The issue is not the security cameras themselves, but the way the proposed Policy permits police to use them. The proposed Policy provides access to an ever-growing (and potentially limitless) network of cameras, from a central location, with no restrictions on, or even mention of, advanced software that will allow the government to track anyone, anywhere, so long as a camera has them in view. Such dragnet-style surveillance will not take a mere snapshot of a person in public. It will, over time, construct a "precise, comprehensive record of a person's public movements that reflects a wealth of detail about her familial, political, professional, religious, and sexual associations." *Jones*, 565 U.S. at 415 (opinion of Sotomayor, J.). By allowing police to track "trips to the psychiatrist, the plastic surgeon, the abortion clinic, the AIDS treatment center, the strip club, the criminal defense attorney, the by-the-hour motel, the union meeting, the mosque, synagogue or church, [and] the gay bar," comprehensive surveillance cuts deep into the basic privacy rights San Franciscans hold dear. *Id.* (citation omitted). "[B]y making available at a relatively low cost such a substantial quantum of intimate information about any person whom the government, in its unfettered discretion, chooses to track," the proposed policy "may alter the relationship between citizen and government in a way that is inimical to democratic society." *Id.* (quotation marks omitted).

**The Solution to San Francisco's Public Safety Challenges is
Improved Traditional and Community Policing Tactics,
Not Mass Surveillance**

Public safety can be achieved without abandoning residents' Constitutional rights in favor of unprecedented levels of surveillance. Mass surveillance does not enjoy support from experts in modern policing and runs afoul of the traditional process required by law. As proposed, there is little evidence that the proposed Policy will actually improve our community and safety but there is enormous danger that it will undermine our most basic rights. We encourage the San Francisco Board of



THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF
SAN FRANCISCO

Supervisors to put the Constitutional rights of San Francisco's residents and visitors first.

Respectfully,

Yolanda Jackson
Executive Director & General Counsel
The Bar Association of San Francisco

cc: Mayor London Breed
David Chiu, San Francisco City Attorney
Chief William Scott, San Francisco Police Department
Brooke Jenkins, San Francisco District Attorney
Manohar Raju, San Francisco Public Defender



San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

SFCDMA

Masood Samereie
President

Suzie Ferras
Vice-President

Janet Tarlov
Vice-President

Morgan Mapes
Secretary

Tracey Sylvester
Secretary

Anisa Alazrais
Treasurer

September 12, 2022

Mr. Victor Young, Clerk of the SFBOS Rules Committee
City Hall Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Mr. Young,

The San Francisco Council of District Merchants' Executive Board and Legislative Committee support the 19B SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Camera Policy (revised 7/25/22). San Francisco's commercial corridors are increasingly experiencing the negative impacts of assault, brazen shoplifting, open-air drug dealing, thefts from cars, side-shows, chronic graffiti and other acts of vandalism. Even as thieves and criminals use social media and cutting-edge technology to hone their methods, SFPD is largely limited in their ability to utilize the readily available tool of high-quality surveillance cameras which are increasingly present in many businesses. Access to this footage—historical or live—is an indisputably powerful tool for the successful prosecution of bad actors who are making it ever-more challenging to safely conduct business in San Francisco. Business owners invest their own resources in these security systems and they should be permitted to share both historical and live footage with SFPD for the purpose of protecting themselves, their customers and staff and their merchandise and property.

We have closely followed the development of this legislation and feel that the current version adequately addresses concerns raised by the ACLU, the EFF and other privacy advocates; specifically around potential civil rights abuses, restricting access to reproductive health services and participation in immigration enforcement cases. The use of facial recognition technology is not permitted. It is our understanding that merchants and business owners will be empowered at their own discretion to grant access (or not) to SFPD to their cameras and that station Captains or their superiors will approve each authorization for live surveillance that will be in effect for 24 hours. We also approve of the sunset of the legislation in two years, so that a thorough review of any unintended consequences can be addressed.

We urge Supervisors Peskin, Mandelman and Chan to forward this legislation with recommendation to the full SF Board of Supervisors and help protect San Francisco's commercial corridors from continued deterioration in our quality of life.

Best Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Masood", followed by a horizontal flourish.

Masood Samereie, President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Janet", followed by a horizontal flourish.

Janet Tarlov, Legislative Committee Chair



September 12, 2022

Mr. Victor Young, Clerk of the SFBOS Rules Committee
City Hall Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Mr. Young,

The Board of the Glen Park Merchants Association supports the 19B SFPD Non-City Entity Surveillance Camera Policy (revised 7/25/22). In our small urban “village” commercial corridor, we increasingly experience the negative impacts of assault, brazen shoplifting, thefts from cars, side-shows, public intoxication and drug dealing, chronic graffiti and other acts of vandalism. Even as thieves and criminals use social media and cutting-edge technology to hone their methods, SFPD is too limited in their ability to access the readily available tool of high-quality surveillance cameras which are increasingly present in many homes and businesses in our community. Access to this footage—historical or live—is a potentially powerful tool for crime prevention; one that we feel business owners, who have purchased security cameras with their own money, should be permitted to share with SFPD.

We recognize that with current and likely ongoing staffing shortages at SFPD, officers will need every tool at their disposal in order to protect vulnerable business owners and their customers and staff from the kind of crime that has sadly become commonplace here in our own neighborhood. In Glen Park, merchants and business owners are typically eager to share historical video footage of crimes that have happened with SFPD and we know all too well that for criminals to be brought to justice, video evidence is essential. We feel comfortable speaking on behalf of our members in favor of this legislation, with the knowledge that merchants and business owners are free to opt out of requests, which are only in effect for 24 hours.

We urge Supervisors Peskin, Mandelman and Chan to forward this legislation to the full SF Board of Supervisors with recommendation and help protect San Francisco’s commercial corridors from continued deterioration in our quality of life.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Janet Tarlov', is written over the signature line.

Janet Tarlov, President of the GPMA
On Behalf of the GPMA Board of Directors



Monday, September 12, 2022

TO: Rules Committee

RE: Support of Video Surveillance Policy

The Fisherman's Wharf Community Benefit District (FWCBD) is in favor of real-time monitoring, if individual or entities allow access that cannot exceed 24 hours. This policy does not give SFPD access to any video surveillance system, not even doorbell cameras, without the express consent of the owner at the time of request. This policy affirms current law enforcement best practices, allowing SFPD to request footage or live access from businesses or individuals and these entities and individuals retain the right to deny or allow the access.

Therefore the FWCBD is in support of this policy and ask that the Rules Committee approve today so SFPD can continue to use video footage as evidence and as a real time criminal mitigation tool.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "R. J. [unclear]".

