

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 11:39:56 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Susan Fisch <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 11:01 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Susan Fisch**

Email sfisch116@comcast.net

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 10:12:05 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Cathy Borchelt <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:33 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Cathy Borchelt**

Email cmborchelt@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 11**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 10:11:56 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Lou Ann Bassan <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:36 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Lou Ann Bassan

Email louann.bassan@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:26:13 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Randa Dudum <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:25 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Randa Dudum

Email randadudum@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:12:29 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Kathy Ayoub <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:12 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Kathy Ayoub**

Email ekmcnair@pacbell.net

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials, this is unheard of!! You should be ashamed !

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to

ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:12:18 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Sandra Jadallah <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:57 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Sandra Jadallah

Email sjadalla@pacbell.net

I am a resident of District 8

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:12:06 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Sheila Starr <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:06 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Sheila Starr**

Email starrsheilasf@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:12:03 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Nancy Dudum <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:07 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Nancy Dudum**

Email nkatherined@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:50:29 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Maureen Kelly <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2024 4:46 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Maureen Kelly**

Email maureenkellysanf@aol.com

I am a resident of District 7

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:50:28 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Sandra Jadallah <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2024 6:49 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Sandra Jadallah**

Email sjadalla@pacbell.net

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:50:24 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Sophia Jadallah <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2024 7:41 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Sophia Jadallah**

Email sophiajadallah@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:50:18 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Nick Marrone <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2024 7:56 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Nick Marrone**

Email nick.marrone21@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 8

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:49:34 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Joseph McFadden <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2024 5:04 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Joseph McFadden

Email fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:49:11 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Michael Eisler <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 7:49 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Michael Eisler**

Email mbeis@hotmail.com

I am a resident of District 2

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:49:07 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: David Nolley <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 8:41 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **David Nolley**

Email danolley@aol.com

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:49:03 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Anna Bockris <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 8:48 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Anna Bockris**

Email abockris@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:49:01 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Usha and John Burns <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 8:51 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Usha and John Burns

Email Johnmburns48@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 2

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:48:56 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Carrie Mainelli <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 9:10 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Carrie Mainelli**

Email carrie_mainelli@comcast.net

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:48:53 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Tris Thomson <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 9:15 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Tris Thomson

Email tris.thomson@comcast.net

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:48:36 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Judi Hurabiell <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 9:21 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Judi Hurabiell**

Email jmhurabiell1@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:48:31 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Phillip Zakhour <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 11:03 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Phillip Zakhour**

Email philzakhour@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:48:27 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: K. Ruth Schwartz <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 11:57 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent K. Ruth Schwartz

Email kielygomes@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 8

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:48:23 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Erika Kim <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 3:46 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Erika Kim**

Email e_kimch@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:48:19 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Eric Debbane <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 4:06 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Eric Debbane

Email ericdebb@msn.com

I am a resident of District 3

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:48:16 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Holly Peterson <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 4:09 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Holly Peterson**

Email holly.peterson@me.com

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:48:12 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Carmel Passanisi <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 8:27 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Carmel Passanisi**

Email carmel2710@comcast.net

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:48:08 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: John Ng <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2024 9:55 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent John Ng

Email JohnNgSF@aol.com

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:47:50 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Billy Brandreth <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2024 8:44 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Billy Brandreth**

Email wrb100@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:47:43 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: William Lacey <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2024 10:20 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **William Lacey**

Email convict.the.orange.fuhrer@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal. That is NOT YOUR JOB and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:47:39 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Vivien MacDonald <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2024 11:42 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Vivien MacDonald

Email bebemacd@aol.com

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:47:31 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Viktoria Kolesnikova <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2024 2:53 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Viktoria Kolesnikova

Email vxk.viktoria@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:44:11 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Richard Bentley <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 1:20 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Richard Bentley

Email rrb802@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 5

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:37:45 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Kevin Godes <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 4:50 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Kevin Godes**

Email kevingodes@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 6**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete support of eliminating qualified immunity and holding officers accountable for violations of use of force Guidelines, destruction of personal property and especially for harm and injury inflicted on the general

public during the course of duty. I believe officers should be personally responsive and held to a standard commensurate the life and death power given individuals with less training than nail technicians.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:36:57 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Esmeralda Tuttle <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 6:05 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Esmeralda Tuttle**

Email estuttle@hotmail.com

I am a resident of **District 3**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:36:49 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Samuel Hom <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 6:11 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Samuel Hom**

