

Date of Hearing: April 21, 2026
Counsel: Kimberly Horiuchi

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Nick Schultz, Chair

AB 1545 (Krell) – As Amended March 9, 2026

SUMMARY: Mandates the Executive Officer of the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH), refer an eligible inmate for an evaluation as a sexually violent predator (SVP), as specified, at least six months prior to the person’s release from prison or scheduled parole hearing, as specified. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Authorizes a petition for commitment to be filed regardless of whether the person is in custody on either a determinate or indeterminate term.
- 2) Eliminates offenses committed prior to 1977 and for an indeterminate prison term from the stated definition of a sexually violent offense.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Provides for the civil commitment for psychiatric and psychological treatment of a prison inmate found to be an SVP after the person has served their prison commitment. This is known as the Sexually Violent Predator Act (“SVPA”). (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600, et seq.)
- 2) Defines a “sexually violent predator” as “a person who has been convicted of a sexually violent offense against at least one victim, and who has a diagnosed mental disorder that makes the person a danger to the health and safety of others in that it is likely that he or she will engage in sexually violent criminal behavior.” (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600, subd. (a)(1).)
- 3) Mandates that any of the following be considered a conviction for a sexually violent offense:
 - a) A prior or current conviction that resulted in a determinate prison sentence for an offense, as specified.
 - b) A conviction for a sexually violent offense that was committed prior to July 1, 1977, and that resulted in an indeterminate prison sentence.
 - c) A prior conviction in another jurisdiction for an offense that includes all of the elements of a sexually violent offense, as specified.
 - d) A conviction for an offense under a predecessor statute that includes all of the elements of a sexually violent offense, as specified.

- e) A prior conviction for which the inmate received a grant of probation for a sexually violent offense, as specified.
 - f) A prior finding of not guilty by reason of insanity for a sexually violent offense, as specified.
 - g) A conviction resulting in a finding that the person was a mentally disordered sex offender.
 - h) A prior conviction for a sexually violent offense, as specified, which the person was committed to the *former* Division of Juvenile Facilities, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR).
 - i) A prior conviction for a sexually violent offense, as specified, that resulted in an indeterminate prison sentence. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600, subd. (a)(2)(A)-(I).)
- 4) Defines “sexually violent offense” as the following acts when committed by force, violence, duress, menace, fear of immediate and unlawful bodily injury on the victim or another person, or threatening to retaliate in the future against the victim or any other person, and that are committed on, before, or after the effective date of this article and result in a conviction or a finding of not guilty by reason of insanity, as defined in subdivision (a): a felony rape, *former* spousal rape, rape with a foreign object, aggravated sexual assault of a child, sodomy, forcible oral copulation, child molestation, continuous sexual abuse of a child, or sexual penetration, or former provision on child molest, or any felony violation of kidnapping, kidnapping for ransom, or assault with intent to committed rape, *former* spousal rape, rape with a foreign object, sodomy, forcible oral copulation, child molestation, or sexual penetration, or *former* child molest. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600, subd. (b).)
- 5) Permits a person committed as an SVP to be held for an indeterminate term upon commitment. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 6604 & 6604.1.)
- 6) Establishes a process whereby a person committed as an SVP can petition for conditional release or an unconditional discharge any time after one year of commitment, notwithstanding the lack of recommendation or concurrence by the Director of the Department of State Hospitals (DSH). (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6608, subs. (a), (f) & (m).)
- 7) Provides that if the petition is made without the consent of the director of the treatment facility, no action may be taken on the petition without first obtaining the written recommendation of the director of the treatment facility. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6608, subd. (e).)
- 8) Provides that before actually placing a person on conditional release, the community program director designated by the DSH must recommend the program most appropriate for supervising and treating the person. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6608, subd. (h).)
- 9) Provides that a person who is conditionally released shall be placed in the county of domicile of the person prior to the person’s incarceration, unless both of the following conditions are satisfied:

