

**MINUTES OF THE
JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON K-12/HUMAN SERVICES
OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
AND THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

**Seventy-fourth Session
February 19, 2007**

The Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services of the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means was called to order at 8:05 a.m. on Monday, February 19, 2007. Chair Barbara K. Cegavske presided in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Barbara K. Cegavske, Chair
Senator William J. Raggio
Senator Dina Titus
Senator Bernice Mathews

ASSEMBLY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie, Chair
Assemblywoman Barbara E. Buckley
Assemblyman Mo Denis
Assemblywoman Heidi S. Gansert
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith
Assemblywoman Valerie E. Weber

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rex Goodman, Program Analyst
Larry L. Peri, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Mark W. Stevens, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Anne Vorderbruggen, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Fernando Serrano, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services,
Department of Health and Human Services
Barbara Legier, Deputy Administrator, Family Programs, Division of Child and
Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services
Patricia Merrifield, Deputy Administrator, Children's Mental Health, Division of
Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services
Pauline Salla, Social Services Chief, Division of Child and Family Services.
Department of Health and Human Services
Michael J. Willden, Director, Department of Health and Human Services
Thomas D. Morton, Director, Clark County Department of Family Services
Jim Dolian, Clark County Department of Family Services
Michael Capello, Director, Washoe County Department of Social Services
Paul Bowen, Information Systems Manager, Division of Child and Family
Services, Department of Health and Human Services
Jennifer Albin, Management Analyst, Division of Child and Family Services,
Department of Health and Human Services

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 2

Steven J. Thaler, Director, China Spring Youth Camp and Aurora Pines Girls Facility

Daniel Prince, Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services

Audrey Fettes, Superintendent, Summit View Youth Correctional Center, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services

Jamie Killian, Superintendent, Caliente Youth Center Bureau, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services

Dale Warmuth, Superintendent, Nevada Youth Training Center Bureau, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services

Jeffrey Morrow, Administrative Services Officer 3, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services

Mark H. Fiorentino, Clark County Children's Mental Health Consortium

Joseph A. Turco, ACLU of Nevada

HUMAN SERVICES

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

FERNANDO SERRANO (Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

The Subcommittee members have received copies of the Division's budget booklet titled "Presentation to: Assembly Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance, Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Resources" ([Exhibit C](#), original is on file in the Research Library).

The Division of Child and Family Services has several functions. The Division is the service provider for child welfare in the 15 rural counties of Nevada. We also provide statewide monitoring and oversight. In the area of juvenile justice, the Division receives youth from various courts around the State into our institutions. We provide follow-up parole supervision. The Division also provides a number of services associated with passing through federal grants. The Division provides both residential and inpatient mental-health services in urban centers. We also accept rural youth into residential facilities.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

In budget account (B/A) 101-3145 on page 2 of [Exhibit C](#), you are requesting additional staff to meet the requirements of federal programs and the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC). The two positions are a social services program specialist and an administrative assistant. Would you please tell us what the duties of the two positions would be?

HHS - Children, Youth & Family Administration – Budget Page DCFS-12
(Volume II)

Budget Account 101-3145

M-502 Federal Mandate – Page DCFS-15

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 3

MR. SERRANO:

There are 78 full-time employees in the Division's Base Budget for this budget account. In addition, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1997 (HIPAA) imposes training requirements.

BARBARA LEGIER (Deputy Administrator, Family Programs, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

The ICPC staff act as the clearinghouse for all three jurisdictions across the State. We currently have three staff: a deputy compact administrator, an assistant deputy compact administrator and an administrative support position. That staff has the responsibility to approve and coordinate all paperwork and work with other states in the adoption activities. The additional staff are to assist with this coordination and the new requirement that home studies be completed within 60 days.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would this reduce the need for contract staff services?

MS. LEGIER:

Yes.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

What about the federal government's proposal that there be less time for foster-care placements?

MS. LEGIER:

Nevada has not yet adopted the ICPC. The plan is to introduce the ICPC during the 2009 Legislative Session. The primary function of the two new positions would be to address the home-study requirements.

CHAIR LESLIE:

It is not clear if the social services program specialist position will be conducting home visits. Can you assure us both of the positions will be performing home visits?

MS. LEGIER:

The staff at the administrative level will not be performing the actual home studies. They will be monitoring the timelines and ensuring there is compliance.

CHAIR LESLIE:

What happens if there is not compliance?

MS. LEGIER:

If we do not meet the time frame of completing home studies within 60 days, we can incur a financial penalty.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Will these positions be overseeing what is done by others?

MS. LEGIER:

That is correct.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 4

CHAIR LESLIE:

I would like to look at this more closely.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Is there a certain number of people the positions are supervising? Why are you requesting two positions and not one?

MS. LEGIER:

That is because of the volume. Clark County requires one position to be assigned to them. The other position will handle the north and rural areas.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

You are asking for four positions in decision unit M-503 to support the increased federal oversight requirements. Would you please provide a brief status report on the deficiencies noted by the Child and Family Services Onsite Review and the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) review?

M-503 Federal Mandate – Page DCFS-16

MS. LEGIER:

The Division has a CAPTA corrective action plan. One of the areas where we were out of compliance was with the disclosure of child-fatality information. To disclose child-fatality information requires a case review of all child-fatality cases known to the child welfare agencies.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Will the new positions correct this?

MS. LEGIER:

Yes.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would you please describe the duties relating to data analysis and technical assistance to other child welfare jurisdictions?

MS. LEGIER:

Part of the CAPTA requires state oversight, and substantiated and unsubstantiated decisions must be reviewed as they relate to child fatalities. We also have oversight and collaboration activities with the administrative team and executive committee. Only one staff member currently performs all this collaborative activity. As a result of the CAPTA, the Division maintains a courtesy death-notification spreadsheet. Another quality-improvement (QI) activity performed by the child-fatality specialists is to look for systemic issues we can work on for future prevention activities.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Are all four new positions necessary to perform these functions?

MS. LEGIER:

Yes.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 5

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Did the federal government give you an idea when they would be back to review what is being done?

MS. LEGIER:

The Division produces quarterly reports related to our Corrective Action Plan. Our Program Improvement Plan (PIP) was completed in February, but there is monthly monitoring. The next Child and Family Services Review, which is a huge process, will occur in 2009.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Why did you decide on four positions?

MS. LEGIER:

We tried to project the positions based on our fatality analysis. Clark County will require at least one full-time specialist. The other two positions will be for the rural areas and Washoe County. If necessary, those positions can be used to help Clark County.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Is a supervisor the fourth position?

MS. LEGIER:

That is correct.

CHAIR LESLIE:

We may want to concentrate on Clark County at this time.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

In decision unit E-453, you are requesting four positions related to child fatalities. Would you please tell us about your Corrective Action Plan and how the four positions would implement the CAPTA requirements?

E-453 Effectiveness of Family Services – Page DCFS-17

MS. LEGIER:

These positions would deal with the overall QI process for all Child Protective Services cases. States are now required, by the federal government, to exert more oversight activities. With these additional positions, we will be able to increase our QI process to include targeted reviews.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Because there are so many new positions, it is hard to fully understand their duties. Does QI include reviewing case files more carefully? Please explain the QI process.

MS. LEGIER:

Our QI system has been in existence since we started our PIP. Each jurisdiction is reviewed every nine months. The team consists of six State staff members and six staff members from the jurisdictions. Approximately 14 files are reviewed. Interviews are conducted with the parties involved in each case. A

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 6

report is produced and each jurisdiction develops an agency-improvement plan in collaboration with State staff.

CHAIR LESLIE:

With these extra positions, will we become aware of problems sooner?

MS. LEGIER:

Yes. This will allow us to perform the targeted reviews we cannot currently complete because of a lack of staff.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Has the federal government reviewed your new staffing plan? Have they had any input into it?

MS. LEGIER:

It has been discussed with them. They are encouraged that the State is asking for additional staff.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Will you have full implementation with the four new positions? Will you work with our staff to get us the layout of your plan?

MS. LEGIER:

Yes.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

In decision unit E-453, the Division is requesting two administrative assistant positions. How many administrative assistants does that unit currently have?

MS. LEGIER:

The Division has no administrative assistants assigned directly to the QI staff. We have a clerical pool of three staff who support the Family Programs Office staff of 11 professionals, including three managers.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

Would the two positions you are requesting be part of the pool?

