

CENTER^{ON}
JUVENILE &
CRIMINAL
JUSTICE

CENTER ON JUVENILE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

AUGUST 2010

www.cjcj.org

A Working Paper

California Criminal Justice Interest Group Overview
A working paper

Funding was provided by a grant from the Fund for Nonviolence. Conclusions and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views of the report's sponsors.

I. Introduction and Background

Special interest groups have a powerful influence on public policy in California. Every year, labor unions, professional associations, and corporations spend millions on campaigns to sway voters in the run up to special and general elections. These groups also employ legislative advocates, often referred to as lobbyists, who draft and advocate for legislation while maintaining close relationships with lawmakers and government officials. While these special interest groups claim to be concerned with the systemic health and prosperity of California, in many cases these groups are strongly motivated by the employment of their members and/or their profit margins.

Over the years, California voters have passed a series of ballot initiatives limiting direct campaign contributions to candidates in an effort to reduce the influence special interest groups have on public policy. However, these efforts have been ineffective, in large part due to independent expenditures¹. While candidates have limits on how much money they can accept as donations, independent expenditure committees can spend an unlimited amount to elect or defeat a candidate, as long as they do not legally coordinate with a candidate's campaign. These Committees pay for a wide variety of campaign related expenses, including items such as bumper stickers, websites, and television and radio commercials.

Independent expenditure committees often receive funds from multiple interest groups. For example, the independent expenditure committee The Alliance for a Better California is funded by a coalition of educators, firefighters, school employees, health care givers, and labor organizations, including the California Correctional Peace Officers Association. It is clear that special interests have quickly shifted (and pooled) the money they once spent on direct donations into independent expenditure committees. Between 2000 and 2006 there was an

California Public Interest Groups With Sustained Legislative Influence in Criminal Justice

CCPOA
**California Correctional Peace
Officers Association**

PORAC
**Peace Officers Research
Association of California**

CPCA
**California Police Chiefs
Association**

CNOA
**California Narcotics Officers
Association**

CBAA
**California Bail Agents
Association**

GSBAA
**Golden State Bail Agents
Association**

CDA
**California District Attorney
Association**

ACLU NC
**American Civil Liberties
Union of Northern California**

**THE PRACTICE OF
LOBBYING**

The practice of lobbying is to ask a lawmaker to take a specific position on a particular piece of legislation. This is a legitimate and necessary part of the legislative process. The right to petition is protected under the First Amendment of the Constitution.

Lawmakers need to hear from their constituents.

However, sometimes certain voices, amplified by money and power, are inordinately loud. It is the lawmaker's job to support legislation they feel is in the best interest of the state of California as a whole regardless of pressure from any particular interest group.

increase of over six thousand percent in independent expenditure spending in legislative elections in California².

While political spending can help to seat a lawmaker sympathetic to an interest group's agenda, legislative advocates articulate and continue to lobby for that agenda once the legislator takes office.

Interest group agendas have varying degrees of focus. Some interest groups dedicate themselves to supporting very broad ideology. For example, the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California's mission statement is to "guarantee the protections of the constitution's Bill of Rights³." Other interest groups have a more specific agenda, like the Police Officers Research Association whose mission statement is to "maintain a leadership role in organizing, empowering and representing the interests of rank and file peace officers⁴."

II. Criminal Justice Interest Groups in California

Criminal justice special interest groups in California utilize the same political tools that all interest groups employ, resulting in an increase in power and influence. Dominated by the public labor sector, these groups are made up of unions and associations representing prison guards, sheriffs, line officers, and district attorneys. Notably, the California Correctional Peace Officers Association (CCPOA) has become one of the most powerful unions in the state, ranking among the top twenty-five special interest groups in political spending over the last decade. Between 2000 and 2009, CCPOA spent more than \$30 million to influence California voters and lobby government officials⁵. The union looks even more impressive when considering its modest size.