- a) The court finds that extraordinary circumstances require placement outside the county of domicile; and,
 - b) The designated county of placement was given prior notice and an opportunity to comment on the proposed placement of the committed person in the county. (Welf. & Inst. Code, 6608.5, subd. (a).)
- 10) States that the county of domicile shall designate a county agency or program that will provide assistance and consultation in the process of locating and securing housing within the county for persons committed as SVPs who are about to be conditionally released. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6608.5, subd. (d).)
- 11) Specifies that in recommending a specific placement for community outpatient treatment, the DSH or its designee shall consider all of the following:
- a) The concerns and proximity of the victim or the victim’s next of kin; and,
 - b) The age and profile of the victim or victims in the sexually violent offenses committed by the person subject to placement. The “profile” of a victim includes, but is not limited to, gender, physical appearance, economic background, profession, and other social or personal characteristics. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6608.5, subd. (e)(1)-(2).)
- 12) States that if the court determines that placement of a person in the county of their domicile is not appropriate, the court shall consider the following circumstances in designating his or her placement in a county for conditional release:
- a) If and how long the person has previously resided or been employed in the county; and,
 - b) If the person has next of kin in the county. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6608.5, subd. (g)(1)-(2).)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, "AB 1545 closes a loophole under existing law that can result in people who have been convicted of sexually violent offenses being released on parole without first having an assessment for potential commitment as a sexually violent predator. Simply because they are serving an indeterminate sentence. Public safety requires us to fix this loophole."
- 2) **Sexually Violent Predator Act (SVPA):** Enacted in 1996, the SVPA authorizes an involuntary civil commitment of any person “who has been convicted of a sexually violent offense ... and who has a diagnosed mental disorder that **makes the person a danger to the health and safety of others in that it is likely that he or she will engage in sexually violent criminal behavior.**” (Emphasis added.) (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6601, subd. (a).) The SVPA was designed to accomplish the dual goals of protecting the public, by confining violent sexual predators likely to reoffend, and providing treatment to those offenders. “Those committed pursuant to the SVPA **are to be treated not as criminals, but as sick**

persons. They are to receive treatment for their disorders and must be released when they no longer constitute a threat to society.” (Emphasis added.) (*People v. Superior Court (Karsai)* (2013) 213 Cal.App.4th 774, 783, citing Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6250.)

Civil commitment is not a prison sentence. Once a person has been deemed no longer a threat to public safety, they must, as a matter of law, be released from custody. Involuntary commitment under the SVPA only begins after a person has completed their prison sentence. Originally, the SVP laws provided for an initial commitment of two years and then a review every two years thereafter. However, effective September 20, 2006, the law now provides for indeterminate commitments for persons found to be SVPs. (Welf. & Inst. Code § 6604.) A SVP is a person convicted of specified sex offenses against at least one person and who has a diagnosed mental disorder that makes the person a danger to the health and safety of others in that it is likely that he or she will engage in sexually violent criminal behavior. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600, subd. (a)(1).)

a. Offenders that may be designated SVP:

A sexually violent predator is defined in Welfare & Institutions Code section 6600 as “a person who has been convicted of a **sexually violent offense against one or more victims** and who has a diagnosed mental disorder that makes the person a danger to the health and safety of others in that it is likely that he or she will engage in sexually violent criminal behavior.” (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600, subd. (a).) (Emphasis added.) Welfare and Institutions Code, section 6600 further defines a sexually violent predator as someone who suffered the following:

- i. A prior or current conviction that resulted in a determinate prison sentence for a sexually violent offense.
- ii. A conviction for a sexually violent offense that was committed prior to July 1, 1977, and that resulted in an indeterminate prison sentence.
- iii. A prior conviction in another jurisdiction for an offense that includes all of the elements of a sexually violent offense.
- iv. A conviction for an offense under a predecessor statute that includes all of the elements of a sexually violent offense.
- v. A prior conviction for which the inmate received a grant of probation for a sexually violent offense.
- vi. A prior finding of not guilty by reason of insanity for a sexually violent offense.
- vii. A conviction resulting in a finding that the person was a mentally disordered sex offender.
- viii. A prior conviction for a sexually violent offense for which the person was committed to the Division of Juvenile Facilities, CDCR, as specified.

- ix. A prior conviction for a sexually violent offense that resulted in an indeterminate prison sentence. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600, subd. (a)(1)(A-I).)

