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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Los Angeles County is home to the nation’s largest jail system, which also has become the nation’s largest de facto mental health facility. In the face of lawsuits and concerns over jail overcrowding, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors approved a $2.2 billion contract to construct new jails for women and people with mental health and substance use disorders. However, years of community organizing as well as a changing political tide persuaded the Board to cancel the contract and invest in health-centered approaches to reduce the jail population rather than build new jails. This opened space for new strategies that invest in community health and lay the foundation for a comprehensive approach to creating safety.

Three policy areas — Alternatives to Incarceration, Youth Justice Reimagined, and Violence Intervention — offer a new path forward for jurisdictions across the country aiming to “reimagine” public safety. These policies increase access to services, prevent unnecessary contact with law enforcement, and break cycles of violence through community-based responses to build safer, healthier communities.

Three key frameworks are helpful to understanding these policy agendas and act as anchoring goals through changes in politics and implementation:

1. Creating safety through community health: A public health approach to reducing and preventing violence is multifaceted and seeks to address the root causes of the problem.

2. Repairing individual and systemic harm: Restorative and transformative justice provides nonpunitive approaches to accountability and repairing structural harm.

3. Centering communities closest to the problem: The leadership of communities affected by violence and incarceration must be centered in the design, implementation, and oversight of these policy strategies.

Policy Solutions in Los Angeles

Advocates and policymakers in Los Angeles County are building new infrastructures of care and safety that sit entirely outside of the justice system. This robust policy agenda includes:

1. Alternatives to Incarceration, Community-based System of Care: Over 100 recommendations created by the county’s Alternatives to Incarceration Work Group to provide “treatment first and jail as a last resort.” A significant part of the recommendations focuses on building a community-based system of preventive care and alternatives to law enforcement to respond to mental health and substance use crises.

2. Youth Justice Reimagined: An innovative plan to phase youth out of the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles County Probation Department and into a new, health-focused Department of Youth Development within five years.

3. Violence Intervention: Investment in an asset-based, public health approach to preventing and interrupting cycles of violence, with a focus on the Los Angeles Mayor’s Office of Gang Reduction and Youth Development, one of the first and longest-standing public investments in coordinated, community-based violence intervention.

While these policy agendas bring great promise, their implementation faces continued challenges. Bold leadership and significant investments are needed to build long-term solutions and truly shift the status quo toward a holistic approach to community health and safety.
PART I: INTRODUCTION

Cheers echoed through the hearing room as the votes were called. It was Tuesday, August 13, 2019, and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in a 4-1 vote took the final step to cancel a $2.2 billion contract to construct a massive mental health facility that would have replaced the county’s dilapidated Men’s Central Jail.¹ Months earlier, they had voted to abandon a plan to replace the women’s jail under the same contract.² These votes culminated a hard-fought campaign to halt expansion of what was already the largest jail system in the world. Hundreds of activists, led by the JusticeLA Coalition and other organizations fighting for care over incarceration, packed the hearing room clad in orange shirts with a message on the back that encapsulated the fight at hand: “Can’t get well in a cell.”

Like many counties in the United States, Los Angeles has long been guilty of overcrowding and unconscionable conditions in its jail system. Most people who cycle through have serious mental health and substance use issues, and racial disparities abound. At first pass, the Board of Supervisors sought to remedy this with the same strategy relied upon for decades: build a bigger, “better” jail. While this strategy may have once passed with little objection, a turning political tide and years of persistent advocacy pushed the board to reverse course.

The vote to cancel the jail construction contract represented one of the largest divestments from mass incarceration in recent history, and it did not occur in a vacuum. Rather, the reversal came amid a decade-long shift in the politics and policies of criminal justice. Calls for reform now span disparate ideologies and jurisdictions. California itself has seen a wholesale course correction. A state that had been a leader in policies of incarceration has since pioneered large-scale reductions of its prison population. Although court rulings ordering the state to improve conditions provided the impetus, major initiatives such as Assembly Bill 109 and Propositions 47 and 57 passed by wide margins between 2011 and 2016. California’s prison population declined by 26% between 2008 and 2018; however, jail populations remained stagnant or in some places even increased following prison reforms.³

Recent events have added urgency to these developments. The killing of George Floyd shone a spotlight on a tragic reality felt by many Black Americans and other historically marginalized groups, such as Indigenous, undocumented, homeless, and transgender communities. For too many people in the United States, systems of “public safety” have never felt like sources of protection and have often perpetuated harm and violence instead. The massive protests in the summer of 2020 that followed George Floyd’s murder marked broad recognition of systemic failures in the criminal justice system and its role in perpetuating harm and structural racism, particularly against Black people. The protests activated new constituencies to the need for fundamental change. New demands emerged from a consensus understanding that public safety cannot be

Rather than “arrest, incarcerate, repeat,” the board was persuaded to invest in a new system — one that provides needed care in the community, not a jail cell, and that addresses the root causes of harm, violence, and incarceration.

measured by traditional outputs such as the number of arrests, conviction rates, and people incarcerated. The debate over future directions is well underway, and though it is far from resolved, the impetus is clearly toward an entirely different vision of success based on achieving health and safety for all communities.

In the United States, public policy strategies to create public safety have relied almost exclusively on a criminal justice system designed to deliver carceral punishment for acts of crime and violence rather than seeking to prevent them. From its inception, the U.S. criminal justice system was deeply racialized and used by White settlers as a tool of colonization and to exert economic and political control over Black people after the abolition of slavery. In more recent history, the War on Drugs and the era of mass incarceration were a direct response to civil rights activism and unrest in the 1960s among African Americans, as well as Chicanos, Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, and anti-war and prisoner rights demonstrators. Under the justification of fighting crime, our justice system has grown to massive proportions over the past four decades while other needed services, such as mental health care and schools, have struggled to receive adequate resources.

As the criminal justice system has grown, police and jails have become a de facto response to many social maladies they were never designed to address. People with mental health and addiction issues can more easily be admitted to a jail cell than a treatment center. Behavior that once merited no more than a trip to the principal’s office now results in arrest by police officers stationed in schools. Police respond to incidents of violence when they occur, but additional systems are rarely in place to heal victims and stop the cycle that ensues.

The criminal justice system costs local governments and the families of justice-involved individuals tens of billions of dollars each year. It also has enormous human costs, as the collateral consequences of arrest and incarceration disrupt households and place further stress on communities already affected by a lack of safety. Central links between the criminal justice system and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) have led to millions of deportations in the past two decades, further harming and destabilizing vulnerable communities. Even in places that have begun to reform their justice systems, more is needed to repair these harms. The strategies of radically reexamining the justice system and building community-based infrastructures for health and safety must go hand in hand.

Marginalized communities: Groups of people with shared qualities or experiences, such as demographics or geography, who have often faced injustice and discrimination. They are pushed to the “margins” of society through exclusion from mainstream civic, educational, economic, or cultural life due to unequal power relationships among social groups. Government systems often fail to represent and address the needs of these groups, causing further disadvantage and isolation.

Justice-involved individuals: People whose lives are directly affected, and to varying extents controlled, by the justice system through means such as arrest, detention, incarceration, probation or parole supervision, and pending charges.

