

1 [Opposing California State Proposition 20 - Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and DNA Collection
2 Initiative - November 3, 2020, Ballot]

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

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



City and County of San Francisco

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Tails
Resolution

File Number: 201141

Date Passed: October 06, 2020

Resolution opposing California State Proposition 20, Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and DNA Collection Initiative, on the November 3, 2020, ballot.

October 06, 2020 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Walton and Yee

File No. 201141

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 10/6/2020 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

[Handwritten signature of Angela Calvillo]

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Unsigned

London N. Breed
Mayor

10/16/2020

Date Approved

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, or time waived pursuant to Board Rule 2.14.2, became effective without her approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter or Board Rule 2.14.2.

[Handwritten signature of Angela Calvillo]

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

10/16/2020

Date