

From: [Kathryn Inglin](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Wednesday, September 27, 2023 7:27:38 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Kathryn Inglin
Email kathryn@inglin.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Edward Reidy](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 11:28:40 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Edward Reidy

Email edwardreidy@gmail.com

I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Rebecca Saroyan](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 8:20:31 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Rebecca Saroyan
Email rebecca.saroyan@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Garret Tom](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 8:10:31 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Garret Tom

Email gntom@bu.edu

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Anthony Verreos](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 6:30:47 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Anthony Verreos

Email tony@verreos.com

I live in District District10

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an
affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens'
access to public material.

There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most
egregious are this Commission's insistence on
assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming
from the public posting of criminal content, rather
than on the criminal who posted it, outright
censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual
predators and other dangerous criminals who groom
our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far
as public posts on social media are concerned, is
that it is not the responsibility of the person posting
the revealing content to bear the consequences of
what they post to a public platform, rather it is the
police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the
logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it
violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act

on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our City Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Sona Sondhi](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 6:12:40 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Sona Sondhi
Email sonya@sondhi.ca
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Hill Ferguson](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 5:30:03 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Hill Ferguson

Email hillferguson@gmail.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Brett Ortiz](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 5:10:43 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Brett Ortiz

Email ortizbrett@yahoo.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

Thank you,

Brett Ortiz

From: [craig hyde](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 5:00:51 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent craig hyde
Email craighydesf@gmail.net
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Anthony Winogrocki](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 5:00:46 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Anthony Winogrocki
Email sanfranciscotony@yahoo.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Robin Gray](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 5:00:45 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Robin Gray

Email robingray@comcast.net

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Ditka Reiner](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 4:05:40 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Ditka Reiner

Email ditka@reinerassociates.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Karina Velasquez](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 3:10:56 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Karina Velasquez

Email Karinawinder@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Lareina Chu](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 3:01:07 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Lareina Chu

Email lareinachu@yahoo.com

I live in District [District 4](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Mark Hernandez](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 2:57:01 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mark Hernandez

Email mehsfalert@gmail.com

I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Dennis ODonnell](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 2:54:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Dennis ODonnell

Email dennis_odonnell@ymail.com

I live in District [District 4](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Kathy 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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 2:40:40 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Kathy Kelly

Email kathykelly44@yahoo.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Shirley Fogarino](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 2:35:43 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Shirley Fogarino

Email scoopfoggy@prodigy.net

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Caroline Matthews](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 2:19:32 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Caroline Matthews

Email CarolineM_Matthews@yahoo.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 1:45:04 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Usha and John Burns

Email Johnmburns48@yahoo.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Michael Stasko](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 12:35:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Michael Stasko

Email staskodive@yahoo.com

I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Robin McMillan](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 12:14:43 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Robin McMillan
Email rkmcmillan@viselect.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Dennis Bianchi](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 11:58:26 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Dennis Bianchi

Email DBiaLaura@aol.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Herb Meibergert](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 11:49:44 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Herb Meibergert
Email herb.sf@gmail.com
I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

PLEASE LET POLICE OFFICERS DO THEIR JOBS.

ALL San Francisco citizens and residents are sick of
the drugs and crime in this once-beautiful city.

We are impatient that elected officials are not only
doing nothing about it ... they are inhibiting others
who want to stop this from happening.

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an
affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens'
access to public material. There are many issues
with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this
Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD
the consequences stemming from the public posting
of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who
posted it, outright censorship, and the potential
aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous
criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our City Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's

investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP
jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our
children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Martin Anderson](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 10:50:44 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Martin Anderson

Email ttf10b@gmail.com

I live in District [District 4](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Sharon Soong](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 10:46:05 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Sharon Soong
Email soong.sharon@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Mike O'Brien](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 10:41:00 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mike O'Brien

Email stretchob@comcast.net

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Dearan 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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 10:21:15 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Dearan Roche

Email dearan.m.roche@tcu.edu

I live in District [District 4](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Eamon 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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 10:20:55 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Eamon Roche

Email eamon415roche@gmail.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Kevin 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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 10:20:48 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Kevin Roche

Email krochemusic@aol.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 10:20:41 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Marina Roche

Email marinaroche@icloud.ie

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [David Lehr](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 10:16:00 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent David Lehr

Email lehr.david@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [david bancroft](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 9:30:46 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent david bancroft

Email sfdavidbancroft@gmail.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Eric Roddie](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 9:12:20 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Eric Roddie

