



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
9.		Favor	Alicia Zamora	<p>Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, My name is Alicia Zamora with the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. I thank Supervisor Mitchell for bringing forth this motion to oppose Proposition 36. Proposition 36 is a dangerous rollback of successful criminal justice reforms. It would burden taxpayers with over \$26 billion in costs over the next decade while slashing essential funding for treatment, crime prevention, and victim services—a huge setback for community safety. California has saved nearly \$1 billion, which has been directed towards our communities, including organizations like ARC that provide job placement, housing, therapy, and critical crime prevention and reentry services that make our county and communities safer. Prop 36 threatens to take these programs and funding away while bringing back mass incarceration and the war on drugs without providing real solutions to crime, addiction, and homelessness. We should focus on supporting initiatives that promote safety through education, mental health services, and effective crime prevention, not on measures that perpetuate mass incarceration and waste taxpayer dollars. I urge the Board to oppose Proposition 36, Thank you,</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
9.		Favor	Amy Gatto	<p>THANK YOU, Supervisor Mitchell, for bringing forward this motion which declares the Board's opposition to the dangerous Proposition 36. Prop 36, which is on the ballot in November, proposes to extend "three strikes"-style tough-on-crime sentencing to low-level non-violent drug and theft offenses. It also would cost California taxpayers millions each year and strip funding from critical crime prevention programs that keep communities safe and healthy.</p> <p>Prop 36 would strip \$100 million annually in funding for drug treatment, housing, and school-based programs—the very things proven to prevent crime in the first place. Because more Californians would languish in jail and prison on low-level offenses, Prop 36 would cost taxpayers an additional \$5 billion a year on top of the \$27 billion spent annually for jails, courts, and prisons across the state. Prop 36 is pretending to be a treatment-oriented initiative, but it's really a prison spending scam. Prop 36 would further criminalize California's vulnerable communities, pouring more money into jails, prisons and courts while cutting \$850 million from California's best substance treatment programs and houseless prevention programs. California's vulnerable communities deserve investment and compassionate care, not criminalization and punishment. The Los Angeles community wants and deserves safety.</p> <p>The Los Angeles community wants and deserves an end to LA's housing and mental health crisis. For decades, elected officials have used mass incarceration as a "solution" to these urgent issues. They've used our tax dollars to fund decrepit, infested, dangerous jails, which keep under-resourced community members in cages. It's not working. Prop 36 will only further harm and criminalize our communities. We cannot let that happen. Thank you, Board, for taking a stand on this crucial issue before it's too late.</p>
			Andre Barrios	<p>We all want to live in safe and stable neighborhoods, but instead of fixing homelessness, drug use, and crime, Prop 36 will make these issues worse by eliminating programs proven to turn people's lives around and wasting millions of dollars on mass incarceration instead.</p> <p>The big corporations, prison lobby, and right-wing interests behind Prop 36 are putting profit over the health of California's communities. Californians deserve real solutions that prevent crime and improve everyone's quality of life—like affordable housing, good jobs, and access to mental health and drug treatment.</p>
			Andrea Juarez	<p>The reason I am in support of opposing prop 36 is that it will cut funding from programs that are proven to help people with mental health issues or from falling into homelessness. It will also give prisons more money when that money should be given back to our community to help funds programs that also help reduce crime.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
9.		Favor	Anicia Santos	<p>THANK YOU, Supervisor Mitchell, for bringing forward this motion which declares the Board's opposition to the dangerous Proposition 36. Prop 36, which is on the ballot in November, proposes to extend "three strikes"-style tough-on-crime sentencing to low-level non-violent drug and theft offenses. It also would cost California taxpayers millions each year and strip funding from critical crime prevention programs that keep communities safe and healthy.</p> <p>We have seen what's working and what's not working, and we know in our communities Prop 36 will make things WORSE! It will not just make things worse but waste taxpayer money on strategies that we know are not effective and just rip apart our community. We want to be safe and we deserve to feel safe and Prop 36 does not make me feel safe!</p> <p>Prop 36 would strip \$100 million annually in funding for drug treatment, housing, and school-based programs—the very things proven to prevent crime in the first place. Because more Californians would languish in jail and prison on low-level offenses, Prop 36 would cost taxpayers an additional \$5 billion a year on top of the \$27 billion spent annually for jails, courts, and prisons across the state. Prop 36 is pretending to be a treatment-oriented initiative, but it's really a prison spending scam. Prop 36 would further criminalize California's vulnerable communities, pouring more money into jails, prisons and courts while cutting \$850 million from California's best substance treatment programs and houseless prevention programs. California's vulnerable communities deserve investment and compassionate care, not criminalization and punishment.</p> <p>The Los Angeles community wants and deserves an end to LA's housing and mental health crisis. For decades, elected officials have used mass incarceration as a "solution" to these urgent issues. They've used our tax dollars to fund decrepit, infested, dangerous jails, which keep under-resourced community members in cages. It's not working. Prop 36 will only further harm and criminalize our communities. We cannot let that happen. Thank you, Board, for taking a stand on this crucial issue before it's too late.</p>
			Astrid C Serrano	



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
9.		Favor	Becky Dennison	Venice Community Housing (VCH) is in favor of this motion to OPPOSE Proposition 36 on the November 2024 ballot. VCH owns and operates affordable and supportive housing throughout Supervisorial Districts 2 and 3, and our tenants and potential tenants would be incredibly harmed by Proposition 36. VCH strongly opposes criminalization of poverty and of Black and Brown communities, and Proposition 36 is a step backward in the long and overdue calls for care first approaches and ending mass incarceration and drug war policies. Los Angeles and California must focus on solutions to root causes of problems like homelessness and crime prevention, which will improve the quality of life for everyone. We urge all Supervisors to vote yes, and oppose Proposition 36.
			Carolina Goodman	We all want to live in safe and stable neighborhoods. But instead of fixing homelessness, drug use, and crime, Prop 36 will make these issues worse by eliminating programs proven to turn people's lives around and wasting millions of dollars on mass incarceration instead. Californians deserve real solutions that prevent crime and improve everyone's quality of life—like affordable housing, good jobs, and access to mental health and drug treatment. Vote YES to oppose Proposition 36. Thank you.
			Charles Vignola	Hello Board of Supervisors, my name is Charles Vignola, and I am writing on behalf of LARRP, the LA Regional Reentry Partnership. Proposition 36 is a dangerous and misguided initiative that threatens to revert our state back to ineffective, punitive policies. Crime rates have decreased in California over the past decade thanks to investments in wraparound support services, not incarceration. I applaud LA County for taking a stand against this harmful proposition and urge you to support this motion. Together, we can protect our most vulnerable populations and uphold the progress we've made. Thank you!



