



DEFUND SFPD NOW.

A policy proposal to defund, disband, and disarm the San Francisco Police Department.

Last updated December 9, 2020 4:19 PM

About this document

The Defund SFPD Now campaign is led by SF Afrosocialists & Socialists of Color Caucus (Afrosoc) in collaboration with the Justice Committee of the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA), SF. The SF Afrosocialists & Socialists of Color Caucus is a Black-led organization created in 2020 to center BIPOC voices within socialist spaces. The DSA SF Justice Committee was formed in 2017 and organizes DSA SF's work on policing and prison issues.

This campaign is one part of the collective pursuit to defund SFPD into abolition, and ultimately abolish the prison industrial complex in San Francisco and beyond.

For years, there has been a grassroots movement in the City fighting for abolition—a movement where Black-led organizations and San Franciscans have forged the way. We support and work alongside these organizations by adding capacity, Black leadership via AfroSoc, and additional structure needed in times of mass mobilization.

If you'd like to get involved please contact us at defundsfpdnow.com; we'd love to continue to be in community with those who seek to re-imagine public safety.

This version of this document was last edited **December 9, 2020 4:19 PM**. The research contained in this document was done by the SF Afrosocialist Caucus in collaboration with the DSA SF Justice Committee.



DEFUND
THE POLICE



Contents

WHY DEFUND? WHY ABOLISH?	4
OUR IMMEDIATE CUTS	5
ELIMINATING POLICE IN SCHOOLS AND HOUSING	6
ELIMINATING UNITS THAT TARGET BIPOC	8
ELIMINATING SPECIALIZED UNITS	12
ELIMINATING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT UNITS	16
ELIMINATING TRAFFIC AND AIRPORT UNITS	18
ELIMINATING/REDUCING PATROL AND INVESTIGATION	21
ELIMINATING PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND CAPITAL INCREASES	24
MAKING POLICE OVERSIGHT INDEPENDENT OF SFPD	28
DEFUND THE SHERIFF	31
ELIMINATE ALL NON-CUSTODIAL FIELD OPERATIONS	32
ELIMINATE, TRANSFER, AND REDIRECT IN-CUSTODY, RE-ENTRY, AND DIVERSION PROGRAMS	37
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS	45

WHY DEFUND? WHY ABOLISH?

We must reimagine public safety, defund the police, and refund our communities.

The murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Tony McDade, Rayshard Brooks, Alex Nieto, Mario Woods, Luis Góngora Pat and countless others have led many to decry the system of policing as broken.

But policing is operating exactly as it was designed.

The origins of American policing can be traced back to slave patrols—forces created to identify escaped slaves and return them to chains. Modern police forces were established to violently crush the organization of workers in the late 1800s. From slavery in the south to factories in the north, the foundation of police forces have always been to preserve the power and protect the property of the ruling class. Today, roughly 99% of police calls for service are not in response to violence, but property crime and non-criminal matters.

We raise our voices along with the visionaries of abolition who have come before us and with those who march with us. We demand abolition of the entire prison-industrial complex. The time has come to move toward a city we want to live in. A city without police, prisons, and the systems that uphold them. A city whose focus is in the people and not property.

Our city spends more on SFPD than on the Department of Children, Youth and Families, the Environment, Homelessness Services, the Human Rights Commission, and the Public Defender's office combined. We must reallocate SFPD's budget toward the services and interventions that we know keep us safe. We must invest in healthcare, housing, education, trauma centers, free & extensive public transit, universal childcare, alternative community safety programs, and reparations to our Black residents.

Make no mistake: we will not rest until our demand is met—a complete disarmament, disbanding, and defunding of SFPD, and the funding and support for a robust network of community interventions. We are inspired and humbled by the voices that for decades and centuries have fought for abolition, and we will continue to amplify all voices that demand a just and compassionate world.

Join us in calling for real change and check out our concrete steps as a roadmap to abolition in San Francisco.

Part 1

OUR IMMEDIATE CUTS

36

line-item cuts in total

\$294.9M

in funds saved

Getting rid of the police state will require lots of work. For the 2020-21 budget, we have identified specific areas that SFPD can cut immediately to reduce its budget to free up funds for community services and reparations to our Black residents.

These cuts are not all we're asking for, but they're a place to start. We demand the complete defunding, disarming, and disbanding of SFPD. The research below is a road-map to start immediately.

Eliminating Police in Schools and Housing (\$12.0M)

Eliminating Units That Target BIPOC (\$29.7M)

Eliminating Specialized Units (\$25.3M)

Eliminating Community Engagement Units (\$4.5M)

Eliminating Traffic and Airport Units (\$56.4M)

Eliminating/Reducing Patrol and Investigation (\$73.9M)

Eliminating Personnel, Training, and Capital Increases (\$84.7M)

Making Police Oversight Independent of SFPD (\$8.4M)

ELIMINATING POLICE IN SCHOOLS AND HOUSING

2

line-item cuts

\$12.0M

in funds saved

Eliminate School Resource Officers (SROs)

How much do SROs cost?

\$3,397,234 per year (SFPD pays for 17 officers and 80% of 1 captain; SFUSD paid 20% but this is ending¹)

Why should we stop using cops as SROs?

In 2019, Black students comprised 43% of all SFUSD youth who were arrested, cited or detained² at school, despite being only 7% of the SFUSD student body. More than half of the impacted children were in elementary or middle school.

There is no data to prove³ that SROs make students more safe at school, but there

is plenty of data that demonstrates the key role SROs play in the school to prison pipeline. According to a 2011 report from the Justice Policy Institute, “when schools have law enforcement on site, students are more likely to be arrested by police instead of using incidents as teaching moments being handled by school officials. This leads to more kids being funneled into the juvenile justice system, which is both expensive and associated with a host of negative impacts on youth.⁴

San Francisco spends 60% more per capita on policing⁵ than New York City while spending 39% less on education per student. This money would be better put

towards educating rather than criminalizing our youth.

Eliminate District Housing Officers

How much do personnel in the District Housing unit cost?

\$8,660,665 per year (5 sergeants, and 40 officers)

Why should we eliminate the District Housing unit?

The residents of public housing communities are primarily people of color.⁶ Assigning officers specifically to public housing

perpetuates the over-policing and surveillance of Black and Brown families.

The unit maintains a database of all current public housing residents and has issued citations to people whose named residency upon arrest does not match its records, regardless of the truth of the person's statements.⁷

ELIMINATING UNITS THAT TARGET BIPOC

4

line-item cuts

\$29.7M

in funds saved

Eliminate Plainclothes and Homeless Units

How much do the personnel in the Plainclothes and Homeless Units cost?

\$13,968,234 per year (73 cops across different stations)⁸

Why should we eliminate the plainclothes and homeless units?

Homelessness is a public health issue and should not be criminalized. Increased police interaction with people experiencing homelessness drastically increases their risk of becoming targets of police violence, which further harms the lives of those already victimized by our unjust society.

Almost all of the 3,426 “mental health detentions” SFPD made in 2019 resulted in detention or a citation or booking; only in 3 cases were people diverted to other services⁹. However, SFPD is not capable of providing real support to San Franciscans struggling with their mental health. 39% of unhoused people have a psychiatric or emotional condition¹⁰.

People experiencing homelessness in our city are disproportionately BIPOC and LGBTQ+—two groups that are harassed, harmed, and killed by police at much higher rates than the population average¹.

Eliminate Healthy Streets Operations Center Officers (HSOC)

How much do the personnel in HSOC cost?

\$8,934,473 per year (2 captains, 2 lieutenants, 5 sergeants, 36 officers and 1 dispatcher)

Why should we eliminate the assignment of cops to HSOC?

HSOC addresses encampments and “street behavior.” While a variety of city agencies are involved, SFPD and DPW lead operations¹¹. There were an estimated 45,784 encampment calls in 2019¹². SFPD officers are the initial responders for these calls¹³, but they shouldn’t be involved in responding to public health calls.