Email ericdotroddie@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Helen Hughes](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 8:52:14 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Helen Hughes

Email hfmhughes@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Zoe Fuentes](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 8:23:54 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Zoe Fuentes

Email travelzoe@yahoo.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: Philip Healy
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 7:53:03 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Philip Healy
Email lfchere@yahoo.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jennifer Vataru](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 7:35:24 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jennifer Vataru

Email jennifervataru@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Gina Paoletti](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 7:31:19 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Gina Paoletti

Email gilp_94123@yahoo.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Calvin 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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 7:30:40 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Calvin Lau

Email calvinlau@comcast.net

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Garrett Hoffman](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 7:26:03 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Garrett Hoffman

Email garrett.z.hoffman@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Robin Gray](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 7:25:34 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Robin Gray

Email robingray@comcast.net

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Erin Akel](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 7:18:11 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Erin Akel
Email erinakel@me.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Martha Ehmann Conte](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 7:07:55 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Martha Ehmann Conte

Email martha@ehmannconte.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 6:32:57 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Billy Brandreth

Email wrb100@gmail.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Dennis Seaman](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 6:15:55 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Dennis Seaman

Email dseaman@becleanandgreen.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Melissa Aurand](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 6:15:30 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Melissa Aurand

Email melissa.w.aurand@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2023 6:12:17 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Erika Kim

Email e_kimch@yahoo.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jennifer Nagle](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, September 25, 2023 7:31:54 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jennifer Nagle

Email jennifernagle@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Patrick Carroll](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, September 25, 2023 6:48:58 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Patrick Carroll

Email Pchas@comcast.net

I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Steven Callow](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, September 25, 2023 5:30:03 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Steven Callow

Email sdcallow@pacbell.net

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jan Diamond](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, September 25, 2023 2:39:37 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jan Diamond

Email janmdiamond@pacbell.net

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

Respectfully,
Jan Diamond

From: [Patrick Carroll](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, September 25, 2023 9:57:52 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Patrick Carroll

Email pchas@comcast.net

I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Andrew Homan](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Monday, September 25, 2023 6:34:49 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Andrew Homan
Email andrewhoman@mac.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jon W. Churnin](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 9:25:39 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jon W Churnin

Email jchurnin@aol.com

I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jean Whelan](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 8:36:10 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jean Whelan

Email jeanpwhelan@gmail.com

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Eric Jenkinson](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 6:02:40 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Eric Jenkinson

Email ericjenkinson6@gmail.com

I live in District [District 9](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Maria Elena Sereni](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 3:40:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Maria Elena Sereni
Email mgburchard@yahoo.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Lou Barberini](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 2:45:14 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Lou Barberini

Email Luigi497@aol.com

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Paul Dohrmann](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 1:38:11 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Paul Dohrmann
Email kuyatheone@gmail.com
I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Martin Edelson](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 1:19:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Martin Edelson

Email Afifty150@aol.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Natalia V](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 1:17:49 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Natalia V

Email iloveyoumarcello@gmail.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 11:01:57 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Frances Hochschild
Email fhochschild@yahoo.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Brian Fenwick](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 9:40:51 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Brian Fenwick

Email bafenwick67@gmail.com

I live in District [District 9](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Madeleine Xavier](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 9:28:28 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Madeleine Xavier

Email madeleinexavier@gmail.com

I live in District [District 8](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Mike Boyden](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 9:10:06 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mike Boyden

Email mrboyden@yahoo.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Marianne Gosciniak](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 7:59:25 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Marianne Gosciniak

Email effect-cosmic-0c@icloud.com

I live in District [District 3](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Faith Omaque](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 7:46:14 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Faith Omaque
Email fomaque@gmail.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jasmin Makar](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 7:42:17 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jasmin Makar

Email jasminmakar@mac.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Ruby Tondou](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 4:47:01 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Ruby Tondou

Email lki4949@aol.com

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Hans Yu](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2023 2:03:02 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Hans Yu

Email do4md@yahoo.com

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Emily Tam](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 10:52:23 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Emily Tam

Email emilymtam@sbcglobal.net

I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Brigitte Churnin](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 10:45:28 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Brigitte Churnin
Email bqchurnin@aol.com
I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Margaret O'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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 10:30:38 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Margaret O'Sullivan

Email marg_os@pacbell.net

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Margaret O'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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 10:26:25 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Margaret O'Sullivan

Email marg_os@pacbell.net

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Lisa Jung](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 10:17:37 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Lisa Jung

Email ljung552@gmail.com

I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Christopher Xavier](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 9:58:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Christopher Xavier

