Proposition 36

Re-Funding Needs for the State and Los Angeles County
State Costs for Proposition 36

- 2000-01: $7.2 million
- 2001-02: $99.8 million
- 2002-03: $136.4 million
- 2003-04: $134.3 million
- 2004-05: $143.0 million
- 2005-06: $145.9 million (est)
- 2006-07: $???
Changes for 2006-07 Would Need to Address:

- Additional funding for caseload growth to avoid backlog or denial of service
- Additional funding for COLA to maintain levels of service
- Additional funding to implement Administration reforms (SB 803)
- Additional funding for more intensive programming to enhance effectiveness
Los Angeles County Expenditures

- 2000-01  $ 0 (program start)
- 2001-02  $ 18.6 million
- 2002-03  $ 32.7 million
- 2003-04  $ 37.9 million
- 2004-05  $ 40.3 million
- 2005-06  $ 44.7 million
- 2006-07  $ 46.9 million (est.)
Under the current program, Los Angeles County is able to accept all clients directed to Proposition 36 programs by the courts.

This level of service would be jeopardized at the level of funding proposed in the FY 2006-07 Governor’s Budget.
Statewide Unmet Prop 36 Needs

As compared with a $120 million appropriation
(Dollars in Millions)

- FY 2005-06
  - $48.2 Treatment
  - $3.7 Ancillary Services
  - $12.0 Criminal Justice Supervision
  - **Total Unmet Needs** = $63.9 million

- FY 2006-07
  - $68 Treatment
  - $4.5 Ancillary Services
  - $16.8 Criminal Justice Supervision
  - **Total Unmet Needs** = $89.3 million
Impact of $120 Million Program
(As proposed by Governor’s Budget)

- $89.3 million less than budget year needs
- Does not address caseload increase
- Does not address inflation
- Does not address cost of reforms (SB 803)
- Limits court’s ability to use Prop 36 effectively
Impact of Under-Funding

- Reduced number of clients served
- Reduced level of treatment per client
- Reduced flexibility to tailor the program to the client’s special needs
- Reduced follow-up services
- Reduced supervision
- Reduced level of drug testing
- Reduced effectiveness of Prop 36
Direct Impact to Los Angeles Co
($16.9 M shortfall...36% short of $46.9 M)

- Reduction in number of clients served
- Reduction in level of services provided
- No funding for reforms
- More persons to incarceration
- Less supervision of violators
- Less flexibility to address individual needs