A sexually violent offense means any of the following crimes when committed by force, violence, duress, menace, fear of immediate and unlawful bodily injury on the victim or another person, or threatening to retaliate in the future against the victim or any other person, and that are committed on, before, or after the effective date of the SVPA and resulted in a conviction or a finding of not guilty by reason of insanity: (i) a felony violation of rape, (ii) former provision of spousal rape, (iii) aiding abetting rape or sexual penetration, (iv) aggravated sexual assault of a child, (v) sodomy, (vi) forcible oral copulation, (vii) child molestation, (viii) continuous sexual abuse of a child, or (ix) sexual penetration, or (x) former provision on child molest, or any felony violation of (xi) kidnapping, (xii) kidnapping with intent to commit robbery or rape, or (xiii) assault with intent to commit rape, (xiv) former provision of spousal rape, (xv) aiding and abetting rape, (xvi) sodomy, (xvii) forcible oral copulation, (xviii) child molest, or (xix) sexual penetration. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600, subd. (b).)

The SVPA was formally enacted in its current form after the U.S. Supreme Court approved SVP designations in *Kansas v. Hendricks* (1997) 521 U.S. 346. The SVPA was somewhat controversial at the time because offenders had already served their prison sentence and were being re-incarcerated in a mental health facility for the same crimes. As a general matter, that is, on its face, an unconstitutional violation of the Ex Post Facto clause, the double jeopardy clause, and the due process clause of the 5th Amendment. (*Kansas v. Hendricks*, 521 U.S. at 371.) However, in validating the involuntary commitment of sexually violent offenders who are compelled to commit sex offenses due to a “mental illness,” the court explained that due process demands the individual have a mental illness and be provided a meaningful opportunity to be released when the mental illness is controlled. (*Ibid.*, 521 U.S. at 377, conc. Kennedy.)

In 1997, the SVPA required that an offender be committed for two or more sexually violent offenses that received a determinate sentence.¹ However, Proposition 83 and its mostly duplicative legislative companion, SB 1128 (Alquist), Chapter 337, Statutes of 2006 broadened the definition of an SVP and restricted the subsequent civil proceedings necessary to ensure the offender still constitutes a danger to society.

b. Process of SVP designation:

When CDCR- determines that an inmate “may be a sexually violent predator,” the CDCR Secretary refers the inmate to the DSH for a thorough evaluation. (*Hubbart v. Superior Court* (1999) 19 Cal.4th 1138, 1145; Welf. & Inst., § 6601, subd. (b).) A “diagnosed mental disorder” for purposes of determining whether someone is a SVP means a “congenital or acquired condition affecting the emotional or volitional capacity that predisposes the person to the commission of criminal sexual acts in a degree constituting the person a menace to the health and safety of others.” (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600, subd. (c).)

¹ 1995 Cal ALS 763 | 1995 Cal AB 888 | 1995 Cal Stats. ch. 763.

An evaluation “must be conducted by at least two practicing psychiatrists or psychologists in accordance with a standardized assessment protocol[.]” (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6601, subd. (c)-(d).) If the two evaluators agree the inmate is likely to reoffend without treatment or custody due to their mental disorder, the Director of DSH must request a petition for commitment pursuant to the Welfare and Institutions Code section 6602 to the county in which the inmate was last convicted. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6601, subd. (d).) Thereafter, the county district attorney will file a petition for civil commitment. Due process requires any deprivation of liberty by the state requires notice and a meaningful opportunity to be heard.

Accordingly, a court then reviews the petition and determines whether there is probable cause to believe the inmate “is likely to engage in sexually violent predatory criminal behavior upon their release. If the court or jury determines that the person is a sexually violent predator, the person [is] committed for an indeterminate term” to a state mental hospital “for appropriate treatment and confinement.” (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6604.)

The burden then shifts to the “offender seeking his or her release from an SVPA commitment” to prove he or she is no longer a significant risk to society. (Ashley Felando (2012) *California’s Sexually Violent Predator Act and the Dangerous Patient Exception*, 40 W. St. U. L.Rev. 73, 76; Note (2014) *Examining the Conditions of Confinement for Civil Detainees under California’s Sexually Violent Predators Act*, 68 Hastings L.J. 1441, 1444-1446.)

