



**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
Set Matter-1.		Oppose	Jacqueline Beltran	<p>I am submitting this written comment to reiterate the urgent need for the Board to agendize Measure A compliance and to address County-funded LAHSA workforce protections publicly. Staffing and program changes continue advancing without any publicly presented Measure A analysis, despite the legal requirement for non-displacement.</p> <p>I also want to note a concerning development. Immediately following the significant turnout by LAHSA staff at the November 18 Board meeting, LAHSA leadership has now scheduled a mandatory all-staff meeting at the same time as this week's Board meeting.</p> <p>Whether intentional or not, the effect is the same: it prevents workers from participating in public comment and from hearing the Board's discussion of decisions that directly impact their employment.</p> <p>This creates the appearance of retaliation or suppression of worker voice, and it undermines the transparency Measure A requires.</p> <p>County employees and County-funded employees have a right to participate in the public process without interference. Meetings that overlap with Board deliberations — especially during a period when major restructuring decisions are being made — erode trust and restrict access to critical information.</p> <p>I again request that the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formally agendize Measure A compliance for public discussion. 2. Ensure that County-funded workers are not prevented from participating in the public process. 3. Require that all restructuring presentations include a Measure A impact analysis before advancing further. <p>The public deserves transparency. County-funded workers deserve non-displacement. Both are required under Measure A.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
		Item Total	1	
Grand Total			1	

OPEN LETTER TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

RE: Measure A Non-Compliance, Hidden Staffing Cuts, and the County's Legal Obligations to County-Funded LAHSA Workers

To the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and the residents of Los Angeles County:

I am writing to raise urgent concerns regarding the County's continued advancement of a homelessness restructuring plan that appears to violate the non-displacement protections guaranteed under *Measure A*, the voter-adopted County Governance Reform Charter Amendment.

This letter is being made public because this is not merely an internal administrative issue. It affects:

- **Hundreds of County-funded workers,**
- **Thousands of unhoused residents, and**
- **The integrity of voter-approved County law.**

The facts below are based on the County's own documents, public statements, internal presentations, and legal precedents. Caught up amid these Measure A violations are hundreds of Los Angeles Homeless Service Authority employees whose livelihoods are tied to the important work they do to help bring Angelenos inside.

1. Measure A protects any job funded “in whole or in part” by County dollars — including partially funded and vacant positions.

The County has repeatedly described LAHSA positions as funded with “braided funding,” which suggested that they could not be protected because they were not funded 100% by County dollars.

This is **legally incorrect**. Measure A includes **no percentage threshold**.

The phrase “**in part**” in California statutory interpretation means that **any non-zero amount of County funding triggers Measure A protections**. Effectively, a position funded **10%** with County dollars is protected the same as a position funded **100%** with County dollars.

Vacant positions are equally protected, because eliminating a vacant County-funded position reduces the authorized County-funded workforce and prevents employee placement into those roles, both of which are actions that are explicitly prohibited under Measure A.

Measure A protects **structures**, not merely filled seats.

2. The County’s own Feasibility Report contradicts the “braided funding” narrative.

The March 2025 Feasibility Report identified:

- **470 LAHSA positions (52% of the workforce) as County-funded**, and
- Dozens of classifications funded **40–70%** with County dollars.

These are all Measure A–protected positions.

The County cannot claim uncertainty when its own report already unbraided the funding streams, identified County-funded positions, and quantified exposure.

The report proves the County had **clear notice, clear knowledge, and clear legal obligation** months before this transition began.

3. Internal County presentations show specific staffing cuts — contradicting public claims of “uncertainty.”

On Nov. 18, County HSH leadership told the Board of Supervisors they “could not determine” which positions would be affected because funding was “too braided.”

Yet within 48 hours, internal materials showed:

- Reduction of HET teams from **68 to 33 FTEs**
- **\$0** for Housing Navigation
- Eliminations of Problem Solving, Prevention Case Management, Youth Family Reconnection, and more
- Multi-year staffing charts tied to bed/slot ratios

These are explicit staffing reductions — not ambiguities.

The County had this information **before the vote** and did not disclose it publicly.

3A. LAHSA’s Interim CEO has now confirmed these cuts in writing.

On November 27, LAHSA Interim CEO Gita O’Neill circulated an agency-wide email formally detailing:

- Elimination of multiple LAHSA-administered programs,
- LAHSA outreach reduced from **34 to 15 teams**
- Cuts to Pathway Home
- Reductions in ICMS and stabilization services
- Major administrative shifts to HSH

These are the same cuts the County claimed it “could not identify” publicly just days earlier.

This confirms that **the County knew the impacts, the impacts were withheld from the public record, and LAHSA leadership was briefed internally prior to the vote.**

The contradiction is undeniable and deeply troubling.

