
The Safe Neighborhoods Act is a comprehensive criminal penalty and public safety funded initiative that targets criminal street gangs, felons with guns, and drug dealers with focused penalties. The measure also ensures Section 8 Housing compliance, provides funding for intervention and prevention programs and provides sustainable funding to local law enforcement and prosecutors.

The Act creates tougher punishment for gang crimes, drive-by shooting, methamphetamine distribution and victim intimidation. It creates more effective and accountable intervention programs to stop young kids from joining gangs and ruining their lives. The act helps victims who have been intimidated by gang criminals and it funds victim-witness protection programs in our communities. It prohibits bail to illegal aliens who are charged with violent or gang crimes and ensures funding for local police, sheriff, district attorneys and probation officers.

Funding for the Act would come from existing State money that is currently spent on non-public safety programs. The measure would guarantee that less than one percent of the State General Fund is put aside for public safety.

The Safe Neighborhoods Act is currently endorsed by the following public safety organizations:
California Police Chiefs’ Association
California State Sheriffs’ Association
California District Attorneys Association
Chief Probation Officers’ of California
California Peace Officers Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California
California Narcotic Officers’ Association
California Organization of Police and Sheriffs
California Correctional Supervisors Organization
California Probation, Parole and Correctional Association
State Coalition of Probation Organizations
California Law Enforcement Association of Records Supervisor

The California State Sheriff’s Association is hoping to gain the endorsement of every County Board of Supervisors in the State of California and is seeking endorsement from the Mariposa County Board of Supervisors by adoption of the attached resolution.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS: None
### Alternatives and Consequences of Negative Action

If the Board is unwilling to adopt the Resolution, it will not be listed among the California Counties that is in support of the initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Impact? ( ) Yes</th>
<th>( ) No Current FY Cost: $</th>
<th>Annual Recurring Cost: $0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted In Current FY? ( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) No ( ) Partially Funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount in Budget:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Funding Needed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanticipated Revenue</td>
<td>4/5's Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Between Funds</td>
<td>4/5's Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>4/5's Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) General ( ) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clerk's Use Only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Res. No.: 2019-338</th>
<th>Ord. No. ______</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vote - Ayes: ______</td>
<td>Noes: ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent: ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Minute Order Attached</td>
<td>( ) No Action Necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office.

Date: ______

Attest: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board
         County of Mariposa, State of California

By: ________________
    Deputy

### County Administrative Officer:

☑ Requested Action Recommended
     No Opinion
     Comments: ________________________

CAO: ________________________
RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS ACT INITIATIVE ON THE NOVEMBER 2008 GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT

- Whereas, Government has no higher purpose or more challenging mandate than the protection of our families and our neighborhoods from crime; and
- Whereas, Despite limited resources and lack of a comprehensive statewide plan to address criminal activity, California’s law enforcement community has done a remarkable job of suppressing crime in recent years; and
- Whereas, When California homicides exceeded 4,000 in 1993 and other crime levels neared historical peaks, Californians responded with tough new laws including “Three Strikes.” By 1999 homicides declined by more than half. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), California’s overall crime rate dropped from 4th worst in 1993 to 29th among the states in 1999. This clearly shows that tough laws can and do deter crime; and
- Whereas, However between 1999 and 2006, while the national homicide rate declined, our state’s murder rate increased accounting for almost 500 more deaths per year and propelling California from 19th to 10th worst among the states. During the same period of time, California vehicle thefts increased by over 40%, totaling more than Texas, Florida, New York and Pennsylvania combined; and
- Whereas, Other crime levels have been more stable but recent trends should be of concern. According to the Department of Justice, statewide robberies increased almost 12% (an increase of more than 7,500 offenses) between 2005 and 2006; and
- Whereas, The proliferation of methamphetamine has created a multitude of crime problems driving recent increases in vehicle and identity theft. Now the illegal drug of choice methamphetamine, unlike many other drugs, is produced locally and often sold by street gangs. Methamphetamine has proven more devastating to the addict and the public than either cocaine or heroin; and
- Whereas, Nonetheless some communities, including the City of Los Angeles, have had substantial success in stabilizing crime levels while other municipalities have been victimized by rampant and escalating street violence. Part of the difference lies in law enforcement resources and strategy; and
- Whereas, There are more challenges ahead. California’s juvenile justice system reflects a rapidly growing caseload. In just four years (2002-2006), the number of juvenile cases referred to probation increased more than 60%, from 129,000 to 207,000, resulting in an increase of juveniles in the system; and
- Whereas, Gangs are a large part of the reason California has not fared as well as many states. Street gangs are largely responsible for increases in California homicides in recent years. Many gangs recruit juvenile and this is a problem that needs to be addressed; and
- Whereas, Previously convicted felons and gang members with firearms commit the vast majority of gun crimes, including the killing of peace officers. Gangs have
compromised our entire criminal justice system, routinely assaulting victims, witnesses, and sometimes even judges. It is essential that state laws and resources target these offenders; and