If the Director of DSH determines that the inmate’s diagnosed mental disorder has so changed that the inmate is not likely to commit acts of predatory sexual violence while under supervision and treatment in the community, the Director will forward a report and recommendation for conditional release. If the court at the hearing determines that the SVP would not be a danger to others due to his or her diagnosed mental disorder while under supervision and treatment in the community, the court will order the person placed with an appropriate forensic conditional release program operated by the state for one year, a substantial portion of which is required to include outpatient supervision and treatment. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6608, subd. (f).)

After a judicial determination that a person would not be a danger to the health and safety of others (i.e., in that it is not likely that the person will engage in sexually violent criminal behavior due to the person’s diagnosed mental disorder while under supervision and treatment in the community), they will be placed in their pre-incarceration county of domicile, unless the court finds that extraordinary circumstances require placement outside the county domicile. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6608.5, subd. (a); see Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6608.5, subd. (b).)

This bill clarifies that if an offender, who is currently serving or who has previously served a prison term for a sexually violent offense, and eligible for parole within the next six months, the BPH must refer that inmate for an evaluation for involuntary commitment as an SVP. It also clarifies that an offender may be referred for an SVP evaluation so long as they are either currently serving a prison sentence or previously served a prison sentence for a sexually violent offense. Both of these technical amendments were inspired by a recent parolee that was sentenced to multiple terms of 25-life for kidnapping, binding, and sexually assaulting children, mostly under the age of 10, in 1999. He was only technically available for parole at the age of 64 because of court-imposed elderly parole requirements due to

significant overcrowding and universal denial of parole in the early 2000s.² Funston was sentenced pursuant to California's one-strike sex statute (Pen. Code, § 667.61) which was contemplated at the time the SVPA was enacted. Therefore, these clarifications are within the original intent of the SVPA. It is unclear that Funston was not eligible for referral as a SVP notwithstanding his current indeterminate prison term based on his prior record. Nevertheless, since it was contemplated at the time the SVPA was initially enacted, it probably should have been included at its inception.

- 3) **Argument in Support:** According to the *San Diego District Attorney's Office*, a co-sponsor, "Under current law, SVPs are defined as individuals convicted of sexually violent offenses who have a diagnosed mental disorder that makes them a danger to others and are likely to reoffend. As our understanding of recidivism and risk management evolves, it is essential for the law to adapt accordingly to keep our communities safe and to effectively manage these high-risk individuals.

"Recent events have underscored the urgency of this issue. California made headlines with the release of Gregory Vogelsang, a 57-year-old sex offender convicted of 30 counts of kidnapping and sex crimes against multiple children between the ages of 5 and 11 in the 1990s. Vogelsang was released after serving only 27 years of his 355 year-to-life sentences. His release followed the decision to release David Funston, who served only 20 years of a 75- year-to-life sentence for 16 counts of kidnapping and child molestation. Both individuals were sentenced to indeterminate terms but were not evaluated for possible commitment to the state hospital as SVPs because their lengthy indeterminate terms did not qualify for SVP evaluation under current law.

"California's SVP program currently only permits evaluation of sex offenders serving determinate prison terms. Paradoxically, individuals who commit the most egregious sexually violent offenses – those serving indeterminate terms under the One Strike Law or the Habitual Sexual Offender sentencing scheme – often escape evaluation. The rationale for not evaluating these "lifers" is the belief that parole-granted inmates serving indeterminate terms do not pose an unreasonable risk to society. Parole suitability focuses on whether an inmate currently poses an unreasonable risk of danger to society if released. However, SVP commitment uses a different standard: whether the individual has a diagnosed mental disorder that makes them likely to engage in sexually violent, predatory behavior.