SFPD involvement leads to sweeps and confiscations that violate human rights, and to “quality of life” citations that criminalize life-sustaining activities such as sleeping or simply sitting in public spaces.

In leading HSOC, SFPD has failed to engage with the community. For instance, they have created policies without consulting service providers, cancelled or rescheduled advisory board meetings without community input, and not tracked or shared relevant data, such as citation data for quality of life offenses affecting people experiencing homelessness, that providers have requested¹⁴.

Eliminate Gang Unit

How much does the personnel in the Gang Unit cost?

\$4,000,000 per year (1 lieutenant, 15 sergeants, 1 officer, and 2 clerks)

Why should we eliminate the Gang unit?

Gang-specific policing arose in the 1980s and took off in the 1990s. From the be-

ginning, gang policing was meant to track, control and incarcerate Black and Brown youth. The 1998 STEP act created a new crime of “active participation in a CA street gang,” and added gang sentencing enhancements¹⁵. The legislative intent of the act makes clear that the legislature viewed gang crime as an existential crisis; America’s “urban” youth becoming organized superpredators. That was never true,

but it's certainly not true in San Francisco in 2020. Gang policing involves tracking people based on what they wear, who they associate with (including family members), and imputing criminality to gatherings of young Black and Brown people, regardless of any actual criminal activity.¹⁶ In essence, gang policing violates fundamental rights, the right to assemble, the right to free expression. There is no reason we can't track (and peacefully disrupt) interpersonal feuds and organized anti-social activity the same way we do with groups of white people. There's no need for a specialized gang unit.

Thanks to the leadership of the San Francisco No Injustice Committee (SF NIC), the San Francisco City Attorney was forced to abandon racist gang injunctions, which exclusively targeted people of color in the city¹⁷. The San Francisco District Attorney has recognized the racist nature of gang policing and no longer charges gang enhancements¹⁸. Bottom line: if San Francisco is truly committing to addressing systemic racism, then the police unit explicitly dedicated to tracking and targeting Black and Brown youth must be disbanded.

Eliminate Narcotics Unit

How much do personnel in the Narcotics Unit cost?

\$2,830,127 per year (1 lieutenant, 1 sergeant, 12 officers and 1 clerk)

Why should we eliminate the Narcotics unit?

The Narcotics Unit, tasked with handling drug-related policing, is responsible for a disproportionate number of citations of communities of color—Black and Latino residents make up 20% of the City's population but accounted for 78% of individuals booked or cited for drug sales from 2017 to 2018¹⁹.

Only 4.7% of the 601 drug sale arrests by the Narcotics Unit from 2017 to 2018 resulted in the defendant being diverted from criminal prosecution to programs that facilitate drug treatment, mental health, reentry facilitation, and the reduction of recidivism.²⁰

A 2019 report from the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office shows that the costs of policing and criminal justice related to open air drug dealing in the Tenderloin, South of Market, and Mid-Market neighborhoods totaled \$12,519,713—meaning that each arrest costs almost

\$10,000²¹. This amount does not include long-term incarceration costs, associated administrative overhead costs, Drug Court or Behavioral Health Court costs, officer

training costs, or the costs of reactive policing efforts such as responding to calls for service and officer patrols.

Eliminate Sex Work Abatement Unit

Why should we eliminate the Sex Work Abatement Unit?

The Sex Worker Abatement Unit at Mission PD was created in August 2018 in response to neighbor complaints about street prostitution (source). This type of complaint-driven policing prioritizes homeowners' comfort over real public safety, and increases police harassment of people of color and poor people in public spaces.

The DA's office states that they do not pursue charges related to prostitution (source). Thus, the Sex Work Abatement Unit does not exist to file charges but only to intimidate, harass, and displace sex workers and clients. The combination of discriminatory policing and structural inequity means these harassment efforts are disproportionately affecting Black and Indigenous LGBTQ+ workers--this is why decriminalizing sex work, particularly for

criminalization's impact on gender-non-conforming Black people, is part of the Movement for Black Lives policy platform (source). The Unit has not made the neighborhood safer for sex workers or for other residents. Instead, sex workers are at high risk for violence at the hands of both violent clients and the police. The continued surveillance and harassment of sex work, under a DA who does not prosecute prostitution-related crimes, is more unnecessary police work that harms BIPOC communities. The resources given to this unit and other units like it should be diverted to provide direct aid to BIPOC women and gender non-conforming people living in poverty which is more likely to make their lives and communities safer.

For more information, visit <https://bit.ly/3k6uezQ>

ELIMINATING SPECIALIZED UNITS

6

line-item cuts

\$25.3M

in funds saved

Eliminate Vicious and Dangerous Dogs Unit

How much do personnel in the Vicious and Dangerous Dogs Unit cost?

\$188,248 per year (1 officer)

Why should we eliminate the Vicious and Dangerous Dogs Unit?

SFPD's Vicious and Dangerous Dog Unit investigates incidents involving dogs that exhibit menacing and/or aggressive be-

havior. The San Francisco Department of Health already appoints hearing officers to run hearings determining whether a dog is vicious and dangerous, and if so, what action needs to be taken. There is no reason for SFPD to be involved in this process.²²

If animal control can handle mountain lions²³, they can certainly handle dogs!

Eliminate Mounted, Honda, Marine Units

How much does the personnel in the Mounted, Honda, and Marine units cost?

\$8,704,976 per year (1 lieutenant, 7 sergeants, 36 officers, and 1 clerk)

Why should we eliminate these units?

Other cities have eliminated these units or never had them to begin with. Their existence is non-essential and unnecessary.

In particular, the Mounted Unit has been disbanded²⁴ in cities like Philadelphia and Boston with no change in these cities' abilities to search and rescue or patrol parks. In practice, Mounted Units in other police departments have only been used to hamper²⁵ peaceful protest. The Honda Unit is a specialized unit for riding sport motorcycles, something not found in other cities, and the Marine Unit is unnecessary and duplicative to the Coast Guard.

Eliminate SWAT

How much does the personnel in the SWAT Unit cost?

\$6,845,695 per year (4 teams: 1 captain, 2 lieutenants, 4 sergeants, 27 officers, and 1 police services aide)

Why should we eliminate SWAT?

There have been a lot of calls to demilitarize the police. SWAT is militarization by design: they were designed to respond to the Watts Rebellions as if the citizenry were the Viet Cong²⁶, and they've only gotten more militarized²⁷ since. SFPD received \$360,700 in free military gear just last year²⁸. The unit is equipped with specialized armor, armored personnel carriers, assault rifles, etc. SWAT conducts training

with FBI and other federal agencies, despite prohibitions against joint federal task forces. SWAT is an answer to a problem that doesn't exist in San Francisco. And without daily terrorist attacks, the SWAT team uses its military weapons and training to conduct no-warrant raids, and other violent tactics that dramatically escalate situations. SWAT teams are dangerous because they respond to calls with violence, something that has been recognized and exploited by people who seek to harm others through the practice of "swatting,"²⁹ whereby someone reports a false hostage crisis, knowing that SWAT will respond by smashing their target's doors, invading their house, possibly even shooting and killing them.

Slash Homeland Security Unit

How much does the personnel in the Homeland Security Unit cost?

\$6,561,053 per year (1 captain, 26 officers, 1 lieutenant, 2 sergeants, and 9 clerks)

Why should we eliminate the Homeland Security Unit?

This unit's work includes handling large public events and monitoring social media.

Communities are very capable of ensuring

safety at public events themselves. Many grassroots groups already organize their own security and conduct their own trainings.

State surveillance enables privacy infringement, not to mention abuse of power in an already unjust criminal system.

The Homeland Security Unit is commonly used as a place to reassign officers facing misconduct hearings.³⁰

Move Explosive Ordnance Disposal Unit to SFFD

How much does the personnel in the Bomb Unit cost?

\$1,770,032 per year (2 sergeants and 7 officers)

Why should we remove the Bomb Unit from SFPD?