Most long-term gains in political leverage by these interest groups have been due to consolidations of power. CCPOA reinvented itself during the 1980's when Don Novey became president of the organization and unified the California State Employees' Association and the California

Correctional Officers' Association. Currently, the California Bail Agents Association and the Golden State Bail Agents Association are working together with some success due to recent public scrutiny of the private bail bonds system. Law enforcement groups have secured legislative victories by partnering with victims rights groups to wage public relations campaigns.

While prison guards can appear as a less-than-sympathetic group in the public eye, the mother of a murdered child serves as a powerful tool when advocating for stronger punitive laws.

Criminal justice special interest groups have also joined forces with other large unions through independent expenditure committees. The Alliance for a Better California – funded by educators, firefighters, school employees, health care givers and labor organizations – represents a remarkable consolidation of power. The Alliance spent more than \$5 million during the 2006 election year.

A handful of legislative advocates have significantly empowered statewide criminal justice special interest groups. These advocates are lawyers and former legislators whose political connections and ideological flexibility make them powerful players in Sacramento. Often, these legislative advocates represent multiple interest groups simultaneously, some of which maintain opposing views. Legislative advocates have become so pervasive in Sacramento politics that there is currently a proposal to ban text messaging by lobbyists on the Assembly floor and in committee.

III. California Criminal Justice Interest Group Profiles

The following profiles represent the major California criminal justice interest groups and their legislative advocates in Sacramento. These are the unions, associations and lobbyists that spend the most money and wield the most influence on criminal justice policy in the state. The profiles are organized in terms of four categories: overview, legislative advocate, public policy, and political spending. The overview section outlines when the group was founded, whom the group represents and when available their mission statement. The legislative advocate section outlines their main lobbyist and the organization he or she is employed by. The public policy section highlights major legislative battles and current political issues relevant to each group. The political spending section is not intended to be an exhaustive list of expenditures, but rather to track representative campaign contributions and, when available, independent expenditures.

California Correctional Peace Officers Association – CCPOA

Stated Mission: to “promote and enhance the correctional profession, protect the safety of those engaged in corrections and advocate for the laws, funding and policies needed to improve prison operations and protect public safety⁶.”

Overview

The California Correctional Peace Officers Association (CCPOA) was founded in 1957, originally as the California Correctional Officers Association (CCOA). This Association currently represents 30,000 correctional peace officers, including prison guards and state parole agents.

As previously noted, the CCPOA has become one of the most influential unions in the state. According to the CCPOA website, the impetus to organize came from the suicide of a San Quentin guard who was “despondent” with working conditions in the prison⁷. Officer Al Mello began travelling, along with eight other officers, to the three state prisons at the time, San

Quentin, Folsom, and Soledad, rallying and winning support for unionization. By 1978, with 2,500 members, the union moved into an office in Sacramento.

In 1982, two major events catalyzed the start of a new era for the CCOA, the passing of the Dills Act and the election of a new union president, Don Novey⁸. The Dills Act permitted collective bargaining for state employees, clearly opening up new doors for this organization of state workers. At this same time, a strong new leader took over the helm and would begin an impressive twenty year run as leader of the union he would rename the CCPOA. Don Novey has been described both as “one of California’s true political geniuses⁹” and “thuggish¹⁰”. Novey moved immediately to include not only correctional officers, but guards from the California Youth Authority and parole officers in the union membership. Through strategic planning, alliance building, and the use of political leverage, Novey increased union membership by over 1,000%, increased average salaries from \$14,000 in 1984 to \$54,000 in 2002 (with overtime often adding up to over \$100,000¹¹), heavily influenced political races, and won numerous other legislative battles.

In 2002, upon the retirement of Mr. Novey, Mike Jimenez was elected the new president of CCPOA. He is generally seen as less aggressive than his predecessor, but Jimenez has maintained the structure and membership of the CCPOA, its Board and Executive Council and the general philosophical bent of the union. He has continued to use the political leveraging of Mr. Novey, allocating some of the \$1.8 million per month, or \$21.9 million per year, collected in member dues to influence political and legislative campaigns and to put pressure on all concerned parties in order to better the opportunities for union members¹². However, Jimenez has recently begun to make serious shifts in policy towards a more rehabilitative, less punitive model, as can be seen in the CCPOA publication *New Horizons*. The outcome of this shift remains to be seen.