Executive Director
Fisherman's Wharf
Community Benefit District

CC: Rules Committee

From: [Julie Traun](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Burke, Robyn \(BOS\)](#); [Green, Ross \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please add to the materials for item 7 on today's agenda
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 10:51:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am Julie Traun from the Bar Association. I am here in person and I will be referencing this tool kit during public comment. I have previously sent it to each of the supervisors on the rules committee. I sent it yesterday. Can you please add it to the materials for item 7? Thank you very much.

<https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Emerging-Police-Technology-A-Policy-Toolkit-2.pdf>

Sent from my iPhone

Confidentiality Notice:

The information in this e-mail (including attachments, if any) is considered privileged and/or confidential and is intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. Any review, use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited except by or on behalf of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by reply email, delete this email, and do not disclose its contents to anyone.

Emerging Police Technology: A Policy Toolkit

CRIMINAL JUSTICE
POLICY PROGRAM

HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

Stanford Law School

Stanford Criminal
Justice Center

Contents

Advisory Board 3
How To Use This Toolkit 4

Introduction 5
Police Chief Worksheet 6

The Data Challenge 10

01 Costs 11
Risk 11
Lifecycle 12
Hidden Risks 13
Costs Worksheet 14

02 Governance 18
Security 18
Training Personnel 19
Limiting Access 19
Deleting Data 19
Sharing Data 20
Auditing 20
Governance Worksheet 21
Governance Checklist 23

03 Community 25
Community Meetings 26
Operating Policies 26
Accountability 27
Community Worksheet: Planning 28
Community Worksheet: Analysis and Follow-up 30
Community Checklist 32

Conclusion 33

Appendix: Master Worksheets & Checklists 34

Advisory Board

Matt Cagle, Technology and Civil Liberties Policy Attorney, ACLU of Northern California

Amy Condon, former Chief Legal Advisor, Boston Police Department

Catherine Crump, Assistant Clinical Professor and Director of the Samuelson Law, Technology & Public Policy Clinic, Berkeley School of Law

Ronald Davis, former Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice

Alfred Durham, former Police Chief, Richmond (VA) Police Department

Isaiah Fields, General Counsel, Axon

Andrew Ferguson, Professor of Law, University of District Columbia School of Law

Clare Garvie, Senior Associate, Center on Privacy & Technology at Georgetown Law

Sharad Goel, Assistant Professor, Department of Management Science & Engineering, Stanford University

Elizabeth Joh, Professor of Law, University of California-Davis

Eric Jones, Chief of Police, Stockton (CA) Police Department

Nicole Jones, Senior Law Enforcement & Security Counsel, Google

Vivek Krishnamurthy, Counsel, Foley Hoag LLP, and Affiliate, Berkman Klein Center for Internet & Society at Harvard University

David Roberts, Executive Director, Search Group, Inc.; former Senior Program Manager, IACP Technology Center

Adam Schwartz, Senior Staff Attorney, Electronic Frontier Foundation

Sameena Usman, Government Relations Coordinator, Council on American-Islamic Relations

Reilly Webb, Executive Director, Texas Governor Greg Abbott's Criminal Justice Division

Acknowledgments

Emerging Police Technology: A Policy Toolkit was prepared by the Criminal Justice Policy Program at Harvard Law School and the Stanford Criminal Justice Center at Stanford Law School. Research and drafting were contributed by Harvard Law School students Rebecca Martin, Michael Roig, Natalie Salmanowitz, Jonathan Eubank, Keerthana Medarametla, Gene Park, Megan Lee, and Timothy Yap; and Stanford Law School students Julie Goldrosen, Robert Paris, Katie Kelsh, Drew Flood, Leah Yaffe, and Michael Poon. The toolkit drafting was overseen by Colin Doyle, Staff Attorney at CJPP; Mason Kortz, Clinical Instructor at the Harvard Law School Cyberlaw Clinic; Elana Fogel, Legal Fellow at CJPP; Brook Hopkins, Executive Director of CJPP; Debbie Mukamal, Executive Director of Stanford Criminal Justice Center; David Sklansky and Robert Weisberg, Faculty Co-Directors of the Stanford Criminal Justice Center; and Carol Steiker and Alex Whiting, Faculty Co-Directors of the Criminal Justice Policy Program.

How To Use This Toolkit

Modern police technologies pose an enormous challenge for police departments. License plate readers, drones, body cameras, and gunshot detection systems, for example, are powerful data-collection, data-creation, and data-retention tools. The value in these technologies is the information they generate. Their challenge is in collecting, managing, and using that information responsibly.

This toolkit begins with an introduction that describes this challenge and explains how smart, forward-thinking approaches are necessary in order to avoid mistakes and mismanagement. Next is a worksheet designed specifically for police chiefs to use as they consider acquiring new technology. The rest of the toolkit is divided into three sections that examine in detail the interconnected issues that data-collection technologies invariably cause police department leaders to face: Costs, Governance, and Community. Each section briefly summarizes challenges, outlines helpful practices for addressing them, and provides worksheets to help manage the process. The Governance and Community sections also include checklists which contain solutions and best practices.

An appendix at the end of the toolkit collects all of the worksheets and checklists in one place.

Introduction

Law enforcement agencies across the country are adopting new technologies at a rapid pace. Automated license plate readers, facial recognition systems, and predictive policing software are now common policing tools for big and small departments alike. Undeniably, modern technology has transformed the nature of police work. Police departments can now uncover, collect, create, and share troves of new information and integrate this data across devices and agencies.

Data-generating police technologies require new rules and new ways of thinking about long-term costs and controls. Acquiring data-collection technology is unlike other equipment procurement because the costs and downstream effects are connected not just to the physical hardware but to the resulting data governance required. Police departments are not just buying investigative tools, they are buying data systems that must be controlled and managed.

The mistakes and errors of past surveillance technology rollouts have resulted from not seeing this important difference between devices and data. Mismanaging technology can result in exorbitant financial costs, leave private data vulnerable to hackers, and damage a department's relationship with the community.

As technology has transformed policing practices, police departments and legislative bodies have struggled to keep pace with the associated issues and challenges. Police departments sometimes procure devices before establishing internal policies. And the cities and states that have begun to regulate police technology often take a piecemeal approach, designing policies for one specific technology at a time. Police departments and state and local regulators lack flexible, forward-thinking guidance that cut across multiple technologies.

The Stanford-Harvard Project on Technology and Policing was created to fill the gaps in police technology policy. PTP is a collaborative effort of Stanford Law School's Criminal Justice Center and Harvard Law School's Criminal Justice Policy Program. By bringing together law enforcement, state and local officials, lawyers, activists, technologists, community groups, and academics, we aim to identify crosscutting policy issues and develop helpful guidance for police departments, government regulators, and advocates.

PTP Roundtable Policy Discussion

In the fall of 2017, PTP held a roundtable policy discussion on policing technology with 24 national experts. Participants included local and state policymakers, law enforcement leaders, activists, academics, a technologist, and industry representatives with diverse backgrounds and a range of perspectives. Participants uniformly agreed that police departments should adopt policies for the procurement and use of new technologies, but also expressed concern that departments often lack the policy guidance they need.