This highly technical specialty can be housed in other public safety agencies, such as the Fire Department. For example, The Newport News Fire Department Bomb Squad in Virginia is one of 40 fire department bomb squads in the United States³¹. The San Diego Fire Department³² also

houses its bomb unit, so there is plenty of precedent for this to be removed from the police's purview.

Bomb defusing uses robots, and as technology improves, being able to operate these robots is the most important skill. That skill set has nothing to do with law enforcement, and everything to do with public safety.

Other non-police bomb units: Office of the State Fire Marshal in Maryland, and locally in Prince George's County, Anne Arundel

and Arlington.³³

Eliminate Alcohol Liaison Unit

How much do personnel in the Alcohol Liaison Unit cost?

\$1,214,422 per year (1 lieutenant, 2 sergeants, 2 officers, and 1 management assistant)

Why should we eliminate the Alcohol Liaison unit?

The Alcohol Liaison Unit (ALU) is responsible for processing Alcohol and Beverage Control (ABC) liquor license applications³⁴, as well as local enforcement of the state's ABC Act and the city's Deemed Approved Ordinance. This kind of administrative work does not need to be or belong in SFPD.

The Board of Supervisors ultimately determines if a license may be transferred to an establishment in an area of “undue concentration”, but often relies on the ALU's recommendation in making this determination³⁵. A report by the California Department of Justice expressed concern with “anti-Black bias within the department”³⁶ and an implicit bias trainer for SFPD found that “[t]he degree of anti-black sentiment throughout SFPD is extreme.”³⁷ A racist police department isn't a neutral arbiter and should not have the power to deny licenses to businesses.

ELIMINATING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT UNITS

3

line-item cuts

\$4.5M

in funds saved

Eliminate 10B Unit

How much do the personnel in the 10B unit cost?

\$600,000 per year (1 sergeant, 2 officers, and 2 retirees)

Why should we eliminate the cops in the 10B unit?

This department is essentially a 'rent-a-cop' program that will provide nearly any corporation or event a personal police force. This creates a larger police presence in the city for those that can afford it, with the same power and force of police, but with very little oversight. While the 10B unit does not cost SFPD much money, what it stands for is much more insidious.

When a lawsuit does happen, the City is on the hook for paying any cost, meaning that this program is costing not only the police budget, but the larger city budget as well.

The majority of this unit spends most of their time on data entry for scheduling and billing, for a program which should have no place in SFPD that does little for the City.

Many of those hours are paid for by community benefit districts which means we're using public funds to pay police officers time and a half.

In FY 2016-17, 30% of all overtime hours

by sworn staffing came from the 10B Unit at a cost of ~\$3 million³⁸.

Eliminate Community Engagement Division

How much do the personnel in the Community Engagement Division cost?

\$3,454,550 per year (1 commander, 1 captain, 1 lieutenant, 2 sergeants, 8 officers, 4 cadets, 1 management assistant, 1 manager, 12 retirees, 23 reserve officers, 1 senior clerk, and 1 senior analyst)

Why should we eliminate the cops in the Community Engagement Division?

Eliminating other departments of community engagement (HSOC, 10B, special events) will render the administrative functions of this division unnecessary.

Eliminate Special Events Unit

How much do the personnel in the Special Events Unit cost?

\$400,000 per year (1 sergeant and 1 officer)

Why should we eliminate the cops in the Special Events unit?

The cops in the Special Events unit assist with planning and staffing some 100

events across the city. There's no reason this support must come from uniformed officers. Moreover, as we are trying to decrease police presence in San Francisco in general, we call for minimizing the number of events funded and staffed by SFPD.

ELIMINATING TRAFFIC AND AIRPORT UNITS

3

line-item cuts

\$56.4M

in funds saved

Remove Traffic Collision Investigations

How much do the personnel in Traffic Collision Investigations cost?

\$1,600,000 per year (1 lieutenant and 6 sergeants)

Why should we remove TCIU?

An armed body of law enforcement should not be responsible for investigating car crashes. This makes no sense in terms of the budget, since sworn officers cost more than civilians. Also, any extraneous use of armed officers leads to poor outcomes for BIPOC people, who are disproportionately the victims of police violence.

Remove Traffic Company

How much do the personnel in the Traffic Company Cost?

\$6,800,000 per year (1 captain, 2 lieutenants, 4 sergeants, 27 officers, and 1 clerk)

Why should we remove the Traffic Company?

Traffic stops reflect bias and racism in SFPD and endanger nonwhite, especially African-American drivers. A 2016 assessment of SFPD practices by the Department of Justice's Community Oriented Policing Services Office showed that the percentage of traffic stops of African-American residents, 14.8%, outstripped their representation in the city population, 5.8%.³⁹

SFPD isn't even good at traffic enforcement⁴⁰. The number of traffic stops and tickets issues has decreased from 41,000 to 20,154 (almost 50%) between 2015 and 2018 due to decreased police officer motivation given high paperwork volume. If cops aren't even participating in traffic enforcement, why are we funding the Traffic Company?

Traffic policing is reactive, not proactive. If our goal is to keep our streets safe, San Francisco can take a proactive approach⁴¹, tried with great success with Vision Zero in Sweden, and save more lives⁴².

Reduce Airport Police Division Staffing

How much money will be saved by reducing Airport Police Division staffing?

\$48,000,000 per year, by reducing Airport Police Division staffing to 2018 levels and cutting an additional 50%

In FY 2019-2020 SFPD Airport Fund was \$78,072,176. The division includes 201 police officers, 38 sergeants, 12 lieutenants,

3 captains, 200 police services aides, and 16 police services aide supervisors.^{43 44}

Why should we reduce Airport Police Division staffing?

For over a decade, the Airport Police Division consisted of about 140 police officers and 130 police services aides (PSAs). However, the Airport Police division bud-

get exploded in FY 2019-2020, increasing staffing to 201 police officers and 200 PSAs. No reason was given for this massive expansion and it should be rolled back.

45

Further, an additional reduction of staff by 50% is justified by low service needs of the airport.⁴⁶

ELIMINATING/REDUCING PATROL AND INVESTIGATION

5

line-item cuts

\$73.9M

in funds saved

Reduce Proactivity Rate of Patrol Units

How much does reducing Patrol Units' proactive work save?

\$35,821,835 per year, by eliminating proactivity time, not accounting for reduced administrative time

Patrol units cost \$170,580,168 per year (691 officers, 138 sergeants, 40 lieutenants, and 1 captain). They spend approximately 56% of their time responding to calls for service, 23% of their time doing administrative work, and 21% of their time

doing "proactive" work. (Matrix Consulting Report)

Why should we eliminate proactivity time?

"Proactive" work refers to unobligated time, which is typically spent patrolling the streets. Due to extreme anti-Black sentiment⁴⁷ in the police force, we can't trust patrol units to patrol communities in unbiased ways.

Eliminate Foot and Bike Beat Officers

How much do foot and bike beat officers cost?

\$23,531,000 per year (125 officers)

Why should we get rid of foot and bike beat officers?

Foot and bike beat officers spend the vast majority of their time patrolling the streets

as opposed to responding to incidents. They attempt to build trust with the community through repeated face-to-face interaction. Due to reports of extreme anti-Black bias⁴⁸ in the police force, it's crucial that we reduce police contact with the public, particularly communities of color. These officers are primarily assigned to high density areas, which are disproportionately communities of color.

Reduce Staffing of the Remaining Investigative Units

How much would this save?

\$10,477,080 with a 50% cut; the remaining investigative units currently cost \$20,894,16 (125 staff)

Why should we reduce staffing of these units?

These units are extremely ineffective at identifying those who commit crime. For example, the clearance rate of larceny theft is just 4.4%, burglary is 16.3%, and rape is under 20%. We must reevaluate how to best serve victims of crime and invest in solutions that serve the community.⁴⁹

Slash Special Investigations Division

How much would this save?