"Defendants sentenced under the One Strike law are among the most violent sex offenders, yet this category may be released from prison without SVP screening because they are serving indeterminate terms. The One Strike Law mandates 25 years to life for the most severe sexual assaults, including those involving torture, mayhem, kidnapping, or burglary with intent to commit rape. Offenders convicted of rape with Great Bodily Injury or continuous sexual abuse of a child receive indeterminate terms and are not screened for SVP

² <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2026-02-26/serial-child-molester-rearrested-day-hes-set-to-be-freed> ["In 1999, he was convicted of 16 counts of kidnapping and child molestation and had been serving three consecutive sentences of 25 years to life and one sentence of 20 years and eight months at the California Institution for Men in Chino. The sentences followed a string of cases out of Sacramento County in which prosecutors said Funston lured children under the age of 7 with candy and, in at least one case, a Barbie doll to kidnap and sexually assault them, often under the threat of violence."] [last visited April 15, 2026].

upon release. AB 1545 will ensure these violent sex offenders are properly screened for possible SVP commitment, with appropriate legal safeguards in place.

“AB 1545 addresses key gaps in the SVP referral and evaluation process. By authorizing both the Secretary of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the Executive Officer of the Board of Parole Hearings to refer individuals for evaluation, including those serving indeterminate sentences and those with parole hearings within six months, the bill ensures that no potentially dangerous individual avoids review due to procedural limitations. This measure is necessary to close loopholes that could allow high-risk individuals to be released without proper assessment.

“Additionally, the bill’s provisions support victim protection, community safety, and responsible criminal justice administration. While we recognize there may be impacts on local programs, these changes are essential to improve the SVP commitment process and to better protect our communities from preventable harm.”

- 4) **Argument in Opposition:** According to *Prison Policy Initiative*, “This expansion is duplicative of the existing parole suitability system, will not improve public safety, and significantly increases costs within an already overburdened system. Our Principles for Parole Reform, created in partnership with the MacArthur Justice Center’s National Parole Transformation Project, serve as a touchstone for those looking to improve parole systems across the country. Our work has shown that elderly parole is a vital mechanism of release for people in prisons that poses minimal risk to public safety and should not be bound by offense restrictions. This is particularly true as research has shown time and time again that people with sexually-based convictions have among the lowest risk of re-offense of anyone released from prison, as do those who are released from prison after the age of 55.

“The parole suitability process already performs the same function as SVP proceedings: thoroughly assessing whether individuals with sexual convictions pose a current public safety risk. The Board of Parole Hearings conducts comprehensive, individualized evaluations, including psychological assessments, extensive review of institutional records, victim input procedures, and rigorous in-person hearings focused on assessing rehabilitation and risk. Applying the SVP process to people serving indeterminate sentences who have already undergone parole consideration is therefore redundant.

“For people with sexual convictions, both the parole suitability and parole supervision processes additionally require the administration of research-validated, actuarial risk instruments specifically for assessing sexual re-offense risk, including the Static-99R and the STABLE 2007. In other words, the parole release process already thoroughly screens for sexual re-offense risk. As a result, parole is granted very rarely for this group, with approval rates as low as 5% in certain years, compared to 10 to 16% annual parole suitability grant rates for the overall population.

“When those few individuals are granted parole, they remain safe in the community. In fact, there has never been a documented case of someone released through the Elderly Parole program sexually recidivating. For all forms of recidivism, rates are very low, as the parole suitability process is highly effective at preventing all categories of recidivism amongst the population AB 1545 targets. People released through California’s parole hearing process after serving indeterminate sentences consistently have among the lowest recidivism rates not

only in our state prison system, but in the nation — approximately 3% overall including misdemeanor recidivism and just 0.7% for felony crimes against another person. This is remarkably low in comparison to the general CDCR recidivism rate of 39% for the overall prison population and 7% recidivism for felony crimes against a person. Requiring an additional SVP evaluation is therefore redundant and unnecessary to protect public safety.

“Moreover, introducing SVP referrals to a markedly low-risk population *after* they have already been found suitable for parole risks leveraging the SVP system as a back-end civil tool for undermining parole grants, particularly in high-profile or politically sensitive cases. Given the significant political pressure that surrounds parole grants involving sexual offenses, expanding SVP referrals to people with indeterminate sentences invites the exertion of political pressure to influence both SVP and parole proceeding outcomes. This dynamic threatens the integrity and independence of both systems, making them vulnerable to politicized pressures rather than evidence-based standards.