In response to the concerns raised at the roundtable discussion, PTP created this toolkit to help police departments when considering new technology. Most of the roundtable participants are now members of PTP's advisory board and have provided valuable ideas and feedback for the toolkit.

Police Chief Worksheet

Before purchasing any new technology, consider these big picture questions.

1. Why does my department need this technology?

2. What public safety problem(s) does this technology help solve?

3. Is this public safety problem a priority or a distraction from more important issues in our community?

4. What is the full capacity of this technology—in other words, what does it do and what kinds of data does it collect beyond my organization's needs?

Police Chief Worksheet (Continued)

Before purchasing any new technology, consider these big picture questions.

5. Does the purchase of this technology require approval from legislative bodies, boards, or commissions?

6. What control will my department have over the data that is collected? Who will own it?

7. Who will have access to the data?

8. What are the privacy implications of this technology?

Police Chief Worksheet (Continued)

Before purchasing any new technology, consider these big picture questions.

9. What kind of legal liability could this technology bring?

10. How will my department protect data we collect?

11. How might this technology change my department's relationship with the community? How will deploying this technology affect my officers' day-to-day interactions with our community?

12. What concerns might the public have?

Police Chief Worksheet (Continued)

Before purchasing any new technology, consider these big picture questions.

13. How will my department listen to the public about this technology?

14. What independent research has been done to evaluate this technology? (Independent research is not paid for by developers or vendors of the technology or their agents.)

15. How has this technology worked out in other jurisdictions?

16. How much will it cost? Consider: hardware, software, maintenance, data storage, data security, staffing, training, and compliance with open record laws and policies.

The Data Challenge

Police have always adopted new technologies to help keep society safe. Over the years, innovations like police radios, computers in squad cars, and DNA testing have significantly changed and improved law enforcement, allowing police to do their work with more insight, efficiency, and effectiveness. But today's data-collection technologies are so powerful and entail such a problematic set of issues that new approaches to procurement, policies, and planning are imperative.

Today's smart phones and police cars have the ability to collect data about location, time, activity, and behavioral patterns. No longer just ordinary tools, these smart devices now create sophisticated data trails that can be mined for training, accountability, and use in civil or criminal litigation. Police surveillance technologies only add to this complexity. As digital cameras, body cameras, and sensors advance in sophistication, the ability to monitor the community and collect data on people grows in previously unimaginable ways. Police are now in the data business and must plan for this new role.

This toolkit addresses three data challenges: costs, data governance, and community relations. A clear understanding of each issue will help police departments adopt efficient, responsible, and effective policies.

Costs

Modern policing technologies generate substantial financial costs beyond an initial hardware or software purchase. By anticipating these future expenses, police departments can make more informed choices about which technologies are worth adopting.

Governance

Poor data management jeopardizes data privacy, accuracy, and reliability. Police departments can mitigate these risks through sensible data governance policies.

Community

New technologies can strengthen or weaken a department's relationship with the community. Regular public engagement and transparent policies allow police departments to build trust with the communities they serve.

Promising new digital technologies seem to appear every day. All present problems of data collection. If police departments don't have a strategic plan, they can be easily overwhelmed by data. From budgets to security to public trust—so much is at stake.

01 Costs

Data-generating technologies impose different costs than more traditional policing tools. That's because maintaining data has additional costs that can grow exponentially over time—including the costs involved with managing and mitigating risk. This section outlines the costs of acquiring data-generating technologies: Risk, Lifecycle, and Hidden Costs

Anticipating and managing risk is complex and time-consuming, but learning how to detect, prevent, and recover from mistakes and legal disputes will save considerable time, money, and frustration over the long run.

Risk

When a police department collects and retains data, it takes on the responsibility to safeguard it, ensure it is used appropriately, and comply with any applicable laws and regulations. Failure to do so means the department risks being held legally, financially, and publicly accountable—for example, if the data is misused or a data breach occurs.

Taking on these additional risks and responsibilities is costly. Departments should factor in the following costs when considering the adoption of any new data-collection technology:

Litigation

New police technologies are sometimes challenged in court. The cost of defending against a lawsuit can greatly increase the cost of a technology.

Public Record Requests

Emerging technologies generate troves of data—all of which may be subject to a state or local government's public record laws. Compliance with these laws can require dedicated personnel to process requests, comb through databases, and redact complicated files (including video and audio files).

Privacy

Surveillance technologies decrease the privacy of the communities that police serve and often decrease privacy for police officers themselves. This cost is determined by the capabilities of the technology, not the intent of the purchaser.

Community Relations

The public is often skeptical of new technology, especially technology that can infringe on privacy or is deployed only in certain neighborhoods. Overusing or misusing surveillance technology can erode community trust. Police departments around the country have accidentally leaked supposedly secure data, an embarrassing, costly, and potentially dangerous mistake that undermines police-community relations.

Real Risk: Vendor Error

Costly Data Breaches

In June of 2019, U.S. Customs and Border Protection reported that images collected at the border of people's faces and license plates were stolen in a cyberattack of its subcontractor Perceptics. This private vendor had violated CBP policy by transferring the images to its corporate network. The breach brought increased scrutiny and criticism from lawmakers and privacy advocates at an already tense time of national debate over the use of data-collection technology for law enforcement.

01 Costs

Police departments increasingly use sophisticated technologies to gather important data that helps them more effectively fight crime and protect the public. But ensuring that data is secure and properly processed, analyzed, shared, and finally archived becomes exponentially more challenging—and expensive—over time.

Lifecycle

The data lifecycle is everything that happens to a piece of information from the moment it is collected to the moment it is deleted. This includes migrating data from one system to another when storage technologies are updated.

Maintaining data throughout its lifecycle requires significant resources: storage space, computing power, backups, security, an interface to access and use the data, staff time, and more. Because of this, data-generating technologies have ever-growing costs that continue long after the hardware is acquired. These increased costs come in many forms.

Storage

Some technologies, especially video capture systems like body cameras and ALPRs, generate huge amounts of data. The cost of storing that data can quickly exceed the cost of acquiring the systems themselves. Some companies even offer free hardware because their real profits come from charging for data storage and maintenance.

Migration

When new technology replaces old technology, data must be moved from an old system to a new one. This means either spending staff time on the transition or hiring a vendor or outside consultant. There also can be added costs to make that new technology compatible with existing systems.

Staffing

Although police technologies can improve efficiency, more data often means more work. Officers may spend a significant amount of time each shift inputting, uploading, downloading, processing, browsing, searching, or otherwise handling data. For larger departments, getting the most out of data often means hiring specialized staff, such as a data analyst or long-term consultant.