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
9.		Favor	Christopher Lodgson	<p>My name is Chris Lodgson with the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. I thank Supervisor Mitchell for bringing forth this motion to oppose Proposition 36.</p> <p>Proposition 36 is a dangerous rollback of successful criminal justice reforms. It would burden taxpayers with over \$26 billion in costs over the next decade while slashing essential funding for treatment, crime prevention, and victim services—a huge setback for community safety.</p> <p>California has saved nearly \$1 billion, which has been directed towards our communities, including organizations like ARC that provide job placement, housing, therapy, and critical crime prevention and reentry services that make our county and communities safer. Prop 36 threatens to take these programs and funding away while bringing back mass incarceration and the war on drugs without providing real solutions to crime, addiction, and homelessness.</p> <p>We should focus on supporting initiatives that promote safety through education, mental health services, and effective crime prevention, not on measures that perpetuate mass incarceration and waste taxpayer dollars. I urge the Board to oppose Proposition 36.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
			Claire Simonich	
			Cuauhtli Briseno	I am in favor of opposing Prop 36 because I have seen too many youth and young men in our communities end up in jail because of the lack of programs and services to support them. I don't think Prop 36 benefits people in my community of Boyle Heights.
			Daniel Jefferson	The Pilipino Workers Center supports this item and the overall opposition to Proposition 36. Proposition 36 not only moves California in the wrong direction for a better criminal justice system, but also strips \$100 million annually in funding from programs that actually addresses needs in the community. Pilipino Workers Center supports the continued reform of a justice system that disproportionately impacts Black and Brown communities and the much needed investment into issues such as housing and schools that support all communities.
			Elisa Coria	On board for prop 36 to ensure children understand the severity. And to have a better future
			Emanuel D Cruz	This prop won't address homelessness or end crime waves but rather send more people into the private prison complex. We must focus on crime prevention and rehabilitation and alleviate poverty by addressing the root causes that force individuals to commit theft like housing unaffordability and low wages. We must help our communities not over criminalize them.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
9.		Favor	Emily Caesar	I applaud the Board for raising this important issue and I urge support of the motion to oppose Proposition 36. This proposition will eliminate programs proven to improve public safety and will waste millions of dollars on mass incarceration. Californians deserve real solutions that prevent crime and improve everyone's quality of life—like affordable housing, good jobs, and access to mental health and drug treatment. Angelenos support your care first vision and this Proposition would undermine that vision, taking California backwards.
			Fatima Malik	Please see the attached letter. The League of Women Voters of Los Angeles County urges the Board of Supervisors to take an official position opposing Proposition 36. This aligns with the League of Women Voters of Los Angeles County's long-standing positions on criminal justice reform, equitable treatment for all residents, and protection of constitutional rights. By opposing Proposition 36, Los Angeles County will continue to invest in alternatives to incarceration that promote rehabilitation, reduce recidivism, and foster safer, more equitable communities.
			Gabriel Perez	I am in favor of opposing Prop 36 because more prisons and more police do not equal safer communities.
			Giovanni Frausto	I am in favor of opposing Prop 36. Prop 36 does not promote safety, or address root causes of crime. Evidence of Prop 47's success is that violent and property crime rates in California remain well below historical peaks. However, there is even longer standing evidence that sentencing enhancements like those proposed in Prop 36, do not promote safety. The vast majority of people exiting jail or prison are unemployed, have unstable housing, have no steady source of income, and find work difficult or nearly impossible to obtain after release. Studies repeatedly demonstrate that employment after incarceration is key in preventing recidivism and rebuilding stability and social networks that deter criminal activity. Unemployment is the single most important indicator of recidivism. The state has invested over \$200 million in the California Violence Intervention and Prevention grant over the past three years, which provides



