

Completion time	Open public comment
6/4/2026 14:49	Still a test
7/2/2026 8:49	Test
7/2/2026 12:02	I support the use of the best equipment available for use by SPD, including so-called "military" equipment.
7/2/2026 12:03	I think the city has lost control of law violators. The city should be aggressive in ending crime and violence which impacts all of us on a daily basis. I support the actions of the police department to aggressively respond to the behavior of people who violate my personal property and freedom.
7/2/2026 12:05	I am O.K. with Sac PD acquiring military equipment for their use.
7/2/2026 12:06	if this equipment is helpful to our police force, and would assist the department in keeping us safe, then I am in favor of its use.
7/2/2026 12:07	I am concerned about the militarization of our police. I would only support the purchase of military equipment if normal police equipment could not possibly do the job.
7/2/2026 12:08	No purchase or use of military equipment. Use of military equipment makes citizens afraid, and just causes escalation with criminals.
7/2/2026 12:10	Military equipment should not be used by the SPD.
7/2/2026 12:11	You do not need MILITARY equipment, nor should any budget be used for that. Is Sac PD a military? No. No military-grade anything necessary.
7/2/2026 12:11	The military and the police have different jobs. The role of the military is to increase pressure while role of the police is to defuse pressure. Arming the police with battlefield converts them from the police FOR the community to the police OF the community.
7/2/2026 12:13	You are the police department. If you need the use of surplus military equipment then obtain it. The uneducated public really should have nothing to do with this decision.
7/2/2026 12:14	I do not support military equipment use. There is no need to use these things on Sacramento citizens. Thank you.
7/2/2026 12:15	I trust the SPD to use military equipment in a responsible and acceptable manner to improve public safety and to better address situations where such equipment can improve their response.
7/2/2026 12:21	Public Comment — SPD 2025-2026 Military Equipment Use Report Submitted to Sacramento City Council My name is [REDACTED], and I'm a Sacramento resident. I'm here to ask you to vote no on renewing this ordinance. Not to modify it. Not to add more oversight layers. No. Let me start with what this report actually tells us. Of the 188 people whose race was identified in incidents involving military equipment, 93 were Black and 41 were Hispanic. That's 71% of identified subjects. Sacramento's Black residents make up about 14% of the city's population. These numbers are not a coincidence, and they are not a glitch. They are the policy working exactly as it was designed. This equipment doesn't make our communities safer. It makes Black and Brown communities targets. I also want to name what's happening with the Drone First Responder program specifically, because I think it's being significantly undersold. Eighty-five of 152 incidents in District 2 alone involved DFR deployments. That's not emergency response — that's surveillance infrastructure being quietly normalized under the cover of public safety language. Once that infrastructure is in place, it doesn't go away. It expands. Sacramento residents deserve to know that, and we deserve a real say before it gets any bigger. AB 481 was meant to give communities transparency and control. But transparency without power isn't accountability — it's documentation. We can see exactly what's being done to us, and the council still votes to renew it. That has to change. You have a vote in front of you. Use it. Vote no on renewal, and let's have a real conversation about what public safety actually looks like — one that starts with the people most harmed, not the department asking for continued authorization. Thank you.
7/2/2026 12:39	I am opposed to turning police departments into military units. We have a pretty good police department here, and people are beginning to trust officers more. Don't ruin it with tanks and bazookas!
7/2/2026 12:44	I am concerned that the continued expansion and normalization of military-style equipment in local law enforcement moves our community in the wrong direction. While officer safety is important and there may be rare circumstances where specialized equipment is necessary, the routine acquisition and deployment of military-grade resources can create an unnecessary divide between police officers and the residents they serve. Community policing is built on trust, communication, and partnership. When law enforcement agencies increasingly resemble military organizations, it can change public perceptions and interactions in ways that undermine those goals. Residents are more likely to view officers as an occupying force rather than as members of the community working collaboratively to solve problems. The most effective public safety strategies are often those that strengthen relationships, increase transparency, invest in de-escalation training, and address the root causes of crime. Resources devoted to military-style equipment should be carefully scrutinized and balanced against investments that promote community engagement, youth programs, mental health services, and other preventative measures. I encourage the department and policymakers to prioritize approaches that foster trust and accountability rather than further militarization. Public safety is strongest when community members and law enforcement see each other as partners, not adversaries.
7/2/2026 12:44	We do not need more military equipment in our city to intimidate and instill even more fear in an already police traumatized community. Please, spend no city or taxpayer dollars on military equipment
7/2/2026 13:05	The recent ACLU audit of SPD should tell us everything we need to know and answer every question regarding the possession and use of military grade equipment by our local PD. In the report, SPD targeted minority groups more than twice as often as white drivers. In a time of serious Citywide cutbacks, I can find no redeeming arguments for the militarization of our police. Things may not be as bad as under Scott Jones during the Stephon Clark years, but recent settlements to peaceful protesters and media are not all that long ago, and for some as fresh in their minds as if it were yesterday. I say no for the fiscal, and social repercussions of rewarding bad behavior with unnecessary and potentially violent new toys.
7/2/2026 13:08	Your mission is to serve and protect the general public of Sacramento. Purchasing and or using equipment designed for the military sends a very clear message to the general public, intended or not. That message is that the public is your enemy and you will do whatever you have to, use whatever you can afford to subjugate the public as if they are a threat. These people are your neighbors, family, friends, and employers. Please don't forget that. Please remember to treat the public as if you are one of them, because you are. For these reasons and others (waste of money, and unnecessary if you do your actual job and treat the public properly) I am forever fervently against any city purchasing military grade equipment and weapons. Please do not forget you are also a member of this city and should wonder if you would want someone to have that equipment and use it against you with out concern for your wellbeing.
7/2/2026 13:15	I think Sacramento PD's use of military equipment is reasonable for an agency of its size and responsibilities
7/2/2026 13:18	When ever police related decisions come up at the city I suddenly feel like I have entered an alternative universe where the progressive city I love no longer cares about what is best for the everyone. It goes from a city that takes input from experts and looks at data to make decisions. Example what the city is doing with zoning right now. To a city that seems to be okay with finding a balance between the statistically backed up reality that punishment is ineffective at keeping residence safe and that police presence often makes people less safe. With the worst most non serious bad actors in the city. Like a member of the East Sac neighborhood watch who literally suggested the city use drones to hunt down the homeless. I don't care if you have people asking for more police or to keep the military equipment or to raise the budget that will never solve crime. It's like if a bunch of residence came to the city and said we need to start painting stop signs green to stop people from running stop signs. Will it have a small effect in a few people who notice the new color and stop, sure, will it also cause many to no longer be able to see the sign as easy, yes, and will will it actually solve the issue, obviously no. You need to listen to these people and understand what they really want, its either naive people who don't understand and really just want to feel safe and the police wont help with that or they are bad people who want to punish the poor and that is a deeply anti social opinion that should not be tolerated in a functional society. It just feels like a joke, please do better.