The CCPOA has a strong and decisive leadership hierarchy. The Board of the union consists of representatives from each chapter, with each chapter representing one of the 33 state prisons, 5 youth correctional facilities, 9 Federal prisons, and numerous work camps in California. The Executive Council consists of elected members; President, Executive Vice President, Division of Juvenile Facilities Vice President, California Department of Corrections Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer¹³. It is the disciplined, hierarchical nature of the organization that has, at least in part, allowed the intense power building capacity of the CCPOA to flourish. Using four different Political Action Committees, the union influences statewide initiatives and candidates, local candidates and district attorneys, and advocacy groups and initiatives¹⁴.

Legislative Advocate

Craig Brown is CCPOA’s main legislative advocate. Mr. Brown works for Richard Robinson & Associates, Inc., a law firm that represents large professional firms including banks, insurance and utility companies. Mr. Brown has worked in politics and legislative advocacy for over 24 years. Before joining Richard Robinson & Associates, Inc., he was California’s Director of Finance. Earlier in his career, Brown worked for approximately 13 years as the Undersecretary of the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency during two Administrations, and as Director of the California Youth Authority. Brown has also worked for the California Legislative Analyst’s Office and, in the early 1970s, as a budget officer in the United States Air Force.

Public Policy

Starting in the 1980's the CCPOA successfully launched a campaign designed to increase their membership and political clout. The group lobbied for and initiated the building of more correctional facilities and tougher sentencing laws. Since 1984, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) has built 22 new prisons. This is in contrast to the 12 prisons built between 1852 and 1984¹⁵. The corrections budget of California went from \$923 million in 1984 to \$5.7 billion in 2004¹⁶.

In 1994, the CCPOA was instrumental in promoting Proposition 184, mandating that anyone convicted of three felonies serves twenty-five years to life in prison. The law also requires a doubling of the sentence for anyone convicted of a second felony¹. Between 1994 and 2006, courts sent more than 80,000 to prison for 2nd strikes and 7,500 for 3rd strikes¹⁷. With a ratio of 6.46 inmates to 1 officer (a very high ratio in comparison with most states), the 7,500 inmates sentenced to 25 years to life alone guarantee the jobs of 1,161 sworn peace officers for that duration¹⁸.

In 2008, CCPOA led the charge against Proposition 5, an initiative to emphasize treatment over incarceration for non-violent drug offenders, donating more than any other organization to the Campaign for People Against the Proposition 5 Deception. At the same time, CCPOA publicly supported many of the individual sentencing reforms contained in the initiative.

Recently California's correctional system held more than 156,000 inmates, approximately double its capacity. Federal Judges in San Francisco ordered California to reduce its prison population by 55,000 inmates or one third¹⁹. CCPOA has vigorously opposed this ruling through lobbying efforts and by organizing protests with victims' rights groups.

Political Spending

From 2003 to 2010, CCPOA has donated over \$11 million in campaign contributions. Approximately 18 percent went to Democrats, about 11 percent went to Republicans, and about 70 percent went to ballot measures. The association gave Jerry Brown more money than any other candidate between 2006 and 2010, totaling \$63,000. CCPOA contributed 1 million dollars to the People Against the Proposition 5 Deception Campaign²⁰. (These numbers do not include independent expenditures. From 2001 to 2006 CCPOA spent approximately \$3.5 million on independent expenditures²¹.)