MS. LEGIER:

The primary function of the administrative assistants would be to support the QI unit. The activities of the unit include data gathering, data input, coordination of staff to conduct the reviews and random sampling.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

In decision unit E-454, you are requesting one administrative assistant position. Would you please describe the activities of the Quality Improvement Evaluation Unit?

E-454 Effectiveness of Family Services – Page DCFS-18

MR. SERRANO:

This project is funded by the Strategic Incentive Grant (SIG) and a Community Mental Health Services (CMHS) block grant. They are currently working with

service providers and obtaining information about the occupancy and usage of the various programs. We are in the process of evaluating every program in the State. This unit has no clerical support. The requested position would be funded 100 percent with CMHS block grant funds.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would you please describe the internal controls in this unit?

MR. SERRANO:

This is the Division of Children's Mental Health, Quality Improvement and Evaluation Unit. The unit is headed by a community program manager who had been the State mental health coordinator. They answer directly to our deputy administrator for Mental Health Services.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

How will the Division use the additional funding proposed by the Governor's Office as a budget amendment for the training of child welfare staff? What will be the outcome of this training?

MS. LEGIER:

The training funds would support the new worker academy. New staff would be taught core competencies and be able to demonstrate a basic skill level of how to do their job. The funds would also support stipends for students at the universities, but they are primarily for new worker training. The training funds would address best-practice training issues statewide.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

When will the Division be submitting a budget amendment for these changes?

MS. LEGIER:

We are currently working with the Budget Division.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

Would the training consist of college courses and in-house training classes? Since other budgets also have training, maybe we could find some commonalities.

MS. LEGIER:

Training is provided through collaborative agreements with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). The UNR staff provide training to Washoe County and the rural counties. Training for Clark County and the Pahrump area is provided by the UNLV. The in-house training that may be provided by each jurisdiction is not reflected in this information.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Is it correct these training funds would be used only for the training done by the UNLV and the UNR?

MS. LEGIER:

Yes. That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Would new employees have to go through this training?

MS. LEGIER:

This training would be separate from the training they receive in each jurisdiction. It is strictly related to child welfare competencies.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

How long does this particular training last?

MS. LEGIER:

As described in [Exhibit C](#), the training begins with a seven-week course. The Division is working on an academy redesign that will spread the training over a period of three years. The training consists of the initial skills and intermediate and advanced training to assist the staff to rise to the journeyman level.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Do you have some way of testing the participants to determine what they have learned from the training?

MS. LEGIER:

We require pre- and post-testing to measure what they have learned. In our new design, we are working on a method to measure the transfer of learning when the staff goes out in the field and starts working.

CHAIR LESLIE:

In [Exhibit C](#), it states that part of the program consists of intensive supervision. Who is performing the intensive supervision?

MS. LEGIER:

The goal is to have the supervisors well trained in child welfare. The intensive supervision is to improve the skills of the supervisor to supervise staff.

The university instructors will also work with the supervisors in their specific units across the State if they need any technical assistance on how to conduct child and family teams.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

In decision unit E-452, the Division is requesting three grants project analyst positions. Please discuss the cost-benefit analysis of each position. Would it work if the Division started with one position, evaluated the effect of that position to see if it provided a good return and added the other positions later?

E-452 Effectiveness of Family Services – Page DCFS-17

MS. LEGIER:

The Division currently has only one staff person who handles 11 discretionary grants and 150 sub-grantees. As a result of this workload, we contract with as many as seven or eight people to manage the grants at the administrative level. These three positions would alleviate the need for a majority of the contractors and also provide some consistency with the way we provide oversight activities and technical assistance at the sub-grantee level.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 9

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would these positions help with grants in other areas?

MS. LEGIER:

The Division's grants project analysts handle or provide assistance for all grants received by the Division. Aside from the 11 discretionary grants, there may be 2 or 3 more handled through our Mental Health Section.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Are all three grants project analysts needed immediately?

MS. LEGIER:

At the current time, we have only one staff person responsible for grants. The job cannot possibly be done by one person. The effectiveness of the unit would be enhanced if all positions were filled at one time.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would you be able to hire people for these positions at this time, or might some of the positions be filled later?

MS. LEGIER:

We currently use contractors who would be interested in applying for the positions.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Do you think you can get three applicants from the seven people with whom you currently contract?

MS. LEGIER:

Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

With decision unit E-452, the Division would be able to go from seven contractors to three State positions. Is that correct?

MS. LEGIER:

Yes. For the most part, these three positions should resolve the use of contractors. There may be an occasion when a contractor is needed to go out to the rural region, or, depending upon the volume of sub-grants in a particular area, a contractor might be needed.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Will there be a cost savings because the contractors are not needed?

MS. LEGIER:

Yes.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will now discuss B/A 101-3278, the Wraparound in Nevada (WIN) program.

HHS - Wraparound in Nevada – Budget Page DCFS-1 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3278

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 10

A 34-percent vacancy rate in B/A 101-3278 was reported in the 2005 Legislative Session. Has the conversion of the 66 contract staff to State employees helped reduce the turnover and vacancy rate?

PATRICIA MERRIFIELD (Deputy Administrator, Children's Mental Health, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):
In the 2005 Legislative Session, this program was converted to a State program with 66 positions. There has been a reduction in the turnover rate.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:
Do you know what the turnover rate is?

MS. MERRIFIELD:
No, I do not know the turnover rate. At the point of conversion, we had a 42-percent turnover rate. This meant that 42 percent of the staff who had worked as temporary contractors chose not to become State employees. Currently, 5 of the 66 positions are vacant. We are in the process of recruiting and interviewing applicants for those five positions.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:
Your performance indicators do not have any information on vacancies. That might be something you should include in future performance indicators.

CHAIR LESLIE:
Are the vacant positions all psychiatric caseworkers?

MS. MERRIFIELD:
One vacancy is a mental health counselor III which is a manager position for Washoe County. Two psychiatric caseworker positions are vacant in Clark County and two psychiatric caseworker positions are vacant in the rural areas, one of which is in Pahrump and one is in Silver Springs.

CHAIR LESLIE:
Are any of these positions particularly hard to fill?

MS. MERRIFIELD:
We have normal turnover for the psychiatric caseworker positions. That position requires a bachelor's degree and two years of experience in mental health. The mental health counselor III position has been difficult to recruit. The position requires licensure to bill Medicaid. I am hopeful the Governor's recommended two-grade increase for mental health counselors will help solve this problem.

CHAIR LESLIE:
I am convinced we did the right thing two years ago in giving people real jobs with benefits instead of contract jobs. I have seen a tremendous improvement.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:
I have also heard it has made a difference.

Are there any unmet needs for the Wraparound in Nevada services, especially in Clark County?

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 11

MS. MERRIFIELD:

At this time, we do not have a wait list. On Friday, our caseload count statewide was 501 with 9 other referrals in the intake process, mostly in Clark County.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

Has the program reached its capacity for children served in the north and rural regions? Why are those numbers not projected to increase?

MS. MERRIFIELD:

You are correct. There is no growth in this budget recommendation.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

We will now discuss the Community Juvenile Justice Programs, B/A 101-1383.

HHS - Community Juvenile Justice Programs – Budget Page DCFS-5 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-1383

E-900 Transfers BA 3262 B000 to BA 1383 – Page DCFS-8

E-903 Transfers BA 3252 E325 to BA 1383 – Page DCFS-9

E-915 Transfer BA 3229 Cat 23 to BA 1383 – Page DCFS-9

Why do you think the juvenile sexual offenders category should be administered through the Juvenile Justice Programs budget?

MR. SERRANO:

The Juvenile Justice Programs office is the third component of our youth-corrections programming. We primarily provide pass-through monies originating from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The funding is passed on to the nine judicial districts. It is supervised by our social services chief, Ms. Pauline Salla. The funding comes to the Division through a variety of policies and procedures that are set at the federal level which we must follow. In this budget, we would like to continue the funding for the cost of 3.5 positions and have the authority to transfer decision units. We would like to combine the Community Juvenile Justice Program's budget with the Juvenile Accountability block grant. This reorganization will allow us to better track and manage these two grant budget accounts.

CHAIR LESLIE:

How does combining those two into one budget account help you track them better? It seems they would be harder to track.

MR. SERRANO:

Our fiscal unit has determined funneling the money into one account would make it easier for them to report back to your office, the districts and the judiciary, when requested.