7/2/2026 13:22	I am writing to express my absolute opposition to the continued militarization of the Sacramento Police Department. I am horrified that our City continues to spend public money on military equipment while so many of our neighbors struggle to access housing, mental health care, addiction treatment, food, and other basic necessities. I cannot understand how purchasing armored vehicles, military style weapons, drones, and chemical agents is considered an investment in public safety. These are tools designed for war. They have no place becoming a normal part of civilian life, and I refuse to accept the idea that this is what safety should look like in Sacramento. What is especially heartbreaking is seeing how often this equipment is used in lower income neighborhoods. Communities that have experienced decades of disinvestment deserve opportunities, resources, and support. Instead, they are met with an overwhelming show of force. That sends a devastating message about whose lives are valued and whose neighborhoods are treated as places to occupy rather than communities to care for. As someone who lives and works in Sacramento, I want a city where people feel safe because they are housed, supported, and connected to one another. I do not want a city where safety is defined by more surveillance, more weapons, and more military equipment. Fear does not create peace. Force does not build trust. I abhor the continued normalization of militarized policing. Every year that this equipment expands, it becomes easier to accept something that should never feel normal. We should be asking why we continue to invest in tools that escalate fear instead of investing in the people who make our communities strong. I urge the City to reject any additional purchases of military equipment and instead direct those funds toward affordable housing, mental health services, youth programs, violence prevention, education, and community organizations that have spent decades doing the hard work of creating real safety. Those investments strengthen neighborhoods. They save lives. They create the kind of Sacramento I want to live in. I ask you to choose compassion over militarization, prevention over escalation, and community over fear.
7/2/2026 13:22	I see no rationale for military style equipment use by the SPD. I have yet to see anything that would justify such usage.
7/2/2026 13:26	Military equipment simply is not necessary for policing a community. We should not spend money on more/improving what SPD has and we should sell off all they already have.
7/2/2026 13:42	I am opposed to any additional purchases of military equipment by sac PD or sac sheriff
7/2/2026 13:43	The Sacramento Police Department should never purchase, use, or allow to be used any military equipment against any resident. The idea of using military equipment is shameful and true betrayal of trust by the police department.
7/2/2026 14:06	I am disturbed by escalating costs and danger to citizens from increased use of military style equipment and vehicles. This is not the priority that I support for keeping community safe. Please place more funding, expertise, research, and effort into deescalation training, mental health and sexual assault responders, and gun reduction. Thank you
7/2/2026 14:35	I urge the city counsel to reject the acquisition of additional military equipment. As a Sacramento resident, I am writing to oppose the Sacramento Police Department's expansion of military-grade equipment. Law enforcement should prioritize community safety and de-escalation, yet military infrastructure fosters an environment of occupation that inflicts deep psychological trauma on our neighborhoods. The department deployed military equipment 330 times last year, but in 117 of those instances, officers were unable to locate a suspect. Furthermore, demographic data reveals a stark racial disparity: Black individuals accounted for 84 of the total documented incidents. Deploying high-impact tactical weapons where suspects are not found or where communities of color are disproportionately targeted causes significant community trauma without any proven benefit to public safety. Fiscal records also expose a massive misalignment of priorities. The department spent over \$440,000 on training for specialized rifles that were used only once in the field all year. Spending hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars to maintain certifications for gear that is virtually never used is egregious fiscal irresponsibility. Internal audits further reveal alarming policy failures and lack of oversight. If the department truly aims to protect the public's welfare and civil liberties, it cannot continue to expand & fund a military equipment program that loses firearms, neglects basic tracking compliance, and wastes half a million dollars on gear that sits idle.
7/2/2026 14:44	I would rather see purchase costs, maintenance costs, and training costs of having military equipment put toward other uses including crime prevention.
7/2/2026 14:50	As a resident of Sacramento, I fully approve and support the purchase and use of any and all military equipment in order to keep the city safe. Thank you.
7/2/2026 14:55	First, I am glad that this information is publicly available, and two, is there not a plan to share costs of some of this rarely used equipment between SAC Sheriff, CHP, and SAC PD?
7/2/2026 14:55	There should limitations to how military equipment is purchased and used. We need to draw the line between public safety and military force. Using robots to diffuse bombs or enter a dangerous hostage crisis are acceptable, but using drones to harm citizens or violate their privacy rights is not. How the equipment is used matters. There is a big difference between flying a helicopter to locate someone in danger versus escalating the situation by turning it into a lethal game of cat and mouse. Rubber bullets, pepper spray, tear gas can become lethal weapons. Military tanks are never a good idea to use against civilians.
7/2/2026 15:01	I do not support the use of military grade equipment for our local police force
7/2/2026 15:30	I hope the SPD considers less lethal options before military options.
7/2/2026 15:32	The cost of the armored equipment compared to its deployment rates is excessive. In the areas with the highest deployment of these tools, in the long term community outreach or awards for reporting suspicious behavior (cartel, drug, gang) leading to an arrest would be more likely to have a long term positive impact than an escalation of force.
7/2/2026 16:01	Military equipment does not belong in the hands of local police at all! None of it. Local police are here to serve and assist citizens, not to terrorize them with military grade equipment such as tanks and non-lethal gases and flash bombs. Enough is enough! SPD needs to divest entirely from military equipment if it ever wants to rebuild trust in the community.
7/2/2026 16:04	I strongly believe police do not need military equipment and it puts in a further adversarial relationship with the public that it is supposed to serve.
