

CAARR Comments on eliminating DADP

February 21, 2012

- CAARR agrees with the essential notion that Governor Brown outlined in his overall reorganization and streamlining proposal, which is to make government operate more effectively and efficiently. Our issue is that no proper analysis has been done regarding the effectiveness OR efficiency of the planned re-org of ADP.
 - **Last year's AB 106 moved Drug MediCal to DHCS.** It reads, in part: “ ... The plan that shall include, but is not limited to, the following component(s): (D) A list of any planned or proposed changes or efficiencies in how the functions will be performed, including the anticipated fiscal and programmatic impacts of the changes.”
 - The proposal to eliminate ADP should at least address the same issues as above, and changes should be backed up with a defensible socioeconomic cost-benefit analysis demonstrating long term program improvements and efficiencies **BEFORE** plunging into an irreversible decision to eliminate the Department.

- Eliminating ADP will dilute its core missions nearly into oblivion. A Statewide Focus on Alcohol and Other Drug treatment and recovery would be entirely lost. Eliminating ADP sends the signal that, “This just isn't so important”.
 - Simply stated, it IS very important. Far too many lives are at stake to rush headlong into dispersing California's AOD addiction treatment and education system to the four winds without **any considered analysis** of the consequences – now and into the future --- of a disjointed & trifurcated series of minor offices inside 3 Separate and Huge Departments. We cannot know the effects on the impacted population, their families, the corrections system, national health care reform, or the fiscal consequences to the state, without a Real Analysis.

- ADP contracted with UCLA to write a report on re-org considerations last year. Certainly the report is Long. At first blush, it even appears scholarly and authoritative --- full of footnotes, anecdotes from other states, synopses of discussions with “experts”. It also has the weight of a UCLA office behind it.
 - On closer examination, what the report lacks is objectivity. The conclusions seem pre-ordained; Multiple other conclusions that Directly Conflict with UCLA's conclusions could just as easily be reached.

- Virtually all Stakeholders agree on One Point: If the Department is eliminated, ALL ITS CURRENT FUNCTIONS MUST REMAIN TOGETHER. Rhetoric about “integrating” ADP's functions into 3 different Departments is misleading at best; “Disintegration” of the core missions is by far the most likely outcome of the current proposal.

ADP should be strengthened, not blithely dismissed as unnecessary.