



CCI POSITIONS ON ITEMS BEFORE THE JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE March 2016

1.) CCI supports funding for county administration and updating the workload study

- Counties have made it one of their top priorities to secure additional funding for county administration.
- An updated workload study will provide critical information on the level of staffing and funding that is needed to meet the program requirements and highlight newly emergent opportunities that would help make the state and counties more effective and efficient in their delivery of services.
- County support for JBC analyst Kevin Neimond's SNAP administration proposal is conditioned on clarification that counties are not subject to federal penalties if and when we are not provided adequate funds to fully meet the expectations and demands of our system.
STATUS as of 4/8/16– NO cuts in County Administration levels for SFY16-17. A data collection and analysis 'study' is funded and included in a yet-to-be introduced JBC bill.

2.) CCI supports funding to hire child welfare caseworkers, case aides, and supervisors to address the staffing deficit identified in the 2014 Colorado Child Welfare County Workload Study.

- As of December, all 100 allocated positions funded by the JBC last year had been hired and are helping to fill a critical need in addressing child safety and wellbeing.
- In order to meet the needs of the children we serve, counties support flexibility in the allocated Child Welfare positions. The decision of whether or not to hire ancillary positions (i.e. nurses and educational advocates) must be determined by each individual county.
STATUS as of 4/8/16–Funding for an additional 100 child welfare caseworkers, case aides, and supervisors secured for SFY 16-17.

3.) Counties support reviewing the structure of child welfare funding with respect to added flexibility to transfer dollars between core services and child welfare service programs.

- Counties are concerned with the proposal offered by JBC analyst Robin Smart. Counties are appreciative of the JBC willingness to review and possibly restructure child welfare funding. We recommend changes that maximize the flexibility and responsiveness of the system to the family's needs while ensuring efficient management and local control.
- Any review process that is established must clearly articulate the expectations for evaluation and not presume that a change will ensue.
- It is important to keep in mind the historic, statutory basis on which Counties can negotiate and set Provider Reimbursement rates as a corollary to the child welfare funding structure entitled block grants. Prior to block grant funding, counties were reimbursed on the basis of expenditures. Counties support the legislatively recognized ability to manage out of home care rates (the most costly services provided in child welfare) in order to operate within their allocations.
STATUS as of 4/8/16– This review process will be incorporated in a yet-to-be-introduced JBC bill and will include a discussion on provider rates.

4.) Counties support the SB15-109 Taskforce’s funding recommendations, particularly funding for Adult Protective Services (APS) county caseworker staff to true-up the APS system with the service demands experienced through the implementation of mandatory reporting for elder abuse through SB13-111.

- Funding to implement mandatory reporting for adults age 70 and older, which went into effect in July 2014 due to SB 13-111, anticipated a 15% increase in APS reports. Instead, counties have seen a 41% increase in APS reports. The underfunding of the APS system could jeopardize the safety of clients coming into the APS system generally, including individuals with IDD.
- Counties support the request of \$2,586,726, which includes a 20% local match, for staffing of the APS system.

STATUS as of 4/8/16–Funding for additional APS workers to true-up the APS needs created by SB13-111 was denied.