CHAIR LESLIE:

The Subcommittee will need to know why you want to combine the two budget accounts and some rationale for how we can be assured we can track them if they are combined.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 12

Why are you proposing to move the Evaluations of Juvenile Sexual Offenders category from the Rural Child Welfare budget into the DCFS Juvenile Justice Programs?

PAULINE SALLA (Social Services Chief, Division of Child and Family Services. Department of Health and Human Services):

The Juvenile Justice Programs office oversees the General Fund treatment money for outpatient juvenile sex offenders. Rural Child Welfare has the evaluations. It would be easier for our office if we were to oversee all of it.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Would this be for your convenience?

MS. SALLA:

Because they are separate, it currently leads to some confusion with the judicial districts. They have asked why our office does not oversee both.

CHAIR LESLIE:

This decision unit I could approve, but not the other one.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

I agree. Our concern is whether this will increase accountability. We want to make sure the categories are accounted for separately.

MS. SALLA:

Each of the judicial districts has to identify performance measures and outputs with any grant-funding source. The Division keeps track of whether they are meeting their performance measurements. The federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has mandatory performance measurements. The Division tracks and monitors them to make sure they are tracking and providing data on those measurements. We would be able to monitor the performance measurements separately if they were combined.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

There are four major issues in B/A 101-3142, which we will discuss next. They are the projected caseload increase, increasing the daily foster-care rate, increasing staffing to maintain staff-to-client ratio and increasing staffing for various foster-care functions.

HHS - Clark County Integration – Budget Page DCFS-28 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3142

E-327 Services at Level Closest to People – Page DCFS-31

The 2006 national average daily rate for foster care was \$16.20. Nevada's average daily rate for 2006 was \$21.50. The Division is proposing a daily rate of \$24 in fiscal year (FY) 2007-2008 and \$28 in FY 2008-2009. Why do you think Nevada should exceed the national average?

MR. SERRANO:

We are finding statewide, and particularly in Clark County, there is a need to intensify recruitment efforts for foster homes. We believe we will need 450 new

foster homes in Clark County to keep up with the current caseload. We have experienced similar recruitment needs in the rural areas. We look at various methods of recruiting and retaining foster homes. Currently, Nevada pays \$591.69 a month for a 9-year-old child. The Department of Agriculture estimates it costs \$854 a month to raise such a child. With foster parents providing such an invaluable service, we feel they should be compensated to the point where they can provide the service with no financial hardship. This will help us in recruiting foster homes. Washoe County supplemented the \$21 daily rate by paying up to \$30 a day, and the number of foster homes increased dramatically. There are a number of other factors besides compensation, but this is part of a package that will enable us to recruit and retain foster parents statewide.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

The Division is projecting an adoption-subsidy caseload increase of 14.5 percent in FY 2007-2008 and 12.6 percent in FY 2008-2009. Is the special-needs area growing?

M-205 Demographics/Caseload Changes – Page DCFS-29

MR. SERRANO:

Yes. The number of special-needs youth is increasing for a number of reasons. The short answer is the methamphetamine epidemic and the byproducts of the methamphetamine epidemic. Combined with normal drug use and mental health issues, we are seeing many youth in this category.

CHAIR LESLIE:

That might explain the increase in caseload of the foster-care placements and emergency-shelter care, but the adoption subsidies are increasing quite a bit. Are those for special-needs children? Why are the adoption subsidies increasing?

MR. SERRANO:

I would have to research who the targeted youth are. I will provide that information for you.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Is the adoption-subsidy caseload increasing by 14.5 percent because more children are being adopted, or is it because we are overadjusting when the adoptive parents come in for their annual reviews?

MR. SERRANO:

Our finance people could give you a better answer on the second part of your question. This is part of a total package involving foster-care recruitment, retaining foster homes, liaisons to foster parents and training.

CHAIR LESLIE:

We are currently looking at foster-care placements, emergency-shelter care and adoption subsidies.

MR. SERRANO:

With the implementation of this package, I hope more youth will be adopted.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Would you please get back to the Subcommittee with an answer regarding the adoption subsidy? I would like more information about the annual reviews and whether we are giving cost-of-living increases or people are coming in because the children they adopted have special needs.

MR. SERRANO:

I will provide that information for you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUCKLEY:

I would also be interested in that information. One challenge with regard to this budget account is that foster parents will take in children with extremely high mental-health needs, do a tremendous job and become attached to the children. However, when they want to adopt the children, they are told they cannot get the same subsidy amount. It is a disincentive to adopt these children. This request would ensure some of these children could be adopted more quickly. Another reason this budget account was lower in the past is that there was, and still is, a backlog of children who are waiting to be adopted. Bureaucracy and insufficient subsidy amounts are holding up adoptions. We need to improve the system.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

In the Division's performance indicators, the projected number of adoptions for FY 2005-2006 was 192 and the actual was 310. The projected adoptions for FY 2006-2007 decrease again. Would you please provide the Subcommittee with some information about that?

SENATOR RAGGIO:

As I understand this budget for Clark County integration and the budget for Washoe County integration, the amounts in the budget are the State's portion of the funding for the integration program. It appears the State's portion will be almost \$80 million of General Funds for Clark County integration and almost \$30 million for Washoe County integration. During the 17th Special Session in 2001, when the integration program was authorized, the costs were going to be shared and the proportionate funding was going to remain essentially the same. We were talking about front-end funding and back-end funding which was going to be the responsibility of the counties. In A.B. No. 1 of the 17th Special Session, we were to receive a future-funding formula. Where is the future-funding formula at this point? That was a requirement.

MICHAEL J. WILLDEN (Director, Department of Health and Human Services):

You are correct that in the 2001 Special Session it was anticipated there would be a future-funding plan. It was discussed during the 2003 Legislative Session. Governor Guinn's letter of May 20, 2003, talked about how things would be funded coming out of that Session. There have been two interim session committees on children, youth and families.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

We were assured the future-funding formula would be completed.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 15

MR. WILLDEN:

We have looked at different options for future funding. So far, there have been no takers on any of the future-funding plans.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

What do you mean by "no takers"? That was a requirement. It appears the funding is slipping back to where the State is taking on a disproportionate share.

MR. WILLDEN:

Yes, I agree the State is putting in a larger share of the funding.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

That was not the original idea.

MR. WILLDEN:

Two funding plans have been considered. In one, the State would have funded the county-match growth and the county would have funded the child-welfare growth. If this had been done several years ago, the State would be in a better financial position. The other plan that has been explored was switching the district-court costs with the child-welfare costs. Nobody at the State level has been interested in swapping the county-match-court costs with the district-court costs because of what is viewed as uncontrollable growth. We have not been able to get agreement on a swap. Governor Guinn's letter of May 20, 2003, states, absent a swap, we will continue to build budgets as if the State had retained responsibility for the back end of the child-welfare system.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

Is that what this budget represents?

MR. WILLDEN:

Yes. If there had not been integration, this is what the Division would have been requesting had the State assumed or continued to retain the back end of the system.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

I am going to insist on some resolution. It appears there is no effort being put forth to develop a funding formula. That was a prerequisite to this integration process.

MR. WILLDEN:

Until we get better control of the front end of the system, the back end of the system is going to continue to grow out of control, along with the State's participation in the back end of the system.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

That is our concern. Before the budget is closed this Session, there is going to have to be some firm resolution of this matter.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would you please provide to the Subcommittee a breakdown on the \$21.50-a-day foster-care rate and how it compares to other states. Please include the services provided and the outcomes.

M-206 Demographics/Caseload Changes – Page DCFS-29

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

Decision unit M-206 recommends 64 new positions to maintain a 1:22 staff-to-client ratio. What is the benefit of this?

MR. SERRANO:

This decision unit will allow Clark County to keep up with projected foster-care caseload growth and maintain the staff-to-client ratio at 1:22. The quality of service would diminish if that ratio were increased.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

Why are you asking for these positions to start on July 1? Why would you not start the new positions on October 1?

MR. SERRANO:

It is urgent we move the resources in to get staff on board as soon as possible.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

The Subcommittee will need some justification for the increase in administration. Do you have an agreement with the county regarding location and space? Will the court system be able to handle the new cases, and did they budget for them? We have to look at the impact of these new positions.