---

Building Safety in Los Angeles

This report explores a policy agenda in Los Angeles that constitutes significant first steps toward a reinvention, not just a reform, of the county’s systems of public safety. The Board of Supervisors’ decision not to build a bigger, “better” jail opened space for a new paradigm. An affirmative, local policy agenda that invests in infrastructures for community health and lays the foundation for a comprehensive approach to creating safety has emerged. Rather than build a bigger and “better” jail, new policies increase access to services, prevent unnecessary contact with law enforcement, and break cycles of violence through community-based responses.

In this political moment of “reimagining” public safety, community well-being must be recognized as the foundation for lasting safety, and government policies and investments must follow. In Los Angeles County — where more than a third of the population is foreign-born⁸ — that requires addressing the unique vulnerabilities of noncitizens who face the life-shattering consequences of deportation on top of whatever is meted out by the criminal justice system. In the nation’s most populous county, the realization of this new agenda — its successes, challenges, and evolutions — will provide an important example to advocates and policymakers across the country.

PART II: THREE CONCEPTS FOR BUILDING COMMUNITY SAFETY

Three key frameworks are informative to understanding the emerging policy agenda in Los Angeles and how these strategies help to create lasting safety. Furthermore, as policies evolve through changes in politics and implementation, these concepts serve as anchors and larger goals to achieving long-term solutions:

1. Creating safety through community health
2. Repairing individual and systemic harm
3. Centering communities closest to the problem

Creating Safety through Community Health

Violence in the United States remains a severe public health issue, even after a significant decline over the past three decades. A rising number of health experts, practitioners, and organizations urges policymakers to invest in holistic and health-centered approaches to reduce violence.9

Core to a public health approach is recognizing that violence is preventable and treatable. Violence is a product not of "bad people" but of contextual, biological, environmental, systemic, and social stressors.10 The same underlying conditions make all forms of violence more likely to happen. These root causes include a lack of living-wage jobs, weak community ties, and a lack of trust in government officials.11 However, reinforcing communities' existing strengths can help prevent violence altogether.12

A growing body of research points to factors that improve community safety. These factors include community engagement, economic equity, access to quality education and health care, and improved built environments, such as street lighting and parks.13 In New York, the city used a data-driven approach to improve lighting in 40 housing developments. Through a randomized study, researchers found a 59% decrease in nighttime crime in the high-risk areas that received lighting.14 Other studies have found that the presence of nonprofit community organizations helps reduce crime and violence in communities.15 A longitudinal study of 264 cities over more than 20 years found that 10 additional nonprofits per 100,000 residents were associated with a 9% reduction in the murder rate, a 6% reduction in the violent crime rate, and a 4% reduction in the property crime rate.16 Conversely, factors such as social marginalization, negative relations with police, poverty, income inequality, and housing instability put communities at higher risk for violence.17

---

10 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
17 Wilder Research (2020)
When someone experiences or is exposed to violence, they are at higher risk of perpetuating or becoming a victim of other forms of violence.\textsuperscript{18} This is especially true if the person harmed does not receive trauma-informed support to heal from their experience. In addition to harming individuals, violence harms community assets that act as protective factors, such as access to education, shared community spaces, and economic development. Instead of acting as safe and positive resources, schools and parks can become dangerous places where violence can be perpetrated, and locally owned businesses are harmed rather than uplifted. Therefore, once violence takes root, it can quickly become a harmful and self-perpetuating cycle at the interpersonal and community levels, increasing individual risks and harming protective community resources.

How the collateral impacts of incarceration harm community health and safety

Many of the collateral costs and consequences of mass incarceration and deportation undermine safety in the communities in greatest need. Indiscriminate and abusive policing practices not only harm people directly; they also further marginalize and isolate communities and make violence more likely to occur.\textsuperscript{19} Mass incarceration and deportation have destabilized millions of households in the United States, the overwhelming majority of which are people of color. In 2018 alone, some 2.3 million people were in jail or prison and an additional 4.5 million people were on probation or parole.\textsuperscript{20} Furthermore, in the past 20 years, over 2 million people living in the United States have been deported.\textsuperscript{21}

Los Angeles has been greatly affected by these phenomena. Of the sevenfold increase in California’s prison population from 1977 to 2000, over 40% of people were drawn from Los Angeles and 70% from Southern California.\textsuperscript{22} Today, more than 80,000 people in Los Angeles are on probation supervision.\textsuperscript{23} And some 951,000 Angelenos are undocumented, despite most of those people having lived here for at least a decade,\textsuperscript{24} causing great vulnerability and marginalization.

Family separation causes stress and instability, and children with incarcerated parents are more likely to live in poverty and be suspended or expelled from school.\textsuperscript{25} A study on paternal incarceration found that young boys with incarcerated fathers are more likely to exhibit aggressive behavior, a variable associated with a higher likelihood of engaging in criminal behavior in the future.\textsuperscript{26} In addition to the emotional cost, incarceration and deportation harm economic security. A term of incarceration greatly affects the economic mobility of individuals and families, including employment and future earnings.\textsuperscript{27}


The collateral consequences of overpolicing, arrest, and incarceration have further marginalized communities and exacerbated many of the risk factors that leave them more vulnerable to experiencing violence. Considering the depths of harm caused by mass incarceration and violence in many communities, a comprehensive, multisector approach is needed to create safety and to repair the harms often caused by the very systems tasked with creating “public safety.”

**Repairing Individual and Systemic Harm**

Many of the movements to reform and replace our justice system look to practices of restorative and transformative justice as ways to repair harm while creating accountability. Restorative justice (RJ) is based on Indigenous practices in North America and New Zealand and emerged as a school of thought in public policy in the late 1970s. RJ is a theory of justice, and a set of practices and processes, that serves as an alternative to the traditional, punitive justice system. Restorative justice interventions attend to the needs and experiences of everyone involved in an incident of harm. The process promotes accountability and healing as all parties come together in a conference to review what happened, discuss the impact, and come to agreement on actions that can be taken to make things right. This strategy works to heal relationships and promotes forgiveness and accountability by resolving conflict through voluntary collaboration rather than adversarial and coercive measures.

While RJ seeks to repair harm among individuals, transformative justice (TJ) expands this concept to examine and repair harm at the interpersonal and systemic levels. TJ works for healing and accountability for everyone involved, not only for the survivor and the person who caused harm, but also for the collective conditions that allowed violence to happen in the first place. TJ is a theory of justice that sees individual and collective justice as fundamentally intertwined. It seeks to repair incidents of harm as they occur and to prevent future harm by challenging intergenerational injustices and transforming the conditions that allow violence to occur.

To transform social conditions and create safety in our most vulnerable communities, our government officials must acknowledge the deep, intergenerational harm caused by systems such as the criminal justice and immigration enforcement systems and take action to repair these harms. As the United States has spent trillions of dollars on mass incarceration, detention, and deportation, we must just as feverishly invest in an alternative system of care that restores families and communities. Key to this is building capacity and investing in communities that have historically experienced harm to create safety for themselves.

**Centering Communities Closest to the Problem**

To create safety, it is necessary to fortify community strengths and connectedness. The criminal justice and immigration enforcement systems have caused...
great intergenerational trauma, resulting in civic isolation. They have also caused deep distrust of government systems, even those that seek to provide care and services. If our public institutions are to repair harm and transform the conditions that allow for violence, they will need to earn the trust of affected communities. The best way to do this is to ensure that those communities have a seat at the decision-making table, create mechanisms for accountability and ongoing involvement, and invest in people from those communities to design and deliver services.

