

## **MINUTES**

### **MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 52nd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION**

#### **SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES & AGING**

**Call to Order:** By **CHAIRMAN DOROTHY BRADLEY**, on February 18, 1991, at 8:05 a.m.

#### **ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:**

Rep. Dorothy Bradley, Chairman (D)  
Sen. Mignon Waterman, Vice Chairman (D)  
Rep. John Cobb (R)  
Rep. John Johnson (D)  
Sen. Tom Keating (R)  
Sen. Dennis Nathe (R)

**Staff Present:** Sandra Whitney, Associate Fiscal Analyst (LFA)  
Bill Furois, Budget Analyst (OBPP)  
Faith Conroy, Secretary

**Please Note:** These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

**Announcements/Discussion:**

#### **DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES (DFS)**

**Tape 1A**

**Sandra Whitney, Legislative Fiscal Analyst**, distributed a budget summary for Benefits programs. **EXHIBIT 1**

**CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** asked the subcommittee to consider removing line-item language from developmental disabilities (DD) case-management funding. The line item will complicate accounting.

**Ms. Whitney** said payroll for a targeted case-management program is an administrative nightmare. Each time there is a separate appropriation, it has to be recorded on the employee's payroll record. The amount has to be separated into different accounts. Line-iteming the appropriation would mean paycheck amounts would be divided into numerous categories. The question would be how to allocate holidays, overtime, sick leave, travel, etc. It is a problem for the payroll clerk.

**CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** said the subcommittee line-itemed the appropriation because **Cris Volinkaty, Developmental Disabilities Legislative Action Committee representative**, was concerned the money would not be used for what it was intended.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON DD CASE MANAGEMENT

**MOTION:** SEN. KEATING moved to strike the line-item language.

**DISCUSSION:** CHAIRMAN BRADLEY said Ms. Volinkaty and Tom Olsen, DFS Director, worked out concerns. The subcommittee will have intent language and a report in two years to see how it worked.

**VOTE:** The motion PASSED unanimously 5-0. SEN. NATHE was absent.

HEARING ON THE BENEFITS PROGRAM

Jesse Munro, DFS Deputy Director, distributed background information on Subsidized Adoption, Alcohol and Drug Treatment for Indigent Youth, Supplemental Security Income, Independent Living, and the Big Brothers and Big Sisters benefits programs. EXHIBIT 2

SUBSIDIZED ADOPTION:

Mr. Olsen reviewed the Subsidized Adoption program. EXHIBIT 2

SEN. WATERMAN asked why the number of children receiving adoption subsidies has risen dramatically in the last few years. Gary Walsh, Protective Services Division Administrator, said the appropriation had been limited to the dollars available for subsidized adoption. During the 1989 session, the restriction was lifted. DFS now transfers foster-care money to this budget.

REP. COBB asked about the budget and the number of children projected for subsidized adoption over the biennium. Mr. Walsh said DFS' budget is flat. About 740 children are in foster care for one year or more. Of the total, 191 are in permanent custody of the state. Those 191 children are potential candidates for the Subsidized Adoption program.

REP. COBB asked where DFS gets money for additional adoptions if the budget is flat. Mr. Olsen said it comes from the foster-care budget or another funding source. Doug Matthies, Administrative Support Division Administrator, said these children are in foster care now. Subsidized adoption costs less than foster care.

SEN. NATHE asked how much of a subsidy is paid for each child, how long it runs, what happens when the subsidy period ends and how much is saved. Mr. Matthies said the subsidy rate is based on the needs of the child and is \$10 less than the foster-care rate. Costs can range from \$280 to \$320 per month. There is a minimum savings of \$10 per month per child. Betty Bay, Adoption specialist, said rates vary. Some children receive subsidies of as little as \$100 per month. Some receive subsidies for only a year, or subsidies can continue up to age 18. If the child is in high school, it can continue up to age 21.

**SEN. NATHE** asked if these children are automatically covered by Medicaid up to age 18. **Ms. Bay** said yes.

**ALCOHOL AND DRUG TREATMENT FOR INDIGENT YOUTH:**

**Mr. Olsen** referred to Page 31 in the executive budget narrative. He reviewed background information in **EXHIBIT 2**.