Email acxavier@aol.com

I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Alice Xavier](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 9:54:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Alice Xavier

Email acxavier@aol.com

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Joseph Cannata](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 9:08:36 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Joseph Cannata

Email joey@cannatagroup.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Roberta Economidis](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 7:25:32 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Roberta Economidis

Email reconomidis@yahoo.com

I live in District District 3

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jason DiLullo](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 7:25:32 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jason DiLullo

Email jasondilullo@yahoo.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Phillip Raiser](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 7:17:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Phillip Raiser

Email phillip@raiser.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Morgan Thorne](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 7:05:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Morgan Thorne

Email morganthorne@gmail.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

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

From your constituent **Mark Jonty**
Email **00series.jitters@icloud.com**
I live in District **District 2**

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: **Dear Police Commissioners,**

The subject of this message was forced by people campaigning and directing people to the form at <https://forms.guest.com/2323035330145...> YJAOuHnMZKdMqE6bzpJzYvImJpCZYWNAt2A3YkxMjZdMn4M5OTFjMz4mZto2QmYjY2Y6YmeEkM2NY2jYmZNMKSDMdhHtRMVjWYVhY2YmJdHjY2uKwNE4OTYSNTMGM5MwHnZmJqHtQMA1MDc3ZpQOG

Best of luck. Please keep our SFPD accountable.....for both their actions and inactions.

From: [Gene Dea](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 4:49:10 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Gene Dea

Email gene.dea@gmail.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Sydney Lo](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 4:24:49 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Sydney Lo

Email sydneyvlo@hotmail.com

I live in District [District 9](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Thomas Petrovic-Schmidt](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 3:40:43 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Thomas Petrovic-Schmidt

Email tgschmidt@gmail.com

I live in District [District 8](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [John 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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 3:40:42 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent John Kim

Email gocaljohn@somasf.com

I live in District District 6

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Taylor Nagle](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 3:34:43 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Taylor Nagle

Email tnagle@vallejoinvestments.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Barry Kane](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 3:33:15 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Barry Kane

Email sfobayguy@gmail.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [craig williams](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 1:12:40 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent craig williams

Email cwilliams557@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Michael Terrigno](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 12:51:18 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Michael Terrigno

Email trigs@sbcglobal.net

I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jane Russell](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 12:49:57 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jane Russell

Email wisdom.jane@yahoo.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 12:11:55 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Holly Peterson

Email holly.peterson@me.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Marina Kagan](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 12:11:13 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Marina Kagan

Email marina.kagan@gmail.com

I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Kimberly Coffey](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 11:42:56 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Kimberly Coffey

Email ksubscriptiononline@gmail.com

I live in District District 6

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Carol Enright](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 11:19:23 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Carol Enright

Email enright@mindspring.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [kelvin yip](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 10:54:20 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent kelvin yip
Email rentaluniversal@gmail.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Briana Santiago](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 10:36:03 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Briana Santiago

Email briana.ariel513@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Kevin 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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 10:27:27 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Kevin Roche

Email krochemusic@aol.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Franco Lucchesi](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 9:45:25 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Franco Lucchesi

Email francolucchesi204@gmail.com

I live in District [District 11](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Mario Ramirez](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 9:36:07 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mario Ramirez

Email unesceptico@gmail.com

I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Andrew Ho](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 8:44:40 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Andrew Ho

Email Andrewho.sf@gmail.com

I live in District [District10](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: C J
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 8:42:18 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent C J
Email cjs05@gmail.com
I live in District District 6

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies. Stop being a sell out.

From: [Matt Goldberg](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 7:50:31 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Matt Goldberg

Email matt.goldberg1@gmail.com

I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Spencer Sherwin](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 7:33:26 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Spencer Sherwin

Email spencer.sherwin@gmail.com

I live in District [District 5](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Diane Wilson](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 7:31:47 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Diane Wilson

Email divegas57@gmail.com

I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Victor Mezhvinsky](#)
To: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 7:16:31 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Victor Mezhvinsky

Email vmezhvinsky@me.com

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 5:35:03 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Marina Roche

Email marinaroche@icloud.com

I live in District [District 4](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Bill Lewis](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 5:21:00 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Bill Lewis

Email bill.lewis@gmail.com

I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Sheel Mohnot](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 5:02:03 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Sheel Mohnot

Email sheel@btv.vc

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Barbara J Dwyer](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 1:44:29 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Barbara J Dwyer

Email montereydivingwoman@gmail.com

I live in District [District 8](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Connie Solowoniuk](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 1:18:23 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Connie Solowoniuk

Email Connie@duck.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Linda Reilly](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2023 1:16:01 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Linda Reilly
Email linda.reilly2@ucsf.edu
I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning to SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than to the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Mark O'Connor](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 11:51:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mark O'Connor

Email seltzer.lemon@gmail.com

I live in District District 8

**I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard
to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying
SFPD access to this important modern day crime
fighting tool**

Message: Why are you so opposed to law enforcement actually
enforcing the law? What value do you bring to this
city? Please explain.