Court Prep

Even if day-to-day use of the data doesn't require a specialist, use of the data in a trial may. In order to use data from police technologies at trial, departments need to be able to identify Brady material, respond to requests for evidence from the prosecution and defense, and get the data into formats that court systems can use and that judges and jurors can understand.

Legal Compliance

As local and state governments continue to amass more data, state legislatures are passing regulations that mandate how data must be stored, how long it must be retained, and how it must be made available to the public. As these laws proliferate, police departments can encounter unexpected cost increases for technologies that they've already purchased.

Community Oversight

Independent of any legal requirement, police departments often have their own transparency policies for disclosing information to the community. As a police department deploys more technology, it must also invest more time and energy into complying with these policies to maintain community trust.

01 Costs

Understanding the hidden costs of new technologies helps police departments make smart decisions, select the right tools, and reduce unnecessary expenditures.

Hidden Risks

Data-generating technologies often come with unknown capacities and consequences. Hidden risks are often impossible to identify, but there are specific areas where we know these risks can hide.

Vendors

Vendors are understandably eager to tell police about the benefits of their products—especially free ones. But “free” technology is rarely free for long. Vendors often offer free tools so they can charge for services later once a department has become dependent upon the technology.

Academic and Independent Research

Many academic institutions and independent research organizations examine the effectiveness of police technologies. Unfortunately, they do so with varying amounts of rigor, making it difficult to know which ones to trust. Sometimes a flawed research report can undermine the legitimate use of a technology. Good research on the other hand can help predict the effectiveness and impact of a new technology, but results are seldom universally applicable. Conclusions drawn from studying large, urban departments, for example, may not be applicable to smaller, rural departments, and vice versa.

Other Police Departments

With around 18,000 police departments in the United States, the chances are good that other nearby departments will have experience using and maintaining the same technology and are often the best resource for learning about unexpected costs. When considering the drawbacks to a technology, a police department can't limit itself to thinking only of the department's own potential problems. Lawsuits or protests challenging another jurisdiction's use of a police technology can have national consequences affecting the viability of using the technology elsewhere.

Real Risk: Bodycams

Technology Purchased and Abandoned

Police departments are abandoning once-promising bodycam programs because the costs of maintaining them have spiraled out of control. The East Dundee, Illinois police department ended its bodycam program because the data storage costs grew too big. And police in Wahoo, Nebraska ended their bodycam program because a new state data-retention law sent the cost of maintaining the program through the roof.

The Washington Post quotes Jim Pasco, executive director at the National Fraternal Order of Police: “The easy part is buying the body cameras and issuing them to the officers. They are not that expensive. But storing all the data that they collect—that cost is extraordinary. The smaller the department, the tougher it tends to be for them.”

Costs Worksheet

Calculating the costs and benefits of data-generating technologies is difficult. The following questions make the process more manageable.

1. Are there ongoing costs associated with maintaining the technology or storage equipment? What are the typical costs for a department of our size?

2. Does the vendor provide assistance with transition from older systems? What about transitioning away from the technology if we change vendors in the future?

3. Does the vendor provide training? Does this training fit the needs of our police department?

4. How much does the training cost? How much time does the training take?

Costs Worksheet (Continued)

Calculating the costs and benefits of data-generating technologies is difficult. The following questions make the process more manageable.

5. Does this technology rely on a proprietary (secret) software that is inaccessible to the police or the public? Are there alternatives available?

6. Has there been any litigation over the use of the technology, either against the company or against a police department that uses the technology?

7. Can our police department control what types of data are collected?

8. Can our police department control who has access to the data collected and can it share it with other entities?

Costs Worksheet (Continued)

Calculating the costs and benefits of data-generating technologies is difficult. The following questions make the process more manageable.

9. Where is the data we collect stored?

10. Is the vendor prohibited from using, sharing, or selling the data without express permission of our police department?

11. Does the vendor provide security software with this product? Does the software meet the security standards of our state, municipality, and department?

12. Does the vendor use data collected by the police or collect data beyond the needs of law enforcement? If so, how is the company using that data?

Costs Worksheet (Continued)

Calculating the costs and benefits of data-generating technologies is difficult. The following questions make the process more manageable.

13. Have independent studies been conducted on the effectiveness of the technology? (Independent studies are those not conducted or paid for by developers or vendors of the technology or their agents.)

14. Does our department need to sign a non-disclosure agreement to acquire the technology?

02 Governance

The data challenge makes smart data governance and management indispensable. Data governance is the creation and implementation of a strategy to ensure data best serves the needs of its organization. It determines the policies and practices that consistently keep data safe, accurate, relevant, and reliable. Data management is the administrative process that supports that strategy by appropriately collecting, securing, storing, organizing, sharing, archiving, and deleting data. Data governance and management work hand in hand. This section defines and explains some of their major goals.

Policies for data collection and management ensure that sensitive, useful information remains protected, accessible, and trustworthy.

Security

Sound data governance greatly benefits police departments and the public they serve by providing:

- Better protection of individual privacy
- Lower risk of cyber-attack
- Lower risk of staff misuse or abuse of technologies
- Increased accountability

The right time to create your data governance plan is before you begin collecting data. The decision not to collect data is always the first line of privacy protection. Data that is never collected cannot be lost, leaked, or misused. When a police department decides to collect data, the department should be able to articulate:

- How the data will be used
- What type and what amount of data will be collected
- With whom will the data will be shared
- When the data will be deleted
- Who in the department can read or edit the data

Many technologies collect data that can be used to identify specific individuals. This type of data must be managed carefully so that it is stored securely with strict access controls. Certain types of sensitive data must be handled with particular care under state and federal laws like HIPAA and FERPA which prohibit the disclosure of medical and educational histories.

02 Governance

Training is an essential part of any data governance plan—even the most comprehensive policy is ineffective if users do not follow it.

Training Personnel

Many data breaches are caused by avoidable internal errors rather than by external attacks. Employee training has been proven to significantly reduce such errors, yet many local agencies often have difficulty finding qualified data security personnel, let alone training the rest of their employees.

The Department of Homeland Security and the National Institute of Standards and Technology provide a list of resources that can help departments improve security awareness. Private companies also provide data security training. Even with these resources, training diverts time from other important police activities. Therefore, departments often choose a two-tiered plan for data security training:

Tier One

Employees who work directly with sensitive data and have the capability to add, delete, alter, or share this data receive comprehensive security training before being granted access.

Tier Two

Employees who do not work directly with this data also receive training, but this training focuses on spotting common security risks rather than understanding the inner workings of security frameworks, standards, and technologies.

Limiting Access

An access policy determines who has access to a dataset, network, or device. It also determines how much access each person has. The best access policies require logging all access and activity. Access policies can, if necessary, also restrict which devices a certain dataset is accessible on. For example, mobile phones and devices that can connect to public wifi networks are notoriously unsafe.