¹ Proposition 36, the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000, changed state law to allow qualifying defendants convicted of a non-violent drug possession offense to receive a probationary sentence on a third strike

Sample Political Contributions from the CCPOA

Contribution Destination	Years	Amount	Reason
Jerry Brown-D	2006-2010	\$63,000	
Pete Wilson- R	1994	\$425,000 ²²	
Gray Davis-D		\$3,000,000+	Union contract guaranteeing salary increases and other benefits (including increased safety) for peace officers during his time in office
Against Arnold Schwarzenegger-R	On-going	\$2,000,000+	Attempting to repeal his position, worked against special election measures, etc. The Governor has openly criticized the union and tried to instate reforms
Alliance for a Better California	2005-2006	\$2,900,000	
People Against the Proposition 5 Deception		\$1,000,000	
Crime Victims United of California		84-95% of funding ²³	To promote public sympathy towards Prop 184
No on Prop 66	2004	\$500,000	Prop 66, which sought to reform the three strikes law to omit non-violent crimes as a third strike equaling a life sentence, was defeated
Doris Tate Crime Victims Bureau		78% of funding, office, staff ²⁴	To promote public sympathy towards Prop 184

Peace Officers Research Association of California – PORAC

Stated Mission: to “maintain a leadership role in organizing, empowering and representing the interests of rank and file peace officers; to identify the needs of the law enforcement community and to provide programs to meet those needs; to represent and protect the rights and benefits of peace officers; to create an environment in which peace officers interact and work toward achieving common goals and objectives; to conduct research, to provide education and training, to define and enhance standards for professionalism; to promote public awareness that encourages and maintains the image of a Professional Peace Officer²⁵.”

Overview

PORAC was founded in 1953. The group represents over 890 associations with more than 62,000 members. The association claims to be the largest statewide association representing public safety personnel in the country.

Legislative Advocate

PORAC’s main legislative advocate is Randy Perry. Perry works for Aaron Read and Associates, whose clients include AT&T, CDF Firefighters, The San Francisco Police Officers Association, and TASER International. Mr. Perry has 27 years of experience as a legislative advocate and has

been employed as the main advocate for PORAC for 15 years. He has written and lobbied for labor and workers' compensation laws as well as legislation to increase penalties for crimes against the public. Mr. Perry has a Bachelors Degree in Political Science.

Public Policy

PORAC has lobbied for tougher drunk driving laws including the use of ignition interlock devices, a device that prevents a vehicle from starting unless the driver first blows into it.

The association was also instrumental in passing harsher laws for sex offenders, including Megan’s Law and Jessica’s Law. PORAC is currently pushing for the passage of Chelsea’s Law, legislation that could send people convicted of a sex crime against a minor to jail for life on their first offense.

Political Spending

PORAC spent over 2.9 million dollars on political campaigns between 2003 and 2010. More than 48 percent went to Democrats, just below 9 percent went to Republicans, and approximately 42 percent went to ballot measures. PORAC gave Jerry Brown more money than any candidate between 2008 and 2010, totaling more than \$51,000²⁶. (These numbers do not include independent expenditures. From 2001 to 2006 PORAC spent approximately 985 thousand dollars on independent expenditures²⁷.)

Sample Political Contributions from PORAC²⁸

Contribution Destination	Year	Amount	Result
Jerry Brown		\$51,000	
Angelides, Phil	2006	\$42,100	
People Against the Proposition 5 Deception	2008	\$56,000	Prop 5 Defeated
Campaign For Child Safety 2006 Jessica’s Law Yes On 83	2006	\$50,000	
Committee To Protect California’s Future-No On 74 75 76 & 77	2005	\$50,000	
Yes On 6 CMTE To Take Back Our Neighborhoods	2008	\$31,000	Prop 6, which would have required new state spending on programs to combat crime and gangs, and to operate prison and parole systems, as well as mandating harsher penalties for methamphetamine and eliminated bail for undocumented workers with violent or gang related charges, failed
Alliance For A Better California-Yes On Proposition 79 & 80	2005	\$20,000	

California Police Chiefs Association – CPCA

Stated Mission: “to provide programs, services, and representation that serves the interest and responsibilities of California's municipal police chiefs²⁹.”

Overview

The California Police Chief’s Association (CPCA) was established in 1966. The Association is comprised of 16 board members. The members are Police Chiefs representing different regions of the state. Each Police Chief acts as a liaison between the association and the law enforcement community in his or her local area.