**REP. COBB** asked if follow-up is provided. **Mr. Olsen** said the program doesn't have sophisticated follow-up capabilities. **Mr. Matthies** said DFS relies on monitoring provided by the Department of Institutions. DFS provides a list of youth served. Institutions reports back.

**SEN. WATERMAN** said some treatment services are in the Department of Institutions and some are in DFS. This seems to be a prime opportunity for the state to provide some sort of family-based service. She asked how the program fits into overall care and how the state can better serve these children. **Mr. Olsen** said intervention is needed in the family if a child is removed from the home and may return in the future. DFS will phase in a home study to determine if the child can be returned home. If not, alternatives must be considered to prepare the child for the future. Money isn't available to do that for every child right now.

**CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** said DFS indicated that it stops taking applications when funds run out. She asked at what point in the biennium this occurs. **Mr. Matthies** said that occurred in January of this year. **CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** asked if adjudicated youth sometimes wait months for treatment. **Mr. Matthies** said yes.

**SEN. KEATING** asked if county taxes help finance indigent youth. **Mr. Matthies** said he thinks so. When the program began, no reserve money was available for a youth program.

**Ms. Whitney** reviewed updated beer tax revenue projections. The LFA predicts beer consumption will rise in the next biennium. Based on 30 cents per barrel going into the General Fund for this program, the estimated revenue would be \$212,100 for fiscal year (FY) 1992 and \$213,300 for FY 93. **CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** said the subcommittee can use these figures when voting on the issue.

**SEN. WATERMAN** said there is a high rate of recidivism in alcohol and drug treatment programs because of a lack of after-care services. She is concerned about the amount of money being spent on inpatient services for youth when the subcommittee has spent a lot of time talking about treating adults on an outpatient basis. She is troubled that children are being taken from their homes and sent through treatment when this is a prime opportunity to target family treatment. **Mr. Olsen** said he is not sure how targeted the money is. Historically it has been used for residential treatment, but such treatment for youth isn't necessarily the most effective. Community-based services and

programs that involve the family may be better.

**SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME (SSI):**

Mr. Olsen reviewed the SSI Program. EXHIBIT 2

SEN. NATHE asked if federal funds are included for people on social security. Mr. Matthies said this is the state supplement to the federal amount. SEN. NATHE said the state puts in \$94. He asked how much the federal government puts in for supplemental social security. Mr. Matthies said \$386.

SEN. NATHE asked if developmentally disabled children on Subsidized Adoption also qualify for SSI. Mr. Walsh said some disabled children can be SSI-eligible. DFS prefers to make children on Subsidized Adoption eligible for IV-E money. That ensures federal reimbursement.

SEN. KEATING asked how the program got started. Mr. Walsh said the legislation that created federal SSI benefits also authorized states to create the state supplement. Montana has had an SSI program since the late 1970s.

**INDEPENDENT LIVING:**

Mr. Olsen reviewed the Independent Living Program. EXHIBIT 2

SEN. KEATING asked if there is a 30 percent state, 70 percent federal match. Mr. Matthies said the program was 100 percent federally funded when it began. Beginning next year, the state will get a federal base amount of \$155,000. Montana can go up to approximately \$244,000, but the difference of about \$87,000 must be matched dollar for dollar by the state.

CHAIRMAN BRADLEY asked what the implications will be in the future. Mr. Olsen said he would like to see a drop in the number of children served in the program, as children are permanently placed in adoptive homes. Right now, these funds are used to help children who cannot return home.

CHAIRMAN BRADLEY asked if maintenance will be required and if the state will be locked into the present level. Mr. Matthies said this is part of the IV-E program. There has never been a maintenance requirement in IV-E. CHAIRMAN BRADLEY asked if this program could eventually be eliminated as DFS is more successful in the other program. Mr. Olsen said he hopes so.

CHAIRMAN BRADLEY asked how DFS will match anything over the \$155,000 base. Mr. Matthies said DFS plans to use social worker time to match the federal money.

**BIG BROTHERS/BIG SISTERS:**

Mr. Olsen reviewed the Big Brothers and Big Sisters program.

**EXHIBIT 2.** He noted that the state will never know how many children are kept out of the juvenile justice system because of this program.

