OUR COUNTY’S BUDGET SHOULD REFLECT OUR VALUES AND THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE, WHO ARE DEMANDING SYSTEMIC CHANGE.
KEY CONTACTS

• EUNISSES HERNANDEZ | EUNISSES@LADEFENSA.ORG
  Chair (Re-Imagine LA) + Co-Executive Director (La Defensa)

• ISAAC BRYAN | IGBRYAN92@GMAIL.COM
  Chair (Re-Imagine LA) + Founding Director (UCLA Black Policy Center)

• TOMMY NEWMAN | TNEWMAN@UNITEDWAYLA.ORG
  Treasurer (Re-Imagine LA) + Sr. Director, Impact Initiatives (United Way LA)

• EMILY BRADLEY | EBRADLEY@UNITEDWAYLA.ORG
  Director, Strategic Investments (United Way LA)
1. **OVERVIEW + CONTEXT**
   *What streams of work have brought us here and together?*

2. **COMPONENTS OF RE-LA**
   *What is Re-Imagine LA, and what impact would it have?*

3. **THE CAMPAIGN: YES ON J**
   *What are voter attitudes, campaign structure, and strategy?*

4. **OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVOLVEMENT**
   *How can funders get involved and help?*
#1. OVERVIEW + CONTEXT
500,000+
on the brink

- SELF-RESOLVED: 52,689
- HOUSING PLACEMENTS: 22,769
+ INFLOW: 82,955
+ 7,497 (13%)

HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION

2019 58,936
2020 66,433
ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION: CARES FIRST JAILS LAST
THE MOVEMENT FOR BLACK LIVES

BLACK PEOPLE ACCOUNT FOR:

- 8% L.A. COUNTY POPULATION
- 34% PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS
- 41% PEOPLE DIAGNOSED WITH A MENTAL HEALTH CONDITION IN A JAIL

○ BLACK PEOPLE
¬ EVERYONE ELSE
INTERSECTIONS

Homelessness Prevention
ATI: Care First, Jails Last
Movement for Black Lives

Re-Imagine LA

Measure J

2015-2020
July 2020
August 2020
#2. COMPONENTS OF RE-LA
THE CHARTER AMENDMENT

1. FOREVER AND ALWAYS
A change to the County’s “Constitution” with no sunset

2. 10% MINIMUM, NO SUPPLANATION = ~$1B/YEAR
At least 10% of the County’s unrestricted revenues (Net County Cost) will be required to be spent on a defined set of uses

3. ELIGIBLE USES/PROHIBITED USES
This set-aside will create intentional investments in direct community investments and alternatives to incarceration for our black and brown communities: jobs, youth development, housing, small biz, ATI

4. INCLUSIVE, TRANSPARENT, PHASED PROCESS
The specific allocations will be determined through a dedicated process that has until July 1, 2024 to reach the full set-aside.
Mandated vs. Discretionary Costs
2020-21 Adopted Budget
$34.901 Billion*

* Excludes major interfund transfers of revenue that would artificially inflate the size of the total County budget
** Flexible Costs include one-time only expenditures and mandatory functions with discretionary service levels

Program Specific Revenue/Fixed Costs
$26.094 Billion (74.8%)

Flexible Costs**
$4.964 Billion (14.2%)

Public Protection - $2.152 Billion (6.2%)
($ in Millions)
Community-Based Contracts 2.0
Coroner 42.5
Correctional Health Services 384.1
District Attorney - Criminal 192.3
Diversion and Re-Entry 57.9
Fire - Lifeguards 37.5
Probation 24.7
Prepayment Related Services - Public Safety 199.7
Sheriff 992.8

All Other Costs - $2.812 Billion (8.0%)
($ in Millions)
Adequate Housing 100.4
Agric. Comm./Weights & Measures 15.4
Animal Care and Control 44.2
Appropriations for Contingencies 22.1
Capital Projects 767.0
Consumer and Business Affairs 11.6
Countywide Services 55.8
Economic Development 45.7
Extraordinary Maintenance 121.0
General Government 817.0
Health 24.0
Health-Tobacco 60.5
Homeless Services 47.8
Mental Health 23.9
Parks and Recreation 169.5
Project & Facility Development 62.5
Prepayment Related Services - Other 39.3
Public Health 130.4
Recreation and Cultural 70.7
Regional Planning 28.7
Use of Obligated Fund Balance 68.3
Various Social Services 148.6

Non-Flexible Costs
$3.843 Billion (11.0%)

Public Protection - $2.654 Billion (6.9%)
($ in Millions)
Alternate Public Defender 71.4
Court Related (Judgment Defense 56.2) 367.0
District Attorney - Criminal 83.7
Health/Mental Health 688.9
Probation - Other 285.0
Public Defender 221.2
Sheriff 736.7
Social Services 120.5

Other Non-Flexible Costs - $578.3 Million (1.7%)
($ in Millions)
Grand Jury 1.9
Judgments & Damages/Insurance 19.4
Museums/Obligation 57.0
THE FACTS