Legislative Advocate

The main CPCA legislative advocate is John Lovell. The Law Offices of John Lovell claim that during their 20 years of existence, 99 percent of the bills they have lobbied for have been signed into law in the California State Legislature. They also claim that no bills they have opposed have ever been enacted. Lovell also represents The California Narcotics Officers’ Association, The California Peace Officers’ Association, The California Association of Code Enforcement Officers, and the California Correctional Supervisors Organization.

Public Policy

In 2008, CPCA joined other law enforcement groups in waging a campaign to defeat Proposition 5. CPCA is currently supporting the newly formed Public Safety First campaign in an effort to defeat a marijuana legalization bill on the 2010 November ballot.

Political Spending

In 2008, CPCA gave \$5,000 to the campaign for People Against Proposition 5 Deception³⁰. (This number does not include independent expenditures.)

Sample Political Contributions from the CPCA

Contribution Destination	Year	Amount	Result
People Against the Proposition 5 Deception	2008	\$5,000	Prop 5 was defeated

California Narcotics Officers Association – CNOA

Stated Mission: to “Provide high quality training for law enforcement professionals³¹.”

Overview

The California Narcotics Officers Association was founded in 1964. They claim to be the largest non-profit training association in California. The association has approximately seven thousand members, including local, state, and federal peace officers, prosecutors, and law enforcement personnel.

Legislative Advocate

John Lovell is the main CNOA legislative advocate. See full description above listed under CPCA.

Public Policy

Over the years, CNOA has strongly opposed needle exchange programs including a 2003 bill called AB 136 and an earlier version AB 518.

CNOA joined the CPCA and others to defeat Proposition 5, a 2008 ballot initiative that would have shortened parole for methamphetamine dealers and other drug felons from three years to six months. CNOA assisted in branding Proposition 5 as the “Drug Dealers Bill of Rights”.

CNOA maintains that marijuana is not medicine under any circumstances, calling studies supporting medicinal cannabis “unscientific” and “poorly researched³².” CNOA is fighting hard to defeat marijuana legalization legislation on the November California ballot.

Political Spending

In 2008, CNOA gave \$60,000 to the campaign for People Against Proposition 5 Deception³³. (This number does not include independent expenditures.)

Sample Political Contributions from the CNOA

Contribution Destination	Year	Amount	Result
People Against Proposition 5 Deception		\$60,000	Proposition was defeated (keeping longer parole sentences for drug felonies)

California Bail Agents Association–CBAA/ Golden State Bail Agents Association–GSBAA
CBAA Stated Mission: to “promote the mutual benefit of its members by disseminating information among members of the Association about issues of import to the profession and to monitor and attempt to influence governmental decisions that impact the profession.”³⁴
GSBAA Stated Mission: to “inform citizens and California Government regarding the benefits of the private surety bail bond industry, increase the market share of private surety bail bonds through the reduction of un-secured pre-trial release throughout the State of California, represent the interests of the professional bail agents of California, work to improve business conditions and promote professionalism and integrity throughout California’s bail industry, [and to] provide advocacy for private surety bail bonds by promoting legislation that will insure that our industry can provide its essential service of ‘*Insuring That Defendants Appear In Court*’³⁵.”

Overview

The Golden State Bail Agents Association was formed in 1978 explicitly to lobby for increases in the fee detainees must pay for bail posting services. The California Department of Insurance regulates bail premiums, which are set as a percentage of the court ordered bail. California sets

bail premiums at 10 percent. Recently the CBAA has coordinated with the Golden State Bail Agents Association.

Legislative Advocate

Both associations employ Kathy Lynch, who founded Lynch and Associated in 1985, as their legislative advocate. Prior to this, Lynch worked in Human Resources for a New York based Fortune 500 Company specializing in labor relations. Lynch graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing from Mt. Mercy College and a Master of Science degree in Labor and Industrial Relations from Iowa State University.

