



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
11.		Favor	Cassandra F Bolden	
			isabel villarreal	
			Maria Jose Vides	
			Nashana Alexander	
		Oppose	Aleks Navasardyan	
			Nicole Osyka	
		Item Total	6	
Grand Total		6		

February 18, 2025

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

Supervisor Mitchell

Supervisor Solis

Supervisor Horvath

Supervisor Hahn

Supervisor Barger

Via email: executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov

Re: In Support of Board Agenda Item 11: Motion, Entitled, “Understanding the Fiscal Impact of Proposition 36 on County Programs”

Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors,

My name is Maria Jose (MJ) Vides. I am a Senior Program Associate with Vera California, a local initiative of the Vera Institute of Justice, which is a national organization working to end mass incarceration, protect immigrants’ rights, and build safe, thriving communities. I am also a resident of District 2. **I am writing to support the board’s motion directing the Chief Executive Office and the Justice Care and Opportunities Department to analyze the impact Proposition 36 will have on funding for “care first” programs and services in Los Angeles County.**

Vera California has participated in numerous county workgroups to build safety, accountability and justice in Los Angeles, including the Alternatives to Incarceration (ATI) Workgroup, the Men’s Central Jail (MCJ) Closure Workgroup, and the Jail Population Review Council. We also worked to oppose Prop 36—by highlighting the critical care-first funding Los Angeles County stood to lose and how that would undermine public safety. In those roles, we have seen firsthand the need for Los Angeles County to remain committed to the “care first, jails last” vision as our north star so that every Angeleno has the safety they deserve and access to the services they need, especially as we start to see the effects of Prop 36.

Because **Prop 36 will increase prison spending** by increasing penalties that will result in more people incarcerated, it will **decrease Prop 47 cost savings**—also known as the California Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Fund.¹ Over the last decade, Prop 47 saved the state approximately \$95 million per year, which was reallocated to fund crime prevention programs including drug treatment, homelessness prevention, victims’ services, and K-12 school programs.²

Instead of continuing to fund these “care first” programs Los Angeles desperately needs, which are roughly three times more effective at reducing future convictions compared to prison—Prop 36 will strip more than **100 million** each year in funding for those vital services.³ **In Los Angeles County**, these programs have served **more than 10,000 people** with excellent results:

- The rate of new convictions for people who participate in these programs is around **four times lower** than that of people coming out of state prison.

- Only 10 percent of people in the county’s programs faced a new criminal conviction in the years after incarceration, compared to an almost **35 to 45 percent** rate statewide.⁴
- In one Los Angeles County program, 86 percent of participants left the program with housing, and **more than half found employment**.
- Los Angeles County’s **Reentry Intensive Case Management Services (RICMS)** program—in partnership with community-based providers—has served **more than 7,300 Angelenos** and **89 percent** of participants do not face a new conviction in the year after program completion.⁵

It is imperative that Los Angeles County expands and invests in “care first” responses to counter the impacts of Proposition 36 on our communities. The first step is to determine where those funding gaps will be.

We therefore urge the Board of Supervisors to vote “YES” to support this motion, which will help us understand Prop 36’s impacts on funding for vital programs and resources. Further, we strongly urge the board to leverage these findings to inform investments into successful programs like RICMS that will allow the county to continue delivering life saving and life changing services to system-impacted Angelenos. Vera’s experts and researchers would be glad to provide more information or answer questions—you can contact me at mvides@vera.org.

Sincerely,



Maria Jose (MJ) Vides
Senior Program Associate
Vera California

¹ Vera Institute of Justice, *What the Legislature Needs to Know About Prop 36* (Los Angeles: Vera, 2025), https://vera-advocacy-and-partnerships.s3.amazonaws.com/Vera%20CA_Prop%2036%20Fact%20Sheet%20for%202025%20Legislative%20Session.pdf.

² Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO), *Proposition 36: Allows Felony Charges and Increases Sentences for Certain Drug and Theft Crimes. Initiative Statute* (Sacramento, CA: LAO, 2024), <https://lao.ca.gov/BallotAnalysis/Proposition?number=36&year=2024>.

³ Californians for Safety and Justice (CSJ), *Mass Incarceration Ballot Initiative: A New Proposed Ballot Initiative Offers No Treatment, Only Punishment* (Oakland, CA: CSJ, 2024), <https://perma.cc/NLA9-9PWS>.

⁴ California Board of State and Community Corrections, “Proposition 47 Grant Program Evaluation Shows Recidivism Cut,” February 15, 2024, <https://www.bscc.ca.gov/news/proposition-47-grant-program-evaluation-shows-recidivism-cut>.

⁵ Vera Institute of Justice, *Proposition 36 Risks Cutting Millions in Funding that Helps Thousands of Angelenos* (Los Angeles: Vera, 2024), https://vera-advocacy-and-partnerships.s3.amazonaws.com/Vera%20CA_Los%20Angeles%20Prop%2047%20Funding%20Research%20Brief.pdf.