

# HOUSE BILL REPORT

## 2SHB 1483

---

**As Passed House:**  
March 10, 2005

**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:** By House Committee on Appropriations (originally sponsored by Representatives Dickerson, McDonald, Moeller, Darneille, Jarrett, Simpson, Morrell, Sommers, Kenney, McDermott, Kagi, Chase and Clibborn).

**Brief History:**

**Committee Activity:**

Juvenile Justice & Family Law: 2/2/05, 2/9/05 [DPS];  
Appropriations: 2/22/05, 3/2/05 [DP2S(w/o sub JJFL)].

**Floor Activity:**

Passed House: 3/10/05, 85-0.

**Brief Summary of Second Substitute Bill**

- Requires the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration of the Department of Social and Health Services to establish a reinvesting in youth pilot program that awards grants to counties for implementing research-based early intervention services that target juvenile-justice involved youth and reduce crime.
- Permits the pilot program to be expanded to all counties effective July 1, 2007.
- Creates a Reinvesting in Youth Account in the state treasury.

---

### HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE & FAMILY LAW

**Majority Report:** The substitute bill be substituted therefor and the substitute bill do pass. Signed by 6 members: Representatives Dickerson, Chair; Moeller, Vice Chair; McDonald, Ranking Minority Member; McCune, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Lovick and Roberts.

**Minority Report:** Without recommendation. Signed by 1 member: Representative Crouse.

**Staff:** Sonja Hallum (786-7092).

---

## HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

**Majority Report:** The second substitute bill be substituted therefor and the second substitute bill do pass and do not pass the substitute bill by Committee on Juvenile Justice & Family Law. Signed by 28 members: Representatives Sommers, Chair; Fromhold, Vice Chair; Alexander, Ranking Minority Member; Anderson, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; McDonald, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Bailey, Buri, Clements, Cody, Conway, Darneille, Dunshee, Grant, Haigh, Hinkle, Hunter, Kagi, Kenney, Kessler, Linville, McDermott, McIntire, Miloscia, Pearson, Priest, Schual-Berke, Talcott and Walsh.

**Staff:** Nona Snell (786-7153).

### **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 Second Substitute Bill:**

### **Establishment of the Program**

The Department of Sound 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. 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 nonstate 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.

### **Pilot Program**

A pilot program is created to test methods for reinvestment of state savings that result from local investments in evidence-based services for juvenile justice involved youth. The pilot program will operate from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2007 and is limited to three counties. For the pilot program established during the 2005-2007 biennium, only the following intervention service models shall be considered eligible for reimbursement: (i) functional family therapy, (ii) multisystemic therapy, and (iii) aggression replacement training.

Payment to the counties in the pilot program will be based on a specified formula.

### **Expanded Program**

Effective July 1, 2007, all counties are eligible to participate in the reinvesting in youth program. In order to receive funding, the program must meet certain criteria. The minimum criteria for the service models that will be eligible for the program are as follows:

- (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.

Beginning in 2006, WSIPP is required to publish a list of service models that are eligible for reimbursement through the reinvestment in youth program.

The JRA is required to form a technical advisory group to assist in the implementation of the program.

Every four years the WSIPP is required to update the calculations of savings accruing to the state and local governments and a technical work group will review and comment on the WSIPP findings.

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

### **Reinvesting in Youth Account**

A Reinvesting in Youth Account is created in the state treasury and moneys in the account may only be spent after appropriation. The amount of \$997,000 is transferred from the general fund into the newly created reinvesting in youth account for the biennium beginning July 1, 2005. The JRA will review and monitor expenditures made from this account.

### **Miscellaneous Provisions**

The JRA is required to establish a state quality assurance program and must monitor the implementation of the intervention services.

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.

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Available.

**Effective Date:** The bill contains an emergency clause and takes effect July 1, 2005. However, the bill is null and void unless funded in the budget

**Testimony For:** (Juvenile Justice & Family Law) (In support on original bill) The Legislature has focused on investing in research based programs. The WSIPP has developed a list of programs proven to save money for the state and local governments. This bill takes the savings and reinvests it into programs proven to be cost-effective. There is no intention to pay for this through the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA) budget. Crime is down 55 percent. Use of the JRA is down since 1997. Part of the reason for this is due to the treatment provided, but the need is greater than what is currently being provided. This will create

incentives for local government to invest money into the programs. This has been working in King County. It has been funded largely by grants which are now ending. Tough budget times are when the reinvesting in youth strategy is needed.

(With concerns on original bill) The Family Policy Council would be the logical choice to administer this program. Currently, this bill targets the same population as those served by the JRA, so it doesn't make sense to put it with an agency other than the JRA. The JRA has expertise to administer this program. We are concerned with the unintended consequences of marginalizing kids at the deep end.

**Testimony For:** (Appropriations) The bill would pay back the state economically. It encourages investment in research proven programs for juveniles.

Both sides of the aisle support the bill. The pilot will demonstrate how investment in early intervention programs works and will encourage collaboration. The CTED was chosen as the administering agency because the program is more than juvenile justice. It involves other locals and CTED has experience working with local governments and general government, but another agency may be able to administer the program. Savings should be reinvested to reduce crime. The bill is an important step in the state partnering with local governments to reduce crime. Investing in programs saves money. Similar programs in King County reduce crime, save money, and save kids. It is our last, best hope. We have punishment in place, but not prevention, and the program would utilize proven prevention programs. This bill does that. There is no new money, so we must invest in proven, research-based programs that result in savings.

**Testimony Against:** (Juvenile Justice & Family Law) None.

**Testimony Against:** (Appropriations) None.

**Persons Testifying:** (Juvenile Justice & Family Law) (In support on original bill) Bruce Knutson, Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators; Jim Davis, Christian Faith School; and Jim Street, Reinvesting in Youth Project.

(With concerns on original bill) Trish McNabb, Eastside Community Network and King County Network Alliance; and Cheryl Stephani, Department of Social and Health Services/ Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration.

**Persons Testifying:** (Appropriations) Representative Dickerson, prime sponsor; Representative Jarrett; Norm Maleng, King County Prosecutor; Bruce Knutson, King County Juvenile Court, Superior Court Judges Association, and Washington; Kristy Sullivan, Community Networks Coalition; and Jim Street, Reinvesting in Youth.

**Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying:** (Juvenile Justice & Family Law) None.

**Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying:** (Appropriations) None.