From: [William Dymek](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 11:31:08 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent William Dymek

Email bdymekster@gmail.com

I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Chiara Wine](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 11:15:27 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Chiara Wine

Email chiarawine@hotmail.com

I live in District [District 8](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Sina Parhizi](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 11:15:25 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Sina Parhizi

Email sparhiz@alumni.ncsu.edu

I live in District [District 7](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jim Irving](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 11:06:01 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jim Irving
Email jpirving3@gmail.com
I live in District District 11

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Max Young](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 11:04:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Max Young

Email maxyoung@icloud.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Marshall Alexander](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 10:49:01 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Marshall Alexander

Email marshall.alexander@yahoo.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Catherine Wu](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 10:35:31 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Catherine Wu

Email catwudesign@gmail.com

I live in District [District 5](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Karen Eggert](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 10:28:57 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Karen Eggert

Email keggertsf@gmail.com

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Amy Mc Manus](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 10:25:22 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Amy Mc Manus
Email asmtoyou@gmail.com
I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Dirk Probstel](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 10:15:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Dirk Probstel

Email dirkprobstel@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Jennifer Yan](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 10:10:13 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Jennifer Yan

Email jennifer.yan@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Chris Lehman](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 10:03:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Chris Lehman

Email crlehman@yahoo.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Carl 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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 9:53:52 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Carl Kim

Email carlckim@gmail.com

I live in District [District 5](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Luis Gil](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 9:45:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Luis Gil

Email f.gil.luis@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 9:40:37 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Susan fisch

Email sfisch116@comcast.net

I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Carla Schlemminger](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 9:35:27 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Carla Schlemminger

Email carlas@yahoo.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Gina Tobar](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 9:35:27 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Gina Tobar

Email ginatobar@gmail.com

I live in District [District10](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Angie Yap](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 9:30:25 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Angie Yap

Email ayhc69@gmail.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Kyle Matson](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 9:27:38 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Kyle Matson

Email 07-sonars-fuzzed@icloud.com

I live in District District 6

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Davide Radaelli](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 9:27:05 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Davide Radaelli
Email daviderady@gmail.com
I live in District [District 5](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Michael Dechert](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 9:16:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Michael Dechert

Email michael.dechert@gmail.com

I live in District [District 3](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Alex Fishman](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 9:07:03 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Alex Fishman

Email afishman@gmail.com

I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [David Chang](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 8:40:39 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent David Chang

Email dchangster@gmail.com

I live in District District 9

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 8:30:37 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Susan McDonough
Email sdrCRM@hotmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Alexander Yancher](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 8:23:47 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Alexander Yancher

Email alex.yancher@gmail.com

I live in District [District 9](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [David Driver](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 8:17:51 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent David Driver

Email davidrandolphdriver@gmail.com

I live in District District 9

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Bob Bonnet](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 7:28:45 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Bob Bonnet

Email bobbonnet@gmail.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Kathy Hallinan](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 7:28:13 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Kathy Hallinan
Email kathyleather@gmail.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Will Cody](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 7:15:31 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Will Cody
Email wcody415@yahoo.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [McKenna Quint](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 7:08:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent McKenna Quint

Email mckenna.quint@gmail.com

I live in District District 9

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Thomas Tenreiro](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 7:03:10 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Thomas Tenreiro

Email tomi.tenreiro@gmail.com

I live in District [District 3](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Reynolds Ospina](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:55:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Reynolds Ospina
Email reynoldsospina@hitmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Susan Coveleski](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:50:28 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Susan Coveleski
Email Coveleskisusan59@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Angela Tickler](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:45:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Angela Tickler

Email angela.tickler@yahoo.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,
It is reprehensible that the Police Commission would even consider barring SFPD from using social media for investigations of criminal activity. STOP FINDING WAYS TO MAKE SFPD's JOB MORE DIFFICULT. No one wants to join this department because YOU make it so much more difficult than it needs to be. And often seem far more concerned about the CRIMINALS than the VICTIMS and our law enforcement officers. SHAME ON YOU.
DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is

that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our City Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our

children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [John 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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:40:22 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent John Kim