As the adage goes, “if you’re not at the table, you’re on the menu.” For so long, policymakers have made decisions trying to “fix” problems faced by neighborhoods or groups with little to no input from the people affected by those very problems. Thus, time, money, and energy are spent trying to implement “solutions” that are ineffective and sometimes harmful. Through coproduction of policy solutions with affected community members, government systems can effectively identify and address people’s needs.34 Continued collaboration in the implementation process allows for collective problem solving and lasting solutions. Even systems of health and “care” need to be held accountable to ensure that they are achieving their goals. Thus, built-in accountability mechanisms that allow for stakeholders to raise concerns and collectively work toward solutions — such as councils, roundtables, and oversight bodies — are essential for ensuring that government departments and the organizations they contract with are achieving their mission and goals.

To build trust and provide effective, culturally responsive services, community health systems should invest in a workforce of people with lived experiences similar to those of the communities they seek to serve. In the context of justice reform, these community leaders are often referred to as “credible messengers.” Evidence-based programming led by credible messengers has proven to significantly reduce recidivism. The Arches mentoring program in New York reduced felony recidivism by over 50% among probation clients ages 16 to 24.35 Evaluations of Youth Advocate Programs Inc. (YAP), which works with youth at high risk of justice system involvement, found that 86% of participants remained arrest-free while in the program,36 and youth were significantly less likely to be in out-of-home placements or secure facilities after completion.37 Credible messengers are a foundational part of the YAP model.38

While credible messengers are often associated with programs to reduce recidivism, the concept that the people most directly affected by a problem are the most effective at solving it can be applied to many contexts. This strategy has proven effective in areas such as preventing HIV or cardiovascular disease.39 In the context of creating safety, credible

---

messengers, gang interventionists, and community health workers (CHWs) provide unique insight and credibility to engage communities at the highest risk of experiencing violence. Community knowledge and relationships are necessary to identify and interrupt violence, as well as to connect residents to solutions and change community norms.

In the context of immigrant communities, the success of this concept can be seen in the promotora community health worker model. As one study puts it: “A promotora is someone that is working in the community and comes from within the community.” They are skilled at building bridges between medically underserved communities, community-based organizations, and health care agencies to increase access to needed care. As trusted members of the communities they serve, CHWs effectively leverage existing networks of relationships and use culturally appropriate messages to help people navigate services and increase access to health care and supportive services. This model has been used to reach some of the most vulnerable communities, such as Indigenous women farmworkers suffering from sexual violence. During the COVID-19 pandemic, CHWs in Los Angeles County, including violence intervention workers, played a critical role in providing personal protective equipment and accurate health information in some of the hardest-hit and hardest-to-reach communities.

Building the capacity and economic mobility of workers and organizations rooted in the communities they serve not only is more effective but can also be viewed as a kind of double investment. Investing in a workforce from the very communities in need of service is a direct investment into the community itself. Many of the people best suited to be CHWs and peer navigators are natural pillars of their communities. By investing in them, public agencies invest in stabilizing communities while building trust and repairing harm.

---

41 Ibid.
43 Ibid.
PART III: POLICY SOLUTIONS IN LOS ANGELES

Advocates and policymakers in Los Angeles County are building new infrastructures of care and safety that sit entirely outside of the justice system. Rather than continuing to expand systems of policing and incarceration, three policy areas — Alternatives to Incarceration, Youth Justice Reimagined, and Violence Intervention — offer a new path forward. Together, they are an affirmative local agenda for jurisdictions across the country aiming to “reimagine” public safety. While much of this agenda is focused on jails and the juvenile justice system, where most people are accused or convicted of nonviolent offenses, these policy areas work to build critical public health infrastructures that can address root causes of violence and respond to emerging needs.

In Los Angeles, proposals in these three policy areas aim to prevent violence by investing in systems of care for communities with the greatest level of need. They promote restorative justice strategies to create nonpunitive approaches to accountability and repair structural harm through equitable investments in historically underserved areas. They invest in and build capacity for nonprofit organizations that are led by people from the communities they serve. And the leadership of communities affected by violence and incarceration is a critical component of the design, implementation, and oversight of these agendas. If fully implemented, these agendas have the potential to transform conditions in communities across Los Angeles and will provide an informative example for the rest of the country.

LOS ANGELES AS A CASE STUDY

Los Angeles’s size and diversity, as well as the massive scale of its challenges and needed solutions, make it an intriguing case study.

Demography

- Los Angeles is the most populous county in the United States. Home to about 10 million residents, LA County has a similar population to the state of Georgia.
- Nearly half the LA County population identifies as Hispanic and/or Latinx, while 9% identify as Black, 15% as Asian, and 26% as White.
- Immigrants make up 35% of the population, and recent estimates show that 1 in 12 of all immigrants in the United States resides in LA County.
- Some 915,000 Angelenos are undocumented, and 74% of those people have lived in the United States for at least 10 years.

Criminal Justice System

- The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD) is the largest of its kind. It runs the world’s largest jail, which is also the country’s largest mental health facility.
- The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) is the third-largest police department in the country, and there are 45 additional municipal police departments in in the county.
- The combined budgets of LAPD, and the county Sheriff and Probation departments amounted to over $6.2 billion in fiscal 2020–2021 alone.

For a full set of citations, see Appendix A.
Policy Area I: Alternatives to Incarceration, Community-based System of Care

Los Angeles County, like the rest of the nation, has a jail problem. Though its search for remedies is the result of a unique history, it can inform the process elsewhere.

Across the country, local jails are overcrowded, costly, and filled with people in critical need of treatment and housing. In 2019, there were 10.3 million admissions to jails in the United States.47 Approximately 2 million of these were of people with a serious mental illness.48 Almost three-quarters of those individuals have co-occurring issues with drugs and alcohol.49 Seventy-four percent of people held in jails nationwide are awaiting trial, meaning they have not been convicted of any crime.50 Many people cycle through local jails and courtrooms, as a stint behind bars does not address the underlying cause of what might have led them there. What’s more, incarceration can further exacerbate mental health problems and disrupt people’s housing, family connections, and employment.51

With an average daily population of more than 14,200 inmates, the Los Angeles County jail system is the nation’s largest.52 It is also the largest de facto mental health facility,53 with around 40% of the jail population having identified mental health needs.54 The majority of people in the jail are people of color, with Black Angelenos representing 8% of the county population but 29% of people held in the jail.55 Among people released from LA County jail, 60% have a “significant substance use disorder.”56 The majority of people come from five zip codes in South Central, Compton, Long Beach, and the Antelope Valley, which lack key assets such as adequate access to extracurricular activities and employment.57 In these areas, child poverty rates are 50% higher than the national average and almost a third of the population spends more than half of their income on rent.58

Challenged by lawsuits and protests over jail conditions, in 2014 the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors initially offered the knee-jerk response seen so many times before: build a bigger, “better” jail.59 And thus, they approved a $2.2 billion jail

---

49 Ibid.
55 Ibid.
57 Ibid.
A construction contract to replace the dilapidated Men’s Central Jail with one designed for inmates with mental illness\(^6^0\) and to replace a women’s jail near South LA with the Mira Loma Detention Center in Lancaster, some 70 miles away.\(^6^1\)

For over a decade, coalitions like LA No More Jails had pushed back against jail expansion. And in 2018, when the jail construction contract resurfaced after significant delays, a groundswell of community activists argued that billions of dollars would be better spent on services and care than on new jails for women and people with mental illness. Around that time, the JusticeLA Coalition, with an infusion of resources, launched a vigorous campaign to stop the jail expansion while reimagining how dollars could be spent on community-based systems of care.\(^6^2\) A notable leader in the coalition is Patrisse Cullors, a native Angeleno and co-founder of the Black Lives Matter Global Network,\(^6^3\) whose brother has a mental illness and suffered greatly in the custody of the county jail.\(^6^4\) The Board of Supervisors started to reconsider its plans.