THOMAS D. MORTON (Director, Clark County Department of Family Services):

The caseload in Clark County is driven by a number of dynamics, one of which is the practice model. The practice model is a probationary-monitoring model. It does not involve active engagement and working with families. The caseload ratio for children who remain in care beyond 45 days is currently about 39 children for each worker. The active service engagement of workers with families is minimal, regardless of their training. It is necessary to bring the caseloads down to a reasonable level if we are going to have active work. The absence of active work leads to longer lengths of stay which drives up the State costs.

We currently have about 680 children with the goal of adoption. Data provided to me by the State indicates about 80 percent of the children we have in out-of-home care are approaching the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) time frame of 14 of the last 21 months. This means we would be forced to file for termination of parental rights. If they move on to adoption, many of them will have subsidized adoption which will increase the adoption-subsidy cost.

Clark County has a problem with placement disruptions. On any given day, about 20 percent of the children in Child Haven are there because of disruptive foster-care or relative placement. Each disrupted placement adds three to six months to the average length of service for a child. Reducing caseloads is a necessary first step to altering this situation. The Child Welfare League of America standard for out-of-home care is about 12 to 15 children. We can do a reasonable job with 22, but this still does not reach recommended national standards.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would you please address the length of time the vacancies in your department have been open and what you are doing to reduce those numbers.

JIM DOLIAN (Clark County Department of Family Services):

We are currently recruiting for 119 new positions the county has funded. In addition, we are dealing with the normal turnover that occurs in a department of more than 500 employees.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I am told it takes from 90 to 120 days to fill one of these positions. Is that about normal?

MR. DOLIAN:

That may be a little high. It may be fairly accurate for some of the family services specialist positions. Because of the large number of direct-care staff for which we are currently recruiting, it is a challenge to find highly-qualified individuals. In an attempt to identify the most capable employees, we are requiring applicants to participate in a series of evaluation exercises to assess their competencies. We are doing this with new supervisors and will be extending it to the direct service staff.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

Some of these positions must qualify for the critical-shortage provision for retirees to come out of retirement. Do you use that at all in this area?

MR. DOLIAN:

I am not aware of that. We occasionally bring back retirees on a contractual basis for short periods of time. Sometimes a retiree will ask to return to full-time employment, but it is not something we use on a regular basis.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

Some actual recruitment was done in the education field last year and the number of people utilizing this option was almost doubled. This may be something to consider.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEBER:

What type of out-of-state recruitment are you doing, and what would the barriers be to hiring from outside the State?

MR. DOLIAN:

We have tried a number of things. One of the methods we utilize on a regular basis is Websites with national exposure. There are costs associated with most of those. We also have done classified advertising in San Diego and Los Angeles newspapers. Those are expensive, and we do not have any money in our budget for advertising. We have to find cost savings in other areas of the budget for any money spent on this function.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUCKLEY:

Along with recruitment is retention. Clark County's retention rate is bad. What are you doing about retention and worker morale?

MR. MORTON:

The research on retention in child welfare indicates people leave for two reasons. In the first three years of their employment, they leave because they are making a decision about the work and the people with whom they work. After three years, it becomes a matter of administrative support. We need reasonable workloads and adequate training to do the job. We are building the infrastructure that will result in better support for line staff and better retention.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUCKLEY:

The State funded a low-caseload ratio in the past couple of years to provide better service. Now, the training budget needs to be improved. Part of the problem is the county did not lower its caseload ratio at the same time the State lowered its ratio on the front-end services. We need to know for every dollar we are putting into the system, we are getting results for the children in our care. There must be accountability and results.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

The Division is asking for 14 new family-support workers. This is a new position not previously included in the calculation of the caseload ratio. Should this be included in an enhancement decision unit instead of a maintenance decision unit?

MR. SERRANO:

I need to confer with Clark County and our respective offices regarding this.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will expect you to work with staff on that.

MR. MORTON:

Family-support workers, as we intend to employ them, would be a combination of homemakers and parent aides. One of the problems we have on both ends of the system is the unavailability of family-support interventions to go in and work directly with families and provide in-home support for nutrition, home maintenance and improving parental ability to manage child behaviors.

CHAIR LESLIE:

If these are new positions, why are they in a maintenance decision unit?

MR. MORTON:

Two of these positions came over during integration. The remainder are new.

CHAIR LESLIE:

The ratio we approved in the 2005 Legislative Session was one supervisor and one support staff person for every six caseworker positions. This budget looks like it has 7 supervisors and 7 support staff for 36 caseworker positions. Why are you increasing staff we have not agreed to in a maintenance unit?

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Next, decision units M-502, E-256, E-334, E-335, E-336 and E-337 increase staffing for various foster-care functions. You have recommended 58 additional new positions to support activities related to foster care in Clark County. Please

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 19

clarify your method of calculating the number of family-support workers you have recommended.

M-502 Federal Mandate – Page DCFS-30
E-256 Working Environment and Wage – Page DCFS-31
E-334 Services at Level Closest to people – Page DCFS-31
E-335 Services at Level Closest to people – Page DCFS-32
E-336 Services at Level Closest to people – Page DCFS-32
E-337 Services at Level Closest to people – Page DCFS-33

MR. DOLIAN:

When integration occurred, the department had only two family-support workers for the entire foster-care operation. We would like to have at least one family-support worker for every team and that is how we calculated the number of family-support workers. Our preference would be to have two, because our caseworkers are doing a lot of relatively low-level functions such as transporting children to and from medical appointments and teaching housekeeping skills. These functions could be performed by a lower-paid family-support worker.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

Do you have these positions only in Clark County?

CHAIR LESLIE:

There are human service support specialists (HSSS) in Washoe County. They are effective and it is a great use of money. I agree with the concept, but I do not agree with how they appear in the budget. Please work with our staff so it is presented correctly.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

Decision unit M-502 recommends one new administrative specialist position to support requirements related to the ICPC. You did not provide specific information on the current staffing requirements to meet the federal mandate. Do you have any information on that?

MR. MORTON:

Clark County currently has two ICPC teams consisting of approximately 14 staff members handling ICPC placements. This request is for an administrative specialist to support those teams. Clark County has an average of 1 clerical administrative support person for about 19 professional staff.

MR. DOLIAN:

In Clark County, the ICPC team members do not perform some of the functions a foster-care worker would. For example, they do not go to court. The ICPC team members have no support and there are a number of low-level tasks that could be performed by a family-support worker or an administrative specialist, rather than a caseworker.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

Would you please describe the current makeup of the placement team?

MR. MORTON:

The placement team currently consists of only two positions. As part of the 119 positions funded by the Clark County Commission last fall, they pre-funded 25 positions in the hope they would be accepted into the State integration budget. Some of these positions were to expand the placement team. The two-person placement team currently handles the placement requests for all children moving from emergency shelter into foster care. One of our goals is to expand placement capacity to 24 hours a day, 7 days a week (24/7). We are implementing a 24/7 emergency-response capacity which will involve the ability to have child-placement specialists on site 24/7. One of our current dilemmas is a removal from a home almost automatically means an admission to Child Haven. I would like a change so we can place children directly from birth families to relatives or into foster homes. Part of the expanded placement-team capacity would include the ability to immediately identify and fingerprint relatives, do National Crime Information Center (NCIC) checks and place children immediately with family members rather than Child Haven.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

Why should the State pay this? This was something the county initiated. Washoe County was also doing this. Could you tell us about their placements as well?

MR. DOLIAN:

A placement team supports both the front end and the back end of the system. The placement team arranges for placements when children initially come into care. A large number of placements occur in the back end of the system, for which the State is responsible. When children come back into care after having been in care and gone home, that is the back end of the system. The placement team actively supports both the front end and the back end of the system. Equity would require both the State and county proportionately fund the cost of the placement team.

MICHAEL CAPELLO (Director, Washoe County Department of Social Services):

At the time of integration, Washoe County already had a process in place that we were funding. Washoe County had an intermediate back-end foster-care service in addition to performing the front-end service. We had developed a placement-team process along with foster-parent liaisons. Once integration occurred, a couple of staff came through that process. Our placement process is an integrated function for which the State probably covers some of the cost.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

This is another example of the need for the future-funding formula. You are asking the State to fund 25 positions previously funded by the county. This was to be decided by the future-funding formula. It is not a question of not wanting to have the services performed. The State is in a situation where we have a spending cap and are limited in what we can provide. The budgets presented without this formula of future funding and a clear indication or clear path as to who should be providing the funding cause budget problems. We are now being asked to fund matters that historically have been and should be funded by the county in this integration process.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 21

MR. MORTON:

The 25 positions are generally positions that would have been funded by the State and not by the county.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

We do not have a future-funding formula that clearly says who is responsible. We have been waiting for that since 2001. There is some obligation on the part of Clark and Washoe Counties to work with the State to provide the formula. That was the only basis for our agreement to enter into the integration program.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

What happens if we do not fund this?