The best practice in creating an access policy is the principle of least privilege. This means that each person should only have as much access as they need to do their job. For example, a dataset could allow personnel to search through some data but prevent them from being able to alter or delete any of it. Access isn't an all-or-nothing prospect. Users can always be granted higher privileges temporarily if necessary for certain projects. But having an access policy is critical.

Deleting Data

The longer a police department retains its data, the greater the likelihood its data will be disclosed—deliberately or by accident. Over time, many types of data can become less useful for law enforcement purposes. That same data, however, still contains sensitive information. More data means more potential security breaches.

There are many approaches to setting data retention plans. One option is to use one deletion schedule for all of the department's data. A more nuanced plan may be preferable since the usefulness of certain kinds of data will expire faster than others. Some data types may become irrelevant after 24 hours, while others may remain useful for years. Data should not be stored after its usefulness has expired.

Data deletion can be automated. Automation is often desirable because it can be difficult for personnel to be faithful to data retention schedules; human error and day-to-day business can prolong the storage of data when its deletion is neglected. Departments that do not automatically delete data often set periodic notifications that remind appropriate staff members when to purge data.

02 Governance

It's not enough for your department to have secure data-sharing practices. The other departments and organizations you share data with must, too.

Sharing Data

Advances in technology have made data sharing easy and commonplace. Police departments often share data with fusion centers that pool evidence, intelligence, and other data across local jurisdictions and states nationwide.

Data security is only as strong as its weakest link. It doesn't matter how securely a department protects sensitive data if it is shared with an organization that does not have equally strong protections. Not everyone takes good care of their data. Even governmental agencies and other police departments may not apply adequate rigor or care to their data security.

Because increased data sharing results in higher risk of data breach and leaks, police departments must determine whether the entities who can access shared data are secure. Shared access to data requires a policy governing shared data control. Resources like the [National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan](#) help identify the best policies to implement for your department.

Police departments also need to be careful about accidentally sharing information with agencies whose practices conflict with a police department's own policies and mission. For example, many police departments and local jurisdictions have policies against cooperation with U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE). But a recent investigation reveals some of these departments subscribed to a vendor's automatic license plate reader database without knowing that [ICE was also subscribed to the database](#). By contributing information to the database, some of these departments may have unintentionally violated both internal policies against cooperation with ICE and their local sanctuary city laws.

Auditing

Data governance policies often include periodic audits, both to determine policy compliance and to aid in the development of new policies. To enable auditability, every data interaction should be logged, including but not limited to collection, searches, access, and integration. Although data-generating technologies are often less visible than many traditional policing tools, they are also more auditable.

While law enforcement agencies should implement internal auditing procedures, independent third-party audits should also be conducted periodically to ensure objectivity and accuracy. Auditing the use of the voluminous data sets collected by police can be a challenge because of the sheer amount of activity.

Real Risk: Ransomware

Data Held Hostage

In recent years, hackers have infected police departments around the country with "ransomware" viruses that [lock police out of their own systems](#). Affected departments have to choose between paying off the hackers and losing access to their data—which can mean [losing months of work](#). Ransomware attacks can also cost cities [millions of dollars](#) in security fixes.

Governance Worksheet

When a police department collects data, it must be able to articulate every aspect of its data governance and management plans. These questions are some of the most important to answer.

1. What type of data will we collect?

2. Why do we need this data?

3. How will we use this data?

4. Could this data be used in ways that might raise concerns for our community?

Governance Worksheet (Continued)

When a police department collects data, it must be able to articulate every aspect of its data governance and management plans. These questions are some of the most important to answer.

5. Who in our department will be able to access this data and when?

6. Who will we share this data with?

7. When will we delete this data?

Governance Checklist

Use this checklist to make sure you're covering the most important aspects of your data governance and management plans.

1. Dataset integration

Police departments collect many kinds of data. Although individual datasets may be benign, problems may emerge when coupled with other datasets. Consider, for example, that each dataset may contain information about a piece of a person's life. As datasets become linked, they will form a more complete profile of that person. Dataset integration may make for effective policing, but it also raises increased privacy concerns.

- ☐ Avoid data integration if it is not absolutely necessary for legitimate law enforcement purposes.

2. Security Protocol

For a sample security policy, see the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services ("CJIS") [Security Policy](#). For a general introduction to institutional data security, see the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Computer Emergency Readiness Team ("US-CERT") [security publications](#). More guidelines can be found at the National Institute of Standards and Technology ("NIST") [Computer Security Resource Center](#).

Include these security protocol basics to ensure your data is secure:

- ☐ Strong password protocol and standards for all devices
- ☐ Effective antivirus and malware software and policies
- ☐ Stringent, limited access policies
- ☐ Limited connection to the internet
- ☐ Frequent purges to eliminate former users

3. Training

In order to keep data secure, reduce employee errors, and help keep staff accountable, your department should incorporate the following two tiers of training:

- ☐ Tier One Training: all employees receive training focused on best practices and spotting common security risks
- ☐ Tier Two Training: employees who work directly with sensitive data and have the capability to add, delete, alter, or share this data, receive specialized security training

4. Limited access

- ☐ Make sure only personnel who absolutely need data—especially sensitive data—have access to it.
- ☐ Maintain a comprehensive inventory of personnel who have access to sensitive data.
- ☐ Monitor and audit user access to sensitive data.

Governance Checklist (Continued)

Use this checklist to make sure you're covering the most important aspects of your data governance and management plans.

5. Data Sharing

- ☐ Keep track of who we share data with and why.
- ☐ Frequently review whether those we share data with still need it.
- ☐ Vet the organizations we plan to share data with to make sure they have adequate security policies and practices.

6. Data Retention

- ☐ Decide whether automatic or manual deletion approaches are best for each dataset your department collects.

7. Audits

Third-party audits are necessary to protect police data adequately. Some security loopholes escape even the most competent computer users.

- ☐ Use third party auditors to verify that what appears secure is actually secure.

03 Community

Modern policing depends upon strong community relationships. Technology has the potential to strengthen the relationship between the police and the community. Police can interact with community members on social media, issue electronic alerts and advisories, and provide opportunities for public accountability by soliciting feedback and releasing data and video.

But new policing technology can also undermine a department's relationship with its community by intruding upon privacy interests and targeting specific populations for surveillance. Community engagement is essential. When police acquire and use surveillance technology in secret, refuse to disclose how technology is being used, and resist public record requests, community relations fall apart.

In many cities and towns, police departments more heavily patrol and surveil minority and poor communities that have higher crime rates. Taken together, the many forms of police technology—security cameras, license plate readers, gunshot detection systems, and more—can indiscriminately record the entire public life of a neighborhood. Accordingly, police technology can disproportionately encroach upon the privacy of poor communities and communities of color. In many places, a legacy of government discrimination or a history of police violence means that these same communities do not trust the police to use surveillance technologies in a fair and equitable way. This distrust can be hard for departments to overcome.