Public Policy

Both groups have lobbied hard to oppose what is referred to as Credit Card Bail. GSBA and CBAA argue that credit card companies are operating as bail agents without a state license.

GSBA and CBAA have also joined forces to oppose government funded pre-trial bail. Bail Bond associations are facing increased scrutiny as publicly funded bail options are being explored across the country. (The US and the Philippines are the only two nations where pre-trial bail systems are dominated by the private sector³⁶.)

Political Spending

In 2008, Golden State Bail Agents Association gave \$40,000 to the campaign for Yes On 6 CMTE To Take Back Our Neighborhoods³⁷. (This number does not include independent expenditures.)

Sample Political Contributions from GSBAA/CBAA

Contribution Destination	Year	Amount	Result
Yes On 6 CMTE to Take Back Our Neighborhoods	2008	\$40,000	Prop 6 failed

California District Attorney Association – CDAA

Stated Mission: “To promote justice by enhancing prosecutorial excellence³⁸.”

Overview

The California District Attorneys Association was founded in 1974. The CDAA currently has about 2,500 members and sponsors more than 30 special interest committees. These committees are staffed with prosecutors who review bills, provide technical assistance, and lobby the Legislature. The CDAA also advocates for and against propositions during the initiative process. CDAA maintains that “as a matter of policy, CDAA does not contribute to political campaigns, attend fund raisers or endorse candidates.”

Legislative Advocate

Since 2007, Cory Salzillo is employed by CDAA as their main legislative advocate. Mr. Salzillo graduated from the University of Davis.

Public Policy

The association's current focus on criminal justice legislation includes elder abuse, child abuse, and child pornography. While CDAA says that they do not contribute to political campaigns they do openly advocate for legislation and their endorsement carries considerable weight.

CDAA supported the voter initiative in 1977 that reinstated the Death Penalty. They have since opposed recent attempts to characterize capital punishment as cruel and unusual punishment.

In 2004, CDAA opposed Proposition 66 which would have reformed the three strikes law. CDAA awarded Governor Schwarzenegger the "Fiat Justicia Ruat Coelum" award for his leadership and work to defeat Proposition 66. The ballot measure would have required a third strike felony to be a violent and/or serious crime to mandate a sentence of 25 years to life.

Political Spending

In 2008, CDAA spent \$5,000 on the campaign for People Against The Proposition 5 Deception³⁹. (This number does not include independent expenditures.)

Sample Political Contributions from the CDAA

Contribution Destination	Year	Amount	Result
People Against the Proposition 5 Deception	2008	\$5,000	Proposition 5 was defeated

American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California

Stated Mission: to "preserve and guarantee the protections of the Constitution's Bill of Rights...to extend these freedoms to segments of our population who have traditionally been denied their rights,...[and to] educate the public, inform the media, lobby legislators, organize grassroots activists, and disseminate information about our constitutional freedoms through our membership and volunteer chapters⁴⁰."

Overview

The ACLU NC, largest of the 53 ACLU affiliates nationwide, was founded in 1935. The ACLU NC has over 55,000 members and employs 50 staff members. The association has offices in San Francisco, San Jose, and a legislative office in Sacramento.

Legislative Advocate

Francisco Lobaco is employed by the ACLU NC as their fulltime legislative advocate.

Public Policy

The ACLU NC frequently opposes the death penalty based on budgetary concerns, arguing that it costs California more to execute a person than it does to incarcerate them. In 2008, they also argued that Californians could save money and lives by supporting Proposition 5.

Currently the ACLU NC is sponsoring SB 1331, The Racial Justice Act, a bill trying to ensure that race is not a factor in the death penalty. The ACLU NC argues that defendants are more

likely to be sentenced to the death penalty if they are accused of killing a Caucasian person. In California, the group argues that a defendant is three or four times more likely to be sentenced to death in cases where the victim was white as opposed to African American or Latino.

Political Spending

In 2008, they also donated \$67,000 to the No on Proposition 4 campaign⁴¹. (This number does not include independent expenditures.)

