

Subject Heard: Children's Services

SENATE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Friday, January 25, 1991 Hearing Room A 3 p.m. Tapes 7 - 9
MEMBERS PRESENT: Sen. Bill McCoy, Chair Sen. Cliff Trow, Vice Chair
Sen. Shirley Gold Sen. Bill Kenemer Sen. Paul Phillips STAFF
PRESENT: Janice J. Fiegenger, Committee Administrator Mike Meriwether,
Research Assistant Michael Sims, Committee Assistant Andra Woodrum, Page

WITNESSES: William Carey, Administrator, Children's Services Division
Janice Yaden, Governor's Task Force on Children's Services Division John
Ball, Children and Youth Services Commission Muriel Goldman, Children's
Advocate Pam Patton, Oregon Association of Youth and Family Programs
Conference of Private Child Caring Agencies Linda Roberts, Executive
Director, Foster Parents Association _ These minutes contain materials
which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session.
Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words.
For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. _

TAPE 7, SIDE A 006 CHAIR McCOY: Calls the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

015 WILLIAM CAREY, ADMINISTRATOR, CHILDREN'S SERVICES DIVISION (EXHIBIT
A): Gives overview of CSD and summarizes Exhibit A. 045 CAREY: CSD is
one of the few agencies to venture into the area of personal care.
Personal care has been used in the Senior Services Division in the past,
with some success. It's the matching of Federal money with state money
under the Medicaid program, to provide for the needs of special children
in foster care.

This is a population that's grown significantly over the years within
CSD. In the last four years, the percentage of children in foster care
who receive special rates, or have special needs, has grown from 19% to
36% statewide. So while the number of children in foster care is growing
dramatically, the number of really handicapped children is growing at an
even faster rate. Senab Commitbe on Humas Re~ourca lanuaq 2S, 1991- Page
2

Personal care basically took a part of the special rate that we were
able to reimburse foster parents for the special services that they
provide to some very handicapped children. We were attempting to get
more money into foster homes through the personal-care program. In fact,
we have done that probably too successfully. Since July 1990, we have
added approximately \$1.8 million, in addition to the regular foster care
special-rate money, into foster homes. The program is growing extremely
rapidly; we basically ran out of general-fund matching funds to continue
to fund the program. At this point, it looks like we have about a
\$330,000 general-fund problem by the end of the biennium. To try and
meet that, we first took any money we had in other parts of the agency
to support the program. About \$700,000 in general-fund monies was
transferred from any area that had a surplus to support the program,
before we took the action we did, which included freezing of positions,
cutting staff and services and cutting capital outlay. Finally, we had
to meet with DHR to share where we were with the problem. DHR Director
Kevin Concannon was very supportive and asked if we would take this
action if we had another dollar left. I replied no, this is an action of
last resort. In meeting with foster parents in Portland yesterday, I
said that if any general-fund money shows up anywhere in the agency
between now and June, I will put it back into this program.

-Continues with CSD overview (See Exhibit A). 188 SEN. TROW: Did the affected eliminated employees bump down and affect other positions in eliminating those 18 positions? 190 CAREY: Yes. They do have options, if they've been managers. They can bump back into classified at the last level they had. If they've never been in a classified service, they have no options. Of the 18 people who've been advised that their positions are being eliminated, 7 are management and the rest are classified.

-Continues overview. -Highlights major corrections-facility closures and effects on migrant workers, emotionallydisturbed children and foster care. 288 SEN. TROW: How many young people, who we've been serving, will go unserved because of these cuts?

292 CAREY: On the child-welfare side, as we looked at children in terms of risk, we're estimating approximately 1,500 families will go unserved. On the juvenile-corrections side, it would mean the closure of 3 cottages, affecting roughly 65 young people who would have to go back to the counties.

299 SEN. TROW: If they go back to the counties, do you think there will be services for them there, or what? 300 CAREY: No. And I would think we'd push everything down another notch - fewer of the acting-out adolescents, the out-of-control youth. I think girls will be significantly impacted under this budget as you restrict the juvenile-corrections system. In the past, it's always affected girls
Senate Committee OD HUm~D Resouree. Januar' 25, 1991 - Page 3

and I don't know why it would change in the future. Unfonunately, even in abuse and neglect situations we'd be waiting for situations to become more serious before the agency got involved.