7/2/2026 16:17	I think it's essential that the Sacramento Police Department participate in this valuable program. The program was established to Aid police departments and law enforcement agencies throughout the United States by not having to spend large amounts of money on equipment that is essential to provide emergency services to the public. The equipment regulated under this bill is normally used by the Sacramento Police Department to save lives and to protect the citizens of the city. With the city's current budget shortfall it is essential that we are able to find methodologies to help us save money while still providing vital city services. Since it's inception this program has been valuable in that concept. We desperately need to continue in this program and to obtain any equipment that we can find that will save the city money. I have also heard criticism that this program will lead to the militarization of the police department. Nothing could be further from the truth. I have not seen any instance in which any of this equipment has ever been used in a manner inconsistent with how the program was designed to work and I don't think any critic of this program could provide a single case study in which this equipment was used to hurt anyone without it being justified. This is a terrific program that saves the city money and allows us to utilize and obtain

7/2/2026 16:22	I strongly oppose the continued authorization of military equipment because there are reasonable, evidence-based alternatives that can achieve the same objectives of officer and civilian safety without relying on militarized responses. AB 481 requires governing bodies to determine that military equipment is necessary because no reasonable alternative exists. In many circumstances, that standard has not been met. Proven alternatives include violence reduction and prevention strategies, de-escalation and crisis intervention training, community violence intervention programs, behavioral health response teams, procedural justice initiatives, and investments in building trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. In addition, our region is uniquely positioned to develop innovative, evidence-based public safety solutions because of its close proximity to UC Davis. The university is home to nationally recognized experts in violence prevention, public health, behavioral health, trauma-informed care, and community-engaged research. Rather than defaulting to military equipment, local agencies should take advantage of this valuable resource by partnering with UC Davis researchers and practitioners to evaluate, develop, and implement effective violence reduction strategies. We should leverage this unique opportunity to become a model for evidence-based public safety. Research has consistently demonstrated that prevention-focused approaches can reduce violence, improve public safety, and strengthen community trust while minimizing the risks associated with military equipment. By contrast, the deployment of military-style equipment may escalate encounters, contribute to fear and mistrust, and disproportionately impact historically marginalized communities. Instead of continuing to invest in military equipment, resources should be directed toward prevention, training, mental health crisis response, and community partnerships that address the root causes of violence. These investments better align with the intent of AB 481 to protect public welfare, civil rights, and civil liberties while promoting effective, accountable, and community-centered public safety.
7/2/2026 16:40	No comment so far
7/2/2026 17:25	I am opposed to the police department using military equipment but it seems that this request for public comment is just an exercise as nothing changes.
7/2/2026 18:21	I agree with the use of military equipment
7/2/2026 19:14	There is zero reason our PD needs military equipment. You are not at war with Sacramento citizens. You're here to serve. Just like everyone else in this government town. Stop treating us like an enemy you need to arm up against.
7/2/2026 20:34	Buy everything you guys need to keep our seats straight. I don't care if you buy a tank.
7/2/2026 23:06	I saw nothing in the listed equipment that I thought should be blocked. The need for these items is common sensical. The size of Sacramento requires a wide range of capabilities. I see no excessive numbers or types of equipment. The ability to conduct surveillance, communications, and breaching will save lives. There will be smaller surrounding city jurisdictions that cannot afford and/or do not have the Human Resources to develop expertise in these systems. Sacramento PD will be expected to provide mutual aid with some of these capabilities. Again, the requests seem minimal. I support them all.
7/3/2026 6:00	Report is well written and I support the conclusions and direction of the department.
7/3/2026 6:44	I am against any use of military equipment by the city police. It is inappropriate. A couple of years ago my street was blocked off as military equipment was brought into our neighborhood to stop a single man who had locked himself in his house. The equipment apparently wasn't even used but it was frightening to see it on our local sidewalk. I felt like they were just looking for an opportunity to use this completely unnecessary overkill equipment.
7/3/2026 7:06	LRAD usage is too imprecise and can cause lasting damage. These devices should no longer be used.
7/3/2026 7:22	I believe the police department should have access to the equipment needed to help them with certain situations that require a more aggressive approach when the police officers face a situation that the normal police equipment is not working to ease the situation and make the situation less dangerous.
7/3/2026 8:44	I support the use of Military equipment by the City of Sacramento!
7/3/2026 10:24	I don't think the police should have military grade weapons or equipment. This will only escalate violence as people will feel that they have to protect themselves from these weapons. We don't need robot dogs, armored vehicles or any of the terror inducing weapons in this report. We should not be using tools of war on our own people. This money could be going to better things like helping our unhomed population or non-police mental health crisis responses. I'm disappointed we are even considering this.
7/3/2026 12:44	I support and all Military Equipment Use that the PD feels it needs.
7/3/2026 21:55	Please do not use any military equipment in our communities. We are your neighbors, not an opposing army. I understand that police work is dangerous, but fear and lashing out only beget more violence. I urge you to invest in prevention approaches through deescalation and working with social workers, medical professionals, and other community experts. This is a non-Newtonian fluid situation: the harder you hit, the more resistance you meet; the softer you approach, the more it will yield to you. I wish you all the best for this year, and hope that you have many opportunities to see the beauty of the communities you are in.
7/4/2026 1:40	The tools that the police need keep us safe. I hope that they get whatever they need for controlling craziness.
7/4/2026 8:13	The fact that equipment has been used by the military before is not automatically a negative. The military has some great equipment and we need great equipment for our police department. Police service is vital for our community and serves as necessary support for fire and medical first responders.
7/4/2026 10:43	I am unalterably opposed to the Police Department purchasing or using military equipment in any way. Our neighborhoods are not war zones and having our using military equipment in them is not needed. The presence of such equipment is antithetical to community trust. It is also costly and the money can better be used for other things including activities to reduce community tensions and build community trust
7/4/2026 15:26	Military equipment should be used by the military not the police.
7/4/2026 15:32	The list of military grade weapons and equipment to be used on our own people is excessive. In addition to weapons banned by the Geneva Convention in warfare like tear gas, the broad scope of this would allow requests of absurd and inappropriate requests for military equipment like weaponized aircraft and vessels by the district's attorney's office or microwave lessons and explosives by school resource officers. It is unacceptable that there would even be a legal loophole for weapons of war to be requested for use against children and teenagers by the city. This bill should be rewritten to provide clearer restrictions based on the type of law enforcement and type of items requested. Do we need our city's budget spent on "weaponized vessels" like boats or submarines? Why is this even an option listed?
7/4/2026 18:17	I am strongly opposed to any use of military equipment in Sacramento. It is shameful how much money is spent on military equipment for Sacramento's police force, not least because this money would be more effectively spent on de-escalation training, community intervention and engagement programs, and proactive outreach that creates positive, meaningful relationships between law enforcement and the people who live here. Military equipment is designed for use in a war zone, not in an urban city that deserves to feel safe and not at risk of serious harm from the use of deadly police force.