Careless deployment of technology can reopen old wounds or create new rifts between police and the public. Technology that was acquired to support investigations can undermine investigations if police cannot also rely on the support and trust of their community. Recognizing this, some departments have opted out of using certain technologies, not because the department feared that its officers would misuse the technology, but because the department acknowledged that any use of the technology would damage the department's relationship with the community.

When community relationships are not managed properly, police technology can invite public skepticism, distrust, and protest.

Real Risk: Public Backlash

Grounded Drones

In 2010, the Seattle Police Department used over \$80,000 in federal funds to purchase surveillance drones. But the department never informed Seattle's City Council—the local body in charge of the department's budget—about this purchase. In fact, the Council did not learn about the department's drones until two years later, when the Federal Aviation Administration released a report that listed the Seattle Police Department as an authorized drone user. This revelation invited backlash from the public and the City Council. In response to the bad press and public protests, the police department shut down its drone surveillance program without ever using the equipment.

03 Community

Better policies come from cooperation and dialogue. Community meetings are an opportunity for the police to inform the public and for the public to inform the police.

Community Meetings

A police department should hold community meetings prior to technology procurement and deployment to keep the public informed and get feedback. Soliciting public input informs the community, informs the police, and builds legitimacy for police using a technology in the future. Early community feedback and involvement helps the community to be a partner in policing efforts and prevents the public from feeling blindsided by new or expanded uses of policing technologies. By listening to community voices early in the procurement process, police departments can also ensure that public funds are not spent on technology that the community will reject.

Community meetings serve two important goals. First, they allow police to educate the community and correct misconceptions about technology and how police plan to deploy it. Second, they allow the communities most likely to be affected by these technologies to educate the police about their concerns. Without these meetings, communities and police risk talking past each other and holding mistaken assumptions about the other's objectives, actions, and motives.

Dialogue helps clear up misconceptions. In many instances, the public may be concerned about the nefarious deployment of surveillance technology that police have not even contemplated. For example, a police department may acquire surveillance technology thinking that it would be useful for emergency situations like terrorist attacks. The public fears that the police will use the technology to conduct regular surveillance in certain residential neighborhoods that are already heavily policed. Through community engagement, police departments can clear up misconceptions and the public can share their concerns. In response to community concerns raised at these meetings, police can enact policies limiting how a new technology is used.

Operating Policies

An operating policy describes how a department will—and won't—use a given technology. It prevents confusion and miscommunication about appropriate use of a new technology. Without an operating policy, a police department cannot set a standard for responsible use of the technology and will be unable to identify misconduct. Without defining guidelines or limits, police departments won't be able to assure the public with credibility that the technology will be used only in a responsible way.

Operating policies can be shared publicly on a department's website with the opportunity for local residents to provide their feedback and concerns. This kind of sustained public engagement provides reassurance to constituents, demonstrates a commitment to accountability, and can make a department aware of privacy or transparency concerns that it had not previously considered.

03 Community

Every state has adopted some form of public record law that enables the public to access government files. Public record laws typically allow citizens to obtain copies of government documents that are not confidential, do not contain private information, and do not present a security risk.

Accountability

Emerging technologies give a police department the opportunity to more closely and accurately monitor its own activity. Body-worn cameras have gained the most attention, but data collections of all kinds—from videos of interrogations to datasets of arrest information—give departments, the public, advocacy groups, and academics the opportunity to more closely monitor police officer and staff behavior. Public reports and compliance with public record requests serve everyone's interests.

Public Record Requests

The data collected by many police technologies is subject to public records law. Public record laws encompass digital files, including video, audio, and text files. Even when the data itself is not a public record, information about how that technology is used, such as policies and training material, may be. Compliance with public record laws can be both challenging and expensive in an era of automatic data creation. In addition to responding to public record requests and sending relevant data and files, police departments also need to identify sensitive data and decide what information should be redacted. Depending on the jurisdiction, all license plate reader data or [police-worn body camera footage](#) may be subject to public record request laws. The grants that fund the acquisition of this technology often do not extend to cover the public record requests that follow.

Public Reports

Police departments have begun creating public-facing annual reports about the use of surveillance technology within their jurisdictions. In many places, local regulations require police departments to issue these reports and post them on the department's website. Creating public reports can be a helpful, proactive practice for police departments seeking to promote community accountability and build public trust. Across jurisdictions, this type of report chronicles how the police department has addressed many of the issues brought up in this toolkit, including:

- Purpose of the police technology
- Overview of how the technology has been used
- Operating policies
- Policies for data collection, protection, retention, access, and sharing
- Training protocols
- Auditing results
- Impacts on civil liberties and civil rights
- Financial costs
- Records of public meetings and comments from the public

The format and content of the reports vary. For example, [the 2018 Seattle Police Department's Automated License Plate Recognition Report](#) is forty-one pages long and includes descriptions of the technology, operating and training policies, and assessments of racial equity and civil liberty concerns. In contrast, police in Davis, CA created a [four-page report on GPS monitoring](#) that covered similar issues in a briefer fashion, commenting on training, civil liberties concerns, operating policies, and more.

Community Worksheet: Planning

Before acquiring or deploying a new police technology, engage your community to build trust and prevent miscommunication. These questions help prepare your team.

1. What message do we want to send to our community about this new technology?

2. How can we introduce this new technology in a way that reinforces that message?

3. What are we interested in learning from our community?

4. How will we manage and run our community meetings to make them effective?

Community Worksheet: Planning (Continued)

Before acquiring or deploying a new police technology, engage your community to build trust and prevent miscommunication. These questions help prepare your team.

5. Who will speak on behalf of our department? How can we train or prepare the team for the meeting?

6. How will we communicate operating policies to the community?

7. How will we invite community members to contribute?

8. How will we invite community feedback beyond community meetings?

Community Worksheet: Analysis & Follow-up

Before acquiring or deploying a new police technology, engage your community to build trust and prevent miscommunication. These questions help you process the feedback you received from your community.

1. What concerns has the community raised about the new technology?

2. What misconceptions about this technology need to be addressed?

3. How will we address these misconceptions?

4. Does the feedback we received affect how we should use this technology? Are there uses of this technology that need to be limited or prohibited?

Community Worksheet: Analysis & Follow-up (Continued)

Before acquiring or deploying a new police technology, engage your community to build trust and prevent miscommunication. These questions help you process the feedback you received from your community.

5. How will we communicate operating policies to our community and the larger public?

6. How will our community and the larger public be able to verify that our department is following these policies?

7. How else can we address our community's concerns?

8. What public reporting and public record laws apply to this technology? Are we prepared to comply?

Community Checklist

Before acquiring or deploying a new police technology, engage your community. It will build trust, prevent miscommunication, and help you to plan. The following checklist provides ways to engage.

