

NO on Proposition 1E

Diverting Mental Health Services Funding

- Proposition 1E is part of a budget package that was negotiated behind closed doors without input or scrutiny by the public or even most legislators. It is a stopgap proposal that will not address the problems underlying California's state budget crisis.
- Prop. 1E would cut almost a half billion dollars from Proposition 63 mental health service funds over the next two years. Although those cuts are a significant part of Prop. 63 funds, they would provide less than a quarter of a percent (0.25%) of the state budget.
- Proponents would like to make it look as if Prop. 1E is essential to the funding of another program, the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) program. However, the EPSDT program is federally mandated and will be supported with General Fund dollars whether or not Prop. 1E passes.
- Since Prop. 63 was passed by the voters in 2004, more than 200,000 people who had no prior care, including 50,000 children and young adults, have received mental health services. Prop. 1E's funding cuts—with resulting program reductions for mental health care—would mean increased state and local costs for homeless shelters, social services programs, medical care, law enforcement, and county jail and state prison operations.
- Mental health services funded by Prop. 63 emphasize early intervention and treatment that can help some people before their symptoms become severe and thereby reduce the need for future mental health services.
- Diverting Prop. 63 mental health funds could result in a decrease in federal matching funds for the Medi-Cal program.
- Prop. 63 mental health programs were established by an initiative that “did the right thing” in the eyes of many by providing a source of funding, while many other programs created by initiative have not. In a sense, these programs are being punished for having their own funding source, which is now targeted by Proposition 1E.
- Rather than raiding existing programs to create temporary “savings” for the state General Fund, we need to address the structural budget deficit with real reforms like eliminating the two-thirds vote requirement to pass a budget and taxes.