MR. MORTON:

I would have to go back to the Clark County Commission and ask them to continue these positions. As you are aware, we have a critical shortage of foster homes. When I came to Clark County, there were no staff dedicated to foster-family recruitment. The positions include four additional foster-parent liaisons to work toward support and retention of foster families, additional foster-parent licensing specialists and additional foster-parent trainers. Maintenance of effort, regardless of who does it in this area, is absolutely critical. Otherwise, the overcrowding at Child Haven will continue.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

Senator Raggio has made some good points and I hope they are being taken to heart.

In decision unit E-335, you recommend five new positions to increase foster-care recruitment, training and retention. Who has been responsible for the recruitment of foster homes?

MR. DOLAN:

At integration, we had one individual who was responsible for recruitment. That individual focused on adoptive homes, not foster homes.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

How did you determine the number of positions to recommend?

MR. MORTON:

I looked at the number of additional foster homes needed to meet current demand, particularly requests from external entities such as the National Center for Youth Law, which is in negotiations with Clark County, in lieu of litigation. I considered our present performance in terms of net gain of foster homes and estimated the number of positions needed to expand community-based recruitment efforts and generate the additional homes needed within the next three years.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

How are the supervision and support staffing for the foster-home recruitment functions currently provided?

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 22

MR. MORTON:

We have a general shortage of clerical-support staff across the agency. We are requesting the addition of enough positions to make eight units. That would increase the unit needs to a supervisor and clerical support.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Who is performing those functions now?

MR. MORTON:

The clerical function is being shared. We have approximately ten people reporting to one supervisor.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

In decision unit E-336, you are asking for six new positions to support the increased foster-care-licensing needs. What would the caseload ratio be if the four family service specialist positions were approved?

MR. MORTON:

That is basically maintenance of effort.

CHAIR LESLIE:

All these positions are critical if we are going to resolve the situation in Clark County. We have to recruit and retain foster-care parents. It is not just about the money. The caseload ratio has been 1:80 and the national average is 1:70. Will the caseload ratio be reduced if we add the six new positions?

MR. DOLIAN:

The positions would provide the licensing staff to support the 450 new homes we expect to recruit. It is essentially maintenance of effort and the ratio would not change.

CHAIR LESLIE:

How many homes would each position be responsible for?

MR. DOLIAN:

The ratio would be approximately 1:80.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will now discuss B/A 101-3141. Two issues in B/A 101-3141 are increasing the daily foster-care rate and increasing staffing to maintain the staff-to-client ratio.

HHS - Washoe County Integration – Budget Page DCFS-35 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3141

E-327 Services at Level Closest to People – Page DCFS-38

You are proposing to increase the daily foster-care rate for Washoe County from \$21.50 a day to \$24 a day. I am assuming the rationale is the same as it was for Clark County.

MR. CAPELLO:

As mentioned earlier, since integration, Washoe County has supplemented the daily rate provided by the State up to \$30 a day. We have seen some benefit in terms of both recruitment and retention of foster parents by paying the higher rate.

CHAIR LESLIE:

What do you plan to do with the extra money the county will have because the State will be raising the daily foster-care rate?

MR. CAPELLO:

This year, we have been targeting recruitment for sibling-foster homes. If we engage a foster parent and the right combination of siblings is not available, we need to hold off on placements. That sometimes puts the foster parent in a difficult financial position. We anticipate paying a higher rate for foster parents who would take large sibling groups to compensate for having to wait until they are needed for the sibling groups. At this point, the plan is to take whatever savings are generated and devote them to growing our sibling-placement options.

CHAIR LESLIE:

That sounds like a good option.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

In decision unit M-202, why are all the recommended new positions in FY 2007-2008 when some caseload growth is projected in FY 2008-2009? Presently, you have four vacant positions.

M-202 Demographics/Caseload Changes – Page DCFS-36

MR. CAPELLO:

Let me start with the four vacancies. One social service supervisor position has been vacant since October 1, 2006. One mental health counselor position became vacant on January 7, 2007. One social worker position became vacant on January 7, 2007, and one office support specialist position became vacant on December 10, 2006. An offer has been made this week for the office-support specialist position. The supervisor position is for a swing shift as part of expanding our service hours to a 24/7 basis. We have had difficulty finding someone willing to work swing shift.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Do the swing-shift positions receive additional compensation?

MR. CAPELLO:

Yes, they are paid a shift differential. We have just completed interviews with several applicants for this position.

The justification for beginning the new positions in FY 2007-2008 is it will help alleviate the current caseload. Our caseload projections are not growing at a high rate.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 24

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

How do you calculate your caseload-growth rates?

M-201 Demographics/Caseload Changes – Page DCFS-36

MR. CAPELLO:

We use a projection model that looks at paid placements and a projection model is used to determine how many staff are needed. We have to provide a caseworker to manage the cases even if the placement is not paid. As a benchmark, we use the State demographer's child-population-growth rate over the biennium. The growth rate for Washoe County is projected at about 2.4 percent in children age 0 to 19 for each year of the biennium.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will now discuss B/A 101-3143.

HHS - UNITY/SACWIS – Budget Page DCFS-41 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3143

E-276 Maximize Internet and Technology – Page DCFS-44

The major issues in B/A 101-3143 are increased utilization of the mainframe services and enhancements to support the AVATAR application. Has the increased utilization of mainframe services been discussed with the Department of Information Technology (DoIT) and can they accommodate the increased utilization?

MR. SERRANO:

This past year, we have increased staff training for entering data into the system. The continued training of staff will lead to better input of data and increase the reports generated. I have seen progress in this area.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

What are we doing differently with the training than we did before?

MR. SERRANO:

We track closely what the social workers are doing and where the mistakes are taking place. We target specific employees for specialized training in the areas in which they are deficient with the goal of increasing the accuracy and efficiency of data input.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Have we increased the amount of information in the system?

MR. SERRANO:

We have increased the amount of accurate data going into the system. We have a training plan in place.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Would you please provide the Subcommittee with a copy of your plan? We would like to see your objectives.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 25

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

I notice you are increasing your usage of the system. Would the usage decrease because there are fewer mistakes and the system would be more accurate?

PAUL BOWEN (Information Systems Manager, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

The accuracy would decrease the usage. In many cases, the data was not being entered at all. Within the last year, there has been a significant increase in the number of transactions being entered into the system. From January 2005 to January 2006, we saw a 29-percent increase in transactions entered into the system.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Was it only a training issue? Was the system so difficult to use they did not want to use it?

MR. BOWEN:

There was some reluctance to use a new system, but the system was not difficult to use. The training is to show staff how to use it and encourage use of the system.

E-275 Maximize Internet and Technology – Page DCFS-44

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

In decision unit E-275, you are asking for a new position. Why was that not requested previously? What will you be doing now that is different?

MR. BOWEN:

The AVATAR is a relatively new application for us. It was implemented fully toward the beginning of the last biennium. We are going through a process where we now better understand how it can be used. We underestimated the amount of technical staff needed. One more position is needed to keep up with requests.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Is the DoIT going to be able to accommodate what you are doing?

MR. BOWEN:

The DoIT does not support us on AVATAR. It is completely within our organization.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Is there going to be a time when you will be able to do all the work in house without relying on contractors?

MR. BOWEN:

We currently have enough work to keep the contractor busy as well as our staff. At some point, we should be able to reduce the contractor's work.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

I notice there are a couple of vacant positions you have been trying to fill. Please tell us about that.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 26

MR. BOWEN:

The vacancies do not correspond to the AVATAR support. We have four vacancies at this time, all associated with Unified Nevada Information Technology for Youth (UNITY). Two of them are recent, and we are currently recruiting for them. We are also actively recruiting for the information system specialist position. We have had a difficult time getting anyone to apply for the master information technology professional position. It is a technical position requiring certification.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

What are you doing to make up for the work these positions would be doing?

MR. BOWEN:

We are reducing the speed with which we complete our tasks.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

There are no major issues in B/A 101-3149.