- Whereas, The Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department reports that L.A. County has experienced 5,752 gang-related homicides during the last ten years. Between 2004 and 2007, Los Angeles County residents reported an average of 166 gang shootings and 252 gang robberies to the Sheriff’s Department each month. The 80,000 gang members estimated to reside in county vastly outnumber the 20,000 police officers and deputy sheriffs who protect the cities and county of Los Angeles; and

- Whereas, By comparison, New York City, with two million fewer residents then Los Angeles County, is served by more than twice as many peace officers. Chicago also employs twice as many peace officers, despite a smaller population than the City of Los Angeles; and

- Whereas, The State’s public safety resources problem is not limited to peace officers. California has opened only one new prison during the past 10 years while 32 counties, many with inadequate jails, are under federal court ordered or locally imposed population caps because of overcrowding. As a consequence offenders in some counties serve 10% or less of their sentences; and

- Whereas, In 2003, the federal government estimated that California prisons held 32,000 illegal alien felons, more than Texas, Florida, New York, and Pennsylvania combined. Many of these felons are gang members. Absent this growing and disproportionate burden on California’s penal system the state prison incarceration rate (per 100,000) would fall below the national average. Accurate record keeping would better enable California to seek federal reimbursement for the expense of incarcerating these alien felons; and

- Whereas, In 2006, 14 states had higher prison incarceration rates than California. When jails are included, the FBI reports that California’s overall incarceration rate (per 100,000) is below the national average; and

- Whereas, While the criminal justice problems facing California are difficult, they are not insurmountable. More prison and jail facilities are needed and planned. In the interim prudent use of existing resources, and temporary jail facilities where necessary, can be employed to meet some of the demand; and

- Whereas, The challenges of gangs and street crime are more elusive and require resourcefulness and more efficient application of the laws and remedies available. Efficiencies can be best achieved by increasing and sustaining personnel, training, and information available to local enforcement agencies; and

- Whereas, California adds several hundred thousand people to its population each year and must commit resources necessary to support increasing demands on criminal justice personnel and infrastructure; and

- Whereas, State laws which mandate early intervention programs or increase punishment provide little public safety unless they are accompanied by local resources commensurate with the labor and facilities they require; and

- Whereas, If public safety is in fact the state’s primary purpose it is altogether fitting that at least 1% of the state’s budget be dedicated to the support of local crime prevention and deterrence programs and law enforcement; and
• Whereas, A well-informed and actively involved citizens can often be the greatest resource of any police agency. Efforts to better inform and involve the public in its own safety must increase; and
• Whereas, Long-term, statewide efforts to address public safety must incorporate programs designed to educate, deter crime and rehabilitate. When effective, such programs can relieve the burden of the criminal justice system in a very desirable way. In each instance the expenditure of public funds must be accompanied by accountability, oversight, and public disclosure; and
• Whereas, Because criminal activity changes over time, enforcement agencies must adapt. Computers and GPS devices are now as essential as firearms. Moreover, adoption of new technologies requires inkless fingerprinting hardware, computer software, forensic testing capacity and training beyond the budgetary capacity of most local police, sheriffs, and district attorneys; and
• Whereas, Statewide leadership is necessary to link local enforcement agencies through statewide networks that share information on gangs, sex offenders, stolen vehicles, DNA profiles, and criminal histories; and
• Whereas, A comprehensive approach to the problems of juvenile delinquency, crime, and law enforcement funding is necessary to keep our communities safe;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDERED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Mariposa, State of California supports the effort to allow the People of the State of California to achieve a more balanced and sustainable statewide public safety plan by enacting the “Safe Neighborhoods Act: Stop Gang, Gun and Street Crime.”

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Mariposa, State of California, this 22nd day of July 2008, by the following vote:

AYES: ABORN, TURPIN, FRITZ, BIBBY, PICKARD
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE

[Signature]
LYLE TURPIN, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
Margie Williams
CLERK OF THE BOARD

[Signature]
DEPUTY