308 SEN. TROW: In addition to being a detriment to children in terms of their needs, it also poses a real hazard to the communities we send them back to, is that correct? 312 CAREY: Yes. We've tried to preserve the diversion money going to county juvenile departments at the same level, plus inflation. We didn't make any cuts in that. Cuts come because we're saying please serve another 65 youth, using the same amount of trainingschool beds you currently have available.

317 SEN. TROW: These cuts are really pretty dismal, aren't they? 318 CAREY: Yes.

321 SEN. KENNEMER: You show a flattening in the number of people who are willing to provide foster homes. One argument raised was that we're having a real problem in that we underfund these homes. But today, in your discussion of the problem, you didn't mention money. 328 CAREY: I tried to address that when we were talking about the U.S. Department of Agriculture figures on what it takes to raise a child in Portland. We currently pay foster parents 51 % of that rate. We've got a slight rate-increase in our budget to 54 1/2%. That's not a very big raise; I think it's more of a commitment - at least on the part of CSD - that we realize we have a significant problem here and would like to do more but are unable to do so at this time. 339 SEN. KENNEMER: What is policy with regard to juvenile probation? An incident that happened to one of my constituents, who has an adolescent son who was involved in an incident before his 18th birthday. He committed another offense promptly after turning 18, and it's interesting to me that he has 2 probation officers - one for the offense he committed as an adult; one for the juvenile offense. That strikes me as unnecessary duplication and, I might add, the P.O.s have contradicting suggestions about what might be

best for this young man. 356 CAREY: Probation is a county service and the CSD no longer is involved. We have parole services if the youth was committed to the state's juvenile-corrections system (MacLaren or Hillcrest schools). Is that the case with your constituent, Senator Kennemer? 360 SEN. KENNEMER: Yes. 361 CAREY: If he committed an act before he was 18 and became a ward of the court, and the court had custody of that youth; then he committed another act after turning 18, between the ages of 18 and 19 the statute allows the court to commit a youth to MacLaren anyway. If the crime was serious enough, and he was tried and convicted as an adult - 368 SEN. KENNEMER: That's what happened. 369 CAREY: - he could be transferred back to MacLaren if he was under 18. If he was older, he couldn't be transferred back unless there was an agreement as allowed under an administrative rule. That rule has been used once in the last 10 years that I know of. . 392 SEN. KENNEMER: How many different sub-organizations of CSD work with children? You have protective services, juvenile probation and parole - how many others? I counted 27.

402 CAREY: Refers to chart on page 4 of Exhibit A.

-We expect our branch managers to be extensive partners in their communities, with as many agencies that serve children as exist in those communities. And we expect them to help create such community-based agencies as could help us in the future. When the Oregon Children and Youth Services Commission came on line, we wanted to be strong partners with John Ball in planning at the local level. And we instructed our branch managers to that effect. I'd hope that we'd have many partnerships serving Oregon's children because they really are a community responsibility. 420 SEN. TROW: As you restrict client intake, and limit caseloads to 20 per worker and so forth, what percentage of restriction of client intake is that?

425 CAREY: An estimated 1,500 families, on the child-welfare side. 428 SEN. TROW: What do you think are the spin-off effects of that? I think what you've said before, that in some other ways you had some restrictions - you didn't serve everyone needing to be served. You had waiting lists, etc., right?

433 CAREY: At this point, we couldn't create waiting lists. Each individual office triages the cases coming into the branch. The other day, Rep. Vera Katz shared a story about her experience sitting on the Community Protective Services Team, which includes the district attorney, law enforcement, CSD and schools. She said she listened to them decide which cases would and would not get immediate attention, and was shocked that some of the cases she thought warranted immediate attention were put on a waiting list. I think that happens statewide, and in individual caseloads. And then, when one of those cases that isn't served blows up, CSD looks as if it hasn't performed the mission you and the community expect of it. So each office triages each case in terms of risk right now, and we're talking about restricting intake.

TAPE 8, SIDE A

007 SEN. TROW: And some offices say, as they triage, no service ever.

008 CAREY: Yes. And at this point, you don't know who those clients are who won't get service. And we can't tell you who is getting triaged out for services a month from now. What we're proposing, under a restricted intake system, is that we be able to identify those people and possibly put them on a waiting list, and be able to report back to you who we're

not serving. 011 SEN. TROW: In some ways, this is a better approach than before. 012 CAREY: I think it will better address the state's needs in terms of children and families, in a way that will be more understandable and identifiable for the Legislature and the community. Senate Committee on Human Resources January 25, 1991- Page 5

015 SEN. TROW: It seems to me that the overall effect of this is simply to compound expenses later, which would push them into other systems that are more expensive than these. That's just a spinoff effect of what Measure 5 has done to us, really. It's had such an adverse effect in so many ways and not only are we cutting services down, we're making the problem greater for the future. 022 CAREY: The message is that you have to get worse before you get service.