**Tape 1B**

**SEN. KEATING** asked if state special revenue fees come from divorces. **Mr. Matthies** said yes. The money goes into the General Fund and is not targeted. **CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** said the 1989 Legislature detached divorce fees from this program because the budget would rise and fall depending on the divorce rate.

**Jim Smith, Montana Residential Child Care Association representative,** said much of the discussion so far has dealt with questions by the subcommittee about the coordination or lack of coordination among programs being offered. Programs are fragmented and not well-coordinated. Many began in the 1950s as part of the New Deal. They have been built piece by piece since then. The question may not be whether they are coordinated, but whether the subcommittee, through its action, is trying to move toward increased cooperation among agencies. That is the challenge. The subcommittee is heading in the right direction but a coordinated system isn't in place yet. Good legislation has been proposed that the subcommittee ought to look at.

**SEN. WATERMAN** said the state should be looking at community-based and family-based services. She asked if DFS has enough budget flexibility to develop a continuum of family services at the community level. **Mr. Olsen** said DFS hopes there will be flexibility in the residential portion of the Inpatient Psychiatric Services Program to develop community-based services. In terms of grants and benefits, a lot of the money is earmarked and will remain inflexible. DFS is trying to get as much flexibility as possible into its Medicaid General Fund match money. The agency will have enough money to start developing community-based services.

**SEN. KEATING** asked how DFS would establish priorities if the agency had a totally discretionary fund. **Mr. Olsen** said that if he had that kind of flexibility, he would make good use of youth advisory councils to develop priorities. DFS would have the flexibility to provide funding for programs that community groups believe are essential. There would be a community focus on special needs.

**CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** said the Big Brothers and Big Sisters program hasn't had an inflationary increase in six years. **Mr. Matthies** said it was cut to \$150,000 before the 1986 special session, then raised to \$165,000. In 1984, the budget was \$250,000.

**SEN. NATHE** asked what percentage of the total childhood population in Montana is being treated in state programs. **Mr. Smith** said about 10-15 percent. Montana has about 200,000 people under age 18. There are 20,000 children on AFDC, many of whom overlap into DFS services.

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON BENEFIT PROGRAMS**

**Ms. Whitney** said DFS used foster-care money to finance the increase in the number of children served by Subsidized Adoption. The LFA budget shows the increased amount. It does not show inflationary increases or increases for caseload. The LFA took the FY 91 appropriation for foster care to reflect the FY 91 provider rate increase up to 100 percent of schedule. Technically, the LFA has doubled up in these two programs. If the subcommittee adopts the LFA budget for Subsidized Adoption, it may want to subtract the difference out of Foster Care. If the subcommittee adopts the executive budget, the figures are comparable with Foster Care.

**SEN. WATERMAN** asked why the subcommittee can't fund Foster Care and Subsidized Adoption together. The state should be encouraging less foster care and more subsidized adoption. She asked if DFS could be given that flexibility. **CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** said the flexibility is already there. That is what allowed the funding transfer from Foster Care. **SEN. WATERMAN** asked why the subcommittee is considering the programs separately. **CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** said that is being done so the subcommittee knows what it is doing. **SEN. WATERMAN** said it is all the same pot. She asked why the subcommittee doesn't postpone action on this program and put the money into the Foster-Care budget. **CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** said the subcommittee needs to know where the money is going so that it can be followed year to year. **SEN. WATERMAN** said she wants this money to be part of the Foster-Care budget.

**CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** said she wants the subcommittee's action to reflect awareness that the Subsidized Adoption budget will increase and the Foster-Care budget will decrease by a like amount. Maybe the subcommittee should go with the LFA budget.

**Ms. Whitney** said LFA figures reflect increased use of subsidized adoption and decreased use of foster care. **Bill Furois, Office of Budget and Program Planning**, said the record should reflect the ability of the Department to continue moving money from Foster Care to Subsidized Adoption. It doesn't matter which budget is adopted. If the subcommittee takes the LFA budget, it recognizes the transition.

**CHAIRMAN BRADLEY** said it is clear from the discussion that the subcommittee not only recognizes the transition, it supports it.