After months of campaigning, and decades of advocacy, the board was persuaded to reverse action and agreed to halt construction of the new jails, first opting to stop the replacement of the women’s jail and instead construct a large mental health facility, and eventually canceling the construction contract altogether.\(^6^5\)

To devise a new strategy, the board created the Alternative to Incarceration (ATI) Work Group comprised of representatives of county department and appointed community members. The work group embarked on a yearlong process to envision a system that prioritizes “treatment first and jail as a last resort.”\(^6^6\) The group engaged more than 1,000 government and community stakeholders, resulting in a report with 114 recommendations focused on expanding diversion and alternatives to incarceration for some of the county’s most vulnerable populations, including people with mental health and/or substance use issues, women, and LGBTQ+ people.\(^6^7\) The recommendations aim not only to reform the criminal justice system, but also to build a community-based system of care to address the conditions that lead many people to jail in the first place.

**Community-based Care and Alternative Responses: It Matters Where You Start**

So often, justice reform efforts focus only on changing the justice system itself rather than imagining the alternatives necessary to address the social conditions that lead to acts of harm and violence. While the ATI Work Group did recommend important reforms to the justice system, over a third of its recommendations

---


\(^{61}\) Macias Jr., M. (2019)


\(^{66}\) Los Angeles County Alternatives to Incarceration Work Group (2020, March 18)

\(^{67}\) Ibid.
aim to create a coordinated ecosystem of preventive services and alternative responses to law enforcement. Like many justice reform efforts, the ATI Work Group used the Sequential Intercept Model (SIM), a conceptual framework to reduce justice system contact for people with mental health and substance use disorders. The traditional SIM defines Intercept Zero, the starting point, as a response to a mental health or substance use crisis, often as a collaboration between health professionals and law enforcement.

In the ATI Work Group, community advocates pushed to expand and modify the traditional SIM. In thinking through points of intervention, they argued it necessary to focus on front-end prevention services rather than waiting until people are in crisis. In LA County, supportive services for housing, health, and employment are inadequately resourced. Many Angelenos lack access to health services because of economic and geographic barriers, so they cannot proactively identify and address issues such as mental health or substance use disorders. Services lack coordination and are too complex to navigate, so people are not connected to needed supports even when they are available. And many people have been alienated by health care systems and social services because of a legacy of structural racism and a lack of sensitivity to culture, gender, and sexuality. Others fear consequences based on immigration status, including possible disqualification for legal permanent residence based on the use of public benefits.

To begin to imagine policy interventions before the point of crisis, the ATI Work Group redefined Intercept Zero as a “Holistic and Decentralized Community-Based System of Care.” This system is envisioned to help people before a point of crisis, to be accessible in the neighborhoods of highest need, and to include tailored support to individuals returning from incarceration to prevent recidivism. Policy recommendations aim to improve coordination to ensure that people can access all available resources. They also seek to build the capacity of nonprofits that provide rehabilitative services that are culturally rooted and gender responsive. These policy interventions can be less intrusive, can be less expensive in the long run, and can prevent a fragile situation from taking a turn for the worse. The work group put forth 34 recommendations on how the county can build such an ecosystem. Strategies to scale up a Holistic and Decentralized Community-Based System of Care are organized into seven categories:

---

**Holistic and Decentralized Community-Based System of Care:** A coordinated, multisector system of agencies and clinics that provide services to improve individual and community health. These services include health care, housing, substance use support, job training, and reentry services, and they are meant to be accessible to all people regardless of their neighborhood, income, justice system involvement, or immigration status.
■ **Restorative Behavioral Health and Primary Care Villages:** Create and expand service hubs across the county and incorporate coordinated teams to connect clients with optimal services.

■ **Families and Support Network:** Ensure meaningful inclusion, engagement, and information sharing between the loved ones of people with behavioral health needs and the network of supportive services they are enrolled in.

■ **Restorative Justice and Trauma Prevention:** Establish and expand restorative justice programs as well as violence and trauma prevention initiatives for justice-involved and LGBTQ+ communities.

■ **Mental Health, Substance Use, and Co-Occurring Disorder:** Employ best practices and maximize resources to support people with mental health and substance use disorders, including harm reduction approaches.

■ **Housing and Services:** Create and expand programs that provide housing and wraparound services for justice-involved communities and incentive programs to increase housing options and help people maintain housing.

■ **Training and Employment:** Expand opportunities for supported employment for people with mental health and substance use problems, as well as for LGBTQ+ community members.

■ **Reentry and Legal Services:** Remove barriers to employment due to prior convictions and increase access to services for people who are navigating the court system and/or reentering the community after incarceration.

---

**Intercept One: Alternative Responses**

The ATI Work Group modified the Sequential Intercept Model even further and redefined Intercept One to be "Community Response and Intervention Services" if a person is having a mental health crisis. In the traditional SIM, Intercept One is the point at which an individual interacts with law enforcement; however, the modified ATI intercept seeks to expand non-law-enforcement responses to crisis and follow-up services. The 10 recommendations within this intercept call for enhancing the Department of Mental Health (DMH) Psychiatric Mobile Response Teams for faster, 24-hour service. They also recommend expanding and diversifying noncrisis mobile response teams to follow through with clients, connect them with needed services, and avert further crises and involuntary hospitalization. The recommendations call for improved systems to identify clinical and bed availability, and to train 911 dispatchers to redirect calls involving behavioral health crises to the DMH ACCESS line when a law enforcement response is not required.

---

**Behavioral health:** The promotion of mental health, resilience, and well-being. Behavioral health care seeks to address underlying problems that drive behaviors that harm one’s well-being, such as mental health problems, addiction, and substance use disorders. [See Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration](http://www.samhsa.gov)
# Alternatives to Incarceration Initiative

## Key Facts and Figures

### Milestones
- Establishment of the ATI Office and Jail Closure Implementation Team under the chief executive officer
- Men’s Central Jail closure report released March 2021
- Justice, Care and Opportunities Department as a home for Office of Diversion and Reentry, pretrial services, and the ATI office, to be launched fall of 2022

### FY 2021–2022 LA County Spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATI Office budget</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Closure Implementation Team budget</td>
<td>$2.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Diversion and Reentry budget</td>
<td>$173 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASD budget</td>
<td>$3.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual cost of LA County jails</td>
<td>$849 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA County Office of Diversion and Reentry cost per day of wraparound housing and services for people with severe mental health problems</td>
<td>$150 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per day of incarceration in mental health unit</td>
<td>$800 per person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Need versus Investment

#### Funding Needs:
- **Care First Budget**: created by community groups with broad expertise across sectors, identifies $2 billion in needed investment for diversion, health, housing, reentry, youth, education, and economic development programs in LA County
- Estimate for the community-based system of care needed to divert 3,600 people to close Men’s Central Jail: $238 million for the first year