COMPARISON OF CURRENT FLEXIBLE NET COUNTY COST FUNDING ALLOCATION

DISTRICT ATTORNEY, PROBATION, AND SHERIFF’S

$1.75 BILLION

HOMELESS & HOUSING, MENTAL HEALTH, DIVERSION & RE-ENTRY

$230 MILLION
DIRECT COMMUNITY INVESTMENT

- Increase funding for community-based youth development programs
- Provide career training and jobs to low-income residents with a focus on jobs highlighted by ATI workgroup (e.g., construction jobs, jobs that support a decentralized system of care, restorative care village)
- Create access to capital for small minority-owned businesses, with a focus on Black-owned businesses
- Provide rental assistance, housing vouchers, and accompanying supportive services to those at risk of losing their housing and those without stable housing
- Provide capital funding for affordable housing, transitional housing, supportive housing, and restorative care villages

ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION

- Increase funding for community-based restorative justice programs
- Increase support for pre-trial non-custody services and treatment
- Increase life-affirming community-based health services, health promotion, wellness and prevention programs, and mental health and substance use disorder services
- Increase non-custodial diversion and re-entry programs, including housing and services.

*prohibitions: funds cannot go to or through Sheriff, DA, Probation, Courts
THE CHARTER AMENDMENT

FOREVER AND ALWAYS
A change to the County’s “Constitution” with no sunset

10% MINIMUM, NO SUPPLANATION = ~$1B/YEAR
At least 10% of the County’s unrestricted revenues (Net County Cost) will be required to be spent on a defined set of uses

ELIGIBLE USES/PROHIBITED USES
This set-aside will create intentional investments in direct community investments and alternatives to incarceration for our black and brown communities: jobs, youth development, housing, small biz, ATI

INCLUSIVE, TRANSPARENT, PHASED PROCESS
The specific allocations will be determined through a dedicated process that has until July 1, 2024 to reach the full set-aside.
#3.

THE CAMPAIGN

YES ON J
MEASURE J

A change to the County’s “Constitution” with no sunset

PROPOSED COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENT.
COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION MINIMUM COUNTY BUDGET ALLOCATION.

Shall the measure, annually allocating in the County’s budget no less than ten percent (10%) of the County’s locally generated unrestricted revenues in the general fund to address the disproportionate impact of racial injustice through community investment and alternatives to incarceration and prohibiting using those funds for carceral systems and law enforcement agencies as detailed in the ordinance adopting the proposed charter amendment, be adopted?
A Majority Would Strongly Support Shifting Funding from Law Enforcement Into Community Programs

Q: The structure of the Community Reinvestment and Housing Stabilization Measure has not been finalized. I am going to ask you about a variety of potential features that might be included as a part of the measure. After each one, please tell me if you support or oppose that feature.

- **Shifts funding from law enforcement to community-based programs proven to address the root causes of crime**
  - Strongly Support: 51%
  - Somewhat Support: 16%
  - DK/PNTS: 7%
  - Somewhat Oppose: 6%
  - Strongly Oppose: 19%
  - Total Support: 67%

- **Reduces the Sheriff’s Department budget by at least 10 percent and redirects the funding to programs and services in underserved communities**
  - Strongly Support: 45%
  - Somewhat Support: 16%
  - DK/PNTS: 7%
  - Somewhat Oppose: 9%
  - Strongly Oppose: 23%
  - Total Support*: 61%

- **Would target funding to historically over-policed communities**
  - Strongly Support: 38%
  - Somewhat Support: 20%
  - DK/PNTS: 15%
  - Somewhat Oppose: 10%
  - Strongly Oppose: 16%
  - Total Support*: 59%

* Split sampled.
More Than 3-In-5 Voters Support Directing Funding To Those Earning Less Than The Median Income And Black Residents

Q: The structure of the Community Reinvestment and Housing Stabilization Measure has not been finalized. I am going to ask you about a variety of potential features that might be included as a part of the measure. After each one, please tell me if you support or oppose that feature.

* Would target funding to residents and families earning less than the County’s median income

- Strongly Support: 43%
- Somewhat Support: 24%
- DK/PNTS: 9%
- Somewhat Oppose: 10%
- Strongly Oppose: 15%

Total Support* 66%

* Would target funding to Black residents and communities

- Strongly Support: 43%
- Somewhat Support: 22%
- DK/PNTS: 12%
- Somewhat Oppose: 7%
- Strongly Oppose: 16%

Total Support* 64%

* Split sampled.
**Increasing Mental Health Services and Programs for Youth Rank as Top-Tier Priorities**

Q: I’d like to ask you about other ways funding from this measure might be spent. After you hear each one, please tell me how important it is to you personally that each one receive funding—extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important.