**MOTION: REP. JOHNSON** moved approval of the LFA budget for Subsidized Adoption.

**VOTE:** The motion **PASSED** 4-2, with **REP. COBB** and **SEN. WATERMAN** voting no. **REP. COBB** was absent but was recorded as voting no. **SEN. NATHE** said **REP. COBB** indicated he supports the executive budget in these programs.

**MOTION:** SEN. KEATING moved approval of the LFA budget at the increased level of revenue predicted to be raised by the beer tax.

**VOTE:** The motion PASSED 5-1, with SEN. WATERMAN voting no. REP. COBB was absent but recorded as voting aye as instructed by SEN. NATHE.

**MOTION:** SEN. KEATING moved approval of the LFA budget for Supplemental Security Income.

**VOTE:** The motion PASSED unanimously 6-0. REP. COBB was absent but recorded as voting aye as instructed by SEN. NATHE.

Ms. Whitney said the subcommittee should approve the LFA base if it wants to reflect increased dollars that are available. The subcommittee already approved \$39,000 in operating.

**MOTION:** SEN. KEATING moved approval of the LFA budget for Independent Living.

**VOTE:** The motion PASSED unanimously 6-0. REP. COBB was absent but recorded as voting aye as instructed by SEN. NATHE.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE BIG BROTHERS AND BIG SISTERS PROGRAM**

CHAIRMAN BRADLEY introduced Jennifer Miller Smith and Nancy Arthur, participants of the Big Brothers and Big Sisters Program. She said Ms. Smith has been a big sister to Ms. Arthur for seven years. She was selected as the 1990 National Big Sister of the Year. Ms. Arthur is a freshman at Montana State University (MSU), studying honors engineering.

Ms. Smith encouraged the subcommittee to continue financial support for Big Brothers and Big Sisters agencies statewide. She said the program serves 1,000 youth from single-parent families statewide. It is a prevention program that helps youth through their tough teen years. Professionally paid staff are vital to the organization. They screen volunteers and youth to provide good matches. They conduct fund-raisers, work within communities and serve as representatives for program participants. She stressed the value of the experience in her own life.

Ms. Arthur said she is studying civil engineering at MSU and has applied to be a resident adviser. She described how Ms. Smith has helped her in her life and how invaluable she is to her.

Linda Lafavaur, representative of the State Federation of Big Brothers and Big Sisters and Executive Director of the Missoula Big Brothers and Big Sisters Program, testified in support of continued funding for the program. EXHIBIT 3.

SEN. WATERMAN asked about the waiting list and what work is done with families. Ms. Lafavaur said Montana has been above the national average in divorces since 1945. Waiting lists exist. Thirteen matches were made in January in Missoula. Another 11 were pending for February. The organization provided an average of three to four new matches per month last year. Boys wait five to six months for a match. Girls wait about one month. The organization provides support for families, including referral services for single parents and sexual abuse prevention training.

Tape 2A

CHAIRMAN BRADLEY asked if more volunteers are needed. Ms. Lafavaur said yes. There probably will always be more children than volunteers. CHAIRMAN BRADLEY said the program is demanding on volunteers' time. Ms. Lafavaur said yes. Volunteers are asked to commit three to four hours per week for a year. They are put through a thorough screening process. The budget pays for screenings, and resources and training for volunteers.

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON THE BIG BROTHERS AND BIG SISTERS PROGRAM**

**MOTION:** SEN. WATERMAN moved a 10 percent inflationary increase in the Big Brothers and Big Sisters budget.

**DISCUSSION:** CHAIRMAN BRADLEY asked if the increase would be 5 percent in each year of the biennium. SEN. WATERMAN said she was thinking of a 10 percent increase each year. CHAIRMAN BRADLEY said it should be 5-and-5 for consistency. SEN. WATERMAN said OK. Her motion would be for 5-and-5.

SEN. KEATING asked if United Way has increased funding for this program. Ms. Lafavaur said Missoula's program receives about 15 percent of its funding from United Way. There has been no increase for three years. United Way promised a \$2,000 increase this year, but the increase may not occur because of Champion layoffs. Some agencies don't have United Way in their communities.

Lavern Peterson, Executive Director of the Yellowstone County Big Brothers and Big Sisters Program and United Way Liaison in Yellowstone County, said the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association want to be included in the United Way campaign, which will decrease the money available for other organizations funded by United Way.