Email samhom1958@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:36:42 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Mary McFadden <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:02 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Mary McFadden**

Email jandmmcfadden@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:36:30 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Mary McFadden <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:15 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Mary McFadden**

Email mmcfadden9614@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:36:25 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Brian Clausen <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:21 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Brian Clausen**

Email bccclausen@comcast.net

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:36:22 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Jeffrey Ricker <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:27 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Jeffrey Ricker**

Email the_dreadnought@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:36:07 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Joseph McFadden <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:59 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Joseph McFadden**

Email fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:36:03 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: K Hegerhorst <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 8:01 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent K Hegerhorst

Email katheg@att.net

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:35:55 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Wincy Wong <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 8:45 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Wincy Wong**

Email WincyWong9@gmail.col

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:35:32 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Marina Roche <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 9:13 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Marina Roche**

Email marinaroche@icloud.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:35:13 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: EBERT KAN <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 10:19 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **EBERT KAN**

Email Nomad627@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:34:48 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Susan McDonough <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 10:59 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Susan McDonough

Email sdrcrm@hotmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:34:35 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Edward Sullivan <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 11:34 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Edward Sullivan**

Email efsullyjr@aol.com

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:34:28 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Mary Dudum <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 12:47 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Mary Dudum**

Email marydudum@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:34:23 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Michael Dudum <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 12:51 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Michael Dudum

Email mdmndsfca@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:34:19 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Gail Rutherford <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 3:08 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Gail Rutherford**

Email gail_rutherford@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:34:15 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Michael Puccinelli <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 6:58 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Michael Puccinelli

Email michaelpooch@comcast.net

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:34:11 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Helen Lau <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 7:24 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Helen Lau**

Email sfbluejade@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:34:03 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: James Horan <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 7:54 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent James Horan

Email jph.3037@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Cc: [Scott, William \(POL\)](#); [Kilshaw, Rachael \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Reynolds, Sondra \(POL\)](#); [Singh, Kristine \(POL\)](#); [Tom, Risa \(POL\)](#); [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:32:52 AM

Commissioners,

The Commission Office has received almost 100 of the below emails from various people.

Stacy

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Carolyn Conwell <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:22 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpo.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Carolyn Conwell

Email cmconwell@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 11

**I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts
Federal/State Law**

Message to the Police

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Thursday, February 15, 2024 3:31:27 PM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Joey Nutz <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2024 3:28 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Joey Nutz**

Email jose556799@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Thursday, February 15, 2024 1:30:19 PM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: frank billante <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2024 10:05 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpd.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **frank billante**

Email francob7@aol.com

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Thursday, February 15, 2024 9:10:50 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: LAUREN PIERIK <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 6:30 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **LAUREN PIERIK**

Email laurenpierik@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 8

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Thursday, February 15, 2024 9:10:31 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Anna Marie Viola <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2024 7:50 AM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Anna Marie Viola**

Email anitaviola08@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 11**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 1:29:33 PM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Karla Henderson <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 1:27 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>; Scott, William (POL) <william.scott@sfgov.org>; Tracy McCray <tracym@sfpoa.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Karla Henderson

Email blkdolphin@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 7

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part

reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police

commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Youngblood, Stacy \(POL\)](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)
Subject: FW: Public Comment on Department General Order 9.07
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:36:13 AM

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood #1211

Officer in Charge - Police Commission Office
San Francisco Police Department
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158
stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org
415-837-7071 – Desk

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

From: Teresa Palmer <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:47 PM
To: Youngblood, Stacy (POL) <Stacy.A.Youngblood@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment on Department General Order 9.07

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

Secretary Stacy Youngblood,

Please go forward!

In April of 2023, the Police Commission voted unanimously in favor of DGO 9.07, a comprehensive policy to prohibit racially-biased traffic stops in San Francisco.

I am asking you to vote to approve DGO 9.07 and continue the transparency as you have practiced it though the policy's implementation period and beyond.

Thank you,

Teresa Palmer
teresapalmer2014@gmail.com
1845 Hayes St

San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Susan Fisch](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 11:00:58 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Susan Fisch**

Email sfisch116@comcast.net

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Lou Ann Bassan](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:36:39 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Lou Ann Bassan**

Email louann.bassan@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Cathy Borchelt](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:33:29 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Cathy Borchelt**

Email cmborchelt@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 11**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Randa Dudum](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:25:52 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Randa Dudum**

Email randadudum@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Kathy Ayoub](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:12:25 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Kathy Ayoub**

Email ekmcnair@pacbell.net

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials, this is unheard of!! You should be ashamed !