7/6/2026 11:43	The Sacramento Police Department should have access to all the equipment they determine is necessary to protect our community. We can't predict when a major incident will occur, and officers should have the tools they need to respond effectively. It is also clear that the majority of Sacramento residents support a police department that is well-trained, well-equipped, and well-funded. Based on the turnout and public comments at the last few meetings, this no longer appears to be a divisive issue. The overwhelming majority of those who have participated have expressed support for the Police Department and its Military Equipment Use policy. Thank you.
7/6/2026 12:28	I'm against military anything being passed down to community police. The medium is the message. Our town and city police are different and should be used differently. Sell the military gear to other countries and give the money to local police.
7/6/2026 12:32	As a property owner and taxpayer of Sacramento County, I do not support the use of or purchase of military equipment by Sac PD.
7/6/2026 12:50	I support the use of available military equipment that allows SPD to keep officers and the public safe during the course of incidents.

7/6/2026 15:42	To whom it may concern, I am writing as a constituent to express my strong opposition to the acquisition and use of military-style equipment by our local law enforcement agencies. While AB 481 has created important transparency requirements around this issue, transparency alone is not enough — I am asking you to go further and actively oppose the use of militarized equipment in our community altogether. Militarized policing does not make communities safer. As the Legislature itself acknowledged in the findings of AB 481, research consistently shows that the deployment of military equipment by civilian law enforcement frequently results in increased risk of civilian harm, chilling effects on free expression and protest, deepened distrust between law enforcement and the communities they are supposed to serve, and a lopsided burden placed on communities of color that are already underserved. These are the very communities that deserve more investment, not more surveillance and force. Equally important is the question of resources. The funding required to acquire, train for, maintain, store, and upgrade military equipment represents a significant allocation of public money — money that could instead be directed toward: • Mental health crisis response programs • Youth intervention and community violence prevention • Affordable housing and homelessness services • Restorative justice and diversion programs • Neighborhood infrastructure and environmental health These investments address the root causes of community safety concerns in ways that armored vehicles and weapons never will. I urge you to use the oversight authority granted under AB 481 not simply to regulate military equipment use, but to actively decline to approve it — and to redirect those civil resources toward programs that genuinely serve and protect all members of our community. Thank you for your time and public service. Respectfully, [REDACTED] PhD she/her/hers
7/7/2026 9:44	In reviewing what is an eligible items for acquisition, it's clear that this creates far too much space for loose interpretations that could allow for a rapid expansion of an already problematic amount of militarization within community level police and law enforcement agencies. Training and tactics promoting de-escalation and resolving tense situations without violence or minimal use-of-force should be a priority when trying to build and restore lost community trust. When law enforcement seeks military-grade equipment that is often expensive and has incredibly narrow use — it reduces trust and community safety. This bill has many broad and loose definitions, it raises a lot of concerns. on the use of that same military equipment by community police officers and law enforcement. Only a narrow band of specialized law enforcement should have access to any sort of military grade hardware, and even then, it should not be a spending priority. Eligible munitions included like "Weaponized aircraft, vessels, or vehicles of any kind." or "Any firearm or firearm accessory that is designed to launch explosive projectiles." is so categorically broad that it opens the potential for misconduct, let alone public perception that undermine the goals of community-based policing. Law enforcement is already asked to do far too much and this bill needs a lot or redress and specificity before it should be considered.
7/7/2026 12:36	To: The Sacramento City Council and the Sacramento Community Police Review Commission Public Comment: 2025–2026 Military Equipment Use Policy, General Order 410.06, and Annual Report Dear Mayor, Members of the City Council, and Commissioners, I am a Sacramento resident. I strongly oppose the continued authorization, expansion, and normalization of military equipment by the Sacramento Police Department. This is not an anti-safety comment. It is a pro-community safety comment. Local police are supposed to protect and serve our communities, not approach civilian neighborhoods as battlefields. Police are not here to battle citizens. They are here to protect the public, reduce harm, de-escalate conflict, and preserve life. AB 481 requires the City Council to determine whether this equipment is truly necessary, whether there is no reasonable alternative, whether the policy protects public welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties, whether the cost is justified, and whether prior use complied with policy or was corrected. Based on the City's own reporting, I do not believe that standard has been met. The current draft report shows SPD used military equipment in 330 incidents during the reporting period, totaling 1,186 individual equipment uses. Several high-concern categories increased from the prior year: armored vehicle use increased from 165 to 224, flashbang use increased from 39 to 60, chemical-agent use increased from 15 to 25, LRAD use increased from 79 to 105, and less-lethal shotgun use increased from 10 to 16. That is not a meaningful reduction in militarized policing. That is continued reliance on it. The demographic data is also deeply concerning. SPD reported that military equipment was used to locate, detain, or arrest 182 individuals, with race data available for 174 of them. Black and African American residents were the largest identified racial group, with 84 individuals listed. That should concern every person responsible for public safety and civil rights in this city. The policy also still relies too heavily on internal review. While the policy now references outside oversight bodies, it does not clearly establish enforceable independent investigative authority, public disciplinary standards, or a transparent sanctions matrix. Listing oversight bodies is not the same as creating real accountability. If an officer misuses military-category equipment in our neighborhoods, the public deserves to know what the consequences will be. I am also concerned that the policy does not set clear enough limits on where and when this equipment is prohibited. A policy that explains when military equipment can be used, but does not clearly state when it cannot be used, leaves too much room for harm. There should be firm restrictions around First Amendment activity, children, medically vulnerable people, and situations where de-escalation or non-police crisis response is available. Sacramento is not a war zone. Our neighborhoods are not battlefields. Our residents are not enemy combatants. Public safety should feel like protection, not occupation. Please vote no on continued authorization unless and until the City adopts enforceable restrictions, true independent oversight, full public reporting of every deployment, clear consequences for violations, and a real plan to reduce reliance on military equipment. Thank you, [REDACTED]
7/7/2026 15:12	1. Drone Expansion & Privacy Concerns. The report proposes acquiring more than 30 new drones, including advanced Skydio X10 units. While drones can support emergency response, the report does not clearly define: When drones may be deployed? Whether they will be used for routine patrol? What data they collect? How long footage is stored? What privacy safeguards protect residents? What uses are explicitly prohibited? The report states drones will be used to "gain visual-only data of confined spaces," but does not define what "confined spaces" means. Without clear limits, this could include private property or sensitive locations. I urge the Council to require a detailed drone use policy that includes warrant standards, privacy protections, data retention rules, and clear operational boundaries. 2. Vague Justifications for New Acquisitions. Several proposed purchases are justified with broad language such as "meeting the growing needs of our city." This phrasing is too general to support meaningful oversight. Equipment acquisitions should be tied to specific, documented operational needs — not general statements. 3. Explosive Breaching Tools & Safety. The department maintains a substantial inventory of detonating cord, blasting caps, breaching shotguns, and flash-bang breaching rounds. These tools carry significant risks, including injury, structural damage, and trauma. The report does not specify: Deployment thresholds; Supervisory approval; Safety protocols; Risk mitigation for civilians and property. Explosive breaching is a high-risk tactic. The community deserves clear guardrails on when and how it is authorized. 4. Large Ammunition Stockpiles Without Transparency. The report lists hundreds of thousands of rifle rounds, including armor-piercing .308 ammunition. However, it does not explain: Annual consumption Training vs. operational use Storage security Rotation or disposal practices Large stockpiles require strong accountability and clear justification. 5. Equity & Community Impact AB 481 requires transparency, but the report does not address: Which neighborhoods see the most deployments Whether certain communities experience disproportionate militarized policing How SPD evaluates equity impacts Transparency must include deployment patterns and community impact, especially in a diverse city like Sacramento. 6. Recommendations I respectfully request that the Council require: Clear operational definitions for drone use, explosive breaching, and specialized ammunition. Privacy and data retention policies for all UAS systems. Scenario-based justification for each proposed acquisition. Annual equity impact assessments to ensure fair deployment across neighborhoods. Accessible, well-publicized community engagement meetings with meaningful Q&A.