#### Key Investments Made:
- **$29.9 million** to the Department of Mental Health’s crisis and outreach efforts
- **Care First Community Investment** included $42 million to divert people with behavioral health issues into treatment to close Men’s Central Jail, $17 million for more diversion and pretrial services, and $21 million for housing and reentry programs

---

For a full set of citations, see Appendix B
Policy Area II: Youth Justice Reimagined

Adolescence is a time of experimentation and boundary pushing. Data show that, across Western nations, people are more likely to be involved in crime in their teens, with these behaviors declining as they age into their 20s.\(^\text{72}\) Brain development continues into the mid-20s in areas such as impulse control, pointing to why criminal involvement often ceases as juveniles become adults.\(^\text{73}\)

Justice system involvement is particularly detrimental to youth as it impairs development, exposes youth to negative influences, and harms connections with school and family.\(^\text{74}\) It also interrupts desistance, the process by which youth age out of criminal behavior.\(^\text{75}\) Once a juvenile is arrested, they are significantly more likely to be rearrested, setting off a cycle of recidivism.\(^\text{76}\) Rearrest rates within three years of a juvenile’s release from confinement can commonly be as high as 75%.\(^\text{77}\)

All too often, involvement in the justice system starts early and it starts in schools. An analysis of FBI data found that from 2013 to 2018, over 30,000 children under the age of 10 were arrested in the United States.\(^\text{78}\) Data from 2018 show that 85% of these arrests were for nonserious offenses.\(^\text{79}\) About 1% of schools had police presence in the mid-1970s, as compared with 60% of schools today.\(^\text{80}\) And, in the 2013 academic year, nearly 70,000 students were arrested in about 8,000 schools across the country.\(^\text{81}\) School arrests have a disproportionate impact on students of color, particularly Black students.\(^\text{82}\)

Progress and Persistent Challenges in Los Angeles

In recent decades, youth arrests for violent crimes and rates of juvenile incarceration have dropped by over 50%.\(^\text{83}\) Following state and national trends, LA County saw a 78% decrease in youth incarceration from 2002 to 2020.\(^\text{84}\) While this is great progress, the county faces persistent challenges. The county Probation Department, which is charged with the

\(^{74}\) Ibid.
\(^{75}\) Ibid.
\(^{79}\) Ibid.
\(^{81}\) Education Week. (2017). Which students are arrested the most? https://www.edweek.org/which-students-are-arrested-most-in-school-u-s-data-by-school/overview
custody and supervision of justice-involved youth, has been plagued with issues such as excessive use of pepper spray, sexual assault, and a ballooning budget despite dramatic declines in the population of incarcerated youth. In September 2021, the state oversight board found that both of the juvenile halls were “unsuitable for the confinement of youth,” and in March 2022 the Probation Department hastily emptied Central Juvenile Hall because of ongoing issues including excessive use of room confinement.

From 2014 to 2017, one in four arrests made by the Los Angeles School Police Department — a stand-alone agency with 211 sworn police officers — was of an elementary or middle school-aged student. In 2021, in response to mounting pressure from advocates, the LA Unified School District Board of Education cut the agency’s budget by about a third. The cut totaled $25 million and 133 positions, including 70 sworn officers. Police were also removed from school campuses and barred from using pepper spray. The board redirected the $25 million and an additional $11.5 million to hire school climate coaches, nurses, and counselors, and to support Black student achievement.

Although numbers have dropped, youth in the LA County juvenile justice system remain in great need of support. A 2019 assessment by the Department of Mental Health found that the “County’s juvenile justice system is the product of a juvenile incarceration model that is flawed and fundamentally fails to adequately meet the current developmental and mental health needs of youth and their families.” The assessment found that as the population of incarcerated youth declined, those who continued to be detained were significantly more likely to have mental health issues, particularly trauma-related and substance use disorders, and that they were more likely to have faced sexual exploitation, homelessness, and a variety of other severe stressors.
The mission and culture of law enforcement agencies, including probation, are focused on compliance and enforcement rather than support. To overcome challenges, young people need to feel comfortable being honest, heal from experiences, and be given the opportunity to learn from mistakes. The constant threat of probation violations and incarceration makes it virtually impossible for a probation officer or other law enforcement agents to truly promote youth development for young people with the highest level of need. For this reason, 20 states situate their juvenile justice systems within a health or child welfare agency, rather than law enforcement and corrections.\(^98\)

After years of attempts at probation reform, the LA County Board of Supervisors recognized the status quo as “fundamentally flawed” and that housing juvenile justice within a law enforcement agency may be “counterproductive.”\(^99\) In a motion passed unanimously in August 2019 — the same day the board voted to end the $2.2 billion jail contract — the board declared that moving “towards a rehabilitative, care-first model is not just ideal, it is necessary, and likely requires a different structure and framework to achieve.”\(^100\) With that, the board initiated a yearlong collaborative process and created the Youth Justice Work Group, comprised of youth leaders, community organizations, youth-serving government agencies and justice partners, to explore transitioning youth out of probation into a “rehabilitative, health-focused and care-first system.”\(^101\)

**Youth Justice Reimagined**

The culmination of the Youth Justice Work Group’s yearlong process is Youth Justice Reimagined, an innovative plan to phase youth out of the Probation Department and into a new Department of Youth Development within five years.\(^102\) The plan is guided by a long-term vision, rooted in a countywide system of youth development and principles of restorative and transformative justice.

Youth Justice Reimagined will help create safer communities because, like the Alternatives to Incarceration Work Group, it focuses not only on changes to the justice system itself, but also on the countywide system of youth development needed to promote well-being and prevent system involvement. Creating supportive environments for youth is essential to building healthy communities, as stress and trauma can harm childhood development and affect adult decision-making.\(^103\) Many of the youth at highest risk of criminal behavior are also at the highest risk of crime victimization.\(^104\)

Youth Justice Reimagined envisions key community supports, coordinated by a new Department of Youth

---


\(^99\) Ibid.

\(^100\) Ibid.

\(^101\) Ibid.


\(^104\) Jannetta & Okeke (2017)
system. One component is a network of 24-hour youth and community centers to act as hubs for programming, restorative processes, and community-rooted support. The plan also proposes embedding youth development workers, such as restorative justice practitioners and credible messengers, in schools to help change school culture, mentor youth, and respond to conflict with restorative approaches. The plan proposes leveraging schools as after-hours youth development sites, with holistic youth and family programming from 3 to 10 p.m.

The new department would also aim to divert youth out of the justice system through an Office of Diversion and Restorative Practices. Instead of being arrested, most youth would be diverted through this office to community-based organizations that provide programming, case management, and restorative justice services. This will make sure youth do not land in juvenile hall or on probation supervision when they could be better served in the community and allow for a restorative approach to creating accountability if a young person caused harm. To reduce the traumatic and detrimental impacts of youth incarceration, the Department of Youth Development would house the small number of youth awaiting trial and serving sentences in therapeutic, homelike settings through an Office of Youth Housing and Reentry.

Youth Justice Reimagined is built on seven foundational components:

- **Countywide Coordination and Capacity-Building:** Coordination across youth-serving systems, such as schools and the Juvenile Court; and building capacity among agencies and organizations to address youth needs more effectively.

- **Youth Development Network (YDN):** Community-based network to prevent system involvement, including 24-hour Youth and Community Centers.

