
From: Dana Williamson [REDACTED] >

Date: Saturday, June 15, 2024 at 10:30 PM

To: Greg Totten [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Response to Governor's Office Proposal

And point of personal privilege, it's really rude that you agreed to a meeting and then backed out and didn't reply.

This is why no one wants to work with you.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Dana Williamson [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, June 15, 2024 10:15:28 PM

To: Greg Totten [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Response to Governor's Office Proposal

If that's your position then I agree, there's nothing to talk about. It's really amazing how you are incapable of taking a win. And the consultants you're working with haven't won anything in a decade. Good luck.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Greg Totten [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, June 15, 2024 10:04:31 PM

To: Dana Williamson [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Response to Governor's Office Proposal

Dana,

Thank you for getting back to me on this important issue. As I noted previously, our focus is on amending Proposition 47 on the 2024 ballot. This necessary policy change is simply too urgent to wait

for another two years. If the administration is prepared to consider an amendment of Proposition 47 on the 2024 ballot, then we are happy to meet. If not, we understand and accept your decision, and don't believe further meetings would be productive.

All the best,

Greg

From: Dana Williamson [REDACTED]

Date: Saturday, June 15, 2024 at 11:35 AM

To: Greg Totten [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Response to Governor's Office Proposal

Unfortunately, the retail theft bills have to be amended on Monday so we don't have much time. I will say that we are very much open to amendments on the language we provided so it would be helpful if you could provide what you'd like to see and we can react.

As far as an initiative, we are open to something in 2026 as well as providing all of the necessary bells and whistles to make sure that deal is rock solid.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Greg Totten [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, June 15, 2024 8:22:06 AM

To: Dana Williamson [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Response to Governor's Office Proposal

Thank you so much for suggesting a Zoom meeting today. Unfortunately, I have prior family commitments this weekend, but would be happy to meet early next week. Additionally, given the importance of the issues and our focus on the 2024 ballot, I would prefer to meet in person rather than by Zoom.

Also, in order for us to have meaningful negotiations next week, will you kindly provide your proposal in writing so that our entire executive team can properly consider the issues prior to the meeting?

Thank you,

Greg

From: Dana Williamson [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, June 14, 2024 5:29 PM

To: Greg Totten [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Response to Governor's Office Proposal

Hi. Rather than engage over email, why don't we plan to meet? Obviously time is of the essence so how is tomorrow?

From: Greg Totten [REDACTED]

Date: Friday, June 14, 2024 at 4:41 PM

To: Dana Williamson [REDACTED]

Subject: Response to Governor's Office Proposal

Dear Ms. Williamson:

Thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and other members of the Governor's Office to discuss the critical public safety issues facing California. We greatly appreciate the Governor's interest in working with all stakeholders to address these issues.

In our discussions on June 12, 2024, you provided a proposal and asked our coalition to withdraw the ballot initiative. Our legal experts have reviewed this proposal, and I have attached our legal analysis.

Unfortunately, this proposal will not meaningfully and specifically address the necessary reforms proposed by the ballot initiative, particularly the retail theft crisis. This proposal does not address repeat theft, aggregation, excessive taking, or smash-and-grab thefts. Rather, this proposal seeks to amend the failure to appear statute rather than directly addressing the underlying criminal behavior and history of the defendant. This proposal would be rarely charged due to its extremely narrow scope, difficulty to prove, and the likelihood that it would rarely, if ever, apply to any offenders (please see the attached legal analysis).

We have heard from others that there may be a willingness to entertain a legislative ballot measure in 2024 that addresses the retail theft and fentanyl public safety crisis. If that is accurate, we should meet. I have briefed members of our committee and other representatives from law enforcement, and I am sure they will all participate.

As you know, The Homelessness, Drug Addiction, and Theft Reduction Act has qualified for the November 2024 ballot after submitting over 900,000 signatures. This ballot measure was drafted to provide holistic, compassionate, and common-sense solutions to the theft, fentanyl, and drug crisis that is plaguing California.

With that in mind, the ballot measure has three main components:

1. Addresses Organized and Serial Retail Theft as follows:

- Classifies repeated theft as a felony for individuals who steal less than \$950 if they have two or more prior theft-related convictions.
- Allows stolen property values from multiple thefts to be combined so repeat offenders can be charged with a felony if the total exceeds \$950, countering tactics by career criminals to avoid harsher penalties.

- Authorizes judges to impose an enhanced penalty when an offender steals, damages, or destroys property by participating in organized theft with two or more offenders or by causing losses of \$50,000 or more.

2. Confronts the Fentanyl Crisis in Our Communities as follows:

- Adds fentanyl to the list of hard drugs—such as heroin, cocaine, and methamphetamine—that are illegal to possess with a firearm and authorizes greater consequences for selling deadly quantities.
- Enables stricter penalties for dealers whose trafficking causes death or serious injury and warns traffickers of potential murder charges if continued drug trafficking results in fatalities.

3. Prioritizes Mental Health and Drug Treatment as follows:

- Enacts a new class of crime called a “treatment-mandated felony” where offenders with multiple hard drug possession convictions would be given the option of participating in drug and mental health treatment in lieu of incarceration.
- Allows offenders who successfully complete drug and mental health treatment to avoid jail time and have the charge fully expunged.

Thank you for your consideration.



Greg Totten

Chief Executive Officer

California District Attorneys Association