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
9.		Favor	Giovanni Pesce	Hello Board of Supervisors, my name is Giovanni Pesce, and I am writing on behalf of LARRP, the LA Regional Reentry Partnership. Proposition 36 is a dangerous and misguided initiative that threatens to revert our state back to ineffective, punitive policies. Crime rates have decreased in California over the past decade thanks to investments in wraparound support services, not incarceration. I applaud LA County for taking a stand against this harmful proposition and urge you to support this motion. Together, we can protect our most vulnerable populations and uphold the progress we've made. Thank you!"
			Grace P Kim	
			greissy villa	I support the board's opposition to Prop 36 it takes away local fundings for our community. crime seems to be priority and i believe our children education should be as important.
			Isabella A Borgeson	
			Jada P Johnson	Prop 36, which is on the ballot in November, proposes to extend "three strikes"-style tough-on-crime sentencing to low-level non-violent drug and theft offenses. It also would cost California taxpayers millions each year and strip funding from critical crime prevention programs that keep communities safe and healthy. If someone gets caught possessing a small amount of drugs three or more times, they could go to jail or prison for up to three years. If someone gets arrested for low-level theft three or more times, including something as simple as returning a rental car late or stealing a pizza, they could go to jail or prison for up to three years. Prop 36 will strip \$100 million annually in funding for drug treatment, housing, and school-based programs—the very things proven to prevent crime in the first place. Because more Californians would languish in jail and prison on low-level offenses, Prop 36 would cost taxpayers an additional \$5 billion a year on top of the \$27 billion spent annually for jails, courts, and prisons across the state.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
9.		Favor	Jaime Flores	Dear Board of Supervisors, my name is Jaime Flores, and as a community advocate with a background in research, policy, and youth empowerment, I strongly oppose Proposition 36. This measure is a step backward toward mass incarceration, targeting low-level, non-violent offenses and stripping \$100 million from critical programs that actually reduce crime. By incarcerating people for minor offenses, Prop 36 will add \$5 billion to our already overburdened prison system. We must invest in plans and transformations that empower and uplift our communities. Let's reject Prop 36's false promises and invest in the transformations we want—one where our communities are healthy and full of opportunity for all. Thank you.
			Janie R Hodge	? "Hello Board of Supervisors, my name is (INSERT NAME), and I am writing on behalf of LARRP, the LA Regional Reentry Partnership. Proposition 36 is a dangerous and misguided initiative that threatens to revert our state back to ineffective, punitive policies. Crime rates have decreased in California over the past decade thanks to investments in wraparound support services, not incarceration. I applaud LA County for taking a stand against this harmful proposition and urge you to support this motion. Together, we can protect our most vulnerable populations and uphold the progress we've made. Thank you!"
			Jaylyn A Broadway	Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, My name is Jaylyn with the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. I thank Supervisor Mitchell for bringing forth this motion to oppose Proposition 36. Proposition 36 is a dangerous rollback of successful criminal justice reforms. It would burden taxpayers with over \$26 billion in costs over the next decade while slashing essential funding for treatment, crime prevention, and victim services—a huge setback for community safety. California has saved nearly \$1 billion, which has been directed towards our communities, including organizations like ARC that provide job placement, housing, therapy, and critical crime prevention and reentry services that make our county and communities safer. Prop 36 threatens to take these programs and funding away while bringing back mass incarceration and the war on drugs without providing real solutions to crime, addiction, and homelessness. We should focus on supporting initiatives that promote safety through education, mental health services, and effective crime prevention, not on measures that perpetuate mass incarceration and waste taxpayer dollars. I urge the Board to oppose Proposition 36, Thank you!
			Jemima Lainez	I want less focus on prison and more on local help with affordable housing.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
9.		Favor	Joanne Russell	<p>Hello, my name is Joanne Russell. Let's Make It Happen is joining with LARRP, the LA Regional Reentry Partnership to ask the Board of Supervisors to Oppose Proposition 36 on the Nov 2024 state ballot. Prop 36 is a dangerous and misguided initiative that will 'take us back' reverting our State to the formerly ineffective, punitive 'war on crime' policies designed to strip the formerly incarcerated of opportunities for humane reclamation of freedom and to honestly improve their quality of life. I applaud LA County's efforts to support the affected communities and residents by vigorously supporting the implementation and stewarding the mandates of Prop 47. As a result Crime rates have decreased in California over the past decade thanks to investments in wraparound support services, not incarceration.</p> <p>We commend the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors for taking a stand against this harmful Proposition 36 and urge you to support this motion. Together, we can protect our most vulnerable populations and uphold the progress we've made. In addition, opposing Prop 36 would avoid encumbering an additional financial burden on our California State budget as Prop 36 would require allocations to support increasing carceral punishment, again.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
			Jorge Briseno	I believe we need to put our dollars to support our youth through programs and services and not to push people into prisons by imposing harsher sentencing.
			Jules Yun	If passed, Proposition 36 will be devastating to our communities by reclassifying misdemeanors and petty theft as felonies, which will inevitably put more of our community members behind bars and take more funding out of our communities for prisons. We support the Board of Supervisors in opposing Proposition 36.
			Justin D Cox	Sending drug addicts back to our prison system. Is not the right answer . We all know California prisons are a business. The state receives \$120,000 a year for each inmate. We don't need to go back to warehousing people.
			Kaley Ortega	I support the board's opposition to Prop 36 because it takes funding from programs as well for mental health treatment that has been proven to increase safety by reducing crime and homelessness. California want solutions that include rehabilitation and treatment, but Prop 36 expands prisons at the expense of alternatives.
			Karla B Zombro	NO on Prop 36-- we need leadership and REAL solutions. Help protect us from a return to mass incarceration and don't let them cut the hundreds of millions of dollars in prevention and intervention programs we stand to lose if this unnecessary and draconian measure passes.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
9.		Favor	Kasandra Cordova	I support opposing prop 36 because i do not agree in cutting 750 million in mental health resources and rehabilitation programs over the next couple of years. I hope to see the BOS also vote against funneling funding straight into prisons.
			Kent G Mendoza	Hi Board of Supervisors, Thank You Supervisors Holly J. Mitchell for bringing this motion to the board. On behalf of the Anti-Recidivism Coalition (ARC), I'm here to speak in support of item 9: LA County officially taking a stance on opposing CA propositions 36. We strongly urge you all to oppose this misguided proposition that will role us back in time to ineffective solutions to public safety issues that rely on punishment, undermines social economic realities and disproportionately impacts vulnerable communities. This proposition will bring up incarceration rate across county's, create more burden for county's to address the root causes of incarceration, and continue to waste millions of dollars on historically known ineffective tough on crime solutions. LA County has to take a stance in opposing Prop 36, especially since we see the good work and tons of money that has been been saved and redirected to effected services in our communities from prop 47 since 2014. LA County is the biggest county and not opposing prop 36 will show and reflect that we do not care about saving tax payers money and public safety. LA care, care too much not to say no on Prop 36. I urge you to pass this motion.
			Kevin Perez	
			Kitty Twu	Please don't oppose Proposition 36. Proposition 36 will restore safety to our communities.
			Lidia Hernandez	Apoyo que la mesa se oponga a la Proposicion 36 porque la propuesta le va a quitar fondos a programas de rehabilitacion y apoyo psicologico. Gracias.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
9.		Favor	Lisa Harrison Dillihunt	<p>My name is Lisa from Bellflower. I strongly support of Agenda Item #9 - a motion to oppose Prop 36. Instead of funding programs for drug treatment and harm prevention, or services for survivors of harm, Prop 36 removes funding from programs that have proven to reduce recidivism, support survivors, and prevent harm from happening in the first place. I work for the school district, and this is a direct attack against who I work for and why I work in the school district. School violence is present in our school system, even at the elementary school level.</p> <p>Prop 36 will reduce funding for school-based violence prevention programs and reduce access to and resources for drug treatment programs. Prop 36 will result in longer prison sentences, increasing the prison population and the state's prison spending. The California Legislative Analyst's office estimates that criminal justice costs related to court workload and increased prison and jail populations would increase by tens of millions of dollars EVERY year - at minimum. We need more investments in our communities, not more investment in police, prisons, and policies that harm Black, Brown and poor communities. Prop 36 will not invest in people and will harm our communities. Please support Supervisor Mitchell's motion to oppose proposition 36. Thank you.</p>
			Luz Castro	
			Lynn Stransky	<p>Prop 36 is a terrible move that would roll back a decade of progress in criminal justice reform. We do not need to re-up the penalties for theft, and this measure will do nothing to help with the Fentanyl crisis or to subvert retail theft. We know that petty crimes like retail theft are SURVIVAL CRIMES, which means that people are only committing these crimes because we, as a society, have failed to provide adequate support to help people get on their feet. Prop 36 is bad, and we should not adopt it!!!!</p>
			Matthew D Hing	<p>Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors,</p> <p>Hope that you are all having a good afternoon. My name is Matthew Hing, and I am an MD/PhD student at UCLA. As both a concerned citizen of Los Angeles and resident of Supervisor Horvath's district as well as someone who works and cares directly for our county's most vulnerable patients at Harbor-UCLA, Olive View, and other county health settings, I am writing to register my personal and professional opposition to Prop 36 and my SUPPORT of Supervisor Mitchell's motion. Rather than bring services that will continue to improve the health and wellbeing of our Los Angeles communities, Prop 36 deepens the criminalization of poor residents of color and wastes valuable dollars and resources on incarcerating measures rather than proven medical and public health approaches to public safety.</p> <p>Although there are multiple reasons why myself and other health workers feel compelled to raise our voices against Prop 36, I want to center on the</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