1. Community Meetings

- ☐ Hold community meetings before new technologies are procured and deployed.

2. Open Communication

Invite public comments by any means possible, including:

- ☐ Phone
- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Email
- ☐ Website
- ☐ Social media

3. Transparent Operating Policies

Publish operating policies on the police department's website and include:

- ☐ The purpose of each police technology
- ☐ The allowed uses for each police technology
- ☐ The prohibited uses for each police technology
- ☐ Internal oversight practices

4. Annual Public Reports

Publish annual public reports on police technology on the police department's website and include:

- ☐ The purpose of the police technology
- ☐ An overview of how the technology has been used
- ☐ All operating policies, including for data collection, protection, retention, access, and sharing
- ☐ Training Protocols
- ☐ Results of any internal or external audits
- ☐ The benefits these technologies bring to law enforcement investigations
- ☐ The impact on civil liberties
- ☐ The impact on racial, ethnic, and religious equality
- ☐ The fiscal costs
- ☐ The records of public meetings and comments from the public

Conclusion

Police departments across the country face the challenge of properly managing police technology. Modern technology is different than police equipment of the past because of its capacity to acquire, create, store, and interpret data. Modern police technologies can assist with building investigations and deterring criminal activity, but they also carry costs and risks. Police departments are buying data systems, not just hardware. Predicting future expenses is a challenge when data storage and public record requests have limitless potential. Protecting troves of data requires much more sophistication and effort than a strong computer password. And building community relationships is a particular challenge in a time of increased data collection and reduced privacy.

As chronicled in this toolkit, many of the mistakes of police technologies deployment are the direct result of departments not understanding the difference that data makes. We hope that this toolkit provides useful frameworks and worksheets for thinking through modern police technology's unique challenges.



Appendix: **Collected Worksheets & Checklists**

Police Chief Worksheet

Before purchasing any new technology, consider these big picture questions.

1. Why does my department need this technology?

2. What public safety problem(s) does this technology help solve?

3. Is this public safety problem a priority or a distraction from more important issues in our community?

4. What is the full capacity of this technology—in other words, what does it do and what kinds of data does it collect beyond my organization's needs?

Police Chief Worksheet (Continued)

Before purchasing any new technology, consider these big picture questions.

5. Does the purchase of this technology require approval from legislative bodies, boards, or commissions?

6. What control will my department have over the data that is collected? Who will own it?

7. Who will have access to the data?

8. What are the privacy implications of this technology?

Police Chief Worksheet (Continued)

Before purchasing any new technology, consider these big picture questions.

9. What kind of legal liability could this technology bring?

10. How will my department protect data we collect?

11. How might this technology change my department's relationship with the community? How will deploying this technology affect my officers' day-to-day interactions with our community?

12. What concerns might the public have?

Police Chief Worksheet (Continued)

Before purchasing any new technology, consider these big picture questions.

13. How will my department listen to the public about this technology?

14. What independent research has been done to evaluate this technology? (Independent research is not paid for by developers or vendors of the technology or their agents.)

15. How has this technology worked out in other jurisdictions?

16. How much will it cost? Consider: hardware, software, maintenance, data storage, data security, staffing, training, and compliance with open record laws and policies.

Costs Worksheet

Calculating the costs and benefits of data-generating technologies is difficult. The following questions make the process more manageable.

1. Are there ongoing costs associated with maintaining the technology or storage equipment? What are the typical costs for a department of our size?

2. Does the vendor provide assistance with transition from older systems? What about transitioning away from the technology if we change vendors in the future?

3. Does the vendor provide training? Does this training fit the needs of our police department?

4. How much does the training cost? How much time does the training take?

Costs Worksheet (Continued)

Calculating the costs and benefits of data-generating technologies is difficult. The following questions make the process more manageable.

5. Does this technology rely on a proprietary (secret) software that is inaccessible to the police or the public? Are there alternatives available?

6. Has there been any litigation over the use of the technology, either against the company or against a police department that uses the technology?

7. Can our police department control what types of data are collected?

8. Can our police department control who has access to the data collected and can it share it with other entities?

Costs Worksheet (Continued)

Calculating the costs and benefits of data-generating technologies is difficult. The following questions make the process more manageable.

9. Where is the data we collect stored?

10. Is the vendor prohibited from using, sharing, or selling the data without express permission of our police department?

11. Does the vendor provide security software with this product? Does the software meet the security standards of our state, municipality, and department?

12. Does the vendor use data collected by the police or collect data beyond the needs of law enforcement? If so, how is the company using that data?

Costs Worksheet (Continued)

Calculating the costs and benefits of data-generating technologies is difficult. The following questions make the process more manageable.

13. Have independent studies been conducted on the effectiveness of the technology? (Independent studies are those not conducted or paid for by developers or vendors of the technology or their agents.)

14. Does our department need to sign a non-disclosure agreement to acquire the technology?

Governance Worksheet

When a police department collects data, it must be able to articulate every aspect of its data governance and management plans. These questions are some of the most important to answer.

1. What type of data will we collect?

2. Why do we need this data?

3. How will we use this data?

4. Could this data be used in ways that might raise concerns for our community?

Governance Worksheet (Continued)

When a police department collects data, it must be able to articulate every aspect of its data governance and management plans. These questions are some of the most important to answer.

5. Who in our department will be able to access this data and when?

6. Who will we share this data with?

7. When will we delete this data?

Governance Checklist

Use this checklist to make sure you're covering the most important aspects of your data governance and management plans.

1. Dataset integration

Police departments collect many kinds of data. Although individual datasets may be benign, problems may emerge when coupled with other datasets. Consider, for example, that each dataset may contain information about a piece of a person's life. As datasets become linked, they will form a more complete profile of that person. Dataset integration may make for effective policing, but it also raises increased privacy concerns.

- ☐ Avoid data integration if it is not absolutely necessary for legitimate law enforcement purposes.

2. Security Protocol

For a sample security policy, see the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services ("CJIS") [Security Policy](#). For a general introduction to institutional data security, see the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Computer Emergency Readiness Team ("US-CERT") [security publications](#). More guidelines can be found at the National Institute of Standards and Technology ("NIST") [Computer Security Resource Center](#).

Include these security protocol basics to ensure your data is secure:

- ☐ Strong password protocol and standards for all devices
- ☐ Effective antivirus and malware software and policies
- ☐ Stringent, limited access policies
- ☐ Limited connection to the internet
- ☐ Frequent purges to eliminate former users

3. Training

In order to keep data secure, reduce employee errors, and help keep staff accountable, your department should incorporate the following two tiers of training:

- ☐ Tier One Training: all employees receive training focused on best practices and spotting common security risks
- ☐ Tier Two Training: employees who work directly with sensitive data, and have the capability to add, delete, alter, or share this data, receive specialized security training

4. Limited access

- ☐ Make sure only personnel who absolutely need data—especially sensitive data—have access to it.
- ☐ Maintain a comprehensive inventory of personnel who have access to sensitive data.
- ☐ Monitor and audit user access to sensitive data.