**VOTE:** The motion PASSED 4-2, with SEN. KEATING and REP. COBB voting no. REP. COBB was absent but recorded as voting no as instructed by SEN. NATHE.



ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 9:45 a.m.

Dorothy Bradley  
REP. DOROTHY BRADLEY, Chairman

Faith Conroy  
FAITH CONROY, Secretary

DB/fc

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**HUMAN SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE**

**ROLL CALL**

**DATE**

2/18/91

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
REP. JOHN COBB	✓		
SEN. TOM KEATING	✓		
REP. JOHN JOHNSON	✓		
SEN. DENNIS NATHE	LATE	missed first vote	
SEN. MIGNON WATERMAN, VICE-CHAIR	✓		
REP. DOROTHY BRADLEY, CHAIR	✓		

Exhibit #1  
2/18/91  
Human Services  
Subcommittee

DFS COMMUNITY SERVICES  
Program 02 Benefits

BENEFITS P. B-116	Executive Fiscal 1992		LFA Fiscal 1992		Difference Fiscal 1992		Executive Fiscal 1993		LFA Fiscal 1993		Difference Fiscal 1993		NOTES
Subsidized Adoption	\$199,504	\$275,987	\$275,987		(\$76,483)		\$199,504		\$275,987		(\$76,483)		Actual 90 exceeds approp 91; transfers from foster care
Alcohol & Drug Treatment	\$205,000	\$205,000	\$205,000		\$0		\$205,000		\$205,000		\$0		
SI	\$914,954	\$914,954	\$914,954		\$0		\$914,954		\$914,954		\$0		
Independent Living	\$244,190	\$244,190	\$244,190		\$0		\$244,190		\$244,190		\$0		New \$ - Match Required; LFA incl. approx. \$39,000 in OP
Big Brothers & Sisters	\$165,000	\$165,000	\$165,000		\$0		\$165,000		\$165,000		\$0		

ISSUES

1. Subsidized Adoption differences - Current level is based on fiscal 1990 actual which is higher than the appropriation because funds were transferred from foster care. However, current level foster care was based on the FY 1991 approp. to capture the provider rate increases. If the committee accepts LFA Subsidized Adoption, it may wish to consider reducing foster care by \$76,483.
2. Independent Living
  - a. Updated grants show funds increased from \$174,421 in Current Level to \$244,190 per year
  - b. A 50/50 match will be required on all funds above \$155,000 - A soft match may be sufficient

## SUBSIDIZED ADOPTION

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Subsidized Adoption program is designed to encourage and promote the adoption of children who have special needs. Support services and financial and medical assistance are provided to eligible children who would not likely have a permanent home without a subsidy.

### GOALS:

To provide permanent adoptive homes to children unable to return to the homes of their birth parents.

To keep children from languishing in the foster care system.

To insure medical coverage for children with special needs.

### SERVICES PROVIDED:

The objective of the department is to enable all children, whose biological parents' rights have been terminated and who would otherwise languish in foster care, to have a permanent home. Medicaid assistance is provided to eligible children when an adoption assistance agreement is signed.

A child who meets the eligibility criteria for the subsidized adoption program must be deemed as hard-to-place because of (a) a physical or mental disease or disability, (b) a recognized high risk of physical or mental disease or disability, or (c) having a sibling relationship to another child who is also eligible for adoption. A child must also be legally free for adoption and under the age of 18 years.

### BUDGET AND FUNDING:

The Subsidized Adoption program is funded by both federal and general funds. Federal funding for IV-E eligible subsidy is at the Medicaid rate. Non IV-E subsidies require total state funding.

	FY 92	FY 93
General Fund	\$109,637	\$109,637
Federal Special Revenue Fund	<u>89,867</u>	<u>89,867</u>
Total funding costs	\$199,504	\$199,504

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

The number of children receiving adoption subsidy:

	IV-E Funded	State-funded	Total
FY86	39	36	75
FY87	47	32	79
FY88	59	32	91
FY89	74	32	105
FY90	88	33	121

## ALCOHOL AND DRUG TREATMENT FOR INDIGENT YOUTH

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

This program provides inpatient residential drug/alcohol treatment to indigent youth who have been adjudicated youth in need of supervision, youth in need of care or delinquent youth. These services are purchased by the Department of Family Services.