\$3,241,540 with a 50% reduction; the Special Investigations Division currently

costs \$6,483,080 (1 lieutenant, 15 sergeants, and 15 officers)

Why should we slash the Special Investigations Division?

This division includes the Arson Task Force and confidential investigations

Arson forensics is notoriously unreliable and has led to the false imprisonment of

numerous people.⁵⁰

The confidential investigation office is staffed by 15, highly paid sergeants. There is no transparency into their work and no mechanism for the public to hold them accountable.

Eliminate the Crime Gun Investigation Center (CGIC)

How much do the cops in the CGIC cost?

\$1,095,921 per year (1 lieutenant, 2 sergeants, and 2 officers)

CGIC is used to justify enforcement strategies that are both discriminatory and ineffective.

Why should we eliminate the CGIC?

Although gun crime analysis may be valuable to identify opportunities for compassionate, community-drive intervention, this is not an intervention that SFPD can provide. Instead, SFPD uses this data as justification to engage in “broken windows” policing that targets communities of color.

CGIC is relatively new, making it easier for SFPD to revert to the structure it had before the unit was instituted in late 2017⁵¹. Additionally, the CGIC seems to originate from a federal grant program that provides increased funding for SFPD⁵². These are excess funds which should be excised in a police downsizing.

ELIMINATING PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND CAPITAL INCREASES

10

line-item cuts

\$84.7M

in funds saved

Eliminate Basic Recruit Course Staffing and Recruitment Unit

How much does this unit cost?

\$2,550,486 per year (1 lieutenant, 2 sergeants, 9 officers, 1 part time recruiter, and 1 senior clerk)

Why should we eliminate this unit?

Decreasing the number of police officers eliminates the need to hire and train new ones.

Eliminate New Academy Classes

How much does this unit cost?

The costs for this are accounted for when eliminating Basic Recruit Course Staffing and the Recruitment Unit.

Why should we eliminate this unit?

New academy classes are only needed if new officers are being hired and trained,

which isn't happening if the goal is to eliminate the police force entirely.

Cut Admin Roles that are Ratio Based

How much would this save?

\$21,600,000 per year. A 30% reduction in the number of SFPD employees and significantly reduced calls for service should – at minimum – reduce administrative duties by 50%. Current administrative personnel compensation is budgeted at ~\$43,200,000.

Why should we eliminate this?

We are cutting the number of police officers and the services they are asked to provide. Administrative roles to support these officers and services should be cut proportionately.

Eliminate Grants Unit

How much does the personnel in the Grants unit cost?

\$250,144 per year (1 manager and 2 administrative analysts)

Why should we eliminate the Grants unit?

At a time when the focus is on avenues to defund SFPD, a department whose sole function⁵³ is to identify and take advantage of additional funding opportunities for the police is irrelevant.

Halt Replacement of Departmental Vehicles

How much does the program for replacing department vehicles cost?

\$2,400,000 per year⁵⁴

Why should we stop replacing department vehicles?

Police unions claim that police vehicles are “old, unsafe, and unreliable” due to high mileage and maintenance costs. However, SFPD’s own report shows that 50% of

vehicles have fewer than 50K miles, with only 11% of vehicles over 150K miles. 45%

of the fleet is less than 10 years old.^{55 56}

Freeze Overtime

How much does overtime cost?

\$31,000,000 from the general fund in Fiscal Year 2019-20⁵⁷

Why should we freeze overtime?

Overtime costs SFPD a huge amount each year — but doesn't actually help with achieving department goals. The amount of overtime increased 57% between FY 2010-11 and FY 2016-17. During that time, arrests did not increase but in fact decreased.⁵⁸

Lawsuit Payout from the SFPD Budget

How much do lawsuits cost?

\$14,676,000 for 13 months⁵⁹

Why should lawsuits be paid out from the SFPD budget?

Payouts for lawsuits related to SFPD currently come out of San Francisco's general fund. We propose that this amount comes from the SFPD budget instead, since officer incidents are under SFPD's purview.

Eliminate Excessive Capital Expenditures

How much do excessive capital expenditures cost?

\$6.5M for the Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility in the pro-

posed 2020 budget⁶⁰

Why should we eliminate excessive capital expenditures?

Excessive capital expenditures include furniture, fixtures, and equipment. Given that

we are reducing the reach of SFPD, there is no reason to continue over investing in this area, especially when we recommend moving traffic matters out of SFPD.

Eliminate Range Training

How much does range training cost?

\$1,920,381 (1 sergeant and 9 officers)

Why should we eliminate range training?

We demand the disarmament of SFPD, making firearms training irrelevant.

We take inspiration from the many countries where cops are not armed on patrol. These include New Zealand, Britain, Ireland, Norway, and Iceland⁶¹.

Eliminate Crisis Intervention Training (CIT)

How much does CIT cost?

\$3,690,415 per year (conducted by 3 sergeants and 3 officers)

Why should we eliminate CIT?

CIT is extremely ineffective, despite its capacity to train approximately 336 officers a year during a two-week training – equivalent to 13 years of officer work. For just one anecdote, all five of the officers who shot and killed Mario Woods completed CIT⁶².

In addition, a study found⁶³ that there was no measurable difference in the use of force between officers with CIT training and those without it. CIT officers believed they were arresting people with mental illnesses at a lower rate, but in reality that wasn't true. Further, these CIT officers believed they used force against people with mental illness less often, when they in fact did not.

MAKING POLICE OVERSIGHT INDEPENDENT OF SFPD

3

line-item cuts

\$8.4M

in funds saved

Move the Internal Affairs Division to an Independent Non-Police Body

How much does the Internal Affairs Division cost?

\$6,300,000 per year (2 lieutenants, 20 sergeants, 2 officers, 1 retired employee, 3 attorneys, 1 senior clerk, and 1 senior legal clerk)

Why should Internal Affairs be moved to a civilian body?

IAD's process is not transparent, and when it handles a case, the public has no insight into what happens⁶⁴.

There is already a separate Department of Police Accountability (formerly Office of Citizen Complaints), separate from SFPD and not funded by the police budget, which IAD does not effectively work with.

IAD does not track or evaluate data related to the discipline process in a robust manner. Neither does IAD properly track outcomes of disciplinary proceedings.

IAD investigates slowly, possibly intentionally to allow cases to lapse.

IAD retaliates against whistleblowers⁶⁵.

Overall, IAD is not good at what it's meant

to do (discipline police), and using sworn officers also makes it cost more than it should.

Make Early Intervention System an Independent Non-Police Body

How much does the Early Intervention System cost?

\$500,000 per year (1 sergeant, 1 principal analyst, and 1 senior analyst)

Why should EIS be moved to a civilian body?

EIS is highly inaccurate⁶⁶. It misses officers who are in need of intervention (a University of Chicago study identified 33 such officers versus the 19 SFPD's EIS identified), and also flags many non-problematic officers (only a 10% hit rate for misconduct among flagged officers).

The review process is highly subjective, being handled by a single sergeant, Wesley Villaruel.

Villaruel has said that SFPD has no codified method of review and everything is up to his individual judgement.

Villaruel has opted to not intervene in all 175 cases that have come before him.

Villaruel has a history of bias and violent behavior against Black people.⁶⁷

The problem cannot simply be solved by swapping out Villaruel. Generally, SFPD has shown an "extreme degree of anti-Black sentiment"⁶⁸

The California Department of Justice has, as recently as early 2020, expressed continued concern with reports of anti-Black bias within SFPD and with the persistent disproportionate use of force against African-American and Latinx individuals.⁶⁹

A police department this full of racial bias and specific anti-Black bias cannot be trusted to hold themselves accountable for problems such as use of force against BIPOC individuals and overpolicing of BI-

POC communities.

Move Bodycam Unit to Independent Oversight Committee

How much does the Body Camera Unit cost?

\$1,600,000 per year (2 officers and 9 legal assistants)

Why should the Body Camera Unit be moved to a civilian oversight committee?