- **Increasing community-based counseling and mental health services**
  - Extremely Important: 49%
  - Very Important: 27%
  - Somewhat Important: 12%
  - Not Too Important: 6%
  - Total: 76%

- **Increasing funding for restorative justice programs to keep young people out of the criminal justice system**
  - Extremely Important: 45%
  - Very Important: 28%
  - Somewhat Important: 13%
  - Not Too Important: 9%
  - Total: 72%

- **Providing job training and placement services to low-income residents**
  - Extremely Important: 43%
  - Very Important: 29%
  - Somewhat Important: 15%
  - Not Too Important: 8%
  - Total: 72%

- **Increasing funding for mentoring and youth development programs**
  - Extremely Important: 39%
  - Very Important: 31%
  - Somewhat Important: 16%
  - Not Too Important: 6%
  - Total: 70%

*Percentages below 5% not displayed.*
### 3-in-5 Voters Identify Rental Assistance and Grants for Small Minority Owned Business As Highly Important

Q: I'd like to ask you about other ways funding from this measure might be spent. After you hear each one, please tell me how important it is to you personally that each one receive funding—extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not too important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>DK/PNTS</th>
<th>Not Too Important</th>
<th>Total Ext./Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing rent assistance and housing vouchers to those at-risk of losing their housing</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing a funding grant program to help support small minority owned businesses</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing incentives for employers to hire job candidates who have a prior criminal conviction but have served their time and are trying to get a job</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing rental support programs for people at risk of eviction</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages below 5% not displayed.
Movement for Black Lives

CAMPAIGN STRUCTURE

Re-Imagine LA Coalition
Steering Committee
Campaign Committee + Consultants
CHAIRS: EUNISSES HERNANDEZ + ISAAC BRYAN

ADVANCEMENT PROJECT
BLACK WORKER CENTER
BLD PWR
BLM-LA
COMMUNITY COALITION
COMMUNITY POWER COLLECTIVE
CURB
DIGNITY & POWER NOW
INITIATE JUSTICE
INNER CITY STRUGGLE
LA CAN
LA DEFENSA
LA VOICE
LIBERTY HILL FOUNDATION
REFORM LA JAILS
TRANSLATIN@ COALITION
UNITED WAY OF GREATER LOS ANGELES
WHITE PEOPLE FOR BLACK LIVES
YOUTH JUSTICE COALITION

THE STEERING COMMITTEE
### Re-Imagine L.A. County Budget (8.16.20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Low Case</th>
<th>High Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management &amp; Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$3,880,000</td>
<td>$5,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voter Contact &amp; Activation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$1,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure J has good intentions, but the consequences will be painful.

Vote No on Measure J.

No on Measure J – the county is struggling just to provide existing services
- Measure J permanently diverts nearly $500,000,000.00 away from essential workers and critical public services county residents already rely on to a broad wish list of unspecified programs county government isn’t equipped to manage.
- The county is still struggling to help get us through the COVID-19 crisis and decrease homelessness.
- Permanently diverting hundreds of millions of dollars from essential services into a whole new set of unspecified programs during a health and economic crisis will hurt the people we relied on to help.

No on Measure J – puts the safety of our neighborhoods at risk
- Measure J permanently takes $500,000,000.00 in funding away from workers, emergency responders, workers, nurses, 911 operators, public safety officers, and essential workers.

OPPOSITION STATEMENTS

No on Measure J – big political promises and no explanation of consequences
- The Los Angeles Times called it a “bad idea” and a “poor substitute for careful study, deliberation, and decision making.”
- Measure J is cloaked in progressive words and big political promises, but no plan to implement and no specific fiscal accountability to make sure the money is spent effectively.
- Four county politicians rushed Measure J to the ballot without assessing the consequences of how permanently diverting nearly half a billion dollars away from essential county services will harm our neighborhoods.

We all want more people in Los Angeles to succeed, but all Measure J actually does is permanently divert nearly $500,000,000.00 away from essential county services into a whole new wish list of programs the county can’t effectively manage.

Vote No on Measure J.
#4. HOW YOU CAN HELP

REIMAGINE.LA
before nov 3

public education
research + issue polling
Anchor CBO capacity
Anchor CBO capacity
Planning + convening
Research
direct campaign contribution
community organizing + comms

after nov 3

private family

public/ community
BEYOND DOLLARS

• **ENGAGE PERSONALLY** - Personally sign up for updates on campaign at reimagine.la and encourage staff/colleagues to do the same.

• **SHARE WITH YOUR LEADERSHIP** - Tell Board Members about opportunity to individually engage and invest if interested.

• **SHARE WITH YOUR PARTNERS** - Spotlight ballot effort on your organization’s social media, newsletters, and other external communications—with or without position statement.

• **CREATE CONNECTIONS** - Help connect cross-sector partners across issue areas you invest in to grow the coalition.

• **CREATE CAPACITY** - Remove requirements that are not legally required from general operating grants to provide greater flexibility for partners to participate in this and other advocacy efforts.

• **MAKE INTRODUCTIONS** - Introduce coalition leadership to individuals and organizations in your network that can help expand and enhance our efforts.
SIGN ON + SIGN UP @ REIMAGINE.LA

CONNECT ON SOCIAL
twitter.com/reimagine_la
facebook.com/reimaginelosangeles
instagram.com/reimagine_la

FOLLOW UP CONVO
ebradley@unitedwayla.org