The goals of this program are:

1. To treat youth adjudicated by the Youth Court who have chemical dependencies that require residential settings for treatment and who have no means of purchasing such services for themselves.
2. To prevent adjudicated youth from going on to commit adult crimes related to alcohol/drug abuse and from entering more costly adult jail programs.

DFS payments for residential alcohol and drug treatment for indigent youth are subject to the availability of funds appropriated to the department by the legislature. When the funds run out, the department no longer accepts applications.

### SERVICES PROVIDED:

1. Residential services aimed at eliminating chemical dependency among adjudicated and indigent youth are provided by qualified licensed staff.
2. Other services provided by identification of eligible youth, payment for needed services and monitoring after treatment in accordance with case plans.

### BUDGET AND FUNDING:

The Alcohol and Drug Treatment program is 100% funded by state general funds. Revenues are generated through taxes on beer sales.

	FY92	FY93
General Fund	\$205,000	\$205,000
Total Funding Costs	\$205,000	\$205,000

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

1. Number of eligible youth who will receive drug/alcohol treatment under this program: 56 in FY92 and 56 in FY93.
2. Percentage of youth who continue to show improvement after six months of completion of treatment: 60%

adsup\common\alc-drug.f08

## SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The State Supplemental Payment Program provides monthly supplemental payments to individuals eligible for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) who reside in designated facilities. The SSI program includes the adult financial assistance programs of Old Age Assistance, aid to the disabled and aid to the needy blind, all of which were put under federal administration by 1974 amendments to Title XVI of the Social Security Act. Those same amendments authorized states to supplement the SSI payments to individuals.

## GOALS:

1. that all eligible persons in designated licensed residential care facilities are receiving the appropriate state supplemental payment -- so they do not have to move to higher levels of care;
2. that state general fund dollars are saved -- since the majority of the people served under this program would otherwise have to go into skilled nursing facilities or back to state institutions;
3. that there are accurate and adequate funding levels by monitoring any proposed program changes or increases from any state agency that could affect this program;
4. that state supplemental payments are changed or terminated as required in a timely manner;
5. that DFS is aware of and in compliance with the federal regulations related to this program to avoid loss of any federal funds for such programs as medicaid or AFDC.

## SERVICES PROVIDED:

1. Provide a monthly payment to any individual who is eligible for SSI and who resides in the following types of living situations:
  - a. Community Homes for the Developmentally Disabled \$94.00
  - b. Group Homes for the Mentally Ill \$94.00
  - c. Group Homes for the Severely Disabled \$94.00
  - d. Personal Care Homes \$94.00
  - e. Children and Adult Foster Care Homes \$52.75
  - f. Developmentally Disabled in Transitional Living \$26.00



2. Transfer funds to the Social Security Administration to cover the state supplemental payments made by the Social Security Administration. The state supplemental payments become a part of the individual's monthly SSI check from the Social Security Administration.
3. Verify individual eligibility for this program -- completed annually by DFS social workers.

BUDGET AND FUNDING:

The funding for the SSI program is 100% state general funds.

	FY 92	FY 93
General Fund	\$961,766	\$995,606
Total Funding Costs	\$961,766	\$995,606

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

1. Conduct case administration (opening, terminating and changing cases and verifying program eligibility) efficiently as the SSI caseload increases to the FY92 and FY93 levels indicated below.
2. Make 11,892 SSI payments in FY92 and 12,520 payments in FY93.
3. Serve 1,022 SSI recipients in FY92 and 1,071 in FY93.

adsup\common\ssi.fo8

## INDEPENDENT LIVING

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

This program serves youth in foster care who are age 16 or older, by assisting them in attaining those attitudes, values, skills and experiences necessary for living independently and becoming self-sufficient. Independent living services are transition services for the purpose of moving a youth to a lesser degree of dependency upon DFS into a more normal environment.

In addition, youth who have been in out-of-home placements and have been discharged from foster care are provided with follow-up by DFS social workers. This includes at least two contacts within six months following the date the youth left foster care to determine how the youth is doing, whether further assistance is needed and to evaluate whether the independent living services provided were adequate.