023 SEN. TROW: Maybe. But I just hate to see us do this now because I'm not sure we can repair this damage. And if the people really don't want to provide us with replacement revenues, then what we do is even more of this in the future, in a substantially greater amount.

028 SEN. KENNEMER: Overall, how is the CSD workers' morale? 030 CAREY: It varies from office to office, I think, from what I've observed as I've traveled about the state. Sometimes, I wish people could do that with me because you can walk into an office and within 15 minutes you know whether people are up being creative, thinking of new ways and new partnerships. Then you go to other offices and morale is absolutely abominable, almost to the point of inaction.

035 SEN. TROW: What makes the difference? 035 CAREY: I think part of it is the management tone of the office, and part is people's participation in the community. If people think they have no help, there are no resources, it gets to be a very gloomy picture. You've got lots of partnerships and lots of other community help, there is some hope.

040 CHAIR McCROY: It's not all a dismal picture. Sometimes, at least those people who come in and whose names are at least on the list, might get referred to another service - maybe - if there are any other providers in that community that might meet their needs. 048 JANICE J. FIEGENER, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: I'd be interested in your comments on the recent report by the Governor's task force, and the child-welfare report. Did those have recommendations about restructuring and streamlining CSD, and putting more focus for juvenile corrections in the counties? 052 CAREY: I think Janice Yaden and the consultants she brought to the state to look at CSD have been extremely helpful. Anytime you have an outside review, if you're open about it, you're going to learn things about yourself and your operation, and where you need to improve. You don't hire people to come in and tell you how good you're doing; you really want to identify the areas in which you're having difficulties and then devise solutions. I basically agree with the majority of the reports. There are certain areas in which I have concerns. One was the provider issue, where the contracts looked like they'd be better operated at the local level. I think with the degree of need in this state, and the degree of instability in our provider system, I think that'd be very difficult at this time. In terms of the juvenile-corrections piece, we have been working as part of the Juvenile Justice Senate Committee on Human Resources January 25, 1991 ~ e ~

Coalition. We are analyzing the most recent Juvenile Justice Act, which was presented last Monday, and we're presenting a response. We basically are supportive, and have been a part of that planning process. In terms of spinning off the other services to the community, it again is an accessibility issue. There are other, technical kinds of issues as well

- union contracts and contracting out state work. I know that what Janice wants is for children to be safe in this state, to receive timely and adequate services. And we certainly support that.

074 SEN. TROW: As you spin off services to the counties, which are really short of resources to handle those services, is the money to pay for the services going to follow the kids from the agency to the communities? 078 CAREY: If it doesn't, I don't think we have a prayer of spinning anything off.

079 SEN. TROW: I know but we've seen that happen time and time again. And what happens is the services go the counties and some money comes, but not enough. And not nearly as much as there had been before when it was state-delivered. 082 CAREY: I'll give you a good example of that from Marion County. We did a pilot project for young offenders who were being served in the CSD caseload, and put together a casemanagement trial where we would transfer cases and staff to the Marion County Juvenile Department for a period of time to see how that system would work together. This agreement broke down when we had 4 caseloads of delinquent kids to transfer and when we looked at our entire workload, found we were only able to transfer 2 1/2 positions. I think as we look at workloads within the agency, I think that just highlights the problems that are there.

092 SEN. TROW: Did the study go out to the counties, to see if they were willing, able and prepared to provide these services?

094 CAREY: In terms of the range of family services that were in Janice Yaden's report, I don't think we've done that with the counties at this point. 095 SEN. TROW: You really haven't? And you've got a recommendation to end these services out to the counties and you haven't decided whether they're receptive?

097 CAREY: We do not have a recommendation to spin any of those services off to the counties at this time - only the juvenile corrections piece. We haven't had a chance to really get involved with the range of people that would have to have been involved to spin off the range of family services and other kinds of support services that we're in the report.