HHS - Child Care Services – Budget Page DCFS-49 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3149

The major issue in B/A 101-3229 is the increase in the daily-foster-care rate.

HHS - Rural Child Welfare – Budget Page DCFS-55 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3229

M-200 Demographics/Caseload Changes – Page DCFS-58

Are increases in the adoption-subsidy amounts anticipated in the 2007-2009 biennium? If so, why are the increases not included in the agency's budget?

MS. LEGIER:

We will provide a response in writing regarding the adoption-subsidy amounts.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

We will now move to B/A 606-3250.

HHS - Transition from Foster Care – Budget Page DCFS-68 (Volume II)
Budget Account 606-3250

SENATOR RAGGIO:

As I understand it, this program covers the gap for children transitioning out of foster care at age 18 until they are able to fend for themselves. The funding was to be used for things such as job training, assistance in getting a job, subsidizing a job, housing and related expenses.

MS. LEGIER:

The transition from foster care is covered in B/A 606-3250. During the last fiscal year, we served over 800 children. We have folded this budget account into our grants-management unit to ensure we have appropriate use of funds and they are spending on target. We also have a five-year spending plan for this budget account. The 898 children we served in 2006 were split among Clark

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 27

County, Washoe County, the Fallon Shoshone Paiute Tribe and the rural region. Clark County utilized approximately 69 percent of those funds, Washoe County utilized 18 percent, the Tribe used 2 percent and the rural region used 11 percent.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

Do you follow up on the children after assisting them? Do they get jobs? Do we know what happens to them?

MS. LEGIER:

I will check the information we have about what happens to the children after they leave our custody and get back to the Subcommittee.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BUCKLEY:

I am familiar with what is happening in Clark County where this has been subcontracted. The children, or young adults, are followed as they get a job, get job training, and go to college. I do not know what is happening in the rural areas and in Washoe County. Perhaps we could get a short presentation on this program in a future meeting. We would like details on the programs, including how many have been employed, how many have gone on to college and where they are now.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

We will now discuss B/A 101-3251.

HHS - Review of Death of Children – Budget Page DCFS-71 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3251

CHAIR LESLIE:

Please tell the Subcommittee how the money in B/A 101-3251 has been spent. It appears we are spending down the reserve. What amount do you think needs to be in the reserve?

MS. LEGIER:

The money in this account is used primarily for public education and prevention activities. By June 30, 2007, we anticipate we will have spent about \$70,000 in prevention activities. We have a movie theater campaign, a safe-sleeping pamphlet and packets of information we are producing for hospitals with labor and delivery rooms, so new parents will take home the information.

This account also funds a contract with the UNLV for data collection of the local multi-disciplinary teams that review child deaths in Clark County. They sit in at all of the meetings and do the data collection that goes into our national database. We have a consultant for the administrative team and the executive team to pull together the meetings, help produce the annual report and help manage the number of recommendations that come from the five local teams to the administrative team. The administrative team's responsibility is to analyze all of these recommendations, take appropriate action and inform the local teams of the results.

This budget account also provides for the travel or per diem cost related for administrative and executive committee travel and local participation in the meetings.

JENNIFER ALBIN (Management Analyst, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

We are working with the Budget Division on a technical amendment to B/A 101-3251 regarding the reserve. The amount of the reserve is going to decline, as revenues decline. It is hard to determine from one year to the next how much revenue is going to be received, because we do not know how many copies of death certificates are going to be requested by the public.

CHAIR LESLIE:

I assume the items you selected for the public education campaign related directly to what the child death review team said was needed.

MS. LEGIER:

The public campaign topics are chosen based upon the highest number of fatalities for the year being reported.

CHAIR LESLIE:

In decision unit E-325, the Division is asking for a reallocation of expenditure authority in regard to the UNLV contract.

E-325 Services at Level Closest to People – Page DCFS-72

MS. ALBIN:

That relates to the technical adjustment we are working on with the budget office. You should be seeing that within the next week.

CHAIR LESLIE:

I am not sure I would classify that as technical. If we are going to change the way we do things, it sounds like it is more programmatic.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

The next budget account is Child Abuse and Neglect, B/A 101-3271.

HHS - Child Abuse and Neglect – Budget Page DCFS-77 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3271

E-903 Transfers Base and M150 From BA 3271 to BA 3145 – Page DCFS-80
E-914 Transfers E-710 From BA 3271 to BA 3145 – Page DCFS-80

The major issue in B/A 101-3271 is the consolidation of the budget account into the Division's central administration budget. How will this consolidation provide better monitoring for the grant funds? Should a separate account be created to manage the grant funds?

MS. LEGIER:

From a programmatic point of view, the consolidation would have no impact on our ability to satisfy the requirements of the grants. The budget has a category numbering system that would allow us to track the grants separately.

CHAIR LESLIE:

I understand this would be more convenient for you programmatically, but fiscally, we would like them separate. There is still some lack of confidence the Division can track things accurately, and I would be opposed to this.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We need to look at the cost benefits, if the consolidation takes place, to ensure the Division is complying with all the requirements of the federal grants.

In decision unit E-325, can you describe the role of the Children's Justice Act Task Force in determining program activities?

E-325 Services at Level Closest to People – Page DCFS-79

MS. LEGIER:

The Children's Justice Act Task Force analyzes existing functions of the Child Protective Services, particularly looking at child sexual abuse and exploitation, how the State and jurisdictions handle those cases, how we collaborate with the tribal jurisdictions and if our policies support appropriate handling of these cases. They also analyze any internal reports, QI results or other studies done through each jurisdiction to give their opinion on the effectiveness of those reports. The Task Force publishes a report on their involvement approximately every three years.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Budget account 101-3262 is the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant.

HHS - Juvenile Accountability Block Grant – Budget Page DCFS-82 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3262

The *Executive Budget* recommends the consolidation of the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and the Community Juvenile Justice Programs budget. Why do you want to consolidate these budgets? How will this consolidation improve the monitoring of the grant funds and what is the cost savings? Does the federal government allow you to mix accounts? Is that an issue?

MR. SERRANO:

No, that is not an issue. Our fiscal people feel that combining those two grants would be more efficient, but I am respectful of the comments I have heard this morning.

CHAIR LESLIE:

In decision unit E-325, you are recommending the addition of a part-time contract staff to perform the administrative functions of the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant. Who is currently responsible for those functions?

E-325 Services at Level Closest to People – Page DCFS-83

MS. SALLA:

I am currently overseeing all of the grants.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 30

CHAIR LESLIE:

Is the purpose of this decision unit to relieve you of some of your duties?

MS. SALLA:

The position is statewide and we have to monitor all of our sub-grantees as well as the detention center, adult jails and lockups. A part-time contractor would help in the southern part of the State.

CHAIR LESLIE:

The Subcommittee would like more detail about how you would be using the extra time you would have with the addition of this part-time contract staff.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I understand there will be a bill draft request (BDR) from Clark County regarding B/A 101-3147.

HHS - Youth Alternative Placement – Budget Page DCFS-86 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3147

STEVEN THALER (Director, China Spring Youth Camp and Aurora Pines Girls Facility):

A BDR is being drafted to address the formula for the county camps, including Spring Mountain Youth Camp, China Spring Youth Camp and Aurora Pines Girls Facility.

The Subcommittee has received a copy of our budget proposal titled "China Spring Youth Camp/Aurora Pines Girl's Facility, Budget Proposal, 2007-2009" ([Exhibit D](#)). This is a brief summary of our budget request to meet the growing needs of the facilities.

We are requesting an additional \$222,000 for the first year of the biennium. The State's share would be \$82,000. The second year of the biennium we are requesting \$277,000, \$102,000 of which would be the State's share. We are not proposing any additional staff or any enhancements. This is just to keep up with the increasing costs.

The second page of [Exhibit D](#) lists some of the statistics for our facilities. Payroll accounts for 82 percent of our budget. Almost 17 percent of the budget consists of operating expenses and a small amount is capital outlay.

The remainder of [Exhibit D](#) contains a brief overview of the China Spring Youth Camp and the Aurora Pines Girls Facility. Clark County operates the Spring Mountain Youth Camp, which is another youth-alternative-placement program. That is also included in this budget.

CHAIR LESLIE:

The Subcommittee received a FAX from the Juvenile Justice Commission regarding the Spring Mountain Youth Camp request. They are requesting \$1.8 million. To evaluate these requests, we need the cost-per-placement for all the youth camps. There has to be some equity.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 31

MR. THALER:
We will get that figure for you.

