Committee Item	No.	
Board Item No.	69	

## **COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee:		Date:	
Board of Sup	pervisors Meeting	Date:	October 6, 2020
Cmte Boar	d		
	Motion Resolution Ordinance Legislative Digest Budget and Legislative Analys Youth Commission Report Introduction Form Department/Agency Cover Let MOU Grant Information Form Grant Budget Subcontract Budget Contract/Agreement Form 126 – Ethics Commission Award Letter Application	ter and	
	Public Correspondence		
OTHER			
H			
H			
H			
H			
HH			
H H			
Prepared by: Lisa Lew Date: October 2, 2020			
Prepared by: Date:			

1	[Opposing California State Proposition 20 - Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and DNA Collection Initiative - November 3, 2020, Ballot]
2	
3	Resolution opposing California State Proposition 20, Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and
4	DNA Collection Initiative, on the November 3, 2020, ballot.
5	
6	WHEREAS, Safety for all Californians is the highest priority for the San Francisco
7	Board of Supervisors; and
8	WHEREAS, Once a bellwether for mass incarceration, in the past decade, California
9	reduced incarceration more than any state in the nation and has fueled a national movement
10	that is leading the country away from the ineffective status quo of mass incarceration and
11	toward a new approach that prioritizes prevention and addressing the root causes of crime;
12	and
13	WHEREAS, California's California voters' overwhelming support for two criminal reform
14	ballot measures – Proposition 47, which in 2014 reclassified some low-level nonviolent crimes
15	from felonies to misdemeanors; and Proposition 57, which in 2016 gave inmates convicted of
16	certain non-violent offenses an opportunity to earn early release; led to a 25 percent drop in
17	incarceration, while statewide crime rates remain at historic lows and new crime prevention
18	programs launched as a result of these reforms are showing promise; and
19	WHEREAS, Proposition 47 was the hallmark ballot initiative that officially ushered in an
20	era of reform and shifted investments from ineffective mass incarceration programs to
21	services that better meet community needs and prevent crime from occurring in the first place
22	mental health services, trauma recovery and addiction services; and
23	WHEREAS, According to the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, Proposition 47
24	is projected to save a record \$122.5 million in the 2020- 2021 fiscal year; and
25	

1	WHEREAS, The nonpartisan Public Policy Institute of California reported in 2018 the
2	Proposition 47 had also closed racial disparities in arrests and bookings; and
3	WHEREAS, Despite a decisive body of research that has shown that zeroing in on
4	community health, not incarceration, more effectively prevents crime, thousands of
5	Californians currently struggle with untreated mental health, substance abuse and trauma -
6	some of the well-known drivers of crime as well as drivers of health vulnerabilities and less
7	than 10 percent of people struggling with substance abuse and only 1 out of 6 people
8	struggling with mental illness attain treatment; and
9	WHEREAS, Prevention should be the focus of our justice resources and attention – for
10	both public health and public safety, California still spends more than \$11 billion annually on
11	prisons, a 500 percent increase over 30 years and one that dwarfs other critical public
12	investments and over the past 20 years, for example, prison spending has grown 65 percent
13	faster than spending on hospitals; and
14	WHEREAS, Proposition 20 on California's November 3, 2020, ballot is an effort to turn
15	back the clock, is funded by special interests that want to spend tens of millions of taxpayer
16	dollars on prisons while rolling back effective criminal justice reforms overwhelmingly
17	supported by California voters; and
18	WHEREAS, Proposition 20 would reduce California's threshold for felony theft to one of
19	the lowest in the nation and waste taxpayer dollars incarcerating people for nonviolent crimes
20	while causing draconian cuts to proven crime-reduction programs; and
21	WHEREAS, Passage of Proposition 20 would mean as many as 10,000 more people
22	could end up in California prisons and jails, undermining the key pathway California
23	lawmakers have used to reallocate resources from incarceration to local safety solutions; and
24	WHEREAS, Black and Latinx people are disproportionately impacted in the criminal

justice system, as nationally, Black men comprise about 13 percent of the male population,

25

1	but about 35 percent of those incarcerated; and one in three Black men born today can expect
2	to be incarcerated in his lifetime, compared to one in six Latino men and one in 17 white men;
3	further, Black women are similarly impacted: one in 18 Black women born in 2001 is likely to
4	be incarcerated sometime in her life, compared to one in 111 white women; and
5	WHEREAS, Passage of Proposition 20 would also defund Trauma Recovery Centers,
6	which primarily serve people of color and are critical lifelines for survivors of violence; and
7	WHEREAS, According to a ballot analysis, the fiscal impacts of Proposition 20 would
8	include an increase to state and local correctional costs in the tens of millions of dollars
9	annually, and increase by several millions of dollars annual state and local court-related costs
10	and with state and local governments already reeling from COVID-19 fiscal impacts, voters
11	should not support a proposal to once again balloon prison populations and increase costs;
12	and
13	WHEREAS, Proposition 20 would also remove the incentives for inmates to modify
14	their behavior and seek rehabilitation by limiting opportunities for early release; now,
15	therefore, be it
16	RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco hereby formally opposes
17	Proposition 20, the Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and DNA Collection Initiative, on the
18	November 3, 2020, ballot; and, be it
19	FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco go on record in
20	opposition of Proposition 20, the Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and DNA Collection Initiative,
21	on the November 3, 2020, ballot; and, be it
22	FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco urges other
23	municipalities to oppose Proposition 20, the Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and DNA Collection
24	Initiative, on the November 3, 2020, ballot.

25

## **Introduction Form**

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or Mayor

Time stamp or meeting date I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one): 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment). ✓ 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee. 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee. 4. Request for letter beginning: "Supervisor inquiries" 5. City Attorney Request. from Committee. 6. Call File No. 7. Budget Analyst request (attached written motion). 8. Substitute Legislation File No. 9. Reactivate File No. 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following: Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission Ethics Commission **Building Inspection Commission** Planning Commission Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Form. Sponsor(s): Walton, Peskin, Haney, Fewer, Ronen, Preston Subject: Opposing California State Proposition 20 - Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and DNA Collection Initiative - November, 3, 2020, Ballot The text is listed: Resolution opposing California State Proposition 20 - Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and DNA Collection Initiative -November, 3, 2020, Ballot

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: /s/ Shamann Walton

For Clerk's Use Only