101 SEN. TROW: So you're still going to do that. 102 CAREY: Yes.

114 JANICE YADEN, GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON CHILDREN'S SERVICES DIVISION (EXHIBIT B): Summarizes Task Force's report as presented in Exhibit B.

- Senate Committee on Human Resources January 25, 1991- } - e 7

265 SEN. TROW: As you thought about narrowing the-focus of the CSD programs, had you thought about what happens to those who aren't going to be served by CSD? There they are, out in the community, committing crimes, abusing drugs. Some who won't be served may get along fine but many won't. What about the spinoff costs all over the face of things - local, state and so forth? Is this cost-effective, if you take that into consideration? 279 YADEN: The question is, do you believe you can do a good job and make the impact you want with a limited number of families, rather than perhaps making no impact at all with lots of families. We're kidding ourselves when we say those 40,000 children who were served by CSD last year were served well.

So the policy question for the Legislature to ultimately decide is, do

you serve a fewer number well, and have them move into stronger family relationships that can protect the children? Or do you keep spreading yourself so thin and perhaps all of your families, all 40,000 children, still remain in trouble? SD trying to calculate how much ends up in some other system is very, very difficult. We recommend that CSD not be the preventive agency. Hopefully, the Oregon Youth Services Commission could sene this purpose. We have the Great Start program, whose focus is early intervention and prevention, operating in all counties. We recommend that you take the \$10.5 million that CSD currently spends on families that are not in their caseload and put them into those county grants, just like you do for Great Start - it would double your Great Start money. It would double your capacity in every county, and give you a system and structure in any one county to provide some help for families that are more voluntary at that point. 317 SEN. TROW: I'm trying to visualize who we're serving with Great Start and the younger ones. Again, as we change our focus in CSD, we're serving the younger children. But once we change our focus, who will serve the Icids aged 14 to 20, those at the highest risk? 323 YADEN: To the degree that they would not fall within the protective system, they would be served by those grants that are out in the community through the Youth Commission - that's how I'd do it. Whether someone else would do it another way - hook it to a county government, or have some completely new structure - the Youth Commission serves children from birth to 18 or 20 - and the grants are kind of divided into the Great Start, which is really that very early prevention and intervention. Then there is a middle group, and then the older group - status offenders, etc.

337 SEN. KENNEMER: I sense that this is a gigantic job. We need to do some reshaping, see about not reaching as far, to try to maximize those dollars. Prevention and targeting areas are critical. 349 YADEN: That's an area where I think the whole state should put its focus.

351 CHAIR McCOY: I wonder what happens with the public perception, that this agency has a mission to take care of kids from zero to 18 or 21. Once you stop that mission and start funneling Icids off someplace else at a certain age, what does that do to you? What does that do for accountability for the Youth Commission? How do they worn with CSD? Everything is so closely related, I don't know how or whether you can draw the line and do a good job? Saute Co nmittee on Humea Resource. lanuary 2S, 1991 - 1~ue ~

371 YADEN: It's hard to draw such lines in social services. But I think we do it to allow people to focus on what they want to accomplish. If you're going to be all things to all people, you end up not being anything. CSD is under a lot of stress because they're trying to be all things to all people and they have fewer people, fewer workers than they had in 1981 - and tougher issues, tougher families. The inclination is to want to do more, up front - prevention, health. That's the direction the social workers would really like to be involved in. But if push comes to shove and you really have a limited amount of money, of resources, where do you think you should draw the line? Well, it's protecting those children - it's making sure that a child in danger has a safe place to be and treatment. You heard from the director that caseworkers triage during the day - well, let's look at the system. Let's look at where we need the treatment the most and provide the most vulnerable children immediate treatment and a safe place. Let's ensure them that as a state. 400 SEN. TROW: I don't disagree with the idea of doing a better job with a whole group of people, but it seems to me that we have these other people we ought to be doing a good job with, too. Maybe we just need more resources, more dedication and better programs

for them. But what I see is abdicating responsibility for a lot of people who will be out in society, then you'll have a demand for all these prison beds that are so expensive. We'll spend all that money building more prison beds which immediately will be filled, and we're just going to lock people up. That doesn't seem to me to make sense. We should spend the money down at this level, not triaging people but treating them. 416 YADEN: I think you need to be honest. Too often we don't say, here is what the need is, and here is what we're going to do. This way, it clearly is honest to the taxpayer to say that this is what we're going to do next year - we're not going to serve these children because we don't have enough money.