Sample Political Contributions from the ACLU

Contribution Destination	Year	Amount	Result
Fix Three Strikes Yes On 66	2004	\$20,000	Prop 66 failed
No On Proposition 6 & 9		\$2,500	Prop 6 failed, Prop 9 passed
Nora Campaign-Yes on Prop 5	2008	\$2,500	Prop 5 failed

Notes

¹ <http://www.fec.gov/pages/brochures/indexp.shtml>

² <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/ie/IEReport2.pdf>

³ <http://www.aclunc.org/about/index.shtml>

⁴ <http://www.porac.org/mission.html>

⁵ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/reports/Report31110.pdf>

⁶ <http://www.ccpoa.org/union/about>

⁷ <http://www.ccpoa.org/>

⁸ *Ib id*

⁹ Walters, D. (2008, September 1). Guards and tribes wield influence. *The Modesto Bee*, p. A10.

¹⁰ Abramsky, S. (2008). The Taming of the Shrews. *Mother Jones*. 33, (4). from <http://www.motherjones.com/>

¹¹ Carrasco, B., Petersilia, J. (2006). Assessing the CCPOA's Political Influence and its Impact on Efforts to Reform the California Corrections System. *Stanford Criminal Justice Center Working Papers*.

Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=977005>

¹² *Ib id*

¹³ <http://www.ccpoa.org/>

¹⁴ See endnote 11

¹⁵ Lopez, P. (2009, April 25). Shared sacrifice: unlock prisons' hold on budget. *The Sacramento Bee*, p. A14.

¹⁶ *Ib id*

¹⁷ Petersilia, J. (2006). *Understanding California Corrections: A Policy Research Report*. Berkeley, CA: Regents of the University of California.

¹⁸ Holwerda, D. (2006). Prison Reform and the California Correctional Peace Officers Association. *Stanford Criminal Justice Working Papers*. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=977252>

¹⁹ <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/11/us/11prisons.html>

²⁰ <http://www.followthemoney.org/database/topcontributor.phtml?u=3286&y=0&incs=0&ince=0&incf=0&incy=0&so3=y#sortable3>

²¹ see endnote 1

²² See endnote 11

²³ Page, J. (2008). Manufacturing affinity: the fortification and expression of ties between prison officers and crime victims. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. 37 (6). 745-777.doi: 10.1177/0891241607310731

²⁴ *Ib id*

²⁵ <http://www.porac.org/>

²⁶ <http://www.followthemoney.org/database/topcontributor.phtml?u=4238&y=0&incs=0&ince=0&incf=0&incy=0&so3=y#sortable3>

²⁷ see endnote 1

²⁸ <http://www.followthemoney.org/database/topcontributor.phtml?u=4238&y=0>

²⁹ http://www.californiapolicechiefs.org/nav_files/mission_statement.html

³⁰ <http://www.followthemoney.org/database/StateGlance/contributor.phtml?d=1122312946>

³¹ <http://www.cnoa.org/about.htm>

³² <http://www.cnoa.org/N-09.pdf>

³³ <http://www.followthemoney.org/database/topcontributor.phtml?u=10706&y=208>

³⁴ http://www.cbaa.com/Mission_Statement.html

³⁵ <http://www.gsbbaa.org/mission/>

³⁶ http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/29/us/29bail.html?_r=1&th&emc=th&oref=slogin

³⁷ <http://www.followthemoney.org/database/topcontributor.phtml?u=12500&y=2008>

³⁸ <http://www.cdaa.org/>

³⁹ <http://www.followthemoney.org/database/StateGlance/contributor.phtml?d=1122312945>

⁴⁰ <http://www.aclunc.org/about/index.shtml>

⁴¹ <http://www.followthemoney.org/database/StateGlance/contributor.phtml?d=1139017137>



For more information please contact:
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
440 9th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 621-5661
cjcj@cjcc.org
www.cjcj.org

The Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that offers policy analysis, program development, and technical assistance in the criminal justice field.