Body-worn camera footage ends up being used against civilians, rather than against police officers, most of the time.

“In one study, 93 percent of prosecutors’ offices used camera footage primarily in prosecutions of civilians”⁷⁰

When SFPD’s body-worn camera policies were being put together, SFPD and POA members made up a disproportionate part of the working group ⁷¹, leading to com-

munity concern that the department had outside influence on the adopted policies.

There has been low compliance with body-worn camera policies in other cities, per a 2016 police commissioner, and allowing SFPD Risk Management Office⁷² to review policy compliance is problematic because of accountability problems similar to those mentioned for IAD above.

As an example of problematic policy, the Blue Ribbon panel report⁷³ recommends that body-worn camera policy prohibit officer review of footage following any reportable use-of-force incident, yet the official SFPD policy⁷⁴ only provides exclusions in cases of officer-involved shootings, in-custody deaths, or criminal matters (vs administrative).

Part 2

DEFUND THE SHERIFF

14

line-item cuts in total

\$217.0M

in funds saved

While we work towards defunding, disarming, and disbanding the SFPD, we cannot allow funds to simply be reapportioned to another part of law enforcement. To fully defund the police in San Francisco, we must also defund the Sheriff's Office; these 14 line-item cuts are our starting point for this process.

Eliminate all non-custodial field operations
(\$56.0M)

Eliminate, transfer, and redirect program funding
(\$48.0M)

Decarcerate jails and cages (\$113.0M)

End the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the Sheriff's Office and the City

ELIMINATE ALL NON-CUSTODIAL FIELD OPERATIONS

6

line-item cuts

\$56.0M

in funds saved

End DPH contracts and remove deputies from City clinics, hospitals, and public health buildings (\$18.5M)

What is it?

"Sheriff's office has a contract with the Department of Public Health to provide security to public hospitals, clinics and public health buildings in SF. This unit includes patrols, one Captain, and one Field Training Officer.

This includes \$13.1M for SF General Hospital, \$4.7M for Laguna Honda and \$678,751 for community clinics⁷⁵.

With the expansion of Zuckerberg SF General Hospital, there has been an expansion of overtime costs paid to the Sheriff's Dept to patrol the larger hospital space⁷⁶. These costs are attributed to the rising

costs of the SF Sheriff's office."

Why cut?

We stand in solidarity with DPH Must Divest, a coalition that seeks to remove SF Sheriffs from DPH clinics and SF General Hospital.

"Sheriff presence at DPH clinics and SFGH manipulates the concept of safety to police our patients' bodies. This system perpetuates systemic racism without accountability. We must prioritize the well-being of all in San Francisco seeking healthcare services, including our Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC) patients and providers."

“Unarmed, plain clothes mental health or social work professionals with training in nonviolent de-escalation and restorative justice would be able to handle the vast majority of what the sheriffs do provide on a day-to-day basis, meanwhile avoiding the risk of further traumatization to our patients and staff.”⁷⁷

SFDPH Director Dr. Grant Colfax expressed support for these efforts, “We’re thinking through other healthcare security approaches that aren’t law enforcement-driven, but have different background and training around supporting patients and staff to deescalate, is really the standard of care... So we are looking at this pretty intently right now... But as

the department head, I am supportive of transitioning much of this work to a new model.

The history of security in hospitals is racist. It emerged out of the Civil Rights Movement and hospital integration⁷⁸.

Sheriff deputies at the hospital create more criminalization. A doctor writes: “If a patient swings at me, it’s a health care incident. But if the same fist is swung against even an off-duty officer, the encounter is subject to criminal investigation.”⁷⁹

23 percent of emergency department shootings involve someone attempting to take a weapon from a security officer.⁸⁰

Eliminate Canine Unit and Election Security Unit

What is it?

The Canine Unit trains K-9 dogs to detect banned items such as drugs and explosive materials and devices. The unit also provides search and rescue services. SF Sheriff deputies and K-9s patrol San Francisco’s county jails, courthouses and other high-profile civic buildings daily. K-9s and their deputy handlers also provide mutual aid to other cities and counties during emergencies. Deputies assigned to Canine duties receive additional pay.

The Election Security Unit is tasked with patrolling all areas where “live” or voted

ballots are processed, stored, or transported until the election is certified by the Secretary of State. The city charter does not require the Sheriff to provide security for elections, only making the Sheriff responsible for approving a plan. When there are Sheriff-impacted measures, the Director of Elections is in charge.

Why cut?

Police dogs are used to establish probable cause for unwarranted searches under the 4th amendment, but analyses of drug-dog alerts show high error rates, close to and exceeding 50% – worse than a coin flip.

This expands the power to search people without warrants and provides yet another loophole to our 4th amendment rights⁸¹.

The Sheriff is an elected official, held accountable only by the voters through elections. The Sheriff should not be providing a plan for security and transportation of ballots in all elections whether or not there are Sheriff-impacted ballot measures.

In response to the Mayor's directive for

budget cuts this year, the Department of Elections proposed using temporary staff (field election deputies) to guard ballots instead of Sheriffs during ballot transfers (though this would require city legal action); this would save \$417,000 in FY20-21 and \$438,000 in FY21-22⁸². DOE is facing the largest number of cuts this year due to budget shortfall. Let's give them this money.

End contract support with other policing agencies and eliminate regional trainings and competitions

What is it?

The Emergency Services Unit (ESU) provides personnel and logistics to requesting law enforcement agencies. Each ESU staff member receives additional specialized training re: dangers of evictions, court proceedings, protests and crowd control management.

The ESU participates in regional training exercises and competitions with other specialized units from law enforcement agencies: Best in the West, and Special Emergency Response Team (SERT) Challenge.

Why cut?

Since the Sheriff's Dept provides personnel and logistics to requesting law enforcement agencies, diverting funds to the

Sheriff's Dept is essentially still funding the SFPD.

In their protest and crowd control management work, the Sheriff's Dept has been violent to protestors. In June, a Captain from the SF Sheriff's Dept shoved a protestor to the ground using a baton⁸³.

Instead, give resources to communities for scaling existing crowd safety training at protests and neighborhood-based support for general events.

Millions of dollars go to regional trainings and competitions which are militarizing sheriffs. At least one of these competitions has lost funding in recent years: Urban Shield, which had been run by Alameda County Sheriff's Office, was a national war games, SWAT training, and weapons expo held each year in Alameda

County. It was defunded in 2019, cited for

militarizing the police.⁸⁴

Eliminate armed public building security and invest in people, not property (\$3.3M)

What is it?

SF Sheriff deputies act as armed security guards at various City buildings including City Hall, Department of Emergency Management, San Francisco Main Public Library, SFMTA, Medical Examiner's Office, and the Public Utilities Commission⁸⁵. Sheriff deputies also perform court-related actions such as bailiff functions, taking charge of a jury, patrolling hallways and other areas within court facilities, overseeing and escorting prisoners in holding cells within court facilities, providing security screening, enhanced security for judicial

officers and court personnel.

Why cut?

We must meaningfully work to decrease the number of interactions that City residents have with police officers and Sheriff deputies, and public buildings and public spaces are ground zero for these interactions. The public is asking the City to reimagine public security by eliminating our reliance on armed enforcement. This includes public buildings like the SF Main Library and SFMTA.

Stop Sheriff civil court enforcement and end criminalization of poverty

What is it?

This includes the 'enforcement' of civil court procedures including: temporary restraining orders, evictions, third-party claims, enforcing civil court fees, bench warrants, civil forfeitures, and carrying out levies from various third parties.

Why cut?

We need to end Sheriff involvement in criminalizing poverty. First off, there are a multitude of alternatives to evictions and civil court actions that do not involve the Sheriff, such as dedicated eviction courts, mediation, or community services.