Governance Checklist (Continued)

Use this checklist to make sure you're covering the most important aspects of your data governance and management plans.

5. Data Sharing

- ☐ Keep track of who we share data with and why.
- ☐ Frequently review whether those we share data with still need it.
- ☐ Vet the organizations we plan to share data with to make sure they have adequate security policies and practices.

6. Data Retention

- ☐ Decide whether automatic or manual deletion approaches are best for each dataset your department collects.

7. Audits

Third-party audits are necessary to protect police data adequately. Some security loopholes escape even the most competent computer users.

- ☐ Use third party auditors to verify that what appears secure is actually secure.

Community Worksheet: Planning

Before acquiring or deploying a new police technology, engage your community to build trust and prevent miscommunication. These questions help prepare your team.

1. What message do we want to send to our community about this new technology?

2. How can we introduce this new technology in a way that reinforces that message?

3. What are we interested in learning from our community?

4. How will we manage and run our community meetings to make them effective?

Community Worksheet: Planning (Continued)

Before acquiring or deploying a new police technology, engage your community to build trust and prevent miscommunication. These questions help prepare your team.

5. Who will speak on behalf of our department? How can we train or prepare the team for the meeting?

6. How will we communicate operating policies to the community?

7. How will we invite community members to contribute?

8. How will we invite community feedback beyond community meetings?

Community Worksheet: Analysis & Follow-up

Before acquiring or deploying a new police technology, engage your community to build trust and prevent miscommunication. These questions help you process the feedback you received from your community.

1. What concerns has the community raised about the new technology?

2. What misconceptions about this technology need to be addressed?

3. How will we address these misconceptions?

4. Does the feedback we received affect how we should use this technology? Are there uses of this technology that need to be limited or prohibited?

Community Worksheet: Analysis & Follow-up (Continued)

Before acquiring or deploying a new police technology, engage your community to build trust and prevent miscommunication. These questions help you process the feedback you received from your community.

5. How will we communicate operating policies to our community and the larger public?

6. How will our community and the larger public be able to verify that our department is following these policies?

7. How else can we address our community's concerns?

8. What public reporting and public record laws apply to this technology? Are we prepared to comply?

Community Checklist

Before acquiring or deploying a new police technology, engage your community. It will build trust, prevent miscommunication, and help you to plan. The following checklist provides ways to engage.

1. Community Meetings

- ☐ Hold community meetings before new technologies are procured and deployed.

2. Open Communication

Invite public comments by any means possible, including:

- ☐ Phone
- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Email
- ☐ Website
- ☐ Social media

3. Transparent Operating Policies

Publish operating policies on the police department's website and include:

- ☐ The purpose of each police technology
- ☐ The allowed uses for each police technology
- ☐ The prohibited uses for each police technology
- ☐ Internal oversight practices

4. Annual Public Reports

Publish annual public reports on police technology on the police department's website and include:

- ☐ The purpose of the police technology
- ☐ An overview of how the technology has been used
- ☐ All operating policies, including for data collection, protection, retention, access, and sharing
- ☐ Training Protocols
- ☐ Results of any internal or external audits
- ☐ The benefits these technologies bring to law enforcement investigations
- ☐ The impact on civil liberties
- ☐ The impact on racial, ethnic, and religious equality
- ☐ The fiscal costs
- ☐ The records of public meetings and comments from the public

From: [Julie Traun](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Mikele Lewis-Nelson](#)
Subject: RE: BASF CJTF Letter Opposing Surveillance by SFPD Using Privately Owned Cameras
Date: Thursday, September 8, 2022 5:26:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Perhaps it would be helpful to add that this letter pertains to Item 7 on Monday's agenda:
7. 220606 [Administrative Code - Surveillance Technology Policy for Police Department Use of Non-City Entity Surveillance Cameras] Sponsor: Mayor

From: Julie Traun
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 5:21 PM
To: 'victor.young@sfgov.org'
Cc: Mikele Lewis-Nelson
Subject: FW: BASF CJTF Letter Opposing Surveillance by SFPD Using Privately Owned Cameras
Importance: High

Good afternoon,
This was sent to the full board by the Bar Association of San Francisco on September 1, 2022, but I don't see it included in the materials for Rules on Monday, September 12th. Can it be added please?
Thank you.
Julie Traun

Julie Traun
Director of Court Programs
Lawyer Referral and Information Service
Bar Association of San Francisco
201 Mission Street, Suite 400,
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-782-8942
Fax: 415-782-8993

From: Mikele Lewis-Nelson
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 11:06 AM
To: 'Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org'
Cc: Yolanda Jackson; Mary McNamara
Subject: BASF CJTF Letter Opposing Surveillance by SFPD Using Privately Owned Cameras
Importance: High

Good Morning,

Please see the attached letter, *sent on behalf of Yolanda Jackson, Executive Director of The Bar*

Association of San Francisco.

Thank You,
Mikele Lewis-Nelson

Mikele Lewis-Nelson | Executive Assistant
The Bar Association of San Francisco | 201 Mission Street, Fourth Floor | San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-782-8998 | Fax: 415-477-2388
mlewis@sfbar.org | www.sfbar.org
(First name pronounced – Mih-KELL)

Confidentiality Notice:

The information in this e-mail (including attachments, if any) is considered privileged and/or confidential and is intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. Any review, use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited except by or on behalf of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by reply email, delete this email, and do not disclose its contents to anyone.

From: [Krystal Koop](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, September 9, 2022 1:53:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Krystal Koop

Email krystalkoop@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 1](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Howard Lee](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Friday, September 9, 2022 4:51:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Howard Lee

Email howard.lee90@gmail.com

I am a resident of [District 7](#)

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan, and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

From: [Dan Richards](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!
Date: Sunday, September 11, 2022 6:16:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message to the Rules Committee

From your constituent Dan Richards

Email rucks_slats.0@icloud.com

I am a resident of District 11

Approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for SFPD!!

Message to the Rules Committee

Dear Supervisors Peskin, Chan and Mandelman:

I call on you to support the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

The ordinance, as written, balances our rights and public safety. Business owners can opt-in or not. People who own private cameras must consent.

Any claim that the ordinance grants SFPD broad monitoring of our lives, is false. The ordinance applies to very specific, important circumstances, including SFPD officer misconduct. It is case-specific, and protects First Amendment rights and the limits on how long footage can be retained are reasonable. Officer training is extensive, and Chief Scott, who has continuously sought out appropriate criminal justice reforms, has committed to honoring the ordinance as intended.

Please approve the Surveillance Technology Policy for the Police Department's use of non-City entity surveillance cameras.

Thank you.