- **Investment in Diversion Expansion:** Countywide Youth Diversion and Development model, for a restorative approach to reduce contact with the justice system.

- **Youth Empowerment and Support (YES) Teams:** Collaborative, multidisciplinary teams to help respond to incidents of youth crime and inform decision-making throughout the youth legal system. YES Teams will build meaningful relationships with youth and families and bring an asset-based, culturally rooted lens to inform justice-related decisions.

- **Homelike, Community-Based Therapeutic Housing and Reentry:** Homelike supportive housing with a range of security levels for the small number of youth required to stay in custody, with connections to reentry programming.

- **Supportive Youth Development Services and Credible Messengers:** Intensive community-based support through credible messengers, including care coordination and restorative processes, rather than traditional compliance-focused supervision.

- **Transparency and Accountability Mechanisms:** Comprehensive transparency and accountability measures, including youth and community oversight bodies.

To learn more about the full set of recommendations, see [Youth Justice Reimagined: Recommendations of the Los Angeles County Youth Justice Work Group](#).

---
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## YOUTH JUSTICE REIMAGINED

*Key facts and figures*¹⁰⁹

### MILESTONES

- Establishment of Youth Justice Advisory Group for continued implementation planning across seven work groups in 2021
- LA City Department of Youth Development established in 2021
- Department of Youth Development launched in July 2022

### FY 2021–2022 LA CITY AND COUNTY SPENDING

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA County Division of Youth Diversion and Development (YDD) budget:</td>
<td><strong>$26.1 million</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA City Department of Youth Development budget:</td>
<td><strong>$1.4 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA County Probation juvenile operations budget:</td>
<td><strong>$570 million</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County Juvenile incarceration budget:</td>
<td><strong>$405 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ESTIMATED COSTS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per year of pre-arrest diversion:</td>
<td><strong>$7,000 per youth</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per year for juvenile incarceration:</td>
<td><strong>$1 million per youth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per year of juvenile probation field supervision:</td>
<td><strong>$23,125</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEED VERSUS INVESTMENT

**FUNDING NEEDS:**

- Phase 1 of Youth Justice Reimagined: **$75 million**, including $55 million to community-based organizations
- Estimated need for launching the Department of Youth Development and Youth Justice Reimagined: **$152.5 million**

**KEY INVESTMENTS MADE:**

- **$27.4 million** for a Youth Justice Reimagined Development Fund
- **$17.3 million** for YDD Expansion
- **$11 million** to Youth Development and Education through the Care First Community Investment
- **$1.5 million** to Arts for Justice-Involved Youth in American Rescue Plan Act funding

¹⁰⁹ For a full set of citations, see Appendix C
Policy Area III: Violence Intervention

As criminal justice reforms gain momentum across the country, they are most often focused on nonviolent offenses. However, if the nation truly wants to combat mass incarceration and “reimagine” public safety, it is necessary to invest in effective solutions to break cycles of violence. As in many cities, the response to the epidemic of violence in Los Angeles for decades was heavy-handed policing and mass incarceration. However, when the city invested in an alternative approach, safety increased in the most affected communities.

Community safety in Los Angeles and cities across the United States has improved dramatically since violent crime peaked in the early 1990s. Nonetheless, violence remains a cause of concern and anxiety in many communities. While mass shootings grab the most headlines, most gun violence takes place in historically underfunded neighborhoods and disproportionately affects young men of color, particularly Black men. In 2020, the nation saw a 29% increase in homicides, and homicides continued to climb in 2021. The 10 most “dangerous” cities in the United States saw rates of violent crime over four times the national average. Meanwhile, poverty in almost all of these cities is two to three times the average rate.

In 2018, over 20% of violent crimes in the United States were for domestic violence. And, according to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1 in 4 women and nearly 1 in 10 men report having experienced severe physical violence from an intimate partner in their lifetime. The presence of a gun makes it five times more likely that a domestic violence incident will result in homicide.

Nationally, only about 40% of violent crimes and 32% of property crimes went reported. Underreporting is likely even more acute in situations of domestic and partner violence. Of the fraction of crimes that are reported, only about 45% of violent crimes and 17% of property crimes are “cleared” by police, meaning the cases were closed. This demonstrates that the criminal justice system alone is inadequate at addressing and preventing violent crime.

Community violence: Violence between individuals, who may or may not know each other, that generally happens outside the home. Common examples include physical fights among groups and shootings in public spaces such as parks, schools, or apartment complexes. See Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
Historically, much of the violence in Los Angeles was due to conflict among rival gangs. In response, law enforcement agencies relied on aggressive suppression tactics that targeted whole communities, often harming and alienating the people most affected by violence. In the late 1990s, the Rampart scandal exposed widespread violence and corruption inside an LAPD gang unit. And just in the past few years, significant evidence shows that “deputy gangs” have operated within the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department for decades. In 2007, a groundbreaking report titled A Call to Action showed that, after spending $25 billion on a 30-year “war on gangs,” LA County had six times as many gangs and increasing violence, and that gang participation had grown to over 100,000 active members. After decades of failed attempts to quell violence through heavy-handed policing, the report pushed the city to try an asset-based, comprehensive violence reduction strategy that significantly improved safety in Los Angeles.

Violence Intervention

Violence intervention is based on the premise that violence can spread like a contagious disease and that it can also be treated and prevented. Violence intervention, also known as violence interruption, is largely focused on community violence and can take various forms including street outreach, hospital intervention, and Safe Passage to provide safe routes to and from school. Violence intervention workers can play many roles, such as responding to shootings to stop retaliation, connecting people at highest risk with opportunities for employment and education, and promoting anti-violence norms. These programs have proven to be greatly successful.

Street outreach: Outreach done by community violence intervention workers or “interrupters” that aims to identify and mediate conflict, respond to acts of violence to stop retaliation, and build relationships with those at highest risk of causing or being victims of violence to offer them comprehensive support and help them change behavior that puts them at risk of harm.

Hospital intervention: A method of violence intervention that seeks to engage victims of violence while they are still in the hospital setting, such as the trauma unit, to offer them case management, counseling, and other services, and to prevent retaliation. Hospital intervention seeks to leverage the unique moment when someone is recovering from violence, to provide them needed support and help people to turn their lives around so more harm is not inflicted.

Safe Passage: Programs that seek to create pedestrian safety in areas that experience high rates of violence. Safe Passage programs are often focused on creating safety for children and teenagers to walk to and from school. They can involve violence intervention workers, parents, residents, school leaders, and, in some cases, law enforcement. Some Safe Passage programs also involve walking clubs to build community cohesion and provide safety for people to walk in their neighborhoods.
In Chicago’s West Garfield Park neighborhood, the Cure Violence program reduced shootings by 67% in its first year. The Safe Streets program in Baltimore’s Cherry Hill neighborhood was associated with a 56% reduction in homicides and a 34% reduction in nonfatal shootings.

Violence intervention workers must have close ties to the people they serve. They build meaningful relationships with individuals at highest risk of violence victimization, often the same people at highest risk of causing harm. To be effective, they must be “credible messengers.” Many of the most effective intervention workers were formerly involved in gangs, served time in prison, and have turned their lives around. They have shared experiences with those they work with and continue to hold deep relationships in their neighborhoods.