Email johnvpkim1@yahoo.com

I live in District District 9

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Barklee Sanders](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:30:41 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Barklee Sanders

Email barkleesanders@gmail.com

I live in District [District 6](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Dennis Dunne](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:30:38 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Dennis Dunne

Email dunnedf@gmail.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Nancy Yang](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:30:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Nancy Yang
Email nancy94121@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Paul Shinn](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:25:27 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Paul Shinn
Email pbshinn@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Garry Tan](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:25:25 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Garry Tan

Email garrytan@gmail.com

I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Terry Lynch](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:18:32 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Terry Lynch

Email terry5545@msn.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

My first choice would be to disband the San Francisco police commissioners, and take away all power, but they have.

Until then:

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of

what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our City Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Julie Zberg](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 6:10:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Julie Zberg
Email jzberg@comcast.net
I live in District District 6

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Alita Cangemi](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:52:02 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Alita Cangemi
Email alita.macias@gmail.com
I live in District District 3

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Andrew Lehman](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:40:45 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Andrew Lehman

Email aclehman@ehs.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Alison Fong](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:35:20 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Alison Fong

Email ayfong1@gmail.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Stephanie Lehman](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:30:38 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Stephanie Lehman
Email slehman21@yahoo.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Mary Barnes](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:30:36 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mary Barnes

Email roddybarnes@yahoo.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Mitchell Smith](#)
To: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:25:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Mitchell Smith

Email htimsm1@gmail.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Ross Wait](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:20:36 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Ross Wait

Email rosskwait@gmail.com

I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

The below is a form email, but I agree with 100% of its contents. You all should know which way the wind is blowing in SF - stop restricting sensible police work.

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the

police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our City Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Tony Chase](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:15:27 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Tony Chase

Email tony@seapointconstruction.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Greg Harris](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:10:39 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Greg Harris

Email greggbbk@yahoo.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Michelle Cody](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:00:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Michelle Cody

Email wise8689@yahoo.com

I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Ed Wang](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 5:00:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Ed Wang

Email lined065@yahoo.com

I live in District District 4

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Anne Woodward](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:55:28 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Anne Woodward

Email annewoodward11@gmail.com

I live in District District 9

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Laurance Lee](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:40:31 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Laurance Lee

Email laulemlee@gmail.com

I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Teresa Shaw](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:40:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Teresa Shaw

Email tawny.sapient0c@icloud.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Adam Wright](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:35:29 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Adam Wright

Email wrightadamjustin@gmail.com

I live in District [District 9](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: Barb Tassa
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:35:27 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Barb Tassa
Email mister.lankier0p@icloud.com
I live in District District10

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Erica Sandberg](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:30:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Erica Sandberg
Email esandberg_2000@yahoo.com
I live in District [District 3](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Marny Homan](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:25:23 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Marny Homan

Email marny.homan@gmail.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Anthony Fox](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:20:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Anthony Fox
Email sftonyfox@gmail.com
I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Joe Boggio](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:20:28 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Joe Boggio

Email joe@boggioventures.com

I live in District [District 6](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Lee Edwards](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:20:27 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Lee Edwards

Email leeredwards@gmail.com

I live in District District 5

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Spencer Guthrie](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:15:23 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Spencer Guthrie

Email spencer.guthrie@gmail.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Moise Cohen](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:15:22 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Moise Cohen

Email moise@luxforlife.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Maura Mana](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:10:36 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Maura Mana
Email mauramana@outlook.com
I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Victoria Barret](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:05:31 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Victoria Barret

Email vbarret@gmail.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Karina Velasquez](#)
To: [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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:05:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Karina Velasquez

Email karinawinder@gmail.com

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [RICHARD MANSO](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:05:27 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent RICHARD MANSO

Email rmanso2016@gmail.com

I live in District [District 3](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

Your desired policies aren't going to change the lawlessness trend occurring in this once beautiful city of San Francisco. Worse, DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material.

There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it

violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our City Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

Makes me wonder what traumatic events you endured when you were younger that are still affecting your decision making. Making matters

worse for the law abiding residents of San Francisco
should not be part of your PTSD therapy.

