From: Youngblood, Stacy (POL)
To: SFPD, Commission (POL)
Subject: FW: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 28, 2024 9:46:55 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

From: Sylvia Khong-Terpstra <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2024 7:21 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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent	Sylvia Khong-Terpstra
Email	skterp@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: Thursday, February 22, 2024 8:34:27 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

From: Keith Howard <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 10:31 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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent	Keith Howard
Email	S.f.k.howard@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: Thursday, February 22, 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

From: William Sicord <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 10:45 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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent	William Sicord
Email	WFSicord@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 3:38:04 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

From: Frances Hochschild <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 3:37 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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent	Frances Hochschild
Email	fhochschild@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 28, 2024 3:36:12 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

From: Margaret Eshia <noreply@jotform.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2024 3:15 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

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent	Margaret Eshia
Email	mjeshia@hotmail.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: Fwd: I oppose DGO 9.07 because it contradicts Federal/State Law
Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:41:29 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: WESLEY WAKEFORD <noreply@jotform.com>
Date: February 21, 2024 at 8:55:53 PM PST
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
Reply-To: weswake@gmail.com

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent	WESLEY WAKEFORD
Email	weswake@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: Sylvia Khong-Terpstra
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 28, 2024 7:21:10 AM

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Sylvia Khong-Terpstra

Email skterp@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: William Sicord
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 10:45:38 PM

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent William Sicord

Email WFSicord@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: Keith Howard
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 10:31:02 PM

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Keith Howard

Email S.f.k.howard@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: WESLEY WAKEFORD
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 8:55:55 PM

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent WESLEY WAKEFORD

Email weswake@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: Frances Hochschild
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 3:37:50 PM

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Frances Hochschild

Email fhochschild@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: Margaret Eshia
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 28, 2024 3:15:15 PM

Message to the Police Commission, BOS and Mayor Breed

From your constituent Margaret Eshia

Email mjeshia@hotmail.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.