7/10/2026 14:35	"Military equipment" is a broad term, and appears to include gear, vehicles, and weapons that police departments have been using for a long time. Fair enough, you need some tools. But, in general, I don't support purchase or use of most of the items listed in the draft. Thanks.
7/13/2026 9:32	Our police should be better armed and equipped than the bad guys (and gals).
7/13/2026 11:46	I support the Police Department's policy on Military Equipment.
7/13/2026 17:04	I support the police and all their equipment. We owe them the tools they need to protect both the public and themselves.

7/13/2026 17:12	I support the draft and I support the Sacramento police department and public safety. I do not support people that believe the city should be unsafe.
7/13/2026 17:13	I support the police need for tools to address crime in our city. Calling these tool "Military Equipment" is very misleading. The list includes drones - which the public uses too.
7/13/2026 22:07	I support the Police Department's policy on Military Equipment.
7/15/2026 5:14	I think the police owning military equipment is a horrible idea. I've lived in many other countries including Saudi Arabia, Oman, China and Vietnam and haven't seen police like this. American police are corrupt and there's zero reason why they need armored vehicles and stun grenades. We've all seen the footage of the UC Davis police sergeant using military grade pepper spray up close and personal on students sitting on the ground. And then he got paid for emotional damage because the majority of people said it was dumb.
7/15/2026 17:28	I oppose the Sacramento Police Department acquiring more and using military equipment in any policing activities. Adding more military equipment is not going to decrease crime rates. In fact, studies have shown that one of the best ways to prevent crime is to provide more resources and support to low income communities. These funds could instead go to services that actually help our communities. Additionally, SPD has been found by the ACLU* to disproportionately target Black and Latino individuals, the demographics shown in the Annual Military Equipment Use Report back this up. SPD uses more military equipment in largely minority neighborhoods, with the biggest increase being in the Oak Park neighborhood. Until there is a major overhaul of the SPD, they have proven to be not be trustworthy and do not need more military equipment to use against civilians. *https://www.aclunorcal.org/press-releases/aclu-report-finds-sacramento-police-disproportionately-stopped-black-people-for-traffic-violations/ What other resources can be utilized to bolster community safety with the current budget we dedicate to obtaining militarized equipment? SPD participates in federal task forces with various agencies that could allow for this equipment to be used in federal law enforcement operations. The community has expressed concerns about our police's involvement with ICE and the growing number of abuses from the current administration with FBI targets. SPD is known to disproportionately target Black and Latino individuals, that is seen in this report as well with those being the two highest populations to have this equipment used against. We must stop giving them additional tools to terrorize these communities. Are there any items currently in inventory that go unused? Can we offload some of these items to see a decrease in maintenance, storage, and training costs? I Call for an end to blind acquisition of militarized equipment, as they are harmful to the community. 1b. Uncrewed Aerial Systems: Drones Currently SPD has 62 drones in inventory, 49 additional requested. How many currently in use are being decommissioned? 7a. Detonating Cord and Blasting Caps: Last years total from inventory and procurement was 114, current inventory is 112. Why do we need 100 more? 7c. Breaching Munitions, Royal Arms International MB-70S 12 Gauge Muzzle Blast Flash Bang Soft Breaching Round: Last year there were 29 used, but the request is to ordering double. Why? The inventory is already double current usage, for increased cost this does not make sense.
7/15/2026 20:57	I strongly support Sacramento Police use of Military equipment.
7/16/2026 7:20	DJI drones are banned by the FCC. Should we really be using them?
7/16/2026 7:23	I oppose the further militarization of local LE. I am asking our local government to reject military equipment.
7/16/2026 15:44	where is the survey to fill out? What is the military equipment proposed to use against cilivians?
7/18/2026 7:43	Is SPD at war with the people of Sacramento? I do not think the police should have or use powerful military weapons to serve the people of Sacramento.
7/19/2026 13:46	The police should have whatever they need to carry out there duty's
7/19/2026 19:29	N/A
7/20/2026 17:53	I support sac pd and their military equipment policy
7/20/2026 19:09	I support Sac Pd and their military equipment policy
7/20/2026 19:19	"I support sac pd and their military equipment policy"
7/20/2026 19:26	I support Sac PD and their military equipment policy. It's reasonable for the threats faced.
7/20/2026 19:39	Yes on military use equipment
7/20/2026 19:54	I support sac PD and their military equipment policy
7/20/2026 22:08	I oppose the Sacramento Police Department acquiring more and using military equipment in any policing activities. Adding more military equipment is not going to decrease crime rates. In fact, studies have shown that one of the best ways to prevent crime is to provide more resources and support to low income communities. These funds could instead go to services that actually help our communities. Additionally, SPD has been found by the ACLU* to disproportionately target Black and Latino individuals, the demographics shown in the Annual Military Equipment Use Report back this up. SPD uses more military equipment in largely minority neighborhoods, with the biggest increase being in the Oak Park neighborhood. Until there is a major overhaul of the SPD, they have proven to be not be trustworthy and do not need more military equipment to use against civilians. *https://www.aclunorcal.org/press-releases/aclu-report-finds-sacramento-police-disproportionately-stopped-black-people-for-traffic-violations/
7/21/2026 15:07	I support Sac PD and Military Equipment Policy
7/21/2026 15:09	I support Sac PD and its military equipment policy
7/21/2026 17:46	I support Sac PD and military equipment.
