HOUSE BILL REPORT
2SHB 1483

As Reported by House Committee On:
Juvenile Justice & Family Law

Title: An act relating to investments in cost-effective intervention programs for juvenile justice-involved youth.

Brief Description: Creating an "investing in youth program."

Sponsors: Representatives Dickerson, McDonald, Moeller, Darneille, Jarrett, Simpson, Morrell, Sommers, Kenney, McDermott, Kagi, Chase and Clibborn.

Brief History:
Committee Activity:
Juvenile Justice & Family Law: 1/17/06 [DPS3].

Brief Summary of Third Substitute Bill

- Expands the Reinvesting in Youth pilot program to all counties.
- Requires the Department of Social and Health Services Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration to establish a formula for distribution of funds that allocates funds based on the savings to the state.
- Makes technical and organizational changes.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE & FAMILY LAW

Majority Report: The third substitute bill be substituted therefor and the third substitute bill do pass. Signed by 7 members: Representatives Dickerson, Chair; Moeller, Vice Chair; McDonald, Ranking Minority Member; McCune, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Crouse, Lovick and Roberts.

Staff: Sonja Hallum (786-7092).

Background:

In 2003, the Legislature directed the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to review research assessing the effectiveness of prevention and early intervention programs concerning children and youth. The Legislature required the WSIPP to use the research to identify specific research-proven programs that produce a positive return on the dollar compared to the costs of the program. The WSIPP was also required to develop criteria designed to ensure quality implementation and program fidelity of research-proven programs in the state.

As part of this project, the Legislature also directed the WSIPP to investigate ways in which local government can be encouraged to develop economically attractive prevention and early intervention programs.

As a result of the study, the WSIPP found that some prevention and early intervention programs for youth can give taxpayers a good return on their dollar. The study identified several programs that, if properly implemented, are likely to reduce taxpayer and other costs in the future. The WSIPP developed a table that summarized the benefits and costs of the specific research-proven programs that were evaluated.

In addition to evaluating specific programs, the report recommended that the state determine a set of research-based prevention and early intervention programs that would be eligible for reimbursement. The WSIPP recommended establishing an entity to develop a list of approved research-based prevention and early intervention programs. The WSIPP also identified a set of methods to be used as tools to help identify those programs that produce the best return for taxpayers.

The WSIPP also found that another responsibility of the state entity might be to develop an incentive reimbursement methodology for review by the Legislature and Governor. The purposes of the reimbursement formula would be to ensure that (a) the state receives high-quality implementation of the research-based programs by local government, and (b) local government receives a portion of the benefits that would otherwise accrue to the state as a result of the implementation of a successful prevention or early intervention program. The programs chosen must then be implemented with quality control and program fidelity.

Summary of Third Substitute Bill:

<u>Establishment of the Program</u>

The Department of Social and Health Services Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA) is required to establish a Reinvesting in Youth Program that awards grants to counties for implementing research-based early intervention services that target juvenile justice-involved youth and reduce crime. The WSIPP and the JRA are required to develop the guidelines for the implementation of the program. Beginning in 2007, any county or group of counties may apply for participation in the program. In order to participate in the program, counties must meet the following criteria:

(a) counties must match state moneys awarded for research-based early-intervention services with non-state resources that are at least proportional to the expected local government share of state and local government cost avoidance;
(b) counties must demonstrate that state funds allocated pursuant to the program are used only for the selected research-based services;

(c) counties must participate fully in the state quality assurance program to ensure fidelity of program implementation. If no state quality assurance program is in effect for a particular selected research-based service, the county must submit a quality assurance plan for state approval with its grant application. Failure to demonstrate continuing compliance with quality assurance plans shall be grounds for termination of state funding; and
(d) counties that submit joint applications must submit for approval by the JRA multi-county plans for efficient program delivery.

Counties participating in the program will have a portion of their costs of implementing the program reimbursed by the state. The amount of the reimbursement is dependent upon the calculation of cost savings to the state. In order to receive the funding, the service models utilized by the counties must meet the following criteria:

(a) there must be scientific evidence from at least one rigorous evaluation study of the specific service model that measures recidivism reduction;
(b) there must be evidence that the specific service model's results can be replicated outside of an academic research environment;
(c) the evaluation or evaluations of the service model must permit dollar cost estimates of both benefits and costs so that the benefit-cost ratio of the model can be calculated; and
(d) the public taxpayer benefits to all levels of state and local government must exceed the service model costs.

The JRA is required to form a technical advisory group to assist in the implementation of the program. The JRA is also required to establish a distribution formula to provide funding to local governments that are implementing the program. The JRA will report to the Legislature on the initial cost savings calculation methodology and the distribution formula on or before October 1, 2006.

Beginning in 2006, the WSIPP is required to publish a list of service models that are eligible for reimbursement through the Reinvesting in Youth Program. Also beginning in 2006, the WSIPP is required to update the calculations of savings resulting from implementation of the program and a technical work group will review and comment on the WSIPP findings.

<u>Reinvesting in Youth Account</u>

A Reinvesting in Youth Account is created in the state treasury and moneys in the account may only be spent after appropriation. Expenditures from the fund may be used to reimburse local governments for implementation of the reinvesting in youth program. The JRA will review and monitor expenditures made from this account.

The bill does not create an entitlement for any county to receive funding under the reinvesting in youth program. If specific funding is not provided for the bill, it becomes null and void.

Third Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill:

The substitute bill expands the Reinvesting in Youth Pilot Program to all counties. The substitute also adds language directing the JRA to create a distribution formula that allocates funds based on the savings to the state. The bill also makes technical changes and changes the effective date.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Requested on January 12, 2006.

Effective Date of Third Substitute Bill: The bill takes effect on July 1, 2006. However, the bill is null and void if not funded in the budget.

Testimony For (Third Substitute): This bill has strong bi-partisan support. It brings us into a new and much improved way of dealing with juvenile justice involved youth. Under current law, no local government acting alone has incentive to invest in evidence-based practices. The state benefits by helping keep kids out of JRA which is so expensive. The JRA does a great job, but it is very expensive. We have seen this work in King and other counties. This is a mechanism to come together and develop quality programs. We are optimistic this bill will expand our partnerships to reduce crime. This bill basically says that the state and local government will share in the cost based on their savings. The programs target the highest risk kids and uses programs demonstrated to be the most effective.

Testimony Against: None.

Persons Testifying: Representative Dickerson, prime sponsor; Representative Jarrett; Jim Street, Re-investing in Youth Project Director Seattle/King County.

Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying: None.