TAPE 7, SIDE B

001 SEN. TROW: And in 5 years, we're going to build a hell of a lot more prison beds. 002 YADEN: Well, maybe longer than that, and I'm hoping maybe people will come to their senses sooner. 004 SEN. GOLD: Are you, or is anyone else here, having any bills drafted based on those recommendations? 009 YADEN: We actually did not do any bill drafting. We kind of looked at what pieces might need bill drafting, and if CSD were to narrow its focus to protective services only that would need a bill, I think. Probably allowing prioritization, according to available funds, would need a bill as well, I'm not sure.

Community transfer of juvenile services already is in bill form and has been presented to the Judiciary Committee; I don't know if you've seen that yet Caseload size is another issue of concern because we knew the Legislature had funded caseloads at a certain ratio. But, in fact, what happens is once that's funded, the individual branch manager can make changes and carve away from that money for caseloads, and put it into other services. Senate Committee on Human Resources Januar' 2S, 1991 - PaRe 9

We found some very large caseloads, and felt there was no way individual caseworkers could do the kind of job they were doing. They were telling us that 15%, or a top of 25% of their time went into client contact. The rest was in all kinds of paperwork, court appearances, etc. I don't know if that's a legislative issue, because I think you could write something like that up in legislation, but I don't know if it's a good public policy. Clearly, if you can offload something in another way you may not want to be lock d into concrete in terms of caseload, but it's an issue to look at. Finally, we recommended some kind of oversight mechanism- some long-range planning, action planning, and oversight to make sure those plans actually are taking place. Most of the other issues are administrative in nature.

031 SEN. GOLD: So far, there's only that one bill you described? 032 YADEN: Yes. I'm not aware of any kind of consensus on those other issues. I think it's frightening to people to actually consider writing down into law that CSD is clearly protective services, and to define what that'd be. Everyone would have different ideas on what is a protective service.

037 SEN. GOLD: Have you appeared before the House Human Resources Committee?

038 YADEN: No. I talked to the Senate Government Reorganization Committee, and am to speak to the House Friday, Feb. 1. . 048 JOHN BALL, CHILDREN AND YOUTH SERVICES COMMISSION: The Commission was created by the 1989 Legislature via House Bill 3466. In November 1989, the

Emergency Board gave us our funding.

In our agency, you put the previously-existing Juvenile Services Commission, the Student Retention Initiative (which had been in the DHR director's office), the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program, the new Great Start program (also created in the 1989 legislative session) for children from pre-natal to age 6, the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (which administers some federal funds in the juvenile-justice prevention area), and the CourtAppointed Special Advocates program (previously housed in CSD). You asked us to turn these programs into community-based strategies, comprehensive in nature and balanced in their approach to youth at the local level. These programs now are communitybased, and are well-received at the local level. However, it has created some friction between our agency and other state agencies - they say if it moved as much autonomy to the local level as we have been advocating, you'd possibly have a program with 36 different variations (one for each county). You asked us to be comprehensive, so we integrated the programs into a comprehensive community-planning process that the counties are engaged in right now. In the next 4 or 5 months, we will deliver to you needs-assessments and program plans for youngsters from birth through age 18. You will, for the first time, have a pretty good glimpse at how communities view the service-systems for youth at the local level. Saute Committee on Humu Januar, 25,1991Pye 10

You asked us to be balanced in our approach. That's been a very interesting process - this issue of where do resources go, between prevention and early intervention, treatment, remediation. And in a service system where none of those services has adequate funding, we have gotten into some very lively discussions between providers and local agencies all across the state. There has been an emphasis on prevention, a new emphasis.

So there's been some tension between the pre-existing agency (which dealt largely with dropouts, juvenile delinquents and status offenders) which was never adequately funded, and a new program whose inclusion is sometimes seen as a threat to the service. So we've been working to cast this in the context of the continuum of services and the fact that none are effective without the others.

You asked us to do partnerships with the local governments. All 36 county boards of commissioners are engaged in this process voluntarily. They've put a total of about \$500,000 in county general-funds into the process. About 7,000 citizens at the local level have been involved in these efforts in the last 18 months. So the citizen response has been gratifying.

You asked us to leverage private and local resources. Already, in the past 12 to 15 months, we've leveraged almost \$7 million of private-sector and local resources into the program areas, so the return there has been impressive.

