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The Future of Proposition 36 Funding

I. Background on Proposition 36.
   How Does It Work?
   Who Does It Serve?
   How Has It Been Funded?

   • Millicent Gomes, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs.
   • Dan Carson, Legislative Analyst's Office
   • Shawn Martin, Legislative Analyst's Office

II. How Does the Current Resource Level for Proposition 36 Impact the Effectiveness of Treatment?

   • Albert M. Senella, Chief Operating Officer, Tarzana Treatment Centers
   • Toni Moore, Sacramento County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrator
   • Glenn Backes, Drug Policy Alliance

III. How is Funding Related to Effectiveness?

   • Susan Blacksher, California Association of Addiction Recovery Resources
   • Dr. Jack McCarthy, President, Executive Director, and Medical Director, Bi-Valley Medical Clinic, Sacramento
Proposition 36 Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Amount Allocated to Counties</th>
<th>Carryover Funds from Previous Year</th>
<th>Total Funds Available</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>% Expended of Total Funds Available</th>
<th>% Expended of Total Annual Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2000/01</td>
<td>$58,800,000</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>$58,800,000</td>
<td>$7,177,107</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001/02</td>
<td>$117,022,956</td>
<td>$54,241,609</td>
<td>$171,264,565</td>
<td>$92,783,434</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002/03</td>
<td>$117,022,956</td>
<td>$85,971,954</td>
<td>$202,994,910</td>
<td>$136,392,288</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>116.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003/04</td>
<td>$117,022,956</td>
<td>$70,872,140</td>
<td>$187,895,096</td>
<td>$134,282,695</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>114.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004/05</td>
<td>$116,594,956</td>
<td>$59,726,934</td>
<td>$176,321,890</td>
<td>$143,018,036</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>122.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005/06</td>
<td>$116,594,956</td>
<td>$33,303,854</td>
<td>$149,898,810</td>
<td>$145,891,724</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>125.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Column G: Counties can spend more than their total annual allocation by using carryover funds from previous fiscal years.

Sample Proposition 36 Case Processing Flowchart

- **Arrest/Violation of Parole**
  - District Attorney Decides Whether to File Charges under Prop. 36
- **Plea/Conviction and Court Order of Probation and Drug Treatment**
  - Risk and Treatment Assessments
  - Board of Prison Terms (BPT) Screening
  - Service of Special Condition Treatment Order
- **Probation Violation**
  - 1st Violation
  - 2nd Violation
  - 3rd Violation
  - On 1st and 2nd violations, if defendant is a danger to others or is unavailable for treatment, probation violation probation is mandatory.
  - After Parole and Supervision
- **Outcome—End of Probation and Treatment**
  - Defendant eligible for discharge. If court finds sentence unsatisfactory, defendant may be re-adjudicated.
- **Outcome—Jail or Prison Sentence**
  - Upon failure in treatment or any violation leading to revocation of probation, defendant is re-adjudicated. If parole after existing term, which provides for jail or state prison time.

- **Outcome—Program Completion**
  - Parolees are not eligible to have their sentences commuted upon completion of program.

* Effective October 1, 2005, changes to SACA parolee procedures were adopted by the California Department of Corrections (CDC) and the Board of Prison Terms (BPT) to direct parolees to treatment more quickly. Under the revised procedures, parolees are referred to assessment centers by their parole agents, rather than by the BPT. The parole agent is the primary point of contact for the assessment center and treatment provider.