CHAIR LESLIE:
Please provide that information for our fiscal staff along with the backup. We would also like that information from the Spring Mountain Youth Camp.

MR. THALER:
This budget proposal was presented to our Advisory Council and we have their full support.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:
My concern with this budget is there is an equity issue. I want to make sure we are not shortchanging the Clark County facility.

MR. THALER:
That is what will be addressed in the BDR. Hopefully, with the support of the Legislature and the counties, we can fix this problem.

CHAIR LESLIE:
We have not traditionally funded the Clark County program. They have higher costs.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:
Budget account 101-3148 is the Juvenile Correctional Facility.

HHS - Juvenile Correctional Facility – Budget Page DCFS-88 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3148

Why do you need the additional surveillance cameras, and what are the specific problems they are intended to address?

DANIEL PRINCE (Deputy Administrator, Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):
The camera system is antiquated. It was tied to a disk operating system (DOS) computer system when the facility first opened. The cameras do not provide good images. This would upgrade the cameras, provide clearer pictures and a more comprehensive video view of different sections of the facility.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:
What operating system will the new cameras run on?

AUDREY FETTERS (Superintendent, Summit View Youth Correctional Center, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):
It will be a digital system.

CHAIR LESLIE:
Are you adding cameras in addition to replacing them?

MS. FETTERS:
Yes. We have asked for a capital improvement project to add cameras.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 32

CHAIR LESLIE:

We will need more information regarding the camera system.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Is it correct you are proposing to install additional surveillance cameras and replace the security system recording devices?

MR. SERRANO:

Yes. Our plan is to totally replace the current DOS system. The digital system will dramatically increase our security at the facility.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

You are not recommending any new positions. What is your current vacancy level?

MS. FETTERS:

We presently have six positions open.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Are these difficult positions to fill?

MS. FETTERS:

The vacancies have occurred through normal attrition. The vacant positions are a mental health counselor and five group supervisors.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will now discuss B/A 101-3179 for the Caliente Youth Center.

HHS - Caliente Youth Center – Budget Page DCFS-94 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3179

Why is the daytime-staffing schedule at the Caliente Youth Center less than the preferred ratio, and nighttime staffing exceeds the preferred ratio?

JAMIE KILLIAN (Superintendent, Caliente Youth Center Bureau, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

We have increased our nighttime-staffing ratio due to some incidents that have occurred for the third-shift staff.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Are you having more incidents at night than normal? Are the buildings locked down?

MS. KILLIAN:

No, they are not locked.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

What staffing ratio do you want? Do the swing and night shifts receive additional compensation?

MR. PRINCE:

Those employees receive slightly more per hour because of their shift.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 33

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

The staffing-ratio levels preferred by the federal government are 1:8 and 1:16 for day and night, respectively. Why do you have 1:9 for daytime?

MS. KILLIAN:

We would prefer to have a ratio of 1:8 during the day. Due to staff vacancies, we are currently operating at a ratio of 1:9.

CHAIR LESLIE:

I am concerned because seven of the ten positions we approved in the last Legislative Session are vacant. Also, your staff psychologist position is vacant.

MR. PRINCE:

Both the Caliente Youth Center and the Nevada Youth Training Center at Elko are facilities where we face continuing challenges in recruiting staff. At the Caliente Youth Center, the problems are the remote location and housing challenges.

CHAIR LESLIE:

What are we doing about the problems?

MR. PRINCE:

We have made some improvements. Last year, we had twice as many vacancies. Our superintendents have attended job fairs in other states. We are working with the Department of Personnel to look at opportunities to visit colleges and universities to talk to graduating seniors. We have explored the idea of providing State housing at these locations.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Seven of the ten positions are still vacant, and the staff psychologist position is vacant. We have to do better to provide services for these children.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Who is filling in for the vacant staff psychologist?

MS. KILLIAN:

We have a contract psychiatrist. For psychological services, we have utilized Summit View Youth Correctional Center's licensed psychologist on occasion. We have also used the contract psychologist that works with Youth Parole Services.

CHAIR LESLIE:

The Family Court judges are sending children to State facilities. They expect a certain level of care and a psychologist, and we are not giving it to them. If we cannot provide children in our State institutions with the services they need, we are going to have to find some other way to deliver these services. Maybe that means closing the Caliente Youth Center and pushing those services into community-based settings. I am not willing to continue to have children in these facilities who are not getting the care they deserve. If we cannot hire the staff, we are going to have to make a change.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 34

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

What is the status of the superintendent's house at the Caliente Youth Center?

MR. PRINCE:

It has been condemned.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Has it been torn down?

MR. PRINCE:

It is condemned, but has not been torn down.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Will it be torn down?

MR. PRINCE:

I do not know the answer to that. That may be under the control of the State Public Works Board.

MR. SERRANO:

Ideally, we would like to have a zero-percent vacancy rate at our institutions. A year ago, we had approximately 25 vacancies at the Summit View Youth Correctional Center. Vacancies at the Nevada Youth Training Center and the Caliente Youth Center were in the low to mid-30s. Our staff have worked hard to reduce the vacancy rate and we have made progress.

MS. KILLIAN:

An offer is pending for a licensed psychologist and we are waiting for a response.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

In decision units E-450 and E-451, you are recommending uniforms for everyone.

E-450 Effectiveness of Family Services – Page DCFS-96

E-451 Effectiveness of Family Services – Page DCFS-97

What are the benefits of the uniforms? Would that create another budget category to maintain the uniforms?

MR. PRINCE:

If our staff are properly groomed and attired, it sets an example for the youth in the facility. The Summit View Youth Correctional Center has been successful in adopting uniforms for their staff, and we would like to extend that to the other facilities.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

You have not completed five projects in your capital improvement program and you are asking for additional money because the construction costs have risen. Why has nothing been done with those 2003 projects?

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 35

MR. PRINCE:

We have begun renovating two cottages at the Caliente Youth Center. It is anticipated one more cottage will be brought online in the next couple of months. The Public Works Board has assured us they will attempt to complete work on all of the cottages at the Caliente Youth Center in the next year.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Projects such as the fire alarms and sprinklers should have been installed.

MR. PRINCE:

It is my understanding they are being addressed.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Please provide information regarding these projects to staff.

MR. PRINCE:

I will do that.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Next is B/A 101-3259, Nevada Youth Training Center.

HHS - Nevada Youth Training Center – Budget Page DCFS-101 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3259

Is the Department of Justice still conducting site visits at the Nevada Youth Training Center? Is the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the State and the Department of Justice still in effect?

MR. PRINCE:

The MOU is still in effect, but the most significant provisions, the areas involving use-of-force concerns, have been taken off the table. The Department of Justice has found the facility has made significant progress and the only items now remaining under the MOU are some additional training for staff and an expectation we will try to find the resources to put a full-time quality-assurance position in the facility. We remain in contact with them and they have been making regular site visits. Within the last couple of weeks, an agreement has been reached and the Attorney General has signed off on an agreement for the Department of Justice to release us from most of the provisions of the MOU.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

What inflation rate was used to calculate the medical-cost increases in decision unit M-101?

M-101 Inflation — Agency Specific – Page DCFS-102

DALE WARMUTH (Superintendent, Nevada Youth Training Center Bureau, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):
We will review with our fiscal staff how the medical cost increases were calculated and provide that information to the Subcommittee.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 36

CHAIR LESLIE:

I appreciate the improvements made in Elko since we got the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (CRIPA) report and investigation. Is the position for the full-time quality-assurance program recommended by the federal government in your budget?

MR. PRINCE:

No, it is not. This recommendation was tendered in the last couple of months as a result of their last site visit. They are recommending we have full-time quality-assurance people at all of our youth-correctional facilities.

CHAIR LESLIE:

There will be some discussion about the Legislature having oversight through BDRs from a subcommittee I chair. With the history of the Elko facility over the last four years, someone needs to be providing oversight. I am favor of having an outside person do that, but we will discuss it later.

Were the uniforms requested by staff?

MR. WARMUTH:

We determined uniforms would make our staff look more professional and make them easier to identify when they are with the youth. It would also provide a better role model for the youth.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Have you had discussions with staff about the uniforms? Do they presently wear street clothes?

MR. WARMUTH:

Yes, they wear street clothes.

