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Please vote “No” on the “No Place Like Home Act,” which should have been called the “Bureaucrat and Developer Enrichment Act,” because that is who we feel will most benefit at the expense of those suffering with the most severe mental illnesses.

NAMI Contra Costa members are mostly family members with “skin in the game,” so therefore are strong advocates for people living with serious and persistent mental illnesses who oppose this bill. Particularly given looming federal cutbacks, NPLH is counterproductive because it spends billions in treatment funds that Voter Proposition 63 dedicated to the severely mentally ill fourteen years ago. If passed, we strongly feel NPLH will cause more homelessness by forcing more mentally ill people into severe symptoms that could increase the numbers living on the streets.

Proposition 2 is:

• **Costly**—up to $5.6 Billion ($140 million x 40, for 40-year bonds) to raise $2 billion for housing projects. It won’t all go to housing, because county bureaucracies have already guaranteed themselves $100 million (5% of the $2 Billion), admittedly far more than needed to run the program, and have also agreed to take the entire $140 million yearly as “administrative expenses,” whether or not they need that amount to pay off the bonds. Developer subsidies (low interest deferred loans that developers will use to build and purchase $2 Billion in valuable California housing, plus up to 50% of operating subsidies) effectively cost the public even more.

• **Unnecessary**, because the Legislature authorized counties to pay for housing for their severely mentally ill Prop. 63 clients in 2017, in AB 727. Counties, which can accumulate Mental Health Services Act capital funds for up to ten years, can now do “pay as you go” both to build housing and to pay rent subsidies for these clients. Counties do not need to pay out billions in interest on bonds, unnecessary state administrative expenses, and developer subsidies to do so. Counties know their mentally ill clients’ treatment and other needs as well as what housing is already available. Only they can determine whether their MHSA funds are best used to pay for treatment or to build housing in their localities.

• **Does nothing** to address systemic legal barriers, like limited state protection against restrictive local zoning, that make it very difficult to build supportive housing for groups like the severely mentally ill. Neighborhoods often fight hard to keep them out. It is senseless to pay out billions in interest and expenses to borrow money that may sit unspent because of local opposition to supportive housing projects with severely mentally ill tenants.

The Voters dedicated Proposition 63 money to treatment, which prevents homelessness, in 2004. That is where it should go.

**CHARLES MADISON**, President
NAMI Contra Costa

**GIGI R. CROWDER, L.E.**, Executive Director
NAMI Contra Costa

**DOUGLAS W. DUNN**, Chair
Legislative Committee, NAMI Contra Costa

Mental illness tragically affects many families. When left untreated, it can also seriously challenge California communities, in the form of chronic homelessness. Homelessness aggravates mental illness, making treatment even more difficult for those with the greatest needs. People living on our streets, in doorways, and parks need help NOW. That’s why Prop. 2 is so important.

**YES on Prop. 2 will help solve homelessness—and save money**

Prop. 2 creates safe, secure housing, connected to mental health and addiction treatment.

Prop. 2 strengthens partnerships between doctors, law enforcement, and homeless service providers who face the challenge of providing effective care to people suffering from mental illness and substance abuse.

Prop. 2 brings NO COST TO TAXPAYERS. Instead, it cuts through red tape so communities can use existing funds to address the urgent problem of homelessness NOW.

Studies show Prop. 2 will help chronically homeless individuals living with a serious mental illness stay off the streets.

A 2018 RAND study found the Prop. 2 approach is beginning to succeed in Los Angeles County, after only one year:

- **3,500 homeless people off the streets**
- **96% of study participants stayed in program at least one year**
- **Taxpayers saved more than $6.5 million in one year alone**
- **Participants visited the ER 70% less**, saving healthcare costs and easing the burden on emergency responders

Learn more: Visit CAYesOnProp2.org.

Vote Yes on Prop. 2: provide safe, secure supportive housing and services for the chronically homeless—proven to help people living with mental illness stay off the streets.
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