				<p>proposition's potential health harms and the ways in which it takes further away from the evidence-based approaches outlined in the BOS-endorsed Alternatives to Incarceration Roadmap (ceo.lacounty.gov/ati-documents-and-resources/) that address the linkages between health, public safety, poverty, and homelessness. As overwhelming medical and public health literature demonstrates (see Michael Massoglia's and William Alex Pridemore's 2015 piece in the Annual Review of Sociology on "Incarceration and Health as well as Wildeman's and Wang's 2017 review of the literature in the esteemed medical journal the Lancet), incarceration and longer sentencing - as intended by Prop 36 - introduces and exacerbates health disparities for those detained. This occurs through increased exposure to infectious disease, increased allostatic load related to the heightened stress of imprisonment that can lead to conditions like heart disease and high blood pressure, and substantial evidence on the detrimental impact of incarceration on mental health and addiction. As put by Drs. Wildeman and Wang, beyond the impact on the detained individual "The emerging literature on the family and community effects of mass incarceration points to negative health impacts on the female partners and children of incarcerated men, and raises concerns that excessive incarceration could harm entire communities and thus might partly underlie health disparities both in the USA and between the USA and other developed countries."</p> <p>Prop 36 will not solve the addiction and the overdose crisis, nor will it address homelessness or petty crime. What it will do is heighten racial disparities in arrest and sentencing (even though studies show that white people shoplift more, Black people are three times more likely to be arrested for retail theft) and in turn heighten racial disparities in health.</p> <p>As a healthcare worker, I see alongside my fellow providers the health harms of mass incarceration in our county and want to see our Board of Supervisors improve investments in health and safety - not waste necessary public dollars on measures like Prop 36 that actually divest from public health-promoting programs like drug treatment, homelessness prevention, victims services, and K-12 school. Please support Supervisor Mitchell's motion so that we can put resources where they actually make a difference in people's health and safety, and not into false paths like Prop 36 that only retrench us in criminalizing past measures that have been proven to fail. Thank you for your time and attention.</p> <p>Sincerely, Matthew Hing</p>
			<p>Maya Mackey</p>	<p>Prop 36 has some good intentions behind it but the good does not outweigh the bad. This proposition needs several revisions as the punishment does not match the crimes listed. Placing people in prison for stealing \$950 worth of merchandise but only letting drug dealers off with a "warning they can be charged with death" is absurd. This proposition would place the wrong people on prison. I strongly oppose this initiative</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Melba Martinez	
Meredith Gallen	
Mirca O Garcia	I support on opposing Proposition 36, because it takes away funding from essential programs that support our community. Cutting funding from these programs will hurt our community, and will increase high rates of incarcerations in neighborhoods of color.
Mynor Godoy	We need more funding for treatment, rehabilitation and reintegration programs. Prop 36 is trying to take us backwards and cuts the vital programs we need to help keep our communities safe.
Norma Palacios	On behalf of the Drug Policy Alliance, please find enclosed our letter urging the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to oppose Prop 36.
Olimpia Blanco-Zuniga	I support the LA County Board of Supervisors' opposition to Proposition 36 because it undermines necessary reforms that ensure fair treatment and rehabilitation opportunities for individuals in our justice system. We must prioritize policies that address the root causes of crime, not measures that disproportionately harm vulnerable communities while diverting 750 million dollars of funding from existing programs that are proven to work.
Pamela Thompson	<p>My name is Pamela Thompson and I would like to change from 1989 to 2018, I spent time in and out of prison. That makes it seem like I was continuously in and out of prison. See below:</p> <p>My name is Pamela Thompson and I served two prison terms, 1989-1993 and 1994-2018. The first time I was released from prison, I felt hopeless. I had no home, no job and no resources to meet my needs because of my criminal record. It wasn't until 2014, with programs funded by Prop 47 that my life truly began to change.</p> <p>Through the New Way of Life program, which was funded by Prop 47, I found the support I desperately needed. They helped me secure housing and provided job training, allowing me to start a new chapter in my life. Now, I work as a life coach at the Anti-Recidivism Coalition (ARC) where I mentor people navigating the reentry barriers that I once faced. I was just promoted and I'm so proud of where I am today.</p> <p>The truth is, reentry programs saved my life. These programs work to get people out of the revolving door of prisons. From 2019 to 2023, 90% of people in Los Angeles who received diversion and reentry services weren't convicted of any new crimes. Prop 36 threatens to cut funding for these crucial programs. Without them, I wouldn't be where I am today, and countless others like me may not get the second chance they deserve. It's crucial that we vote no on Prop 36 to vote for solutions that work instead of a return to mass incarceration.</p>
Rashun Aljuwani	Proposition 36 does not positively impact the individuals suffering from homelessness or drug use, studies have shown that increased punishment and longer-tenured sentences only promote mental deterioration and worsen the issue that is supposed to be being addressed. Speaking as a previously incarcerated individual time spent behind bars negatively affects mental



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	health and places them in a worse position when they are released.
Reed Lenhart	Prop 36 will not make our communities safer. Taking away funding from services to victims of crimes, school based prevention programs, and other programs that strengthen our community and instead funding new prisons, will NOT improve California. Misdemeanors are illegal already, more felony charges for non-violent offenses all but insure our states recidivism rate will increase.
rita g marquez	i am in favor of the board opposing proposition 36 because this proposition is an investment in incarceration when that is the least effective method to address the issues plaguing our streets in LA County. We need funds that provide housing, job opportunities, healthcare, quality education, enrichment for youth. through after school programs, mental health services, and first responders that don't default to violence when all that people need is care and support. proposition 36 is a flagrant attempt by the prison industry and their billionaire investors to exploit the struggle that the people in LA county are experiencing and profit by putting people behind bars and fear mongering our communities who crave safety. we know what keeps us safe and that's services and care not handcuffs and cages.
Saun Hough	<p>We all want to live in safe and stable neighborhoods. We want our neighborhoods and downtowns to thrive, and we want our neighbors to get help if they're struggling with homelessness, mental health, or addiction. However, instead of fixing homelessness, drug use, and crime, Prop 36 will make these issues worse by eliminating programs proven to turn people's lives around and wasting millions of dollars on mass incarceration instead.</p> <p>Our current approach to the overdose crisis is failing. People leaving jail or prison today are many times more likely to overdose than if they had never been incarcerated. Please don't fall for Prop 36's false promises. It will strip \$100 million a year from services for drug use, mental illness, homelessness, and more , making it even harder for people who need it to get help for their addiction.</p> <p>Instead of harsh punishment and longer sentences under Prop 36, we should choose "Care First" solutions that are proven to work. In LA County alone, these programs have served more than 10,000 people with excellent results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ten percent of people in the county's programs faced a new criminal conviction, compared to almost 42 percent of people coming out of state prison. One LA program reduced re-arrests by 17 percent, which is 11 percent better than the average reentry program. o In another LA program, 86 percent of participants left the program with housing, and more than half found employment. <p>For these reasons, I support this motion and ask the LA County Board of Supervisors to OPPOSE Proposition 36.</p>
Sergio Hernandez	We should oppose proposition 36 as we see that punishment instead of care does not improve our communities. Punitive measures worsen our quality of