3B. The County HSH could not have “unbraided” this funding in 24–48 hours.

The HSH County leadership claimed on November 18 it was “too early” to identify staffing impacts.

Yet within two days the same team produced:

- Fully unbraided program budgets
- Exact FTE counts
- Multi-year projections
- Bed/slot staffing ratios
- Program elimination plans

This level of detail requires **weeks** of cross-department fiscal analysis. It cannot be produced overnight.

The truth is clear:

- The HSH had already completed the unbraiding.
- HSH knew which positions would be cut.
- They did not disclose this before the vote.

This raises concerns about transparency, accuracy of public testimony, and compliance with public process requirements.

3C. The County is now reframing the crisis to justify sidelining LAHSA staff — but none of these narratives create a Measure A exemption.

Recent public remarks by the Supervisors Horvath, Barger and Solis at the Board Meeting on 12/2/25 have attempted to shift attention away from the County's obligations under Measure A, including:

- AB 218 settlements
- Wildfire costs
- Federal shutdowns
- Inflation
- Systemwide fiscal pressures.

But Measure A does**not** contain exemptions for:

- Fiscal hardship,
- Natural disasters,
- Leadership dissatisfaction, or
- Budget deficits.

LAHSA workers are not being displaced because the workforce failed — they are being displaced because **leadership decisions failed**, and the County is shifting accountability downward.

4. The “concierge hiring program” is not placement — it is competitive civil service hiring.

The program requires County-funded LAHSA workers to:

- Submit applications
- Pass Minimum Qualifications
- Take civil service exams
- Be ranked on eligibility lists
- Participate in interviews
- Complete probation

Workers have already been **rejected at Minimum Qualifications**, which is precisely the displacement Measure A prohibits.

Rebranding competitive hiring as a “concierge” service does not change the legal effect.

5. County precedent proves direct placement is lawful and already established.

From 2021–22, the County transferred LACDA staff into WDACS under Charter § 56¾. This transfer included:

- Direct appointment without examination
- No probation
- Full seniority retention
- Approval by CEO, Personnel, and County Counsel

LAHSA is also a JPA with the County. The County has already performed this type of transfer.

There is **no legal barrier** to direct placement — only a **political** one.

6. The County's hiring freeze makes Measure A compliance even more essential.

On November 25, the County CEO confirmed the following actions:

- Hiring curtailments,
- Frozen positions,
- No new ongoing revenue.

It is impossible for LAHSA workers to “compete” for County jobs that do not exist, are frozen, or cannot be filled.

Attempting restructuring during a hiring freeze creates **guaranteed displacement by design**.

The Board of Supervisors is now formally on notice.

Measure A is **legally binding County law. It is not optional, not advisory, and not suspended during fiscal crises.**

The County must immediately:

1. Identify *all* County-funded LAHSA positions (including partially funded and vacant).
2. Halt advancement of staffing reductions until Measure A compliance is completed.
3. Replace competitive reapplication with direct placement under § 56¾.
4. Disclose full staffing impacts publicly.
5. Ensure no County-funded worker is displaced.

Proceeding despite clear knowledge violates voter intent and creates potential legal exposure, risk of injunction, and erosion of public trust.

The Board of Supervisors must place Measure A compliance on the next agenda — restricting public comment is unacceptable.

At the November 26 meeting, public comment was limited to *agenda items only*, preventing County-funded LAHSA employees from placing Measure A concerns on the public record.

When hundreds of County-funded positions are at risk and voter-protected rights are affected, the Brown Act mandates open session discussion of Measure A compliance.

Failure to agendize Measure A while simultaneously advancing Measure A–related staffing cuts raises serious concerns about transparency and compliance with County Charter obligations.

The Board must **publicly agendize Measure A compliance** at the December 9th meeting.

Because public comment for the Measure A Labor Council closes on **December 4**, this letter is being released now so the public record reflects what the County knew prior to the Labor Council's recommendations.

Signed,

Jacqueline Beltran, Unit Acquisitions, Senior Coordinator / LAHSA County-Funded Employee

With the support of:

E Abdel-Ghany, Time Limited Subsidy Coordinator / LAHSA County-Funded Employee

Kyra Price, Interim Housing Coordinator / LAHSA County-Funded Employee

Heather Varden, Coordinator, Community Relations / LAHSA County-Funded Employee

Susana Diaz, Countywide Matcher, Interim Housing / LAHSA County-Funded Employee

Stephanie Whack, Coordinator, Domestic Violence System / LAHSA County-Funded Employee

Emily Ball, Unit Acquisitions, Coordinator / LAHSA County-Funded Employee