

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

May 27, 1997 Hearing Room D

1:00 PM Tapes 112 -113

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Liz VanLeeuwen, Chair

Rep. Kitty Piercy, Vice-Chair

Rep. Bob Jenson

Rep. Jeff Kruse

Rep. Kurt Schrader

Rep. Mark Simmons

MEMBER EXCUSED: Rep. Dennis Luke

STAFF PRESENT:

Janet Carlson, Administrator

Berri Sellers, Administrative Support

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:

HB 3183 Work Session

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words. For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

Tape/#	Speaker	Comments
TAPE #111 not used.		
Tape 112, A		
004	Chair VanLeeuwen	Chair calls meeting to order at 1:30 pm. Explains that we will be providing an overview of HB 3183. Opens work session on HB 3183.
<u>HB 3183</u> <u>WORK</u> <u>SESSION</u>		

020	Janet Carlson	Committee Administrator. Explains matrix that the committee members have been given (EXHIBIT A).
034		Explains that the left column of the matrix describes SB 943-6 amendments.
041		The far right column is the SB 943-5 Minority Report. The differences are noted in bold in the center column.
046	Vice-Chair Piercy	Who sponsored the minority report to SB 943?
049	Chair VanLeeuwen	Senator Qutub and Senator Tarno.
052	Carlson	Explains that section 2 establishes legislative findings.
057		Minority Report adds a new subsection (h). Page 2, line 31 provides that the State Commission on Children and Families retains responsibility for working with counties for the wellness of children and families.
073		Explains that in the committee report the State Commission role was not mentioned.
076		Explains that the minority report clarifies how to calculate reinvestment savings.
090	Rep. Schrader	Is this a question of revenue or locating costs?
093	Carlson	The theme is that the prevention dollars would be redirected to the higher end of the continuum. The issue is targeting dollars towards the complete continuum.
109	Chair VanLeeuwen	Doesn't this language address the agreement that Deschutes County was trying to address with the Oregon Youth Authority?
115	Carlson	SB 242 tries to reduce the number of commitments to the Oregon Youth Authority.
119	Vice-Chair Piercy	Was the Governor's office still going to commit money to the continuum?
124	Carlson	Explains the "hold harmless" clause that is in section 6. If dollars were being spent on at-risk children in 1995-97, those dollars would not be redirected. The money left over would be targeted at the older group.
144	Vice-Chair Piercy	The First Steps program also goes towards targeting at-risk children. How this all flushes out could actually hold most of those programs in place.
150	Rep. Schrader	Comments that if you take the arrests out of the reinvestment formula that means there are less dollars likely to come back to the counties for prevention.
159	Carlson	Explains that the Governor would be looking for state dollars to reinvest. Eliminating arrests from the reinvestment formula wouldn't really impact the level of available reinvestment dollars because there are no dollars to reinvest at present. These are savings

		of projected cost increases. The dollars are budgeted in state agencies right now, so what they're saying is that next biennium because there is a \$70 million dollar expenditure increase projection, they would have to find the funding in human resources and education to cover that cost. If you could reduce the commitments to Oregon Youth Authority below the current commitment rates, there would be money available for reinvestment there. Comments that arrest rates are not a solid way to examine success, because they are reliant on so many other issues.
175	Rep. Schrader	If your goal is to get more money towards early intervention, then you'd want the arrest rate in there because that would bring more money for early intervention.
184	Carlson	Explains minority report provision that requires the State Team to give counties data about commitment rates. Reinvestment would reward counties that are successful, while considering minimum grant counties and counties with special needs.
203		In the three categories for reinvestment, the first category would be calculated by this formula.
219		Page 4, lines 9-14, explains that the minority report adds seats for a juvenile director and a director of a local commission on children and families on the State Team.
240	Rep. Kruse	Explains that he is against any form of this bill because he is against a State Team in statute. Comments that this is a bureaucracy that we don't need.
247	Chair VanLeeuwen	Comments that these state people are already employed by the state and can meet anyway.
251	Carlson	Section 4 lists the responsibilities of the State Team. The difference in the minority report is subsection (11) in section 4 on page 5, line 25. It adds a State Team responsibility to recommend a funding level to the Governor based on county information.
269	Rep. Schrader	Who does it now?
279	Carlson	The committee report is silent on this point. Asks Gordon Fultz for clarification.
282		Clarifies that the majority report is silent on this issue and the minority report wants the Governor to use the information from the local plans to recommend the next biennium's budget.
284	Rep. Schrader	If it's silent, who has this authority?
289	Carlson	The Governor always has the authority to create his recommended budget upon whatever basis he desires. It would be the desire of those who put together the minority report that he take a look at the content of these plans in order to create his budget.
291	Vice-Chair Piercy	In section 4 of the minority report, the State Team makes recommendations and releases funds.