7/21/2026 18:48	I support Sac PD and the military equipment policy. We need law enforcement. 1% of the population commit the majority of crimes. Arrest them any means necessary and stop them from holding low income neighborhoods hostage.
7/21/2026 19:11	I support sac pd and military equipment policy
7/21/2026 19:56	I support police & military using all measures to have a safe & better community. RESPECT THE LAW.
7/21/2026 20:08	I support Sacramento Police Dept. and it's military equipment policy.
7/22/2026 8:52	I support Sac PD and its military policy
7/22/2026 11:27	I believe that the mayor and city council should support the Sacramento Police Department with whatever funding and equipment the police leadership deem necessary.
7/22/2026 11:31	I believe that the City and County of Sacramento should revoke sanctuary status and corporate fully with the Department of Homeland Security, (ICE), for the safety of our citizens and the illegal immigrants.
7/22/2026 11:44	Instead of defunding our police, I believe there should be a 15% reduction of the salaries of discretionary funding of city hall until they can balance a budget and eliminate all deficit spending.
7/22/2026 11:59	4.It is my belief that obstructing Federal Laws by claiming 'sanctuary status' endangers the citizens of Sacramento by promoting violence from fleeing criminals, rioting by protestors, and it further divides our conservative and liberal populations.
7/22/2026 13:07	I recognize that law enforcement officers may need specialized equipment to safely respond to high-risk incidents. It is important the City continues strengthening transparency by providing clear, easy-to-understand annual reports that explain when military equipment was used, why it was necessary, whether less intrusive alternatives were considered, and what outcomes resulted from its deployment. These reports should be accessible to the public and presented in a way that allows residents to meaningfully evaluate whether the equipment is being used appropriately. AB 481 was designed to promote accountability and public trust. I hope the City continues to treat community input as an important part of that process by ensuring that military equipment is used only when truly necessary and that its continued authorization is supported by clear evidence of public benefit.

7/25/2026 16:08	If you give officers more guns and ammo, you must also retrain every single militarized officer in de-escalation tactics, resources training for mental health services like Sac CWRT and 811 (community wellness response team), and a history of racism and law enforcement, mandatory therapy sessions to for any officer who has opened fire on the clock (even if no one was injured), and mandatory removals / firings for any officer who kills or assaults more than one individual. The occupation of police officer is a serious and difficult job, and time in service should be terminated when that job becomes too much on an individual. The community must feel safe, this is every police officers job. But when militarized equipment is let loose on black and brown streets, we do not feel safe. So make balance — if more heavy equipment is needed, balance officer trainings out so that these officers do not become the very reason my brothers and sisters are murdered.
7/26/2026 9:22	A great deal of the public does not consent to the expense or the use of this equipment in our city. The community input is making it clear. All municipal employees should understand the civil liability that is growing with the escalated use of these weapons. Hiding behind the statutes, codes and commercial laws that give an appearance of 'authorization' will not be enough at some point. We do not consent. As you know, you need our consent to sidestep responsibility in these matters. Again, we do not consent. Your actions are your own, each one of you participating in this hierarchy of control masquerading as 'safety' will not be able to hide behind 'I was just following orders'. Nope. Please cease and desist the use of military weapons in our communities. Do it before it becomes a bigger issue than it is. Thank you.
7/27/2026 10:04	It is just plain common sense that Sacramento Police use the best equipment available. I have full confidence that the Police will make good decisions on necessary equipment and reasonable pricing.
7/27/2026 13:58	I support the Police Department in their use of "military equipment" including beanbag launchers, drones and flashing devices. Thank you for your consideration.
7/27/2026 16:52	I support the SPD to be able to use "Military Equipment". The criminals don't abide by the laws and our law enforcement officers should be able to utilize whatever tools they can use to be able to fight crime. Democratic Progressive policies have allowed criminals and others to disregard law and order to roam the streets of Sacramento which creates an unsafe environment for the law abiding citizens of Sacramento.
7/28/2026 11:34	As a Sacramento resident and mother of two young children, I believe the city of Sacramento should invest our limited resources into supporting our community with programs for children, young people, and those in need. We do not need more surveillance equipment, armored vehicles, and explosives to address the types of crimes we have here in our city. This is a waste of money at best, and the possibility of the police being used against our citizens to quell first amendment rights at worst.
7/28/2026 11:46	I support the City of Sacramento's beneficial applications of Police Department Military Equipment Use.
7/28/2026 12:35	I support the reasonable acquisition and use of so-called military equipment by SPD.
7/29/2026 12:26	I do not believe the City of Sacramento has any need for new nor existing military equipment, and do not support the use of military equipment in the normal course of police business. Use of military weaponry and equipment on citizens of the United States should be considered criminal activity. There is no justification for use of this equipment, designed to subdue and kill, and our local police should be in the business of DEESCALATION rather than warfare against city and county residents.
7/29/2026 13:58	I am writing as a resident of Sacramento who would rather see safety addressed at the root. I oppose the acquisition of additional military equipment because any funds spent on such equipment are funds not going to programs that would directly benefit low income people. Numerous studies show addressing the base causes of crime, poverty and desperation. If any existing equipment is going unused, resources spent of maintenance and training are wasted, which makes the prospect of continued procurement disappointing. I ask that more thought be put into the necessity of this equipment and what alternatives exist that would genuinely benefit our communities.
7/29/2026 14:02	I oppose the Sacramento Police Department acquiring more and using military equipment in any policing activities. Adding more military equipment is not going to decrease crime rates. In fact, studies have shown that one of the best ways to prevent crime is to provide more resources and support to low-income communities. These funds could instead go to services that actually help our communities.