**GRYD: Public Investment in Violence Intervention**

While a growing number of government public health offices are now dedicated to addressing violence, including the LA County Office of Violence Prevention launched in 2019, the Los Angeles Mayor’s Office of Gang Reduction and Youth Development (GRYD) is one of the first and longest-standing public investments in coordinated, community-based violence intervention. Building on the successes and failures of past efforts, in 2008 the GRYD launched a comprehensive strategy to reduce violence in 12 zones hit hardest by gang violence.

The office now operates in 23 zones and contracts with over 20 locally rooted, community-based providers for both prevention and intervention services.

The GRYD Comprehensive Strategy is unique because it incorporates community engagement and does not include law enforcement suppression as one of its components. There are four pillars of the comprehensive strategy:

- **Community Engagement:** To involve community members in promoting peace, and to connect them to services that strengthen community cohesion and civic engagement. This includes pop-up events, community education campaigns, and a gun buyback program.

- **Gang Prevention:** Multidisciplinary services and engagement, aimed at youth ages 10 to 15 at high risk of gang involvement.

- **Gang Intervention:** Community- and individual-level services to reduce social embeddedness in gangs and promote positive decision-making among individuals ages 14 to 25, including a Family Case Management Program.

- **Violence Interruption:** Swift and proactive responses to violence including proactive peacemaking, such as establishing peace agreements among rival groups, and directly responding to incidents of violence through an established protocol to control rumors, stop retaliation, and provide services to grieving families.

---
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23 Building Safety in Los Angeles: A Policy Agenda for Local Health and Safer Communities
Violence typically spikes in the summer, and Summer Night Lights is a cornerstone of GRYD programming. This program creates safe spaces for neighbors to come together for nighttime activities in the summer and fall. Resources are deployed to 32 parks in communities affected by gang violence, including free meals and sports leagues. Hundreds of young people from those communities are hired to put on the Summer Night Lights events. 138

The asset-based approach implemented through GRYD and other violence intervention efforts has proven extremely effective. A recent evaluation found an 18% reduction in violent crime in areas with GRYD Comprehensive Strategy services. 139 Another evaluation found that when LAPD alone responds to a gang-related homicide, the likelihood of a retaliatory assault or homicide is 46% and 26%, respectively. When LAPD and gang intervention respond to the scene, each from their respective lane, the percentages drop to 10% and below 1%, respectively. 140 Other programs around the country, such as Cure Violence and Advance Peace, have also proven to dramatically decrease violence. 141

Interrupting Violence at Home
While violence intervention has largely focused on community violence, many principles of the public health approach can be applied to addressing domestic and intimate partner violence. There is a growing call to move away from justice system responses to family and partner violence, toward more preventative and restorative approaches that address root causes. 142 While the criminal justice system has received the majority of Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant funding — a share that has substantially grown over the past few decades — a survey by the National Domestic Violence Hotline found that 75% of women who reported abuse to law enforcement said it either had no impact or made them less safe. 143 Many justice system responses to domestic violence have proven harmful or ineffective, creating a need for new approaches that are culturally relevant and which seek to heal those who have caused harm. One example is the Domestic Violence Intervention Program at Homeboy Industries in Los Angeles. The program serves gang-affiliated individuals who have harmed their partners and uses approaches to build trust and heal from past traumas to transform their lives and relationships and stop cycles of violence. 144


141 The Justice Collaborative Institute (2020).


143 Ibid.

144 Ibid.
**VIOLENCE INTERVENTION**

*Key facts and figures*

**MILESTONES**
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Health launched the Trauma Prevention Initiative in 2015
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Health established the Office of Violence Prevention in 2019
- California Violence Intervention and Prevention (CalVIP) Grant Program established in 2019
- Biden administration features community violence interventions as part of the White House’s Comprehensive Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gun Crime and Ensure Public Safety
- The U.S. Department of the Treasury provided guidance to use American Rescue Plan Act funds for holistic, evidence-based approaches to reducing community violence
- California CRISES Grant Pilot Program was established in October 2021 to create and strengthen community-based alternatives to law enforcement as first responders to crisis situations

**FY 2021–2022 LA CITY AND COUNTY SPENDING**
- GRYD Office: $32.5 million
- Summer Night Lights: $4 million
- LA County Office of Violence Prevention: $3 million
- LAPD: $1.8 billion
- LASD: $3.4 billion

**ESTIMATED COSTS**
- Estimated cost of each homicide to the criminal justice system, the victim’s family and society-at-large: $8.9 million
- Estimated yearly cost savings to city of LA through GRYD incident response: $55 million

**NEED VERSUS INVESTMENT**

**FUNDING NEEDS:**
- Los Angeles Violence Intervention Coalition has called for **$400 million over three years** to raise wages, improve access to mental health services, and increase the number of violence intervention workers and peace ambassadors across the county

**KEY INVESTMENTS MADE:**
- **$2.5 million** in additional GRYD funding and **$2.4 million** in additional Summer Night Lights funding in mayor’s FY 2022–2023 recommended budget
- **$5 million** in one-time funding to expand trauma prevention initiative and **$1.3 million** (over three years) for Crisis Response and Violence Interruption Program (CRVIP) pilot project
- **$20 million** for violence prevention initiatives through American Rescue Plan funding

---

145 For a full set of citations, see Appendix D
Three transformational policy areas in Los Angeles County — Alternatives to Incarceration, Youth Justice Reimagined, and Violence Intervention — build infrastructures for community health and lay a foundation for a comprehensive approach to creating safety. While they bring great promise, their implementation is not without challenges. The LA County Board of Supervisors has many detailed recommendations to implement in these three policy agendas, but they have struggled to move plans forward at the scale needed.\(^{146}\)

Not surprisingly, one of the greatest challenges is funding. Many of the policies outlined in this report have proven more cost efficient than the status quo. But, in a county of over 10 million people, they require hundreds of millions of dollars to establish and even more to fully implement. The county has made laudable efforts and some significant investments in recent years, but more is needed to meet the true needs of its residents. Communities in LA have experienced extensive, multigenerational harm due to structural racism, violence, mass incarceration, deportation, an ever-accelerating housing crisis, and major loss due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Building the systems of care and safety envisioned in these three policy areas will require massive public investment, capacity building of nonprofits, workforce development in affected communities, and a level of political will that has not fully materialized among bureaucratic hurdles and competing interests.

While these challenges cannot be ignored, there has been significant progress. In November 2020, advocates — with the support of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors — introduced Measure J. The ballot measure amends the county charter to require that 10% of locally generated, unrestricted county funds be spent on services such as housing, mental health, and economic development in communities disproportionately affected by systemic racism and mass incarceration, and prohibits these funds from being used on law enforcement or carceral settings.\(^{147}\) Although the measure is being challenged in court by the sheriff deputies union,\(^{148}\) it was supported by almost 60% of LA County voters\(^{149}\) and the Board of Supervisors chose to move forward with an initial $100 million through the Care First Community Investment (CFCI) and an additional $87 million from American Rescue Plan Act funding.\(^{150}\) The CFCI investment will be renewed in the coming fiscal year,\(^{151}\) and other notable investments have been made in areas such as mental health crisis response, Youth Justice Reimagined, and violence prevention.


\(^{149}\) Cosgrove (2020)


\(^{151}\) Davenport (2022, April 19)
In 2020, LA County voters also passed Measure R, which granted the Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission subpoena power and mandated a plan to reduce the jail population, and elected as district attorney George Gascón, a progressive prosecutor who promised big changes.