When people fail to answer court sum-

mones or pay fees, law enforcement, including the Sheriffs, should not immediately be called to respond. Many people, especially those who do not have stable housing, may not receive written correspondence. Others may not be able to pay excessive fines and fees, yet another way the carceral system criminalizes poverty. And calling on law enforcement to respond

to failure to appear at court dates ignores the reality that people may have personal emergencies or may otherwise be unable to appear.

Additionally, because of COVID, there should be an eviction moratorium in the city, so the city should not need Sheriff deputies to carry out evictions.

Resist the calls to transfer SFO Airport policing to SF Sheriff's Department, and prevent the transfer of SFPD responsibilities of SFSO (\$78M)

What is it?

There is a proposal to transfer policing at SFO from SFPD to the Sheriff's office, primarily to save the airport (and airlines) money, since sheriffs cost less than police.

Why cut?

"Policing does very little at the airport. There were only 144 arrests by SFPD at the airport last year, and those were primarily for traffic infractions and marijuana possession.

Additionally, there are several different policing forces at the airport, including San Mateo police and TSA, and the SFPD does not do much in addition to these forces, and so there's no reason to transfer them to the Sheriff.

The transfer of duties from SFPD to the Sheriff, in addition to doing nothing to save the city money on staffing costs, would also require the city to incur upfront costs up to about \$9 mil."

ELIMINATE, TRANSFER, AND REDIRECT IN-CUSTODY, RE-ENTRY, AND DIVERSION PROGRAMS

4

line-item cuts

\$48.0M

in funds saved

Eliminate electronic monitoring

What is it?

Electronic Monitoring (EM) is a system of supervised surveillance, consisting of a GPS- tracking ankle shackle as well as sometimes an alcohol monitor⁸⁶. Folks may be put on EM pre-trial and/ or as an alternative to a jail sentence. With the elimination of cash bail, there has been a significant increase in the use of electronic monitoring. From 2018 to early 2019, the number of people on EM tripled.⁸⁷

Why cut?

Electronic monitoring (EM) is not an alternative to incarceration, it is incarceration.

EM brings the prison system into folks' homes and communities.

EM devices have GPS tracking and set restrictions on movement which can affect employment, childcare, family responsibilities, and furthers gentrification.

EM increases surveillance and data mining on communities that are already constantly surveilled.

EM is disproportionately used on Black and indigenous folks.⁸⁸

There has been a significant increase in the Sheriff's budget to compensate for overtime costs for supervision of folks on electronic monitoring and associated administration costs. We do not need these increases⁸⁹.

Instead of electronic monitoring, we need

to expand eligibility of Own Recognizance (OR) release [pretrial release with written commitment to show up to court hearings] to more folks. We also need to invest in community support programs that make OR more accessible to folks upon release.⁹⁰

EM makes us all less safe. It is a punitive sanction⁹¹ that does nothing to provide the services, support, and opportunities that people need to find success and promote public safety. Even the Sheriff understands this and has staff dedicated to discharge planning⁹². However, the Sheriff's Department is not a social services agency. Funds

and discharge planning should be redirected from the Sheriff and EM to agencies and organizations that specialize in social services.

One study⁹³ found that when HIV positive incarcerated people in SF jails received discharge planning, they were 6 times more likely to have a regular source of care in the community. There are many studies, such as this one⁹⁴, that demonstrate a strong correlation between access to healthcare and public safety. There are no studies that show that EM has long term, positive impacts on crime rate.

Move SF Pretrial contract and funding out of the Sheriff's Department (\$6.3M)

What is it?

The San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, otherwise known as SF Pretrial, currently receives about \$6.3 million through a contract with the Sheriff's Dept. This funding goes toward taking on intensive-needs clients, facilitating pretrial release via Own Recognizance (OR) release⁹⁵, running pretrial diversion programs, and collaborating on neighborhood-based restorative justice models⁹⁶.

Why cut?

SF Pretrial's work plays an important role in decarceration and reducing recidivism rates, and should continue to be funded. It just doesn't make sense for those funds to pass through a department doing the opposite — throwing and keeping people in jail. The budget for diversion and other care-focused programs needs to be independent of and separate from budgets for incarceration.

Transfer funding, administration, and oversight of educa-

tional, vocational, and rehabilitation programs to appropriate City departments

What is it?

Currently, the SF Sheriff staff monitors community-based organizational programming both inside and outside of the jails. The Administration and Programs Division includes a Director of Programs that oversees discharge planning, Five Keys Charter School, re-entry services, in-custody programs, religious services, and the Survivor Restoration Program.⁹⁷

Why cut?

The Sheriff's Department is not a social services agency, and funding for programs should not have to compete with funding

related to jailing. The goals of programming and caging are opposite and cannot exist together. We need to move any and all funding for programs, including administrative oversight, out of the Sheriff budget and into the appropriate City departments and community-based solutions that carry the expertise and mission-based goals that are consistent with the intention of the program itself.

There is no legal barrier to transferring these duties, as non-sworn civilian staff are responsible for this oversight. Their jobs could easily be transferred.

Transfer funding of sworn staff program and administrative duties to civilian employees (\$909K)

What is it?

A number of administrative units with the Sheriff's office are staffed with sworn Sheriff deputies, among those: warrants and bail processing, data analyst, technical support, technical support management, fleet coordinator, communications coordinator, recruitment, hiring, leave, and worker's compensation employees.

Why cut?

The Controller reported, in June 2019, that civilianizing these positions would save the City over \$900,000 a year and potentially result in more qualified personnel performing these positions' duties, not including savings related to relatively lower pensions for civilian employees in comparison to sworn employees⁹⁸.

The city can save even more money once

the sheriff department staff and responsibilities are reduced as described in our

other recommendations.

DECARCERATE JAILS AND CAGES

2

line-item cuts

\$113.0M

in funds saved

Release people immediately, end policing of quality of life crimes, and stop bookings and transfers

What is it?

Booking arrestees and operating San Francisco jails makes up for about half of the SF Sheriff's budget.

Earlier this month, the San Francisco Superior Court ended⁹⁹ a COVID-19 policy of zero bail that has reduced county jail populations across the state.

A significant number¹⁰⁰ of people imprisoned in San Francisco utilize mental health and substance abuse services.

Why cut?

In March, a coalition of organizations called on the City for drastic action in response

to the COVID-19 pandemic. We commend the Board of Supervisors for finally closing 850 Bryant St. Jail, but the City has not done nearly enough to ensure the safety, health, and well being of our community members that are locked in county jails and to work toward ending the caging of our loved ones and neighbors¹⁰¹.

As COVID-19 infections soar in San Francisco, we must recommit to our efforts of decarceration and abolition of the prison industrial complex. Between June 18th and July 9th, COVID-19 cases in our jails have gone up 40 percent. A recent study¹⁰² took a look at the 20 largest jail systems in the United States and concluded that

over 13,300 more people in the community may die than currently projected due to the impact of jails.

The only way to prevent a tragic outbreak of COVID-19 similar to the outbreak in San Quentin State Prison is to stop bookings or transfers and release more people from our county jails. Many people have already been safely released back to their loved

ones.

The time is now to use these funds to implement the recommendations of the San Francisco Jail Replacement Work Group¹⁰³. The pandemic is an opportunity to begin the necessary work of building a City that does not rely on jailing and cages, not just during a global pandemic, but forever.

Close jails and freeze hiring of new Sheriff deputies

What is it?

Booking arrestees and operating San Francisco jails makes up for about half of the SF Sheriff's budget.

The Custody Operations Division, in addition to the deputies that operate the county jails, also employs a Chief Deputy, a Captain for each County Jail, a DNA and ID unit, a Classification Unit, and an additional unit for Custody Administration.¹⁰⁴

Why cut?

The City must work to continue decreasing the jail population and implement the recommendations of the SF Jail Replacement Work Group, which will eliminate the need for jails in San Francisco.

The Sheriff's Department already has more sworn deputies than people imprisoned in San Francisco as of July 17, 2020. Hiring more deputies will lead to pressure to place and keep more people in jail rather than address the social and economic conditions that increase the likelihood of crime.