7/29/2026 18:00	I support police using military equipment to keep them and us safe
7/30/2026 15:21	What frustrates me is when asked questions like "Why are there significantly more people of color effected by this" and all we get for an answer is "I don't know, its a national issue, its just the data, be glad we even release this because we don't have to". It is either a case of wilful ignorance or active malice because this is something that has a clear data backed answer that many people have gone into detail about for years. The idea that the police don't know the answer to this is just silly. I also just do not care for a second how much the police feel like they are keeping the community safe or a if group of the worst people who say things like "the police should use drones to hunt the homeless" think the police are great. The data does not back this up and I don't understand why they can't just except that. Do they like harming poor and marginalized people? Or are they just really idealistic and think that something data says doesn't work actually will work? Please just do the right thing, you don't have to hold onto false believes. You can be better, please for the sake of everyone in this city. I love this city and I just want what is best for it and if you do as well then you will do the right thing. Please
7/31/2026 15:25	Might as well use technology to help improve public safety
7/31/2026 16:00	This is another surveillance system that the Police over time will use in ways it never said in its initial request. There is no police dept across the country that has not eventually used drones for general survelience
7/31/2026 16:10	I support Traffic Enforcement officers.
7/31/2026 18:13	Sacramento residents want well funded, well equipped and trained police department. This equipment is needed to protect the public and police in any case of an emergency.
7/31/2026 18:14	The majority of people, especially those in the more impoverished areas of the city, want and need a fully functioning police department. The police are not able to perform their duties without the necessary budget for staff and equipment.
7/31/2026 18:16	I am opposed to police using military equipment of any kind.
8/1/2026 8:10	I am opposed to the purchase of more military equipment, specifically drones, by the Sacramento Police Department. Military equipment is, by definition used against an enemy. I think and feel that the culture of the SPD is increasingly becoming militarized and sees many of the citizens of Sacramento as the enemy
8/1/2026 9:14	I strongly approve of the acquisition of new drones by Sacramenrto police.
8/1/2026 23:34	Pain disruptive showoff [REDACTED] can [REDACTED] [REDACTED] needs protection from jiffy lube days soma security did a number today on she needs a home he forgot about seeing me morning [REDACTED] dob
8/3/2026 8:52	I would prefer that you hire more officers to respond to 911 call instead of relying on drones or other electronic technology. Use technology to back up real trained personnel that respond to any police need. I think staffing should be the number one priority instead of asking for money on technology. More staff would relieve the strain on the current staff and make them more productive
8/3/2026 10:07	everyone who approves this dystopian contract is getting voted out. ridiculous, short-sighted, expensive, unhelpful, and completely against the needs of the people. if you approve this direction then you are in the pocket of dangerous people and no longer serving the people.
8/3/2026 10:17	Sacramento police don't need military equipment and drones to warrantlessly spy on the citizenry. control your budget by cracking down on unnecessary overtime. There's no reason every traffic stop needs 3+ cop cars it's just intimidation
8/3/2026 10:18	I'm not a fan of the idea of a police state. Boo!
8/3/2026 10:31	I do not want Sac PD using military equipment. The presence of this equipment in our community would make it less safe, and I fear that giving Sac PD access to military equipment will be used inappropriately.
8/3/2026 10:44	too much surveillance, not enough privacy.

8/3/2026 11:13	Sac PD cannot waste \$111,000 on taxpayer money on buying 41 drones to collect information and surveil citizens. This money can be better allocated towards officers that are trained in community outreach. Policing should be an active job, building relationships with the citizens not just in the affluent Districts 1 and 7, but also in Districts 2 and 8. Policing should not be done passively like a video game with the drones, or by sitting in police cruisers poking at the computers while people run red lights all over the city.
8/3/2026 11:19	The continued militarization of the civilian police, especially of unmanned drones, does not inspire me as my government gets more fascist by the day.
8/3/2026 11:20	You do not need any additional military equipment. Stop pretending you need it and get back to actual community police work.
8/3/2026 11:32	We've gone way over the top with this military equipment. Enough. No drones, no more military equipment.
8/3/2026 14:37	This is terrifying and a complete disregard for public safety. I do not want my city to use these against civilians.
8/3/2026 15:34	This is a terrible idea. Both costly to the community to not make our communities safer. It's constantly proven that more law enforcement presence does not signify some place is safer, yet you want to waste tax dollars on this.
8/3/2026 18:05	Absolutely oppose
8/3/2026 19:24	As a Sacramento resident, I oppose the SPD's use of military equipment and I do not support the acquisition of additional equipment. The equipment requested, including flashbangs, ammunition, and drones, do not make any situations safer. While I am disappointed that the Sacramento City Council continues to approve such requests, many constituents (myself included) do not support this.
8/3/2026 19:51	This is a ridiculous waste of taxpayer money. We don't need this.
8/3/2026 20:52	I do not want sac PD using military equipment.
8/4/2026 21:36	I do not support the use of military surveillance on our community. This is deeply unsettled and SacPD should be ashamed for even considering this as an option.
8/6/2026 11:45	Unaddressed community concerns about why military equipment use is justified and reasons for the racial disparities and excessive use of force: * Use of force is up with an over 90% increase from last year. * Case 25-135710: Drones and armored vehicles were used in an incident with minors for possession for a 16 year old in possession of cannabis. This reads as excessive use of force. Justification for new equipment is lacking * "Depleted stock" is claimed as the reason many times for purchasing more but use over the last year is drastically less than purchase proposal. * For example, only 2 blasting caps were used and there are 112 in stock but 100 are proposed for purchase. They used 29 flash bangs but are ordering 60, when inventory is already double usage and new is at an increased cost. * "Decommissioning" or "needed replacement of expired items" is also claimed. However, they do not report how many will be removed from inventory and when equipment will be decommissioned. Lack of transparency around SacPD budget for military equipment: * \$186,405.32 in addition to the cost of maintaining existing equipment, training, plus other known costs totaling to \$1,170,473.45. * Transparency in reporting the additional recurring costs, particular for "officer training" * How much of this is "mandatory" vs. voluntary * Is the time spent for officer training commensurate to the actual usage of this equipment? Should officer time be prioritized here?