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value

of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal. That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Nancy Dudum](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:07:35 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Nancy Dudum**

Email nkatherined@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Sheila Starr](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:07:06 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Sheila Starr**

Email starrsheilasf@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Sandra Jadallah](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:57:41 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Sandra Jadallah**

Email sjadalla@pacbell.net

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Carolyn Conwell](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:22:34 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Carolyn Conwell**

Email cmconwell@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 11**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [James Horan](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 7:54:22 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **James Horan**

Email jph.3037@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Helen Lau](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 7:24:14 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Helen Lau**

Email sfbluejade@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Michael Puccinelli](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 6:58:38 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Michael Puccinelli

Email michaelpooch@comcast.net

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Gail Rutherford](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 3:08:16 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Gail Rutherford**

Email gail_rutherford@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Michael Dudum](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 12:49:16 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Michael Dudum

Email mdmdsfca@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Mary Dudum](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 12:47:25 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Mary Dudum**

Email marydudum@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Edward Sullivan](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 11:34:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Edward Sullivan**

Email efsullyjr@aol.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Susan McDonough](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 10:58:55 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Susan McDonough

Email sdrCRM@hotmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [EBERT KAN](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 10:19:37 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **EBERT KAN**

Email Nomad627@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Marina Roche](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 9:12:55 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Marina Roche**

Email marinaroche@icloud.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Wincy Wong](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 8:45:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Wincy Wong**

Email **WincyWong9@gmail.col**

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [K Hegerhorst](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 8:01:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent K Hegerhorst

Email katheg@att.net

I am a resident of District 4

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Joseph McFadden](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:59:03 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Joseph McFadden**

Email fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Jeffrey Ricker](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:27:23 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Jeffrey Ricker**

Email the_dreadnought@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Brian Clausen](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:21:39 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Brian Clausen**

Email bccclausen@comcast.net

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Mary McFadden](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:12:34 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Mary McFadden**

Email mmcfadden9614@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Mary McFadden](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 7:03:02 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Mary McFadden**

Email jandmmcfadden@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Samuel Hom](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 6:11:41 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Samuel Hom**

Email samhom1958@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Esmeralda Tuttle](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 6:04:54 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Esmeralda Tuttle**

Email estuttle@hotmail.com

I am a resident of **District 3**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Kevin Godes](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 4:50:11 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Kevin Godes**

Email kevingodes@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 6

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police
Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete support of eliminating qualified immunity and holding officers accountable for violations of use of force

Guidelines, destruction of personal property and especially for harm and injury inflicted on the general public during the course of duty. I believe officers should be personally responsive and held to a standard commensurate the life and death power given individuals with less training than nail technicians.

From: [Richard Bentley](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 1:19:54 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Richard Bentley**

Email **rrb802@gmail.com**

I am a resident of **District 5**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Viktoria Kolesnikova](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Monday, February 19, 2024 2:53:06 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Viktoria Kolesnikova

Email vxk.viktoria@gmail.com

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Vivien MacDonald](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Monday, February 19, 2024 11:42:21 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Vivien MacDonald

Email bebemacd@aol.com

I am a resident of District 1

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [William Lacey](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Monday, February 19, 2024 10:20:01 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **William Lacey**

Email convict.the.orange.fuhrer@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is NOT YOUR JOB and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Billy Brandreth](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Monday, February 19, 2024 8:44:11 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Billy Brandreth**

Email wrb100@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [John Ng](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 9:55:17 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **John Ng**

Email JohnNgSF@aol.com

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Carmel Passanisi](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 8:27:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Carmel Passanisi**

Email carmel2710@comcast.net

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Holly Peterson](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 4:09:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Holly Peterson**

Email holly.peterson@me.com

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Eric Debbane](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 4:06:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Eric Debbane**

Email ericdebb@msn.com

I am a resident of **District 3**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Erika Kim](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 3:46:22 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Erika Kim

Email e_kimch@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 2

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [K. Ruth Schwartz](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 11:57:35 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **K. Ruth Schwartz**

Email kielygomes@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Phillip Zakhour](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 11:03:02 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Phillip Zakhour**

Email philzakhour@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Judi Hurabiell](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 9:21:30 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Judi Hurabiell**

Email jmhurabiell1@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Tris Thomson](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 9:15:29 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent [Tris Thomson](#)