### GOALS:

To assist older youth leaving foster care in locating, maintaining or utilizing housing, jobs, higher education, community resources, and a support network.

To minimize dependency and to increase the coping skills and crisis management capabilities of the youth in the program.

### SERVICES PROVIDED:

1. Cash stipends to youth leaving foster care -- to assist youth in obtaining housing, employment, training, higher education, transportation or other expenses (except room and board) related to moving out.
2. Community-based counseling services (mentor program) -- to assess a youth's independent living skills and provide guidance and support in meeting the goals of independent living.
3. Training for foster/adoptive parents in the Model Approach to Positive Parenting (MAPP contract) -- to improve skills in youth care.
4. Supervision, travel and training for VISTA volunteers in recruiting, retaining and supporting foster parents.
5. Conference or workshops for youth and/or adults on independent living skills.
6. Administration of program includes managing supplies, travel and training for a program manager and DFS field staff.

BIG BROTHERS / BIG SISTERS

EXHIBIT 2  
DATE 2/18/91  
-8-

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Big Brothers and Sisters (BB/BS) program is a community-based prevention program for at-risk children from single parent families. Nine BB/BS programs operate, serving the following communities: Helena, Glendive, Miles City, Butte, Great Falls, Kalispell, Missoula, Bozeman/Livingston and Billings.

The goals of the program are to meet the needs of at-risk children of single parents by providing:

- positive, (same-sex) role modeling;
- healthy adult relationships and an atmosphere for positive growth and self-esteem; and
- single parents some respite from the stresses of parenting.

SERVICES PROVIDED:

1. BB/BS programs arrange matches between community volunteers and children for companionship, role-modeling and guidance.
2. BB/BS programs recruit, interview, screen and train the volunteers and then monitor, review and assess progress in the matches on a regular basis.
3. For those children enrolled in the program for whom no Big Brother or Big Sister has yet been found, recreational and life-enriching group activities are provided.

BUDGET AND FUNDING:

DFS pays for only a portion of the programs. The Big Brothers/Big Sisters program contracts are 100% funded by state general fund. Revenues are generated through the marriage dissolution fee. Other local sources of funding pay at least 2/3 of total program costs.

	FY92	FY93
General Fund	\$165,000	\$165,000
Total Funding Costs	\$165,000	\$165,000