311	Rep. Simmons	Is there any idea what type of funding will eventually be required?
318	Carlson	There is a list of funds from five agencies that formed a decategorized block grant in the Governor's recommended budget. That would have created a budget of approximately \$23 million?
360	Gordon Fultz	Association of Oregon Counties. Comments that the total is actually about \$40 million; \$26 million from the commissions on children and families.
373	Rep. Kruse	Comments that his vision of what we need to be doing is breaking down the barriers at the local level. "This whole thing is a backwards process in getting towards this goal."
391	Carlson	Section 5 deals with the planning process and the responsibilities of the county boards of commissioners.
TAPE 113, A		
012	Carlson	Subsection (5)(a) on page 7, line 18-23, is the "opt out" provision. In the committee report, the money would go under the direction of the State Team and they would determine how the money is spent in that county. The minority report adds a section, which is page 8, lines 2-17, that is not in the committee report. It says that the county board of commissioners would determine how the money is spent in that county under three circumstances.
036	Rep. Kruse	Who determines whether they meet that criteria?
039	Carlson	The bill is silent, but I imagine from the construction of the bill that it would be the State Team.
042	Rep. Kruse	Comments that the same body is the judge and the jury.
053	Vice-Chair Piercy	Comments that there is a lot of room for dollars that have been invested in wellness? Thought that the intention was to build collaboration between the counties and the state. The counties have been working really hard to ensure that this is in place.
076	Chair VanLeeuwen	Comments that the counties did not come out with the number of local people on the team that they hoped for in the negotiation.
084	Fultz	Comments that this is correct. Counties traded the number on the team and responsibilities of the team in order to save the "hold harmless" clause for at-risk children.
127	Chair VanLeeuwen	Provides statistics that demonstrate the difficulties for children who grow up with alcohol or drug abuse situations.
134	Carlson	Section 6 subsection (1) gives the authority to take monies out of various state agencies and combines them into the coordinated block grant.
149		Planning and evaluation funds are allocated to local coordinating and planning processes.
171		Explains that language in the minority report is different. These monies may continue to be used "to advance the goals and

		objectives" of the local plans," rather than the intergovernmental agreement as stated in SB 943-A
200	Carlson	The last difference is that sections 7-10 of SB 943-A shift in statute juvenile services, student retention, diversion and court services funds to go into the coordinated block grant for juvenile crime prevention. The minority report deletes these sections.
220	Rep. Schrader	Do you feel it's necessary to direct those specific dollars as in the committee report or do you think it's better not to mention the dollars specifically, figuring it's all part of the overall package and we'll get back to it anyway?
235	Carlson	There are a couple of issues surrounding that point. The first is that there was some conversation about whether the language in section 6, subsection (1), actually allows the State Team to do that anyway so you don't need to target specific funding streams in statute. The second is around should we wait until the next funding cycle, there is going to be an analysis to determine if it's just those or if it should be those and not others, or if we should wait to change specific funding streams to the block grants. The third is the comfort level of how those fit in the continuum.
245	Rep. Schrader	Can we get the opinion of the two up front on that?
248	Fultz	Does not know the motivation of the minority report for this section. The Governor's office had the intent to move funds. It looks like what the minority report has done is deleted those sections, waiting to look at the budget the next time around.
263	Chair VanLeeuwen	Is it possible for the Oregon Commission on Children and Families to respond as to how directing these funds to the coordinated block grant will affect their budget both administratively and service wise?
271	Mickey Lansing	State Commission on Children and Families. They do not have a precise understanding of how this will affect their budget, but they could get the committee a response at a later time.
320	Rep. Kruse	What would be the implications of killing both bills? Requests that the Governor's Office provide a response on this.
340	Chair VanLeeuwen	Closes work session on HB 3183 and adjourns committee at 2:40 pm.

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Berri Sellers, Janet Carlson,

Administrative Support Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

A - HB 3183, written materials, staff, 2pp.