Voter support faces a new test, however, as concerns grow over crime and violence. Violence in some areas of Los Angeles is increasing at an alarming rate. Homicides and shootings in the city are up 47% and 51%, respectively, from 2019, predominantly hitting the same low-income communities of color that have been historically affected. High-profile armed robberies and a string of violent crimes have shaken the city and made public safety one of the top concerns for voters. In a recent series of interviews exploring crime in Southern California, experts asserted that justice reforms such as Prop 47 and bail reform did not cause significant increases in crime, and primarily attributed increases in violence to COVID-related stressors and the availability of highly lethal guns. Nevertheless, the debate will be on the ballot. Voters will elect a sheriff after four years under the highly controversial Sheriff Alex Villanueva. And crime has become a cornerstone of the LA city mayoral race. Rick Caruso, a billionaire developer and former president of the police commission, is a top candidate and has centered his campaign on public order.

In recent years, the vast majority of Angelenos have chosen to rise above “arrest, incarcerate, repeat” and to try new approaches to solving the issues that have plagued the area for decades. LA is now at an inflection point that will shape the future of the region and set a tone for the nation. In a moment when the county grapples to reimagine public safety while experiencing an increase in violence, the policies outlined in this report offer new strategies to achieving lasting safety. They work to build community health, repair individual and systemic harm, and center the communities most affected by violence and the justice system. As debates go on, these policy agendas offer a roadmap to rectify mistakes of the past and allow for a holistic vision of community health and safety to move forward.

---
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APPENDIX A: Los Angeles as a Case Study

LOS ANGELES AS A CASE STUDY

Los Angeles’s size and diversity, as well as the massive scale of its challenges and needed solutions, make it an intriguing case study.

DEMOGRAPHY

- Los Angeles is the most populous county in the United States. Home to about 10 million residents. LA County has a similar population to the state of Georgia.
- Nearly half the LA County population identifies as Hispanic and/or Latinx, while 9% identify as Black, 15% as Asian, and 26% as White.
- Immigrants make up 35% of the population, and recent estimates show that 1 in 12 of all immigrants in the United States resides in LA County.
- Some 915,000 Angelenos are undocumented, and 74% of those people have lived in the United States for at least 10 years.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

- The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD) is the largest of its kind. It runs the world’s largest jail, which is also the country’s largest mental health facility.
- The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) is the third-largest police department in the country, and there are 45 additional municipal police departments in the county.
- The combined budgets of LAPD, and the county Sheriff’s and Probation Department amounted to over $6.2 billion in fiscal 2020–2021 alone.
## Appendix B: Alternatives to Incarceration Initiative

### Key Facts and Figures

#### Milestones
- Establishment of the ATI Office and Jail Closure Implementation Team under the chief executive officer
- Men’s Central Jail closure report released March 2021
- Justice, Care and Opportunities Department as a home for Office of Diversion and Reentry, pretrial services, and the ATI office, to be launched fall of 2022

#### FY 2021–2022 LA County Spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATI Office budget</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Closure Implementation Team budget</td>
<td>$2.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Diversion and Reentry budget</td>
<td>$173 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASD budget</td>
<td>$3.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual cost of LA County jails</td>
<td>$849 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA County Office of Diversion and Reentry cost per day of wraparound</td>
<td>$150 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing and services for people with severe mental health problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per day of incarceration in mental health unit</td>
<td>$800 per person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Need versus Investment

**Funding Needs:**
- Care First Budget, created by community groups with broad expertise across sectors, identifies $2 billion in needed investment for diversion, health, housing, reentry, youth, education, and economic development programs in LA County.
- Estimate for the community-based system of care needed to divert 3,600 people to close Men’s Central Jail: $238 million for the first year.

**Key Investments Made:**
- $29.9 million to the Department of Mental Health’s crisis and outreach efforts.
- Care First Community Investment included $42 million to divert people with behavioral health issues into treatment to close Men’s Central Jail, $17 million for more diversion and pretrial services, and $21 million for housing and reentry programs.
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# APPENDIX C: Youth Justice Reimagined

## KEY FACTS AND FIGURES

### MILESTONES
- Establishment of Youth Justice Advisory Group for continued implementation planning across seven work groups in 2021
- LA City Department of Youth Development established in 2021
- Department of Youth Development launched in July 2022

## FY 2021–2022 LA CITY AND COUNTY SPENDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Budget (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA County Division of Youth Diversion and Development (YDD)</td>
<td>$26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA City Department of Youth Development</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County Probation juvenile operations</td>
<td>$570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County Juvenile incarceration</td>
<td>$405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ESTIMATED COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Cost Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per year of pre-arrest diversion</td>
<td>$7,000 per youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per year for juvenile incarceration</td>
<td>$1 million per youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per year of juvenile probation field supervision</td>
<td>$23,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NEED VERSUS INVESTMENT

### Funding Needs:
- Phase 1 of Youth Justice Reimagined: **$75 million**, including **$55 million** to community-based organizations¹⁹³
- Estimated need for launching the Department of Youth Development and Youth Justice Reimagined: **$152.5 million**¹⁹⁴

### Key Investments Made:
- **$27.4 million** for a Youth Justice Reimagined Development Fund¹⁹⁵
- **$17.3 million** for YDD Expansion¹⁹⁶
- **$11 million** to Youth Development and Education through the Care First Community Investment¹⁹⁷
- **$1.5 million** to Arts for Justice-Involved Youth in American Rescue Plan Act funding¹⁹⁸

---
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APPENDIX D: Violence Intervention

KEY FACTS AND FIGURES

MILESTONES

■ Los Angeles County Department of Public Health launched the Trauma Prevention Initiative in 2015199
■ Los Angeles County Department of Public Health established the Office of Violence Prevention in 2019200
■ California Violence Intervention and Prevention (CalVIP) Grant Program established in 2019201
■ Biden administration features community violence interventions as part of the White House’s Comprehensive Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gun Crime and Ensure Public Safety202
■ The U.S. Department of the Treasury provided guidance to use American Rescue Plan Act funds for holistic, evidence-based approaches to reducing community violence203
■ California CRISES Grant Pilot Program was established in October 2021 to create and strengthen community-based alternatives to law enforcement as first responders to crisis situations204

FY 2021–2022 LA CITY AND COUNTY SPENDING

■ GRYD Office: $32.5 million205
■ Summer Night Lights: $4 million206
■ LA County Office of Violence Prevention: $3 million207
■ LAPD: $1.8 billion208
■ LASD: $3.4 billion209

ESTIMATED COSTS

■ Estimated cost of each homicide to the criminal justice system, the victim’s family and society-at-large: $8.9 million210
■ Estimated yearly cost savings to city of LA through GRYD incident response: $55 million211

NEED VERSUS INVESTMENT

Funding Needs:

Los Angeles Violence Intervention Coalition has called for $400 million over three years to raise wages, improve access to mental health services, and increase the number of violence intervention workers and peace ambassadors across the county212

Key Investments Made:

■ $2.5 million in additional GRYD funding and $2.4 million in additional Summer Night Lights funding in mayor’s FY 2022–2023 recommended budget213
■ $5 million in one-time funding to expand trauma prevention initiative and $1.3 million (over three years) for Crisis Response and Violence Interruption Program (CRVIP) pilot project214
■ $20 million for violence prevention initiatives through American Rescue Plan funding215
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