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	life where we all deserve much better.
Shakeel Syed	<p>Re: No on Prop 36 9/23/24 To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on California Proposition 36, Drug and Theft Crime Penalties and Treatment-Mandated Felonies Initiative (2024).</p> <p>South Asian Network (SAN) is a community-based, nonprofit organization that has provided direct services to the South Asian community in Southern California for 34 years. Our mission is rooted in community empowerment through our four departments that offer assistance in gender-based violence, community healthcare access, mental and emotional health support, and civil rights through culturally specific services.</p> <p>SAN is writing in support of Supervisor Mitchell's motion to oppose Prop 36. As a community-based organization that assists low-income communities through our services. Prop 36 strips \$100 Million of funding from critical crime prevention programs that keep communities safe and healthy. These programs are intended to provide the community with drug treatment, housing, and school-based programs—the very things proven to prevent crime in the first place.</p> <p>Through its proposal to extend “three strikes”-style tough-on-crime sentencing to low-level non-violent drug and theft offenses. Prop 36 will increase racial disparities in prisons, and homelessness and waste money on mass incarceration. Prop 36 would cost taxpayers an additional \$5 billion a year on top of the \$27 billion spent annually for jails, courts, and prisons across the state. This money should be put back into the community to help rehabilitate those struggling with drug addiction, homelessness, and the incarcerated. For the reasons shared above, the South Asian Network urges you to support Supervisor Mitchell's motion to vote NO on Proposition 36.</p> <p>Sincerely, Shakeel S. Shakeel Syed Executive Director South Asian Network</p>
Soila Rodriguez	I am in favor of the boards decision to oppose prop 36, we need more money for mental health programs and preventative care. Stop spending money on prisons.
Steven Wood	I support the Board Of Supervisors opposition to Prop. 36, because non violent criminals deserve the opportunity to return to our communities without facing major hardship and penalties. The days of indiscriminate mass incarceration have set our state back. This money should be taken out of the prison system and returned to benefit working families, education, and public services. Please oppose Prop. 36! Thank you!
terissa m marcum	Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, My name is Terissa Marcum with the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. I thank Supervisor Mitchell for bringing forth this motion to oppose Proposition 36. Proposition 36 is a dangerous rollback of successful criminal justice reforms. It would burden taxpayers with over \$26 billion in costs over the next decade



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			<p>while slashing essential funding for treatment, crime prevention, and victim services—a huge setback for community safety. California has saved nearly \$1 billion, which has been directed towards our communities, including organizations like ARC that provide job placement, housing, therapy, and critical crime prevention and reentry services that make our county and communities safer. Prop 36 threatens to take these programs and funding away while bringing back mass incarceration and the war on drugs without providing real solutions to crime, addiction, and homelessness. We should focus on supporting initiatives that promote safety through education, mental health services, and effective crime prevention, not on measures that perpetuate mass incarceration and waste taxpayer dollars. I urge the Board to oppose Proposition 36, Thank You</p>
		Tyrique Shipp	<p>Hello Board of supervisors, My name is Tyrique Shipp, and I'm the Advocacy and Community Organizing Associate with the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. I am here today to express strong support for item 9: opposition to Proposition 36 Proposition 36 seeks to roll back key provisions of Proposition 47 by reclassifying certain drug offenses as felonies, increasing penalties, and extending sentences. These changes are projected to cost California taxpayers \$26 billion over the next five years, due to higher incarceration rates and the need for expanded prison facilities. Since the passage of Proposition 47 in 2014, California has saved \$1 billion, funds that have been reinvested into community-based programs like job placement, housing, therapy, and reentry services provided by ARC. These programs have contributed to a 50% reduction in the state's prison population, demonstrating that community-driven solutions are effective in improving public safety. Prop 36 relies on fear-mongering to push for harsher penalties, but research shows that increasing sentences does little to address the root causes of crime, addiction, and homelessness. Instead, this initiative threatens to return us to an era of mass incarceration without providing real solutions. Incarceration has rarely been the best path to rehabilitation and has often caused more harm than good. We urge you to oppose proposition 36 and continue to focus care and not on punishment.</p>
		Wendell L Taylor	<p>I support the LA County Board if Supervisors' opposition to Proposition 36 because it undermines necessary reforms that ensure fair treatment and rehabilitation opportunities for individuals in our Favor justice system. We must prioritize policies that address the root causes of crime, not measures that disproportionately harm vulnerable communities while diverting 750 million dollars of funding from existing programs that are proven to work.</p>
		Wendy M Silva	<p>I support the board's opposition to Prop 36 because it takes away funding for mental health programs that are proven to help out individuals. We don't want money to go to jails but it should go to programs.</p>
	Oppose	Aaliyah Evans	<p>I strongly oppose Prop 36, as it aims to turn misdemeanors back into felonies, pushing us further toward mass incarceration. This would undo the progress made with Prop 47 and disproportionately affect our communities. We need policies that promote rehabilitation, not mass incarceration.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Aletha Perkins	Because it not right.
Annie Hsu	Please DO NOT oppose Proposition 36. Our society's safety is at risk and needs to be restored! Thank you!
Ariadna M Garay	There are enough prisons as is. There are more important matters that need funding. Prisons don't prevent crime.
Chuck Sun	Please DO NOT oppose Proposition 36, our society's safety is at risk and needs to be restored! Thank you..
Cindy Chen	I do not want you to oppose prop 36. It makes me sad to see innocent people get hurts and unable to protect themselves and their families from criminals. The law should be made to protect innocent people not the criminals.
Iretha Warmsley	No on proposition 36
james e brown	because I want to put more schools after school programs homelessness
jerrisha I knox	I oppose because it will effect me as well as other people in the community
Jessica Rath	<p>9. Oppose Proposition 36 on the November 2024 General Election Ballot IN FAVOR</p> <p>THANK YOU, Supervisor Mitchell, for bringing forward this motion which declares the Board's opposition to the dangerous Proposition 36. Prop 36, which is on the ballot in November, proposes to extend "three strikes"-style tough-on-crime sentencing to low-level non-violent drug and theft offenses. It also would cost California taxpayers millions each year and strip funding from critical crime prevention programs that keep communities safe and healthy.</p> <p>Prop 36 would strip \$100 million annually in funding for drug treatment, housing, and school-based programs—the very things proven to prevent crime in the first place. Because more Californians would languish in jail and prison on low-level offenses, Prop 36 would cost taxpayers an additional \$5 billion a year on top of the \$27 billion spent annually for jails, courts, and prisons across the state. Prop 36 is pretending to be a treatment-oriented initiative, but it's really a prison spending scam. Prop 36 would further criminalize California's vulnerable communities, pouring more money into jails, prisons and courts while cutting \$850 million from California's best substance treatment programs and houseless prevention programs. California's vulnerable communities deserve investment and compassionate care, not criminalization and punishment. The Los Angeles community wants and deserves safety.</p> <p>The Los Angeles community wants and deserves an end to LA's housing and mental health crisis. For decades, elected officials have used mass incarceration as a "solution" to these urgent issues. They've used our tax dollars to fund decrepit, infested, dangerous jails, which keep under-resourced community members in cages. It's not working. Prop 36 will only further harm and criminalize our communities. We cannot let that happen. Thank you, Board, for taking a stand on this crucial issue before it's too late.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

