

From: [Ellen](#) [REDACTED]
To: -- City Clerk
Cc: [Flynn, Peggy](#); [McDonnell, Kevin](#); [Dennis Pocekay](#); [Janice Cader Thompson](#); [Barnacle, Brian](#)
Subject: Item 5 on tonight's consent calendar
Date: Monday, July 10, 2023 6:17:19 AM

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Mayor, Vice Mayor and Councilmembers,

Reading the police department's annual report on their use of military equipment, except for projectile launchers and less lethal shotguns, I notice how rarely they used their equipment on calls for service. Especially as to the armored personnel carriers (the big tanks), they were used once to evacuate residents in a flood area, once to conduct operator/driver safety training, once during a training at the Santa Rosa Junior College Public Safety Training Center, and once for display at the AB481 Community Event.

As the Council is aware, to approve the continued use of currently authorized military equipment, the Council must find "the military equipment listed in the policy is necessary because there is no reasonable alternative that can achieve the same objective of community and officer safety . . ."

Can the Council really say this about the big tanks? Surely the tanks deployment to rescue people in a flood area was a benevolent use, but doesn't the fire department have alternative equipment for this purpose?

In addition, the report said the annual maintenance replacement cost for the tanks was \$5000. Does that figure include how much it cost to roll out the tanks these four times? Does that figure include how much it cost to store these tanks the other 361 days of the year?

I urge the Council to take this item off the consent calendar for a full discussion.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ellen Obstler