Email tris.thomson@comcast.net

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

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Carrie Mainelli](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 9:09:53 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Carrie Mainelli**

Email carrie_mainelli@comcast.net

I am a resident of **District 1**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes. DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Usha and John Burns](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 8:51:26 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Usha and John Burns

Email Johnmburns48@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 2

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Anna Bockris](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 8:48:23 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Anna Bockris**

Email abockris@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [David Nolley](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 8:41:32 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **David Nolley**

Email **danolley@aol.com**

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Michael Eisler](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Sunday, February 18, 2024 7:48:57 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Michael Eisler**

Email mbeis@hotmail.com

I am a resident of **District 2**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Joseph McFadden](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Friday, February 16, 2024 5:04:36 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Joseph McFadden**

Email fadsmcfadden@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 4**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Nick Marrone](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Friday, February 16, 2024 7:56:30 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Nick Marrone**

Email nick.marrone21@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Sophia Jadallah](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Friday, February 16, 2024 7:41:43 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Sophia Jadallah**

Email sophiajadallah@gmail.com

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Sandra Jadallah](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Friday, February 16, 2024 6:49:51 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Sandra Jadallah**

Email sjadalla@pacbell.net

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Maureen Kelly](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Friday, February 16, 2024 4:46:26 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Maureen Kelly**

Email maureenkellysanf@aol.com

I am a resident of **District 7**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Joey Nutz](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Thursday, February 15, 2024 3:28:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Joey Nutz**

Email jose556799@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 8**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [frank billante](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Thursday, February 15, 2024 10:05:19 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent [frank billante](#)

Email francob7@aol.com

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

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Anna Marie Viola](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Thursday, February 15, 2024 7:50:54 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Anna Marie Viola**

Email **anitaviola08@gmail.com**

I am a resident of **District 11**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [LAUREN PIERIK](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 6:33:28 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent LAUREN PIERIK

Email laurenpierik@yahoo.com

I am a resident of District 8

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.

From: [Karla Henderson](#)
To: [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#)
Subject: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 1:27:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent **Karla Henderson**

Email blkdolphin@yahoo.com

I am a resident of **District 7**

I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law

Message to the Police Commission

Dear Commissioners and Elected Officials,

I am in complete opposition to this unelected body's abuse of power as you attempt not only to circumvent state and federal law, but further tie the hands of our SFPD to enforce our state and local vehicle codes.

DGO9.07 contradicts vehicle code 21 which in part reads:

Except otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this code are applicable and uniform throughout the state in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolutions on the matters covered by this code, including ordinances or resolutions that establish regulations or procedures for, or assess a fine, penalty, assessment, or fee for a violation of, matters covered by this code, unless expressly authorized by this code.

and it requires SFPD to risk being disciplined or fired for carrying out their obligations to enforce those laws.

Furthermore, DGO9.07 puts additional limitations on SFPD that EXCEED even those found in the failed SB50. Your sheer audacity to engage in this abuse of power is unprecedented and will undoubtedly inspire lawsuits in both Federal and State courts. The use of pretextual stops is currently LEGAL under state and federal law because our legislators understand the value of such stops. Driving with an expired registration or a

broken taillight, for example, is currently ILLEGAL and by banning our SFPD from enforcing these types of traffic infractions, you are essentially making them legal.

That is not your job and you do not have the authority to do it.

Banning pretextual stops repeatedly fail because our lawmakers understand that fewer stops will result in fewer legitimate searches, which means more guns and drugs on the streets of San Francisco. It also means that criminals and gangs will not fear transporting weapons and drugs into our city.

Why does this Commission refuse to acknowledge the data showing current stops have consistently decreased from 102,000 in 2019 to 40,000 in 2020 to just over 17,000 in 2022 showing SFPD is already reforming its processes? Ironically, it is well documented, and often cited by this very commission, that when traffic enforcement laxes, streets become less safe for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists which not only impacts those groups, it has a harmful impact on the local small businesses in our neighborhoods, yet you continue to push for policies that make our streets unsafe!

I urge you to abandon this ill-fated, overreaching, likely lawsuit-generating push to enforce DGO 9.07. It appears that this push to enact this measure is more of a personal ideological obsession and less a reflection of a desire to protect our public safety. It is behavior like this that undermines the public's faith in your ability to ethically and impartially fulfill your roles on the police commission and leads directly to ballot measures such as Prop E.

Please respect our Federal and State laws and abandon this push to enact DGO 9.07.