Close County Jail 4 Now. The closure of CJ4 will already free up assignments for approximately 85 sworn officers. Recruitment of new deputies is unnecessary.

Divesting from jails will allow the City to address the root causes of crime rather than use incarceration as a response to systemic social inequality.

END THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) BETWEEN THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE AND THE CITY

2

line-item cuts

Get rid of MOU staffing requirements and eliminate excess positions

What is it?

Currently, the city has two Memorandums of Understanding with the Deputy Sheriff's Association¹⁰⁵ and the San Francisco Sheriffs' Managers and Supervisors Association¹⁰⁶, each of which includes minimum staffing requirements for each of the jails, field operations, and the wards at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH).

Both MOUs require an average of about 300 deputies and 25 supervisors per day to staff the jails, the Hall of Justice, the civil courthouse, classification division, SFGH, and the Youth Guidance Center.

Why cut?

There is no transparency behind the minimum staffing numbers required by the MOU's.

The MOUs do not account for significant decreases in the number of people in San Francisco's jails.

Employees, patients, and community members want the Sheriff out of SFGH, but those positions are subject to the MOUs.

The MOUs also require that the Sheriff staff certain units, like the Central Records Unit, with deputies for positions that could otherwise be civilianized.

Eliminate overtime (\$31M)

What is it?

In 2019, the Sheriff's Office paid out \$31M in overtime, accounting for 20 percent of total hours.

Why cut?

In 2017¹⁰⁷ and 2018¹⁰⁸, several deputies made more money in overtime pay than they made from their base salary-- a sure sign that the Sheriff's Department is not utilizing its resources in an efficient way. Sheriff's deputies made so much money in overtime that they took 8 of 25 spots on a list of highest-paid city employees at least

two years in a row.

The Sheriff's need for overtime is partly driven by the department's poor record-keeping and time reporting procedures, minimum staffing requirements, and overuse of electronic monitoring. As detailed in other sections, these factors are problematic and should be removed or dramatically reduced.

These expenses could have a more direct impact on public safety if invested into non-carceral community programs.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How did you come up with these numbers?

We calculated the cost of individual units based on public staffing reports and budget data. Our primary sources were the SFPD budget presentations, the San Francisco Salary Ordinance, the [Matrix Consulting report on SFPD staffing](#), the [Board of Supervisors Budget and Policy Analysis Report on SFPD](#), and the [DataSF budget dataset](#). Due to SFPD's lack of transparency, some of this information is our best estimate and not exact figures. We look forward to adjusting them as new data is published.

What about the city charter?

In 1994—a time when our country's politicians labeled Black and Brown children “Super-Predators”—the voters of San Francisco passed a charter amendment to set a minimum police staffing level of 1,971 officers. In November, we will have the opportunity to vote to repeal this requirement. We understand that our current charter provides a limitation for what might be possible, but we believe we must push for abolition. The charter amendment must be repealed in November, and reducing SFPD staff this year will get us on our way to that goal.

What about cops in Muni and other spaces?

We want cops out of Muni too. Muni cops are contracted and paid directly by Muni rather than from the SFPD budget, which is why they're not included in our recommendations for SFPD budget cuts. Instead, we're looking at ways to push Muni and other groups (BART, Transbay Joint Powers Authority, college campuses, etc.) to divest from their contracts with SFPD. If you'd like to help plan our divestment efforts, visit defundsfpdnow.com and join today!

Are these the only cuts that you're recommending?

Nope! The cuts above are baseline items that we want to see eliminated. We focused on personnel because that makes up the bulk of SFPD's budget. We're continuing research and welcome contributions from the community for other cuts.

Endnotes

- 1 <https://missionlocal.org/2020/06/school-district-moves-to-part-ways-with-san-francisco-police-department/>
- 2 [https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/sfusd/Board.nsf/files/BHUSQP736614/\\$file/SFPD MOU 11.12.19 BOE \(1\).pdf](https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/sfusd/Board.nsf/files/BHUSQP736614/$file/SFPD%20MOU%2011.12.19%20BOE%20(1).pdf)
- 3 https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2018/local/us-school-shootings-history/?itid=lk_inline_manual_47
- 4 <http://www.justicepolicy.org/news/11809>
- 5 https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1rm0W4tssDHj2rbuZsOjdVXYowqDUD7R_h2w-2C-Vsl/edit?usp=sharing
- 6 <http://www.streetsheet.org/black-in-san-francisco-housing-discrimination-racism-and-displacement/>
- 7 [San Francisco Housing Authority Developments, Notification and Procedures](#), page 5
- 8 [Matrix report](#), p57-58
- 9 [CIT 2019 Annual Report](#), p32
- 10 [CoH factsheet](#)
- 11 [Coh presentation](#), p5 & p8
- 12 [Matrix report](#), p62
- 13 [SF Controller](#)
- 14 [CoH presentation](#), page 17
- 15 [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=PEN&division=&title=7.&part=1.&chapter=11.&arti-
cle=](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=PEN&division=&title=7.&part=1.&chapter=11.&article=)
- 16 <https://theappeal.org/drakeo-california-gang-laws-racism/>
- 17 <https://sfbayview.com/2020/01/the-gang-injunctions-are-over-community-shifts-its-sights-toward-the-sfpd-gang-database/>
- 18 <https://sfdistrictattorney.org/article/district-attorney-boudin-pioneers-first-nation-policy-directives>
- 19 https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BLA_042519_Open_Drug_Dealing_Sup_Haney.pdf, page 1
- 20 https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BLA_042519_Open_Drug_Dealing_Sup_Haney.pdf, page 12
- 21 https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BLA_042519_Open_Drug_Dealing_Sup_Haney.pdf, page 35
- 22 <https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/stay-safe/safety-tips/dangerous-dogs>
- 23 <https://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/slideshow/Mountain-Lion-Amy-Corso-San-Francisco-204167.php>

- 24 <https://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/02/15/in-new-york-fewer-police-horses-but-still-a-strong-force/>
- 25 <https://www.click2houston.com/news/local/2020/05/30/watch-video-captures-moment-police-horse-tramples-woman-during-houston-rally/>
- 26 <https://www.msn.com/en-us/finance/news/the-riots-of-the-1960s-led-to-rise-in-militarization-of-police/ar-BB15oEhY>
- 27 <https://www.pbs.org/independentlens/blog/the-evolution-of-swat-team-equipment-from-wwii-rifles-to-bearcats/>
- 28 <https://www.dla.mil/DispositionServices/Offers/Reutilization/LawEnforcement/PublicInformation/>
- 29 <https://sfist.com/2020/01/23/instagram-chief-adam-mosseris-sf-home-got-swatted/>
- 30 <https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/capt-nicholas-rainsford-faces-administrative-investigation/>
- 31 <https://www.nnva.gov/2098/Specialty-Teams>
- 32 <https://www.sandiego.gov/fire/about/organization/specialteams/bombsquad>
- 33 <https://mdsp.maryland.gov/firemarshal/Pages/StateFireMarshal.aspx>
- 34 https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BLA_Report_Alcohol_Final-041017.pdf, page 43
- 35 https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BLA_Report_Alcohol_Final-041017.pdf, page 43
- 36 <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/Final%20Hillard%20Heintze%20Phase%20II%20Report%20for%20the%20San%20Francisco%20Police%20Department-1.pdf>, page 2
- 37 <https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/implicit-bias-trainer-finds-extreme-degree-of-anti-black-sentiment-within-sfpd/>
- 38 https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BA_Report_PA_of_San_Francisco_Police_Department_061218.pdf, page 37
- 39 <https://cops.usdoj.gov/ric/Publications/cops-w0817-pub.pdf>, pages 61,70,82
- 40 <https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/sfpd-issuing-fewer-life-saving-traffic-tickets-because-of-additional-paperwork/>
- 41 <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-11-20/the-swedish-approach-to-road-safety-the-accident-is-not-the-major-problem>
- 42 https://www.ourstreetsmpls.org/why_we_don_t_support_traffic_enforcement
- 43 [SF Salary Ordinance](#)
- 44 <https://sfgov.org/policecommission/sites/default/files/Documents/PoliceCommission/PoliceCommisison021220-SFPDBudgetPresentation.pdf>
- 45 <http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/search.aspx?searchString=aso&year=1986&year2=2016&type=All&index=0&index2=0&index3=0>
- 46 <https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/SFPD-flight-to-the-airport-Officers-seek-safe-8150316.php>

