GREATER LA COALITION ON HOMELESSNESS

Advocacy Toolkit

Homeless service providers are urging the Board of Supervisors to reject massive cuts to homeless programs in next year's LA County budget. This toolkit includes important resources for advocates.

BACKGROUND:

In September 2025, LA County estimated a [$303 million revenue gap] in currently funded homeless programs for FY26-27. Based on this shortfall, county officials recommended cutting homeless services by a staggering one-third reduction in a single year.

Greater LA Coalition members began mobilizing against this plan with a [sign-on letter] to the Board of Supervisors. After all, voters just approved Measure A with the recognition that more resources are needed to address the homelessness crisis. Supervisors shouldn't do the exact opposite by cutting programs one year later. In our sign-on letter, we called on the Board to develop a budget process to protect homeless programs along with other basic human needs.

Through this advocacy, we've already scaled back the original gap by $73 million – a huge amount of money in itself. By November, the Measure A spending plan had fallen to a [$230 million reduction] in homeless services. At the first Board of Supervisors meeting after this plan was released, dozens of providers turned out to oppose these cuts to homeless programs:

NEXT STEPS:

The Board of Supervisors is anticipating a final vote on the Measure A spending plan in January. Throughout the month of December, advocates need to generate letters, emails, and phone calls urging Supervisors to restore these spending cuts. Add this request to your newsletters and targeted email blasts to your lists. Set a goal of how many letters, emails, or calls your organization can generate between now and the end of the year.

Hilda L. Solis
FirstDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov
500 W. Temple Street, Room 856
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-4111

Holly J. Mitchell
HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov
500 W. Temple Street, Room 866
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-2222

Kathryn Barger
Kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov
500 W. Temple Street, Room 869
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-5555

Lindsey Horvath
ThirdDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov
500 W. Temple Street, Room 821
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-3333

Janice Hahn
FourthDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov
500 W. Temple Street, Room 822
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-4444

SAMPLE PHONE SCRIPT:

"Hi, I'm [NAME] urging the Supervisor not to cut a quarter of the homeless budget in the Measure A spending plan. Voters just doubled the sales tax on homelessness because we want to see this problem dealt with – we shouldn't do the exact opposite one year later. We want to see homeless programs maintained as a priority within LA County's safety net.

"I appreciate the hard work of county staff at the Department of Homeless Services and Housing who found $73 million last month to reduce the gap in homeless funding. However, that still leaves more than a $200 million deficit in the Measure A spending plan.

"We need is a countywide fiscal plan that solves this gap and other shortfalls in basic human needs. We need the Supervisor to fulfill the promise that voters made when they approved Measure A last year to invest in homeless solutions."

CORE MESSAGE FOR LETTERS AND EMAILS:

Supervisors have an opportunity to spare our unhoused neighbors from greater harm. As you've already done this year with shared reductions across the 26 departments to pay for other revenue gaps like the AB 218 settlement and recent labor agreements, we urge you to fix the homeless revenue gap as part of a countywide budget strategy.

The proposed Measure A spending plan would eliminate roughly a quarter of currently funded programs. These cuts are happening just over a year after millions of LA County voters approved Measure A by a 16% margin of victory. Instead of increased investment, the County is poised to slash programs, close beds, and return people to the streets.

ADDITIONAL TALKING POINTS:

We appreciate the dedicated staff at the new Department of Homeless Services and Housing, who have done their best with the funding they believe is available to them. We're facing a massive shortfall that can't be shouldered by the homelessness response system alone. Making the new department absorb this entire gap will disproportionately burden people experiencing homelessness, who are already vulnerable and deeply impacted by economic and social inequities.

The homeless count shows a second consecutive year of decline in homelessness. By passing Measure A one year ago, voters are expecting further progress. Going backwards and decreasing funding will have a catastrophic effect on public trust and voter confidence that LA County has the ability to implement a homeless strategy.

The success of any system depends on the sum of its parts, and when you make cuts to some parts, you impact all parts by increasing demand on fewer resources and likely making services less effective.

Providers are already stretched to their limits and these cuts will mean a reduced workforce and higher unemployment across our region. Cutting a quarter of the homeless budget will create gridlock and less favorable outcomes, as more of our unhoused neighbors will be told to take a number and wait.