8/6/2026 11:46	Definitions of "use" by SPD underreport and obscures actual deployment of military equipment * Assault rifles and projectiles: How they define "use" of assault rifles and projectiles is only when they are fired. The actual deployment of these weapons is invisible in the report, although we can infer some things from the number of armored vehicle deployments, most of which were likely by the SWAT team, armed with those weapons. What should be reported is how many times this equipment is deployed and out in our community. * Patrol Rifles: The report says SPD used assault rifles only once last year, in the incident of shooting someone described briefly on pp. 46-47 with a link to more information. But SPD clearly deployed with rifles many more times. For example, it deployed armored vehicles 224 times, and most deployments were likely with the SWAT team (see questions below). * Flashbangs: Report doesn't specify each type (which AB481 defines as the model) of equipment used, only what category (e.g. drones, flashbangs), so you can't tell which type SPD is deploying or using on people. This is true both in the summary on p. 37 and in the incident list in Appendix B. Increases in military equipment use across most categories, despite reported firearms and other crimes are down (pg 37): If you remove drone usage, then the use of other military equipment increased over the last year, even though reported firearm and other crimes are down in almost every category. Why does SPD deploy more flashbangs, and armored vehicles and ROOK more times, even when reported violence in Sacramento has declined substantially? Has the policy for use of this equipment changed? * BearCat and ROOK use: Armored vehicle deployment is up 36%. * Question: Are most or all of the deployments of the BearCat and ROOK by the SWAT team? When SWAT deploys, does it always deploy with assault rifles? Would you consider reporting on deployments of weapons, so the community gets a sense of how many times SPD is using / deploying with them? * Flashbangs: Use of flashbangs increased by more than 50% in the last year. Why is that the case, when the number of violent firearm events, calls for service and other indicators of critical situations went down? * Chemical agents: Uses increased from 15 to 25 during the last year. Since these weren't used for crowd control, they were likely used in SWAT operations. The incident list, however, doesn't describe how the equipment was used; instead the list describes some of the alleged behavior of the person it was used on. Report shows equipment was used 72 times for "outside agency assistance", but no consistent comprehensive reporting of what agencies were assisted * What are policies for offering outside agency assistance and is military equipment used to support federal task forces? * How does federal grant UASI impact how equipment is used?
8/6/2026 11:46	Concerns with "Drone First Responder" program, through which SacPD is acquiring XX more drones: See the SacBee article here * What is the policy of drone use going to be under the program? * Concerns about surveillance: how is data going to be used by SacPD? How long is data going to be retained? * Data retention: There is currently no policy published relating to the non-investigative footage storage. This gives the impression of storing indefinitely. It was shared at the forum that it is deleted after 2.5 years. This is abnormal. Many other jurisdictions delete this footage between 5 and 60 days. * Data protections: We "own the data", but does it go into the Axon fusus system? We can't control if Axon then shares data with outside entities and agents Concerns with SacPD's policies with deployment of assault rifles and impact projectiles Assault / patrol rifles: SPD's policy for deployment of assault rifles (General Order 580.04), says only: H. PATROL RIFLE DEPLOYMENT 1. The rifle is a weapon that officers may use to overcome suspects who are armed or may be armed with handguns. It may also be used in other situations to provide a tactical advantage. 2. Officers shall not display the rifle on routine calls or incidents. The circumstances of each call or incident shall dictate the reasonableness of the deployment of the rifle. * This is a very broad policy for deployment of rifles, but it does exclude "routine calls or incidents". Question: How does the Department define "routine calls or incidents"? Does patrolling with the rifle visible on a motorcycle count as routine? I have seen this as well as had many other community members show me photos of this in the field. * SPD allows individual officers to own their own assault rifles. Question: Do any SPD officers own their own assault rifles? If so, how many? Of these, how many are on the SWAT team and how many are not? More restrictive policies: Oakland PD rifle patrol policy, attached and at: https://public.powerdms.com/oakland/tree/documents/419 See especially limitations and prohibitions on deployment on pp. 7, 9 and 12. Oakland PD also reports on deployments of rifles in their AB481 annual reports, not just when they were fired. Impact projectiles (rubber bullets, Pepperballs, "Supersock" rounds, etc): * SPD's General Order 580.12 gives the rules for deploying these weapons. There is no reference at all to excluding the mental health crisis of unarmed persons. The main criterion is the extremely vague "specific information reasonably indicates the potential for the system's use". The one prohibition on use is that "Pregnant women, young children and elderly people shall not be the intentional target(s) of a less lethal weapon system unless the use of the system is necessary and objectively reasonable under the circumstances." Also "The head, neck, spine, heart or any other vital organs and groin should be avoided as target areas unless threat and circumstances justify their use." The policy then says that "Situations for use of the less lethal weapon systems may include, but are not limited to..." a list of situations. The policy also excludes the use of 'glass breaker rounds' on people, and includes restrictions on use during protests, as state law requires. * Impact projectiles (Pepperballs, less lethal shotguns, 40mm munitions) were used at least 32 times in the last year, involving at least 195 projectiles. More restrictive policies: Again, Oakland PD's policy for impact projectiles is more restrictive than Sacramento's.

8/6/2026 11:46	Appendix C: Response to Sacramento Community Police Review Commission Questions * In the questions presented by the review commission, SPD repeatedly did not fully answer questions 1, 3, and 4. * On question 3, what reasonable alternatives were explored? It is never explained in their answers. * Question 4 has two parts, how do these policies serve to safeguard the public's civil rights and civil liberties is never answered. * Question 5 asks for any complaints or misuses as received by SPD, as we heard from a woman at the forum people are turning to their neighbors because they do not trust the police. Can we explore the idea of establishing smaller community based groups or individuals to report the complaints to that regularly reports complaints back to the commission and city council themselves? * Category 10 question 1, the policy quoted states that officers must carry out duties in a way that is unbiased. SPD is knowingly over policing black and brown bodies. What are we doing to reduce the use of force specifically in this area?
8/7/2026 15:56	I am not happy with Sacramento's spending on military equipment. The expenses to acquire and maintain this equipment would be better spent on other city services. I also do not approve of any expansions to drone usage and surveillance. I would rather protect citizens' privacy. There will always be some justification of how it helps solve crimes. But these technologies open up too much potential to be misused and infringe on people's rights. No drone surveillance, no ALPRs. Especially when I don't see Sac PD taking any clear steps to ensure this data is not shared with hostile federal agencies currently targeting immigrants and activists. Military equipment has no place in civilians' lives. Please stop these expensive and dangerous purchases.
8/7/2026 16:57	I am very concerned about the increasing militarization of police forces across this country. There is so much data showing this does more harm than good. Please come to your senses and stop. I am very concerned in particular that the use of force and of most military equipment has increased; that there is no justification for military equipment use, purchases and recurring costs (particularly officer training), with purchases exceeding usage with appears to be stockpiling; the definition of use underreports and obscures actual deployment, there is no comprehensive reporting on which agencies were assisted in 72 incidents, and I have many concerns about surveillance, data protections, and deployment policy for the Drone First Responder Program with Axon.
8/8/2026 15:41	civilians do NOT need military equipment used against them. the drones are used to arrive sooner than officers?? not a benefit worth the surveillance state. be so fr