In the Great Starts summary, counties all across Oregon named child care as their #1 priority. They also talked about parent education, pre-natal and early-childhood health .

The Emergency Board gave us the funding to set up an integrated database in our own office, and hook the counties up to that. We have integrated the information bases for all the programs you gave us last session, and during the next 2-3 months we'll be plugging all 36 counties into that database to give them the benefit of that information and provide them

with instant communication between the state office and between each other.

In Governor Roberts' proposed budget, each of those county-grant programs I mentioned will be recommended for a 10% cut. Our state agency will be in there for a recommended 47% cut.

149 SEN. PHILLIPS: Could you comment on the cooperation, the success rate or failure rate of the tricounty area, with such a major population-base and interesting pulls and tugs politically?

152 BALL: I used to be a Lane County commissioner, and we always looked with great interest upon the conduct of county business in the Portland metropolitan area. All three of those counties (Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington) have been engaged in a very good-faith effort on all of our programs. In fact, some of the state leadership comes from there.

There are programs which are very well integrated at several levels between the metropolitan governments, and some which frankly are not as integrated as they might be. Given the time we've been up and rolling, I think we're making good progress. But, frankly, we have further to go. The juvenile programs that have been working for some time and have a fairly strong provider network in the metropolitan area, have been and continue to be strong. Multnomah County continues to struggle with how these youth services will be positioned in their county government, and what kind of policy process will be used. .

Senate Committee on Human Resources~ January 25, 1991- P4e 11

Beyond that, I'd say the Student Retention Initiative (which we inherited from DHR) is the one that has been the most problematic in integrating it centrally into the county planning process, because it was set up and has been an education-based program. It's main support has been in the school and the education systems, and it's not always simple to integrate local school districts and county governments in the planning process.

181 SEN. PHILLIPS: Have you seen the same type of citizen involvement in the Portland area as you would in, say, Gilliam or Morrow or other rural counties?

184 BALL: We've seen some examples of very strong citizen participation, but there is an effect that takes place in the larger counties throughout the state in which they have greater resources within the governmental agencies themselves. There is a tendency to get a fair amount of work accomplished within the local-government processes. In smaller counties, there is more a willingness and tradition of private-citizen, volunteer involvement.

200 SEN. KENNEMER: It's been something to see the energy-level in Clackamas County, with community leaders getting fired up about it. That citizen involvement has been real unusual and exceptional, and I think there are going to be a lot of spinoffs that'll pay off for a long time. I hope that we can find another charismatic leader at the top - I think we're going to miss Governor Goldschmidt on this, because his lead was part of what made that happen.

210 BALL: I think the message is that when you give local communities the opportunity and challenge, they respond.

212 SEN. TROW: If there is a retrenchment in what CSD does, and things are left at the community level, do you see through the framework of your organization the ability to pick up the young people who may need treatment and service? Or will there be a vacuum?

218 BALL: Many of the providers CSD uses, or would use in those systems, also are providers funded through our network. So there is a fair amount of overlap already. If our comprehensive planning process continues to work and reach out to involve those folks at the local level, then there's the huge degree of overlap. In fact, CSD is a key player in many of our local youth services commissions.

There is an issue of capacity-building. Frankly, not all 36 county youth-services commissions are up to that task right now. Many are less than a year old, volunteer organizations with a very low level of paid staff. If you were to ask them to take on substantial new responsibilities, you have to expect that it won't happen totally successfully overnight.

232 SEN. TROW: Will it happen at all? 233 BALL: This is a model that demonstrates that it can be more cost-effective and more compelling to local citizens in terms of their involvement, than any other model you've got in state government. If you're going to build a model for delivery systems in the 1990s, it seems like this is the kind of model you want to build the capacity in.

240 SEN. PHILLIPS: Could we build on Senator Trow's question, not just in CSD but all through DHR and mental health and some of the other affiliated agencies. Reflecting on the demand on

. . . Seate Committee on Human Resource. Januar'25, 1991- Page 12

capacity, I'd have to think there was some crossfertilization. 244 BALL: There's an enormous amount. Where our system is up and working well, there's a surprising amount. The fact is, we have the basic framework in place, a locally-based needs assessment process for communities to take a look at their needs and then move to deciding what kinds of needs they're going to fund. And that can be expanded over a range of services, for particular program elements within service systems. It simply takes a little more capacity.