				<p>This message was sent by Jessica Rath via ActionButton, on behalf of JusticeLA. Please reply to Jessica Rath at jessicarath@mac.com.</p>
			John M Cruikshank	<p>On behalf of the City of Rancho Palos Verdes, we are writing to express our opposition to the motion by Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell to oppose Proposition 36, which will be considered in the upcoming November 2024 General Election.</p> <p>As a community committed to the safety and well-being of our residents, we believe that Proposition 36 presents an opportunity to address the ongoing challenges posed by repeat offenders and persistent criminal behavior, particularly with regard to drug possession and theft. We understand that the fiscal impact on counties is a concern; however, we believe that the long-term benefits of reducing recidivism through targeted sentencing enhancements will ultimately lead to safer communities.</p> <p>We stand in support of policies that protect public safety and believe that Proposition 36 will help address the negative impact that repeat offenses have on our neighborhoods. By holding habitual offenders accountable, we can better allocate resources toward rehabilitation efforts that focus on individuals who truly want to break the cycle of crime.</p> <p>We urge the Board to reject the motion opposing Proposition 36 and instead support efforts that prioritize both public safety and rehabilitation. You are our county representatives, and it appears that right now 70% of the voters are in favor of Proposition 36. Do the right thing and oppose this motion.</p>
			Jose Hernandez	<p>I oppose Proposition 36 because it cuts funding from schools, rehabilitation, and mental health and gives that money to prisons</p>
			Jose A Figueroa	<p>Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors,</p> <p>My name is Jose Figueroa with the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. I thank Supervisor Mitchell for bringing forth this motion to oppose Proposition 36. Proposition 36 is a dangerous rollback of successful criminal justice reforms. It would burden taxpayers with over \$26 billion in costs over the next decade while slashing essential funding for treatment, crime prevention, and victim services—a huge setback for community safety.</p> <p>California has saved nearly \$1 billion, which has been directed towards our communities, including organizations like ARC that provide job placement, housing, therapy, and critical crime prevention and reentry services that make our county and communities safer. Prop 36 threatens to take these programs and funding away while bringing back mass incarceration and the war on drugs without providing real solutions to crime, addiction, and homelessness. We should focus on supporting initiatives that promote safety through education, mental health services, and effective crime prevention, not on measures that perpetuate mass incarceration and waste taxpayer dollars. I urge the Board to oppose Proposition 36.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	Jose Figueroa
Jose Cosme Z Sandoval	Hello Board of Supervisors, my name is Jose Cosme Sandoval, and I am writing on behalf of LARRP, the LA Regional Reentry Partnership. Proposition 36 is a dangerous and misguided initiative that threatens to revert our state back to ineffective, punitive policies. Crime rates have decreased in California over the past decade thanks to investments in wraparound support services, not incarceration. I applaud LA County for taking a stand against this harmful proposition and urge you to support this motion. Together, we can protect our most vulnerable populations and uphold the progress we've made. Thank you!
Josh Landa	We need to fund schools not prisons. We know 36 will only hurt our communities!
Judith Bahena	The reason I am opposing is because it does not benefit in any way our community and instead it can destroy us as a community
Kaitlyn Lavichant	
Kally Hsiao	
Katrina Yanez	Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, My name is Katrina Yanez with the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. I thank Supervisor Mitchell for bringing forth this motion to oppose Proposition 36. Proposition 36 is a dangerous rollback of successful criminal justice reforms. It would burden taxpayers with over \$26 billion in costs over the next decade while slashing essential funding for treatment, crime prevention, and victim services—a huge setback for community safety. California has saved nearly \$1 billion, which has been directed towards our communities, including organizations like ARC that provide job placement, housing, therapy, and critical crime prevention and reentry services that make our county and communities safer. Prop 36 threatens to take these programs and funding away while bringing back mass incarceration and the war on drugs without providing real solutions to crime, addiction, and homelessness. We should focus on supporting initiatives that promote safety through education, mental health services, and effective crime prevention, not on measures that perpetuate mass incarceration and waste taxpayer dollars. I urge the Board to oppose Proposition 36, Thank you, Katrina Yanez
Knoel Westbrook-Anderson	Im voting NO because prop 36 it take away from mental homes, rehabs, and trauma recovery.
kuochieh wu	
LaKisha G Camese	
linda lard	because we need prevention and intervention programs to continue.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Marvin Gulley

Hello Board of Supervisors, my name is Marvin Gulley , and I am writing on behalf of The Anti-Recidivism Coalition . Proposition 36 is a dangerous and misguided initiative that threatens to revert our state back to ineffective, punitive policies. Crime rates have decreased in California over the past decade thanks to investments in wraparound support services, not incarceration. I applaud LA County for taking a stand against this harmful proposition and urge you to support this motion. Together, we can protect our most vulnerable populations and uphold the progress we've made. Thank you!

Matt Capelouto

Dear Los Angeles Board of Supervisors,

I write to you today not only as a father but as an advocate for public safety, justice, and meaningful change in our fight against the drug-related deaths ravaging our state. My daughter, Alexandra Capelouto, was just 20 years old when she tragically lost her life due to fentanyl poisoning. She was a bright, compassionate young woman with her whole life ahead of her, but it was cut short by a counterfeit pill made with this deadly substance. Since her death, I have fought tirelessly for accountability and laws that would prevent other families from experiencing this unimaginable pain.