# BIG BROTHERS/BIG SISTERS OF MONTANA

EXHIBIT #3  
2/18/91  
Human Serv  
Subc

- Big Brothers/Big Sisters helps kids who otherwise might be a state responsibility.
  - Prevention is much more cost effective than intervention focusing on helping children before their problems lead to contact with the juvenile justice system.
  - This program saves the state money by helping to keep children in the home.
  - BB/BS is a low cost resource - utilizing volunteers. For approximately \$3.50 an hour, a minimum of 12 hours and as much as 80 hours per month is provided of one-to-one adult attention and advocacy focused on children in need; private counselors cost an average of \$40 to \$60 per hour.
  - A minuscule amount of the Department of Family Service's budget (.4%) would be expended for 9 Big Brother/Big Sister programs statewide which last year served 41 Montana communities and 1,074 Montana children. The percentage of non-state dollars (mostly private funds) generated for this program is impressive ranging from 90% in Park County to 69% in Flathead County. BB/BS is a cost effective, prevention program where "so little money serves so many"!
- \* Percentage of each FY 91 program budget funded by the state grant:
- |               |     |             |     |                     |     |
|---------------|-----|-------------|-----|---------------------|-----|
| - Butte       | 29% | Helena      | 25% | Miles City/Glendive | 14% |
| - Flathead Co | 31% | Missoula    | 26% |                     |     |
| - Gallatin Co | 25% | Park Co     | 10% |                     |     |
| - Great Falls | 22% | Yellowstone | 20% |                     |     |
- \* Comparative FY 91 Budgets:
- |  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| - Total state Budget                               | \$1,341,797,000 |
| - Department of Family Services                    | 36,873,286      |
| - Total BB/BS budgets statewide (9 programs)       | 683,023         |
| - BB/BS amount allocated by Legislature            | 165,000         |
| - Allocation after the Governor's 4% statewide cut | 158,400         |
| - BB/BS percent of the state budget                | .01%            |
| - BB/BS percent of Department of Family Services   | .4%             |
| - Percentage of BB/BS funded by state grant =      | 23.2%           |
- \* Annual cost per child for Youth Programs in Montana in FY 90:
- |                              |                |                    |               |
|------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|
| - Out of state placements    | \$56,400 (low) | Pine Hills School  | 26,965 (FY89) |
| - Yellowstone Treatment Cntr | 64,605         | Foster care        | 4,417         |
| - Mountain View School       | 26,965 (FY89)  | Big Bros./Big Sis. | 547           |
- It should be noted that all other services i.e. parenting classes, support groups for parents and volunteers, sexual abuse prevention training, educational and recreation classes, teen groups, group recreation activities, referral services and counseling, provided by Big Brothers/Big Sisters agencies are included in the total budget figure and thus are reflected in the per child cost.
- \* BB/BS prevention services are widely valued by other community services. The largest referral sources besides individual parents are the schools and child protective services. Probation, mental health and law enforcement also are major referral sources.
- \* The program deals with "at risk" kids. Studies have shown that children living in single parent families are at high risk for experiencing emotional and behavioral problems. Their need for additional positive adult role modeling is critical. Right now approximately 60% of the children served statewide by BB/BS have experienced some type of abuse and/or neglect.
- \* The future of Big Brothers/Big Sisters services in Montana would be extremely bleak if state funding is eliminated. At least one program would face definite closure with another on the border of closure. The remaining seven programs would all have to reduce staff and thus reduce the number of children served. Additional services will be lost, waiting lists closed.
- \* What do we ask? We ask that our funding be maintained at current level.

The following is a letter received by the Missoula Big Brothers and Sisters program from a former Little Brother who was matched in our program in 1977. He is now a twenty-six year old, graduate of the University of Montana, married and working in business here in Missoula. When his mom enrolled him in Big Brothers and Sisters his life was in turmoil. His dad's leaving had caused him considerable pain. He became withdrawn from adults and was caught shoplifting. He changed his group of friends and in his own words years later, admitted hanging out with the "wrong crowd".

His story details what prevention services are all about.

"Mike McConnell has been several different people to me throughout our relationship over the years. He served as a father figure in our early years, providing insight and support during my adolescence. He was always there when I had a problem or just needed someone to talk with about things that at the time seemed to be out of the realm of my mother. There were fun times, lots of them, but there were sad times also. Mike helped me to understand there is a positive side to the tragedy of death by placing an emphasis on religion and belief in a higher power.

Our relationship has gone through many changes. As a child I idolized Mike, he could do no wrong, much the same as any child would place their own father on a pedestal. I looked to the way Mike presented himself and I strived to make myself like him. He is dedicated, hard working, and has a pride in all that he does. He has carved out a place in the community for his life and his family, much the same as I would like to do for myself and family. The time I spent with Mike was fun and educational. It served as the form in which I could lay down a foundation for my continued development. I learned to be ambitious yet not overbearing, to have pride and dedication in myself and my work, and to be fair in all of my dealings.

The changes presented here are all subtle, from child adoration to adult respect and admiration of a man who had great bearing on the course of my life. Without the assistance of Mike, I do not believe that I would be the same man I am today. He was a needed link in my family. He provided a figure with which I could identify, confide in, trust and lean on and I am forever grateful. These are a few of the reasons that I chose him to be my best man in my wedding. Even though Mike and I are moving on with our lives, we shall never move apart of the relationship which was started many years ago through the matching of a big brother with a child. The times, the memories, and the future are all available to Mike and I. I can look back with fond memories and gratefulness, but I look ahead to the future with the same fervor. Our relationship is always growing, firmly based on trust and adoration, respect and friendship. Because of all of these things, and also all of the love generated by a relationship this strong, I chose Mike as my best man, My Best Friend."

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
VISITOR REGISTER**

Human Services SUBCOMMITTEE DATE 2/18/91  
DEPARTMENT(S) DFS DIVISION \_\_\_\_\_

**PLEASE PRINT**

**PLEASE PRINT**

[illegible]

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT FORMS ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.