“AB 1545 unjustifiably expands one of the most inefficient and costly public safety systems in the state, as SVP proceedings are notoriously resource-intensive, often involving years of litigation, multiple expert evaluations, and extended detention, placing substantial strain on courts, prosecutors, public defenders, and the Department of State Hospitals. Once committed, individuals may remain in costly inpatient treatment for years, followed by a conditional release process plagued by unlawful delays and housing shortages. A 2024 state audit of the program found that the cost of SVP conditional release alone — not accounting for the cost of SVP referrals and proceedings — is approximately \$495,000 per person annually. Expanding this system to individuals already deemed safe for release by the parole board — and already subject to intensive, sex offense-specific supervision — lacks any evidence-based justification and diverts millions in limited resources from more effective public safety strategies.

“Finally, AB 1545 undermines rehabilitation for people with sexual offenses by creating a conflict in the parole process. Parole candidates are expected to demonstrate insight in hearings by openly discussing their recent sexual urges, triggers, and relapse prevention strategies. However, these same disclosures can later be used against them in SVP proceedings to support a mental illness diagnosis or other SVP criteria. This discourages honesty and participation in sex offense treatment, undermining the rehabilitative goals of the parole system.”

5) **Related Legislation:**

- a) AB 22 (DeMaio) requires, among other things, DSH to approve a potential placement before a department employee or vendor proposes a potential placement to a court, including signing a lease or rental agreement regarding the placement of a SVP who is scheduled to be conditionally released into the community. AB 22 was referred to, but never heard in, this committee.
- b) SB 379 (Jones) states that the DSH is responsible for ensuring that department vendors consider public safety in the placement of a conditionally released SVPs. SB 379 was held on the Assembly Appropriations Committee suspense file.

- c) AB 2727 (Nguyen) is identical as this bill as it pertains to the changes to the SVPA. However, AB 2727 also states that a person sentenced for a one-strike sex offense, as a habitual sex offender, for aggravated sexual assault of a child, or for specified sex acts on a child 10 years of age or younger, is ineligible for elderly parole until the person is 65 years old or older and has served a minimum of 25 years of continuous incarceration on their current sentence. AB 2727 is pending hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

6) Prior Legislation:

- a) SB 380 (Jones), Chapter 581, Statutes of 2025 requires the DSH to conduct an analysis of the benefits and feasibility of establishing transitional housing facilities for the CONREP for SVPs.
- b) AB 763 (Davies) of the 2023-24 Legislative Session, would have prohibited placing an SCP released on conditional release within 1/4 mile of a home school. AB 763 was referred to this committee but never heard.
- c) AB 2035 (Patterson), of the 2023-24 Legislative Session, would have prohibited the DSH from placing a conditionally released SVP into the community if the person does not have housing in a qualified dwelling, which is defined as a structure intended for human habitation by one person or a single family and that is not within 10 feet of another dwelling. AB 2035 failed passage in this committee.
- d) SB 841 (Jones), of the 2021-22 Legislative Session, would have enacted the Sexually Violent Predator Accountability, Fairness, and Enforcement Act, would have required the DSH to take specified actions regarding the placement of SVPs in communities, including notifying the county's executive officer of the placement location, as specified. SB 841 failed passage in the Senate Public Safety Committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

San Diego County District Attorney's Office (Co-Sponsor)
Arcadia Police Officers' Association
Brea Police Association
Burbank Police Officers' Association
California Association of School Police Chiefs
California Coalition of School Safety Professionals
California District Attorneys Association
California Narcotic Officers' Association
California Police Chiefs Association
California Reserve Peace Officers Association
California State Association of Psychiatrists (CSAP)
Claremont Police Officers Association

Corona Police Officers Association
Culver City Police Officers' Association
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
Los Angeles School Police Management Association
Los Angeles School Police Officers Association
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
Ventura County District Attorney's Office

Opposition

A New Path
ACLU California Action
Bend the Arc: Jewish Action, California
California Coalition for Women's Prisoners
California Public Defenders Association
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Dignity and Power Now
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Felony Murder Elimination Project
Initiate Justice
Justice2jobs Coalition
LA Defensa
Prison Policy Initiative
Rubicon Programs
The W. Haywood Burns Institute
Transitions Clinic Network
Uncommon Law
Universidad Popular
3 Private Individuals

Analysis Prepared by: Kimberly Horiuchi / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744