We implore the county to identify funding beyond Measure A and re-evaluate the $52.5 billion countywide budget to address this crisis responsibly and effectively. We can't expect to make better outcomes, better lemonade, by squeezing more juice from even less lemons.

These programs are not extras. They are the foundation for how LA County prevents people from entering homelessness and how to help people stabilize once they exit homelessness. When these programs are cut, we don't save money — we shift these costs to hospitals' emergency rooms, county jails, county and cities' crisis response, and ultimately back to the streets.

What we cannot do is eliminate the programs that prevent homelessness and expect the crisis to improve. Every subsidy cut, every outreach position lost, every navigation team dismantled — each one represents a person who will fall through the cracks.

We urge the Board to preserve these essential programs and continue working with providers to identify solutions that protect the County's progress, uphold Measure A's commitments, and most importantly, prevent more people from becoming homeless.

The proposed cuts are severe and diminish the public's trust in its leaders to do the right thing, especially amid significant federal funding reductions to housing and homelessness. The county must identify funding beyond Measure A and re-evaluate the $52.5 billion countywide budget to address this crisis responsibly and effectively.

Strategic investments in prevention will reduce short-term, long-term, and chronic homelessness, ensuring that individuals and families remain stable — and that future generations are not forced into the same crisis.

SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF PROPOSED CUTS:

Here are a dozen program cuts to choose from to cite specific examples in calls, letters, and emails:

Housing Navigation (*zeroed out*)

Housing navigation is essential to connect people with their own apartments and create pathways out of interim housing. If this program were cut in the Measure A spending plan, we will see more people staying homeless longer. Providers on the ground are already stretched to the limit. Cutting housing navigation while also reducing outreach teams by half, eliminating safe parking sites, and scaling back core services will take away the very tools we rely on to move people off the streets and into stability.

Zeroing out housing navigation will also disproportionately impact people most at risk of housing discrimination as they exit homelessness — Black and Latino residents, older adults, people with disabilities, and individuals with behavioral health needs. These are the very groups Measure A promised to prioritize through its equity framework.

Regional Coordination (*zeroed out*)

Regional coordination is one of the core strengths of LA County's homeless response system. With hundreds of homeless contracts serving thousands of people across one of the largest counties in the nation, coordination in each Service Planning Area is essential. Yet the Measure A spending plan eliminates regional coordination. Homelessness varies widely in LA County. The needs in the Antelope Valley are different from the Westside or Skid Row. Regional coordination helps manage these geographical differences and prioritize what works best in each area.

If we dismantle the regional coordination structure that's been built for more than a decade, we will soon find that it's needed again. This spending cut is a short-sighted and avoidable step backwards that will impact the delivery of homeless services.

Intensive Case Management Services (*cut by $17.9M*)

Intensive Case Management Services or ICMS is the foundation of the Housing for Health model and remains one of the most effective interventions, with a 95% housing retention rate systemwide. Preserving service levels for more than 20,000 people receiving ICMS and ensuring no one is moved to a lower tier of care before they are truly ready is essential to supporting long-term stability, especially as older adults make up the fastest growing population of people experiencing homelessness.

ICMS strengthens community well-being by providing the “wraparound” support people need to heal from trauma, rebuild stability, and remain housed. We need more investment in this program, not a cut as proposed in the Measure A spending plan. Any administrative changes for cost savings should be implemented thoughtfully and in close partnership with providers.

Housing Supportive Services Program in Permanent Supportive Housing (*zeroed out*)

The Housing Supportive Services Program or HSSP is a specialized program that’s been zeroed out in the Measure A spending plan. It provides comprehensive and intensive field-based community mental health services designed to meet the unique needs of individuals in supportive housing who have a severe mental illness or serious emotional disturbance. HSSP allows providers to provide holistic care for our highest acuity clients through case management and crisis intervention. It is important to save the supportive piece of permanent supportive housing so that residents can thrive.

Homeless Incentive Program (*zeroed out*)

The Homeless Incentive Program or HIP is an integral portion of unit acquisition in permanent supportive housing. It’s been eliminated by the Measure A spending plan. Many residents who use HIP will now have no way to pay market-rate security deposits for an apartment. This budget cut would greatly impact move-in’s and it’s not clear what other widely accessible funds will be available.

Keeping barriers as low as possible for permanent housing placements is crucial to improve throughput. We appreciate the work the county has done to fight for permanent housing and we urge funds to be restored to the Homeless Incentive Program so that residents can move in without worry.

