

**CHILDREN'S ADMINISTRATION**  
**Non-Forecasted Extended Foster Care**



ML Request	FY15	FY16	FY17	15-17
FTE				
GF-State	\$3,481,000	\$4,081,000	\$4,421,000	\$8,502,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,055,000</b>	<b>\$5,925,000</b>	<b>\$6,420,000</b>	<b>\$12,345,000</b>

**DECISION PACKAGE SUMMARY**

The Children's Administration (CA) requests \$8,502,000 GF-State and \$12,345,000 Total Funds in the 2015-17 Biennium to cover services delivered to youth in the Extended Foster Care (EFC) program that were not originally anticipated in order to adequately serve the needs of these youth without impacting services to other children in care. By funding this request, CA is expected to ensure youth in the EFC program are receiving the full breadth of services they may need to transition successfully to adulthood.

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The passage of the 2009 federal Fostering Connections Act allowed states to receive federal funding for eligible youth ages 18 to 21 who wished to remain in foster care. Washington State created its own program for youth ages 18 to 21, called the Extended Foster Care (EFC) program. Eligibility categories were added into EFC over time with the largest, youth engaged in activities to removing barriers to employment, being implemented as of July 2013. The EFC is relatively new in all states and therefore data regarding the true costs of providing services to this population was not well known. While many costs associated with this group are funded through the forecasting process, some critical services are not.

These non-forecasted costs were not adequately funded and have created pressure within CA as the administration attempts to serve these new populations while maintaining critical services to foster care children under 18. The largest cost driver is in the Behavioral Rehabilitation Services (BRS) program. BRS is a program for children and youth whose behaviors require more services than a traditional foster placement can provide. The cost of a placement ranges from \$2,538 to over \$15,000 per year. EFC youth tend to have more expensive BRS placements due to the challenges of serving youth over age 18. In Fiscal Year 2013, CA spent \$2,050,000 on EFC youth from our BRS programs, which did not include the youth engaged in activities to removing barriers to employment category. CA spent an additional \$134,000 on other non-forecasted costs for EFC youth. CA never received funding to cover potential impacts in our BRS program from EFC and only received \$250,000 per year to defray non-forecasted costs.



**DSHS VISION**  
 People are healthy • People are safe • People are supported • Taxpayer resources are guarded

**DSHS MISSION**  
 To transform lives

**DSHS VALUES**  
 Honesty and Integrity • Pursuit of Excellence • Open Communication • Diversity and Inclusion • Commitment to Service

## CHILDREN'S ADMINISTRATION

### Non-Forecasted Extended Foster Care



#### PROPOSED SOLUTION

CA requests additional funding to cover the known and projected costs of the current EFC population. While CA does not know how many youth will be in the EFC program once it reaches full implementation, the administration requests to only cover the estimated costs to the non-forecasted areas would be in 2015-17 Biennium for this population.

The average annual cost per EFC case in the non-forecasted area was \$13,800 in Fiscal Year 2013. The cost is projected to be \$15,775 in Fiscal Year 2014. CA calculated the total cost for Fiscal Year 2015 by assuming an average annual cost of \$15,000 per case and applying this to the forecasted EFC caseload.

#### EXPECTED RESULTS

The budget request supports DSHS Goal 3: Protection – Each individual who is vulnerable will be protected. The decision package is essential to implementing the CA's Strategic Objective 3.5: Percentage of all children currently in care for at least one year who have not moved within 12 months of their previous move or their entry into placement will increase.

This decision package supports the Results Washington Goal 4: Healthy and Safe Communities - Fostering the health of Washingtonians from a healthy start to a safe and supported future.

This request will support the needs of the current EFC population receiving services in non-forecasted areas, which is predominately BRS.

#### STAKEHOLDER IMPACT

Stakeholders were told that these costs were increasing for CA during the last legislative session, when additional categories were under consideration. They are extremely supportive of the EFC program and want to ensure that it is successfully implemented and does not negatively impact CA's ability to deliver service to other children in care.



#### DSHS VISION

People are healthy • People are safe • People are supported • Taxpayer resources are guarded

#### DSHS MISSION

To transform lives

#### DSHS VALUES

Honesty and Integrity • Pursuit of Excellence • Open Communication • Diversity and Inclusion • Commitment to Service