One of those efforts is Proposition 36, which includes a critical component: Alexandra's Law. This law aims to hold drug dealers accountable by providing an admonishment—similar to the Watson Advisement given to DUI offenders—that if they continue selling deadly drugs like fentanyl, they can be charged with homicide if their actions result in death. Proposition 36 seeks to address not just the fentanyl epidemic but also the intertwined issues of drug addiction, homelessness, and retail theft.

Today, I oppose the motion by Supervisors Holly Mitchell and Hilda Solis to block Proposition 36, as it not only undermines public safety but also perpetuates the very issues it claims to address.

Addressing Misrepresentations about Prop 36

There has been significant misinformation surrounding Prop 36. Critics, including some members of the LA Board of Supervisors, argue that it is a return to "mass incarceration" and the "failed war on drugs." This could not be further from the truth.

Prop 36 is not about locking people up indiscriminately. It is about accountability for those who knowingly distribute lethal substances. We are not targeting people suffering from addiction or small-time offenders; we are focusing on those who intentionally profit from poisoning others. Fentanyl has become the leading cause of death for Americans aged 18 to 45. In California alone, we lead the nation in fentanyl-related deaths. Yet, there are no adequate laws to hold dealers accountable when their actions result in death. How can we let that stand?

If Proposition 36 had been in place years ago, lives like Alexandra's could have been saved. By warning drug dealers with a clear legal admonishment,



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Alexandra's Law would have created a layer of deterrence and allowed law enforcement to bring justice to those who knowingly distribute deadly drugs. Instead of focusing on stopping the rise of fentanyl-related deaths, some of our elected leaders are choosing to politicize the issue.

The Failure of Status Quo Policies

The status quo approach, represented by Supervisors Mitchell and Solis' motion, has failed us. While Supervisor Solis and others champion their "record-breaking drug seizures," these statistics ring hollow when families like mine are still burying their loved ones due to fentanyl poisoning. Record drug seizures are not a measure of success when California continues to lead the nation in fentanyl deaths.

Proposition 36 is a comprehensive solution. It acknowledges that our state's drug crisis is multifaceted, impacting everything from homelessness to retail theft, and requires both preventative and punitive measures. While it holds drug dealers accountable, it also offers support for individuals caught in the cycle of addiction by expanding access to treatment and rehabilitation programs.

It's clear that current policies have not been effective in curbing the drug crisis, especially the rise of fentanyl deaths. Those opposing Prop 36, like Supervisors Mitchell and Solis, offer no real solutions—just rhetoric that repeats the failures of the past.

Addressing the Root Causes, Not Just Symptoms

At its core, Proposition 36 is about addressing the root causes of the problems plaguing our state. Homelessness, drug addiction, and crime are all deeply intertwined, and Prop 36 recognizes that a solution must be holistic. The motion to oppose Prop 36 by Supervisors Mitchell and Solis disregards the real impact these issues are having on our communities.

Without intervention, our cities will continue to suffer. Homelessness will rise, drug addiction will go untreated, and public safety will deteriorate further. Proposition 36 offers a path forward, one that balances accountability with compassion. It offers resources for addiction treatment, mental health services, and rehabilitation, while ensuring that those who prey on vulnerable individuals by dealing deadly drugs like fentanyl face justice.

How can we ignore the consequences of inaction? As the father of a victim, I have seen firsthand the devastating effects of these issues. I have also seen how the lack of appropriate legal frameworks allows those responsible for spreading this deadly epidemic to escape accountability.