Homeless Prevention, Problem Solving, and Emergency Basic Support (*zeroed out*)

In 2024 alone, more than 60,000 people turned to homelessness services for the first time. While the county is prioritizing the construction of new affordable housing, housing and shelter on their own are not enough. Prevention is essential if we want to stop creating or perpetuating cycles of generational poverty that rely on homeless services for survival.
To truly address homelessness, we must empower our communities through prevention initiatives such as equitable access to living-wage employment, quality education, and timely emergency financial support.

Homeless prevention has been completely eliminated in the Measure A spending plan. While there may be an assumption that quality prevention related programs with cost-effect outcomes will now be administered by LACAHSA or Local Solutions Funds, there is no guarantee these programs will include the case management or emergency problem solving we’ve had up until now. There is no guarantee LACAHSA will prioritize especially vulnerable populations like TAY or domestic violence survivors, either.

Time Limited Subsidies (*cut by $4.0M*)

Time-Limited Subsidies or TLS are among the most effective tools we have, but it's proposed to be cut by $4 million. Studies show that in Los Angeles, TLS programs reduce future homelessness by 25%. Yet this year, providers report they have been forced to turn away more than 750 families due to cuts to TLS. Next year's spending plan would make matters worse, since higher acuity clients who won't be able to sustain their rent after June 30, 2026 are at risk of falling back into homelessness unless other housing options are available. These reductions will inevitably increase encampments — an area that is also slated for budget cuts.

Master Leasing (*cut by $5.3M*)

Master leasing is facing a $5.3 million cut in the Measure A spending plan, even though encampment resolution programs have been prioritized for master leasing. Most of those participants have a higher acuity and are at risk of not being able to pay rent on their own. Closing these sites without an alternative funding stream (like Flex Pool Vouchers or pre-matches to PSH), means tenants may be displaced or face mass evictions.

This is a program that's working. Controlling the leasing process for master-leased sites means that units can be filled in 3 to 5 days, rather than 120 days. Cutting master-leased sites means losing valuable housing stock when so few affordable housing options remain. It will also impact property provider perception and trust, especially in combination with CoC/Federal Voucher cuts, making it even harder for people to utilize scattered site vouchers.

These are especially vulnerable people, such as one master leasing site that is targeted towards unaccompanied women who are at an increased risk of gender-based violence. There are also geographic disparities, since most master leasing sites are in SD 2.

Youth Family Reconnection (*zeroed out*)

Transition age youth have greatly benefited from Youth Family Reconnection funds to reestablish stable relationships between family members as close as the next neighborhood and as far away as Australia. The Measure A spending plan would eliminate this program entirely. Our ability to use these funds to facilitate a return or move young people to a stable home has been critical in preventing long-term homelessness. Cuts to this program will make it much more difficult to reunify families and will contribute to longer experiences of homelessness and more stress on both transitional and permanent housing resources.

CES Youth Collaboration (*zeroed out*)

Youth Coordinated Entry has proven effective in assisting young people in having their unique needs met, but in periods of transition we must make sure that the voice of young people is heard. Intentional collaboration with young people is critical to our successes as a region.

Campus Peer Navigation (*zeroed out*)

Campus Peer Navigation, in a world where the cost of college continues to rise, is vital to young people who are on the educational path but still experiencing housing insecurity. Ensuring that the programming that the State is requiring and funding at our colleges and universities is accessible to those who actually need it is the centerpiece of this peer navigation. We are also working to connect community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities to LACAHSA funding. Without Campus Peer Navigation as an intermediary resource, making the final piece of the puzzle fit will be much more difficult.

In SPA 3 alone, Campus Peer Navigation has made more than 790 referrals between August 2022 and March 2025. During that same time frame, 400 total students were directly referred to alternative housing resources. This program helps students who experience housing instability so that these students are diverted from further reliance on the homeless response system.

USEFUL LINKS:

Proposed Measure A Spending Plan:
https://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/lac/1196579_DraftFY2026-27MeasureASpendingPlan.pdf

Measure A spending plan with comparisons to FY24-25 and FY25-26 (TAB A), as well as an itemized list of program cuts (TAB B): https://glach.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Measure-A-Spending-Plan.xlsx

For more information, please contact info@glach.org