259 MURIEL GOLDMAN, CHAIR, CHILDREN'S COMMITTEE FOR THE MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF OREGON (EXHIBIT C): Details Exhibit C.

TAPE 8, SIDE B

025 SEN. PHILLIPS: I'm particularly attuned to the issue you brought up regarding dropping the age of jurisdiction, especially as it relates to the sexual-offenders program. You're probably aware we had some discussion out in my neck of the woods (eastern Washington County) about this issue. Rather than take the committee's time, can we talk about it at some point?

030 GOLDMAN: Yes.

042 PAM PATTON, OREGON ASSOCIATION OF YOUTH AND FAMILY PROGRAMS/CONFERENCE OF PRIVATE CHILD CARING AGENCIES (EXHIBITS D, D-1, D2): Details Exhibits D, D-1 and D-2. . 155 SEN. TROW: Regarding the physical capacity of the Day and Residential Treatment Services (DARTS) programs, are there enough people who will qualify to keep the DARTS

programs going?

158 PATTON: I'll ask William Carey in (the audience): Are there enough Medicaid-eligible children to fill the slots that will be emptied by non-Medicaid eligible children in the DARTS program?

160 CAREY: CSD transferred funds to the Mental Health Division for the program. We found that 48% of the kids in the system were Medicaid-eligible. We know that if the game rules changed, there were additional children who would be Medicaid-eligible who could be served in the DARTS program. We transferred another \$2 million in general-fund monies to use as match, but it still left a major hole because we don't have enough general funds available to match in the system.

170 SEN. TROW: Do you know how that's going to spread out over the DARTS program? Is it going to affect some more than others? 171 CAREY: I think at this time, no one knows what the true impact is going to be. We've got a transition team set up between CSD and the Mental Health Division, and we want the DARTS providers involved with us to identify where those holes will be, and how to make the system work. Again, I'm concerned that we not destroy a system if there is revenue to be replaced later. I'm concerned that we not destroy private agencies statewide, agencies es who don't have the capacity to reconstitute themselves in 2 years. Senate Committee on Human Resources~ January 25, 1991- Page 13

179 PATTON: Continues testimony.

213 SEN. TROW: The drug- and alcohol-abuse area is an area where we really ought to be doing much more, in terms of prevention. We're cutting back in an area where we need to make a major offensive.

218 SEN. PHILLIPS: I agree but let me ask this - if Ballot Measure 5 were not on the horizon, would you be here with major program proposals? Forget the question of dollars - are there issues that should be addressed that aren't affected by Measure 5? There are a number of issues that need to be addressed to maintain the quality of life in Oregon, and that aren't affected by the ballot measure. 248 PATTON: I'll hit that point near the end of my prepared testimony. I think it's important for us to recognize that children are not in a vacuum and aren't served by one system; they cross multiple systems. When you examine the CSD cuts, you have to realize that they impact all child-serving agencies. When we cut services, you'll either push kids out of one end of the system into another area where there are no services at all. For example, if we continue to let girls go unserved, as we have done, and they continue to get into drugs and prostitution and abuse, and continue to produce babies who have HIV infections and are developmentally delayed and retarded - and they continue the cycles of abuse and dependency, we will create a big problem for ourselves. I think all these services are necessary because otherwise, we will be paying later. It's sad, to me to see our society continue with this short-term thinking, to even think of cutting services to these at-risk children. With the increase in the number of children living in poverty in our state, living with or dying from child abuse, increases in teen pregnancies and in drug and alcohol abuse, violent sex crimes against children - it's unconscionable to me that we could be cutting services and creating a problem that we are putting on the backs of those healthy children who must carry the weight of their unhealthy, unprepared peers who will be unable to contribute to society because we chose not to value or nurture them today when we can make a difference. I'm aware

that you're not the appropriations committee, but the Senate Human Resources Committee can champion the cause of children.

300 SEN. GOLD: At least 20 of us in the Senate list championing preventive services and championing young children and families for this session. 313 SEN. PHILLIPS: That's a good point. That's exactly why I raised the issue of Measure S - if it hadn't passed, these folks wouldn't be coming in to defend cuts but rather, to say this is a program you should look at.