- 47 <https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/implicit-bias-trainer-finds-extreme-degree-of-anti-black-sentiment-within-sfpd/>
- 48 <https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/implicit-bias-trainer-finds-extreme-degree-of-anti-black-sentiment-within-sfpd/>
- 49 <https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/stay-safe/crime-data/clearance-rates-dashboard>
- 50 <https://www.npr.org/2011/11/19/142546979/arson-forensics-sets-old-fire-myths-ablaze>
- 51 <https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/B%202017-196%20New%20Investigative%20Unit%20Crime%20Gun%20Investigations%20Center.pdf>
- 52 <https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/opportunities/bja-2020-17017>
- 53 <https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/administration-page>
- 54 <https://sfgov.org/policecommission/sites/default/files/Documents/PoliceCommission/PoliceCommission061020-Police%20Budget%20Presentation.pdf>
- 55 <https://sfgov.org/policecommission/sites/default/files/Documents/PoliceCommission/PoliceCommisison021220-SFPDBudgetPresentation.pdf>
- 56 <https://www.kron4.com/news/bay-area/police-union-san-francisco-police-cars-are-old-unsafe-and-unreliable/>
- 57 https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BA_Report_PA_of_San_Francisco_Police_Department_061218.pdf
- 58 https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BA_Report_PA_of_San_Francisco_Police_Department_061218.pdf
- 59 <https://missionlocal.org/2019/04/sf-to-pay-millions-for-lies-excessive-force-by-sfpd-officers/>
- 60 <https://sfgov.org/policecommission/sites/default/files/Documents/PoliceCommission/PoliceCommission061020-Police%20Budget%20Presentation.pdf>
- 61 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2015/02/18/5-countries-where-police-officers-do-not-carry-firearms-and-it-works-well/>
- 62 [https://www.sfchronicle.com/file/462/2/4622-151045735-_responsive_1%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.sfchronicle.com/file/462/2/4622-151045735-_responsive_1%20(1).pdf), page 42
- 63 <http://jaapl.org/content/early/2019/09/24/JAAPL.003863-19>
- 64 https://sfdistrictattorney.org/sites/default/files/Document/BRP_report.pdf, pages 5, 89
- 65 https://sfist.com/2017/10/02/sfpd_officer_says_life_is_a_living/
- 66 <https://missionlocal.org/2020/02/sfpd-system-meant-to-prevent-misconduct-is-eviscerated-as-highly-inaccurate-by-outside-researchers/>
- 67 <https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/2432035/loharsingh-v-city-and-county-of-san-francisco/>
- 68 <https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/implicit-bias-trainer-finds-extreme-degree-of-anti-black-sentiment-within-sfpd/>

- 69 <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/Final%20Hillard%20Heintze%20Phase%20II%20Report%20for%20the%20San%20Francisco%20Police%20Department-1.pdf>, page 3
- 70 <https://www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/gov-body-camera-effects-research-gmu-study.html>
- 71 https://sfdistrictattorney.org/sites/default/files/Document/BRP_report.pdf, page 39
- 72 <https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/COMMISSION-DGO-10.11-BODYWORNCAMERAS.pdf>, page 1
- 73 [Blue Ribbon panel report](#), page 45
- 74 [SFPD policy](#)
- 75 https://drive.google.com/file/d/16AQTTeHgCD1h9R_i4PMb2A0VoxWNhd9m/view
- 76 https://sfcontroller.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Auditing/SHF%20-Sheriff%20Staffing%20Report%2006.19.19_0.pdf, p. 19
- 77 <https://www.dphmustdivest.com/stories>
- 78 books.google.com/books?id=y2vs-wPbUUUC&pg=PA51&lpg=PA51&dq=history+of+hospital+security+police&source=bl&ots=ErCk8cr_uN&sig=ACfU3U0vYzbTQx3UFRm5K9FGBMFwntM0AQ&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKewiyi_LO95rqAhViljQIH-WOXDL44ChDoATAGegQICBAB#v=onepage&q=history%20of%20hospital%20security%20police&f=false
- 79 <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/get-armed-police-out-of-emergency-rooms/>
- 80 https://www.hasc.org/sites/main/files/03-hos1_0.pdf, p. 1
- 81 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2019/02/05/supreme-courts-alternative-facts-about-drug-sniffing-dogs/>
- 82 <https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2020-06/REG.pdf>
- 83 <https://www.google.com/url?q=https://missionlocal.org/2020/06/george-floyd-protest-san-francisco-alleged-attack/&sa=D&ust=1595399928209000&usg=AFQjCNHZqaqjggjngF5MgEYBnCrwqH4FTA>
- 84 <https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/philmatier/article/The-police-training-exercise-called-Urban-Shield-13718834.php>
- 85 <https://www.sfsheriff.com/services/field-operations/public-building-safety>
- 86 <https://www.sfsheriff.com/services/jail-services/getting-released-jail/electronic-monitoring>
- 87 <https://www.sfexaminer.com/the-city/number-of-inmates-released-on-electronic-monitoring-triples-following-bail-ruling/>
- 88 <https://www.eff.org/pages/electronic-monitoring>
- 89 https://sfcontroller.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Auditing/SHF -Sheriff Staffing Report 06.19.19_0.pdf, p. 22-24
- 90 <https://www.sfsheriff.com/services/jail-services/getting-released-jail/release-your-own-recognizance>
- 91 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1478601X.2014.885755?scroll=top&needAccess=true&journalCode=gjup20>

- 92 <https://www.sfsheriff.com/services/jail-services/getting-released-jail/discharge-planning>
- 93 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2636533/>
- 94 <https://nicic.gov/access-health-care-and-criminal-behavior-short-run-evidence-aca-medicaid-expansions-2017>
- 95 <https://www.sfsheriff.com/services/jail-services/getting-released-jail/release-your-own-recognizance>
- 96 <http://sfpretrial.org/our-work/>
- 97 https://www.sfsheriff.com/sites/default/files/2020-02/Jail Programs and Educational Classes_Feb. 2020.pdf
- 98 https://sfcontroller.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Auditing/SHF -Sheriff Staffing Report 06.19.19_0.pdf, p. 30
- 99 <https://48hills.org/2020/07/sf-superior-court-ends-zero-bail-policy-threatening-public-health/>
- 100 https://sfdistrictattorney.org/sites/default/files/Document/BHJC Concept Paper_Final_0.pdf
- 101 <https://nonews4jail.org/fewers-ordinance-2020-peoples-summary/>
- 102 https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/field_document/aclu_covid19-jail-report_2020-8_1.pdf
- 103 <https://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/jrp/default.asp>
- 104 <https://www.sfsheriff.com/sites/default/files/2020-06/Policy and Procedures Manual - Part I.pdf>
- 105 https://sfdhr.org/sites/default/files/documents/MOUs/DSA-2019-MOU.pdf&sa=D&ust=1595398805192000&usg=AFQjC-NE2VzHLFO4qUglCcH8_mAyQJKXZ-g
- 106 <https://sfdhr.org/sites/default/files/documents/MOUs/Sheriffs-Managers-and-Supervisors-Association-MOU-2019-2022.pdf&sa=D&ust=1595398823569000&usg=AFQjCNGFO-046FslYF-79Xk25-ZULGmg8Q>
- 107 <https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2018/10/11/san-francisco-25-highest-paid-public-employees.html>
- 108 <https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2019/10/02/san-francisco-highest-paid-city-employees-2018.html>