CHAIR LESLIE:

If you have some documentation of meetings with staff and how they feel about wearing uniforms, I would be interested in seeing that before we approve the uniforms.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

I am in favor of the staff wearing uniforms. I am surprised they have not been wearing uniforms.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

The two major issues in B/A 101-3263 are the restoration of funding for treatment and placement services and a new position for the ICPC requirements.

HHS - Youth Parole Services – Budget Page DCFS-108 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3263

E-325 Services at Level Closest to People – Page DCFS-111

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 37

Please comment on the Division's projected time frame for increasing service levels. Why is the funding in FY 2008-2009 recommended to decrease by approximately \$90,000 from FY 2007-2008?

MR. PRINCE:

I will provide the Subcommittee with a written response to your question after consulting with our fiscal staff.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

It was previously noted Nevada has not yet ratified the ICPC.

MR. PRINCE:

The federal act will go into effect after it is ratified by 35 states. Thirty states have now ratified the ICPC

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

The social services program specialist in decision unit M-502 would be making \$116,000 the first year of the biennium and \$110,000 the second year. What is so significant about this position that it is at that salary level?

M-502 Federal Mandate – Page DCFS-110

MR. PRINCE:

That may be an error.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

Please provide the Subcommittee with the correct information for this position.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

We will now discuss B/A 101-3281.

HHS - Northern Nevada Child & Adolescent Services – Budget Page DCFS-116
(Volume II)

Budget Account 101-3281

E-450 Effectiveness of Family Services – Page DCFS-120

E-452 Effectiveness of Family Services – Page DCFS-121

The two major issues in B/A 101-3281 are new staff for early childhood mental health services and new staff for a therapeutic day-treatment classroom. What does the wait list depend upon, and how do people get on the wait list? What is the current size of our waiting list?

MS. MERRIFIELD:

Our wait lists are calculated on the last day of every month. The Early Childhood Mental Health Services program is designed to expand an existing program. It is a morning program funded 100 percent by the Victims of Crime Act. All the children who are served must meet the eligibility criteria for victims of crime.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 38

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

How are the children referred to your program?

MS. MERRIFIELD:

They are primarily coming from the child-welfare court system.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Will this new position reduce the wait list?

MS. MERRIFIELD:

The treatment program will serve a number of children who are currently not served. We may be providing some services such as individual therapy, family therapy, play therapy and clinical-case management for young children. We do not have the capacity to provide day treatment. Most of these children have been ejected from multiple day care centers for their behaviors. Requests for service come from the community, from the mental health consortium, Washoe County and the Washoe County School District. The Washoe County School District will provide all the transportation.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

How many requests for service are currently fielded by program staff?

MS. MERRIFIELD:

I will get back to you with that information. We are pulling clinicians off the line to respond to calls. We are unable to fully respond to the community and help families connect with other resources that may meet their mental health needs. Other families who have insurance or Medicaid HMO benefits are in such crisis they need someone to walk them through the system, and intake coordinators are doing that. Intake coordinators also do the initial-intake appointment with families. Our clinicians and fiscal staff are assisting with those tasks.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

In decision unit E-452, what type of activities are currently recommended for day treatment classes and how many children are expected to be able to utilize the recommended program?

MS. MERRIFIELD:

We expect to be able to serve between 24 and 38 children a year. It is a classroom size of 8 preschool children. The activities are hands on and social skills, behavior-management skills and peer-relationship skills. We also bring the parents in and teach hands on and parenting skills. Parents can observe and get information and prompting from staff when they are observing.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Is there currently a waiting list for each of these services?

MS. MERRIFIELD:

There is no waiting list for the Early Childhood Mental Health Services. We are responding to people who call. We are pulling clinicians and fiscal staff off the line to do this.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 39

The community knows we are only providing for children who are victims of crime and they are usually referred to us by the Washoe County Department of Social Services.

I could have the clinicians survey the caseloads of the children that need this service if that would help.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:
That would be helpful.

SENATOR MATHEWS:
If these children are being referred to you, what happens to them when they are ejected from one service to another? What happens to these children if you cannot handle them?

MS. MERRIFIELD:
We are not ejecting or rejecting children from our therapeutic day-treatment program. They are children who have been in community-based day care centers with behaviors that have resulted in their being ejected from the day care centers.

SENATOR MATHEWS:
Where do those children go?

MS. MERRIFIELD:
Right now, we are serving those children in our program. We are hearing from the community there is an increased need and we are asking to add another half-day program and increase our service capacity. We will work with parents and day care centers to transition the children back when they finish day treatment and we think they are ready to go back into day care centers.

CHAIR LESLIE:
The adjusted base expenditures for B/A 101-3281 are continuing but there is no justification for why those expenses are continuing. Are Medicaid charges appropriate for these expenses?

M-425 Deferred Facilities Maintenance – Page DCFS-119
M-750 Building Construction Outside Cap – Page DCFS-119

JEFFREY MORROW (Administrative Services Officer 3, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services)
We have been working off a schedule prepared by the State Public Works Board in 1998 for issues that need to be addressed. Funding shortfalls in the last fiscal year did not allow us to get to all the projects. We are hoping the projects can be funded in the next fiscal cycle.

CHAIR LESLIE:
Please work with our fiscal staff to provide an explanation for the Subcommittee. Also, determine whether Medicaid can pay for any of the expenses.

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 40

MR. MORROW:

I believe Medicaid can pay for a portion. I will check into that and let you know.

CHAIR CEGAUSKE:

We will now discuss B/A 101-3646.

HHS - Southern Nevada Child & Adolescent Services – Budget Page DCFS-126
(Volume II)

Budget Account 101-3646

Does the Division have a projection of the number of individuals who would be served each year by the Mobile Crisis Team for Children's Mental Health?

MS. MERRIFIELD:

We have projected how many units of service and how many hours we can provide. We could provide approximately 5,000 hours of service in the first year and about 4,600 hours in the second year. The number of children who would be served depends upon how many hours the child and family require for their particular crisis. We will probably be spending more hours in the first year as our contracted team gets to know the community and resources. They will be expected to develop strong linkages with the mental health providers, both public and private, to transition youth to ongoing services. The transition time should be shorter in the second year after they are more established.

MARK H. FIORENTINO (Clark County Children's Mental Health Consortium):

I am here on behalf of the Clark County Children's Mental Health Consortium. It is a group consisting of child-welfare professionals, advocates, parents, judicial officers and others. It was formed by the Legislature in 2001. It was given the task of assessing the needs of children in Clark County and making recommendations to you every two years on how to fill those needs.

I have provided a summary of the Consortium's recommendations for this year ([Exhibit E](#)). I would like to highlight the second item on the list in [Exhibit E](#) and ask you give it some consideration. The Wraparound in Nevada program is a nationally-recognized program that provides services to children who need mental health treatment. It is a successful program, but it is underutilized. There are thousands of children in the juvenile justice system who need these types of services and do not get them. The Consortium's recommendation to you is to consider funding additional positions to provide children who are in the juvenile justice system the same services now being provided to foster-care children.

I know you have many needs you have to fund and it is a difficult task. We ask only that as you are making your final assessments, you give that funding some consideration.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH:

Are we setting a precedent by using standby pay? Have we provided standby pay in the past?

MS. MERRIFIELD:

We have clinicians on standby because children and families go on crisis any time, 24/7, and we need to be able to respond to the families when they are in

Joint Subcommittee on K-12/Human Services
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
February 19, 2007
Page 41

need. We have two clinicians in Clark County and one in Washoe County who are on standby after hours.

MR. MORROW:

We have always had standby pay, but it was not always funded in the budget. We have often had to cover it with vacancy savings.

MS. MERRIFIELD:

I want to call to the Subcommittee's attention there is an unfunded item for special consideration. It is expanding Wraparound to the juvenile justice population.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will discuss this more in future meetings.

JOSEPH TURCO (Public Advocate for the ACLU):

The National Center for Youth Law and our director at the ACLU have been working closely with Clark County and State officials to avoid any additional litigation by working in a positive direction to improve areas of the child-care system that, in our opinion, are severely broken. The children are neglected to the point their constitutional rights are violated and, to the degree that children's constitutional rights are violated by the lack of care, spending is no longer discretionary but becomes an obligation of the State.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

There being no further public testimony and nothing further to come before the Subcommittee, the meeting is adjourned at 10:59 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Anne Vorderbruggen,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Barbara K. Cegavske, Chair

DATE: _____

Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie, Chair

DATE: _____