You know, these children didn't just disappear. Every morning I go to work, I step over these girls who must be 11 years old, asleep in downtown Portland. It's a lost society out there; an absolute disaster. And it's going to cost lots of money and cause problems in the future, and is a tragedy beyond all proportions. We think about it going on in other countries, but it's happening here too. Senab Committ~ oa Hum~D lle~ource. Janunr~ 2S, 1991- rue 14

331 SEN. TROW: My point atways has been, we will need to malce cuts because we don't have enough money in the general fund to take care of the requirements of Measure S and our other needs as well. Unless we can somehow find some other resources, we need to get imaginative and find them.

348 LINDA ROBERTS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FOSTER PARENTS ASSOCIATION (EXHIBIT E): Details Exhibit E.

405 SEN. PHILLIPS: Why are you recommending a foster-care reimbursement maintenance rate increase to only 80% of what the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates it costs to raise a child? 406 ROBERTS: We didn't think we could get 100X and so compromised at 80%.

One reason that figure is so low is that 10 years ago, when Oregon went into a recession and foster care and all human services were cut, foster parents didn't receive cost-of-living increases for several years. They stayed at the same rate for a long time - in fact, I think it was just 4 years ago when the state was able to give a 2.5% cost-of-living increase, which wasn't much. If you do an increase of 2.5% a year, it's going to take a long time to catch up, if you hadn't teen giving an increase for 5 or 6 years.

The number of foster children has increased, but the number of foster homes has decreased. Those homes we do have available are compelled to take more children. We need the increase in the maintenance rate to help recruit foster parents, and funds for a statewide fosterparents association and increased support of foster parents in the local county areas. The #1 reason foster parents are leaving the system because of a laclc of that support. TAPE 9, SIDE A

019 SEN. TROW: We heard Mr. Carey talk about changing the relationship between CSD and the fostercare program; maybe creating some semi-independent agency or consortium that would then recruit families and run the program. What do you think about that?

024 ROBERTS: That issue really needs careful thought and discussion. The state government of New York has no foster homes. They're all contracted out locally, at the county and city levels. One thing that happened back there 4 or S years ago, along with the sharp increase in foster children, was that contracting meant they could not respond to these needs as quickly as states with foster homes could. So, for

example, you had "boarder babies" - children living in hospitals from their births until they were 6 to 9 months old because they had no homes. That wouldn't happen in Oregon, where the state controls foster care, they're able to place children from the hospitals immediately. 039

SEN. PHILLIPS: Have you looked to see whether we have a higher or lower turnover of foster parents than normal? Or a lower recruitment rate? Did those figures come into being when you decided this was your second priority? 045

ROBERTS: The turnover among foster parents is a nationwide problem. In Oregon, it's about the same as anywhere else - about a 50% turnover rate. The other thing is, there's probably % turnover rate. The other thing is, there's probably only Senate Commidee on Humas R - ources Januaq 25, 1991 - Page 15

2 or 3 other states with statewide foster-parent associations. So when you look over the turnover rate, you can't tell, because these associations are fairly new and just beginning to come on the horizon.

051 SEN. KENNEMER: You talked about \$100,000 in funding to create a support/advocacy group. Wouldn't you perhaps be ahead by seeking some outside grant, or forming a political-action committee? It seems like you sort of hamstring yourself; you take money from us. It strikes me that you have a lot of advocacy and educating to do, as a group.

057 ROBERTS: A lot of advocacy needs to be done. For \$100,000 during the 199 1-93 biennium, we could get a program off the ground, get someone on board and then be able to generate additional dollars. But, in New Jersey, there is a statewide foster-parent association which now is funded at about \$700,000 by the state. It started 4 years ago, at about \$400,000. They are getting money from their state, and performing many services other children's services programs do - such as recruitment, etc., as mandated by New Jersey state statute. 068

SEN. TROW: Adjourns the meeting at 5:08 p.m. Submitted by:
Reviewed by: Michael Sims Janice J. Fiegene Assistant
Committee Administrator

EXHIBIT LOG: A - CSD overview - William Carey - 8 pages B - Governor's Taslc Force Report on CSD - Janice Yaden - 24 pages C - Testimony on CSD budget cuts - Muriel Goldman - 8 pages D - Testimony on CSD budget cuts - Pam Patton - 4 pages D-1 - Summary of services, Oregon Association of Youth and Family Programs - Pam Patton - 47 pages D-2 - Summary of Agency Services, Conference of Private Child Caring Agencies of Oregon - Pam Patton- 35 pages E -Testimony - Linda Roberts - 6 pages