Alexandra's Law: A Lifesaving Measure

When Alexandra's Law was first introduced in the California Legislature four years ago, it could have saved countless lives had it been passed. Instead, it was stalled by the Public Safety Committees, and the death toll from fentanyl continued to rise.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	<p>Alexandra's Law is a simple yet powerful measure. By providing an official admonishment to drug offenders, it sends a clear message: if you continue selling lethal substances like fentanyl, you will be held responsible for the consequences. This is not about punishing addiction; it is about holding accountable those who make a business of death. The Watson Admonishment for DUI offenders has been proven to reduce repeat offenses and save lives. There is no reason why a similar approach for drug dealers cannot have the same effect.</p> <p>The failure to pass Alexandra's Law in the past is a tragedy. Its inclusion in Proposition 36 gives California another chance to do the right thing—before more families suffer the same fate as mine.</p> <p>A Call to Action for the LA Board of Supervisors I urge the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors to reconsider their position. The motion to oppose Proposition 36 is not just a mistake—it is a profound disservice to the people of California. We cannot afford to continue down the same path of inaction and ineffective policies.</p> <p>Fentanyl is killing thousands of Californians, and we need laws that reflect the gravity of this crisis. Proposition 36, and specifically Alexandra's Law, offers a balanced, humane, and necessary approach to tackling the most pressing public safety issues facing our state.</p> <p>I implore you, as elected leaders, to listen to the voices of the families who have lost loved ones. I implore you to act on behalf of the communities you serve, who are counting on you to protect them from this epidemic.</p> <p>For the sake of every family who has suffered from this crisis and for the future safety of Californians, I ask you to oppose the motion against Proposition 36 and support a safer, more accountable future for our state.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Matt Capelouto Father of Alexandra Capelouto Proponent of Alexandra's Law and Advocate for Proposition 36</p>
Michael G Reyes	not a way to stop all of the crime. We need to enforce the laws on the books and punish criminals.
Monisha Parker	<p>Dear Los Angeles County Residents,</p> <p>As we approach the upcoming election, I want to take a moment to address a critical issue that affects us all: Proposition 36. It has come to my attention that Supervisor Mitchell is urging residents to vote against this important measure. I believe it is essential for you to understand not just the implications of this proposition, but also the motivations behind some of the opposition.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			<p>Proposition 36 is a step towards addressing the challenges our community faces—issues like crime, homelessness, overdoses, and retail theft. These are not just statistics; they represent real people and real struggles we encounter on a daily basis. If you care about the future of our neighborhoods and want to foster a safer, healthier environment, I urge you to support Proposition 36.</p> <p>Voting against this measure does not indicate satisfaction with our current conditions; rather, it seems to accept a trajectory that could lead to even greater issues in the near future. A 'no' vote could mean a community where crime becomes more prevalent, where struggling individuals face even greater hardships, and where our beloved neighborhoods become less safe for everyone.</p> <p>If you genuinely want to create positive change in Los Angeles County, you must consider the long-term effects of your vote. Proposition 36 is designed to bring about that change. It offers us a chance to fight back against the problems we currently face and to make a collective statement that we will not stand idly by as things worsen.</p> <p>I implore you to educate yourself about the details of Proposition 36, talk to your neighbors, and engage in discussions about how we can build a better future together. Let's not let fear or misinformation dictate our choices at the ballot box. Instead, let's stand united in support of a proposal that aims to improve our communities for all.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider the future of our great county. Together, we can pave the way for a better tomorrow. Sincerely, Monisha Parker</p>
	Ngee Kon		Prop 47 has destroyed safety in our communities. Prop 36 will try to fix it. We want law and order. Please vote Yes for Prop 36. Thank you.
	Patricia Livingston		Because its not right making petty theft a felony and they are trying change prop 47
	Paul Chang		
	Paul Little		<p>The Board of Directors of the Pasadena Chamber of Commerce supports Proposition 36. Prop 36 creates effective tools to hold individuals accountable by increasing penalties for smash-and-grab crime and creating tougher penalties and better accountability for repeat retail theft offenders. It also allows stolen property values from multiple thefts to be combined, countering tactics by career thieves who steal repeatedly to avoid harsher penalties.</p> <p>Proposition 36 makes commonsense and responsible changes to current laws that will help reduce drug addiction and theft problems, which have afflicted our communities and neighborhoods for far too long. Prop 36 helps</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			<p>compel more people with serious drug addictions into drug and mental health treatment and holds hard drug dealers and career thieves accountable.</p>
		<p>Paul c burt</p>	<p>Does Holly Mitchell harbor so much disdain for, that she completely disregards the law abiding, taxpaying voters of Los Angeles County? Four Democrat Senior State Assembly Members and five leading Democratic State Senators have all publicly come out in favor of prop 36, but the Democrat leadership in favor of Prop 36 isn't limited to State officials. Even San Francisco Mayor London Breed supports Prop 36. Again, Ms. Mitchell's ideology - when it comes to Public Safety - certainly runs opposed to those voters in her District, not to mention millions of Los Angeles County voters in the other four Districts who support Prop 36.</p> <p>To come out NOT in support of Prop 36, causes one to wonder if maybe Ms. Mitchell is in favor of street takeovers, the thrashing of 7-Eleven Stores, and the mass and blatant takeover-robberies of Walmart Stores and Target Stores - to name but two - all of which must stop! - - And whether Ms. Mitchell likes it or not, it's going to happen as the support for Prop 36 is overwhelmingly in favor.</p> <p>Here's a list of all stores that have closed across California due to crime between Summer, 2022 and Spring, 2024: : : : :</p> <p>7-ELEVEN: In July 2022, the company advised several of its California locations in the Los Angeles area to change their operating hours to increase customer safety amidst a rash of crime.</p> <p>WHOLE FOODS: In May 2023, the supermarket chain announced the closure of its "flagship" branch in downtown San Francisco, which it had opened only 13 months before in March 2022.</p> <p>NORDSTROM: In the same month, Nordstrom announced the closure of both of its stores in downtown San Francisco, blaming the changing dynamics in the city market over the past few years.</p> <p>TARGET: In September 2023, Target announced the closure of several of its stores in California—including in Oakland and San Francisco—over concerns of a rise in retail theft.</p> <p>STARBUCKS and SUBWAY: In November 2023, two Starbucks stores and a Subway restaurant located on Hegenberger Road and 98th Avenue closed their doors due to car break-ins targeting their customers.</p> <p>DENNY'S: In January 2024, a Denny's, which had been on on Hegenberger Road in Oakland for 54 years, closed after being hit by a series of crimes.</p> <p>IN-N-OUT BURGER: In the same month, In-N-Out Burger announced its only Oakland store was shutting its doors, citing threat to the safety of its employees and its customers.</p> <p>MACY'S: In February 2024, Macy's announced the closure of one its most iconic locations, the store in Union Square, San Francisco, due to a rise in shoplifting.</p> <p>TACO BELL: In March 2024, the company announced it has suspended indoor dining in four of its restaurants in Oakland, and limited it in a fifth store to customers making contactless payments.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	Robin Line	we need to support prevention and intervention not prisons
	rocio ortiz	no porque no esta dande los sevicio comida
	Ryan Shiao	
	Ryan A Vienna	Members of my community are seriously concerned for their safety related to drug offenders, property crime, and homelessness. A general feeling of lack of accountability and seriousness is felt by many, especially those who have been victims of crime. Please consider supporting Prop 36 or taking no or a neutral position on this issue that will be voted on by the voters at-large.
	Tim Hepburn	
	Victor E Reyes	
	Walter G Landaverde-Ramirez	<p>Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors,</p> <p>My name is Walter Ramirez with the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. I thank Supervisor Mitchell for bringing forth this motion to oppose Proposition 36. Proposition 36 is a dangerous rollback of successful criminal justice reforms. It would burden taxpayers with over \$26 billion in costs over the next decade while slashing essential funding for treatment, crime prevention, and victim services—a huge setback for community safety.</p> <p>California has saved nearly \$1 billion, which has been directed towards our communities, including organizations like ARC that provide job placement, housing, therapy, and critical crime prevention and reentry services that make our county and communities safer. Prop 36 threatens to take these programs and funding away while bringing back mass incarceration and the war on drugs without providing real solutions to crime, addiction, and homelessness. We should focus on supporting initiatives that promote safety through education, mental health services, and effective crime prevention, not on measures that perpetuate mass incarceration and waste taxpayer dollars. I urge the Board to oppose Proposition 36</p> <p>Thank You!</p>
Other	Alexadner Brown	<p>The Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce supports Proposition 36. Prop 36 creates effective tools to hold individuals accountable for repeat retail theft and fentanyl trafficking while incentivizing treatment for those suffering from addiction to hard drugs, increases penalties for smash-and-grab crime, creates tougher penalties and better accountability for repeat retail theft offenders. It also allows stolen property values from multiple thefts to be combined, countering tactics by career thieves who steal repeatedly to avoid harsher penalties.</p> <p>Proposition 36 makes commonsense and responsible changes to current laws, including to Proposition 47, to reduce drug addiction and theft problems, which have afflicted our communities and neighborhoods for far too long. Drug addiction and mental illness are at the root of most homelessness. Drug</p>

			overdoses now kill two to three times the number of people in California as car accidents. The dramatic increase in retail theft in California is driving up prices and driving businesses out of communities due to costs and the safety of employees and customers. Prop 36 helps compel more people with serious drug addictions into drug and mental health treatment and holds hard drug dealers and career thieves accountable.
			Ana R Arias
			Omar Gonzales SUPPORT Prop 36
		Item Total	105
Grand Total			105