

[REDACTED] whom it may concern

My name is Kayla Buchanan  
sentenced under the ~~481.1~~ 481.1  
Drug Career Guidelines for 2 prior  
state drug felony. I've never  
been to prison I was only  
on probation for them 2 state  
felonies but they used them to  
call me a career offender and  
gave me 16 years my first time  
in prison. I've already served  
9 years of them 16. I did not  
even get the -2 drug law because  
the 481.1. I pray you will  
look into the career guidelines  
and fix them. Someone who has  
never been to prison should not  
be a career offender. Only the  
sentencing commission can correct  
this and fix what state prior  
drug felonies can be used to  
career you. It should only  
be "serious drug felonies" that  
you served over 12 months in  
prison on.

I pray you guys will  
research and fix the career  
guidelines.

Thank you for your  
time.

Kayla Buchanan

K. Buchanan [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

HAPPY Holidays  
God Bless!

[REDACTED]  
Acting Chair  
United States Sentencing Commission One Columbus Circle, N.E  
Suite 2-500, South Lobby  
Washington D.C. 20002-802

[REDACTED]

My name is Chan Martin and I am an interested person expressing what I believe the Sentencing Commission should address regarding the Career Offender Enhancement. This enhancement has personally affected my family.

The Commission proposed priorities for the amendment cycle ending May 1, 2019 was to include continuation of its work with Congress and others to implement the recommendations of the Commission's 2016 report to Congress, Career Offender Sentencing Enhancements, including its recommendations to revise the career offender directive at 28 U.S.C. § 994(h) to focus on offenders who have committed at least one crime of violence.

In November 2017 My husband [REDACTED] was indicted for Trafficking 50Kg+ of marijuana with no Mandatory Minimum. He plead guilty of 100KG of Marijuana for sentencing purposes. His criminal history category was 3, and offense level was 21 after acceptance of responsibility. This subjected [REDACTED] to a sentencing guideline of 46-57 months for the marijuana crime he committed, respectably.

[REDACTED], is 38 years old, and has two prior marijuana felonies in his past. [REDACTED] spent a combined six months of his life incarcerated for these two offenses. He has no other felonies, jail or prison in his lifetime. Six months. Because he has two prior Marijuana Felonies, he is considered a Career Offender. With this enhancement, his new sentencing guideline is 210-240 Months.

Unfortunately, My husband has not served enough time incarcerated to have learned from his past bad decisions. He deserves to go to prison for breaking the law, again. He deserves the 4-5 year sentence that the guideline recommends without the enhancement. However, It will not require a 18-20 year sentence to rehabilitate him from selling Marijuana. I believe my husbands sentencing guideline is a perfect example of a major flaw in the Career Offender Enhancement that your commission is attempting to fix.

As intended, the Criminal History Category itself increasingly punishes individuals for their past crimes. Congress intended for the Career Offender enhancement to put away hardened criminals who have multiple prison terms under their belt for most of their remaining life. I do not believe congress intended this enhancement to be applied to non-violent offenders that have not experienced a year of lifetime incarceration to be considered Career Criminals subject to this throw away the key enhancement. It is simply way too harsh.

Based upon the significant research the commission provided in the 2016 report regarding recidivism rates, and as the sentencing commission has concluded, The Career Offender Enhancement should be reserved for violent, repeat offenders, with at least one crime of violence.

My husband will be sentenced later this year, likely to the 210-240 month guideline. Our family is in prayers and hopes that the commission will add this amendment for the cycle ending this year 2019. Should this amendment take place at a later date, making the amendment Retroactive is the right thing to do.

Sincerely,

Chan Martin