From: [Adam Pensack](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:05:26 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Adam Pensack
Email adampenssck@yahoo.com
I live in District District 3

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Maria Harmon](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:00:45 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Maria Harmon

Email maria.h.415@outlook.com

I live in District [District 4](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Michael Falcone](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:00:33 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Michael Falcone

Email michaelfalcone9@gmail.com

I live in District [District 1](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Michael Linksvayer](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 4:00:32 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Michael Linksvayer
Email mlinksva@gmail.com
I live in District District 6

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Scot Conner](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 3:55:23 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Scot Conner

Email scot.conner@berkeley.edu

I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Ashley DeVore](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 3:50:31 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Ashley DeVore
Email ashleycdevore@gmail.com
I live in District District 8

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Tamara Greenberg](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 3:40:36 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Tamara Greenberg
Email tamaragreenberg@gmail.com
I live in District [District 2](#)

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Linda Mathews](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 3:40:35 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Linda Mathews

Email Linda.mathews@yahoo.com

I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

This is unbelievable. Do you sit around and think of the best ways to protect criminals? I don't understand your thinking unless you are pro crime.

Social Media should be used as a tool. Stop aiding the criminals and start realizing that the law abiding citizens are going to be left with no choice but to try and abolish your commission if things don't change. We are tired of seeing our tax dollars being used to help criminals.

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's

investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP
jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our
children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Peter lehman](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 3:35:32 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Peter lehman
Email pclehman18@yahoo.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Eric Swagel](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 3:26:30 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Eric Swagel
Email eswagel@gmail.com
I live in District District 1

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [David Cuadro](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Friday, September 22, 2023 2:54:03 PM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent David Cuadro

Email david.s.cuadro@gmail.com

I live in District District 7

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is a affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's predictable insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work that

results in the protection from modern day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes, are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real world necessary tool for fighting all types of current day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGO's such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

From: [Sarah Byun](#)
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 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool
Date: Wednesday, September 27, 2023 7:35:35 AM

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

Message to the Police Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the City Attorney

From your constituent Sarah Byun
Email sarahmhardman@gmail.com
I live in District District 2

I oppose DGO 6.21 Censoring SFPD with regard to Public Posts on Social Media, and denying SFPD access to this important modern day crime fighting tool

Message: Dear Police Commissioners,

DGO 6.21 far exceeds your authority and is an affront to our democracy: censorship of citizens' access to public material. There are many issues with DGO 6.21, but the most egregious are this Commission's insistence on assigning onto SFPD the consequences stemming from the public posting of criminal content, rather than on the criminal who posted it, outright censorship, and the potential aiding of sexual predators and other dangerous criminals who groom our youth online.

What this Commission would have us accept, as far as public posts on social media are concerned, is that it is not the responsibility of the person posting the revealing content to bear the consequences of what they post to a public platform, rather it is the police's responsibility not to look at it. Not only is the logic behind this DGO flawed and untenable, it violates our officers' basic freedom to view and act on public content. Even more disturbing, this DGO hinders SFPD's ability to engage in undercover work

that results in the protection from modern-day threats such as organized crime rings and online sexual predators.

The commission's "concerns" about officers creating fake profiles, surveilling people, and then using their associations to jump to conclusions and "criminalize" people rather than investigating actual crimes are unfounded and based on hearsay. At a minimum, this commission should be required to provide data on how many crimes have been investigated or resulted in arrests where SFPD used fake social media accounts. Right now, the Commission is working off of assumptions from the DPA, ACLU, and the SF Bar Association, and assumptions are not a basis for creating policy changes that leave our most vulnerable populations less protected. How does this Commission think law enforcement catches pedophiles and sexual predators preying on our children online? Nor are assumptions the basis for eliminating a real-world necessary tool for fighting all types of current-day crime.

This Commission cannot prohibit SFPD from looking at public social media posts any more than it can ban SFPD from reading the newspaper, watching the news, or using their eyes to see what is happening as they walk down a street. Furthermore, this Commission should be well aware that there is no expectation of privacy with regard to public posts, and by brazenly bragging on public platforms on social media about their crimes, criminals WANT the content to be seen by everyone, just as if they were walking down the street engaging in criminal activity, and they should, and must, take full responsibility for the consequences that follow the posting. The burden certainly is not on SFPD to turn a blind eye to public admissions of crimes. That is the opposite of their job. As such, perhaps extreme DGOs such as 6.21 necessarily call for action by our Clty Attorney, who is cc'd on this email, to censure the Police Commission.

STOP DGO 6.21 from advancing any further as it is a form of censorship as well as harmful to SFPD's investigative efforts to solve crime. STOP jeopardizing public safety and the safety of our children, with these unnecessary and bogus policies.

