

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)

Colorado Legislative Council Research
Publications

12-1968

0135 Public Assistance Administration

Colorado Legislative Council

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc_all

Recommended Citation

Colorado Legislative Council, "0135 Public Assistance Administration" (1968). *All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)*. 143.

https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc_all/143

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Colorado Legislative Council Research Publications at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

0135 Public Assistance Administration

Report to the Colorado General Assembly:

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

ADMINISTRATION



COLORADO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

RESEARCH PUBLICATION NO. 135

NOVEMBER 1968

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
OF THE
COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Representatives

C. P. (Doc) Lamb,
Chairman
Ray Black
Joseph V. Calabrese
Carl H. Gustafson
Ben Klein
John Vanderhoof, Speaker
Raymond E. Wilder

Senators

Floyd Oliver,
Vice Chairman
Fay DeBerard
Frank Kemp, Jr.
Vincent Massari
Ruth S. Stockton
Mark Hogan,
Lt. Governor

* * * * *

The Legislative Council, which is composed of five Senators, six Representatives, and the presiding officers of the two houses, serves as a continuing research agency for the legislature through the maintenance of a trained staff. Between sessions, research activities are concentrated on the study of relatively broad problems formally proposed by legislators, and the publication and distribution of factual reports to aid in their solution.

During the sessions, the emphasis is on supplying legislators, on individual request, with personal memoranda, providing them with information needed to handle their own legislative problems. Reports and memoranda both give pertinent data in the form of facts, figures, arguments, and alternatives.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

Colorado **Legislative Council Report**
To The
Colorado General Assembly

Research Publication No. 135
December, 1968

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER, COLORADO 80203
222-9911 - EXTENSION 2285
AREA CODE 303

December 9, 1968

OFFICERS

REP. C. P. (DOC) LAMB
CHAIRMAN
SEN. FLOYD OLIVER
VICE CHAIRMAN

STAFF

LYLE C. KYLE
DIRECTOR
DAVID F. MORRISSEY,
PRINCIPAL ANALYST
JANET WILSON
SENIOR ANALYST
STANLEY KLOFSON
SENIOR ANALYST
RAY M. FREEMAN
SR. RESEARCH ASSISTANT
DAVID HITE
SR. RESEARCH ASSISTANT
RICHARD LEVENGOOD
SR. RESEARCH ASSISTANT

MEMBERS

LT. GOV. MARK HOGAN
SEN. FAY DEBERARD
SEN. FRANK KEMP
SEN. VINCENT MASSARI
SEN. RUTH STOCKTON
SPEAKER JOHN D.
VANDERHOOF
REP. BEN KLEIN
REP. RAY BLACK
REP. JOSEPH CALABRESE
REP. CARL GUSTAFSON
REP. RAYMOND WILDER

To Members of the Forty-seventh Colorado General Assembly:

The Legislative Council is submitting here-with a report on public assistance administration and related welfare matters for your consideration as directed by Senate Joint Resolution No. 42, 1967 Session.

The committee appointed by the Council to conduct this study presented its report to the Council on December 9, 1968. At this time the Legislative Council adopted the report and recommends it favorably to the members of the Forty-seventh General Assembly.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Representative C. P. (Doc) Lamb
Chairman

CPL/mp

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MEMBERS

OFFICERS

REP. C. P. (DOC) LAMB
CHAIRMAN
SEN. FLOYD OLIVER
VICE CHAIRMAN

STAFF

LYLE G. KYLE
DIRECTOR
DAVID F. MORRISSEY
PRINCIPAL ANALYST
JANET WILSON
SENIOR ANALYST
STANLEY KLOFSON
SENIOR ANALYST
RAY M. FREEMAN
SR. RESEARCH ASSISTANT
DAVID HITE
SR. RESEARCH ASSISTANT
RICHARD LEVENGOOD
SR. RESEARCH ASSISTANT



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER, COLORADO 80203
222-9911 - EXTENSION 2285
AREA CODE 303

LT. GOV. MARK HOGAN
SEN. FAY DEBERARD
SEN. FRANK KEMP
SEN. VINCENT MASSARI
SEN. RUTH STOCKTON
SPEAKER JOHN D. VANDERHOOF
REP. BEN KLEIN
REP. RAY BLACK
REP. JOSEPH CALABRESE
REP. CARL GUSTAFSON
REP. RAYMOND WILDER

December 9, 1968

Representative C. P. (Doc) Lamb,
Chairman
Colorado Legislative Council
46 State Capitol
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Your committee appointed to carry out the directives of Senate Joint Resolution No. 42, 1967 Session, has completed its assignment and submits herewith its report of findings and recommendations.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 42 directed the committee to conduct a study of..." the financial and administrative policies concerned with public assistance programs." Consequently, the major emphasis of this report deals with the problems encountered by counties in meeting public assistance obligations. Specifically, the committee proposes that the state assume responsibility for administration of public assistance in Colorado. In addition, the committee considered the impact and implications of several new assistance programs, as well as the changing character of welfare programs, expenditures, and caseloads.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Senator Frank Kemp, Jr.
Chairman

FK/mp

FOREWORD

Under the direction of Senate Joint Resolution No. 42, 1967 Session, the Legislative Council appointed the following committee to conduct a study of the welfare programs of the state:

Sen. Frank Kemp, Chairman	Rep. Jean Bain
Rep. Joseph Calabrese, Vice Chairman	Rep. Roy Shore
Sen. Will Nicholson	Rep. Eldon Cooper
Sen. Sam Taylor	Rep. Mildred Cresswell
Sen. Anthony Vollack	Rep. Don Horst
Sen. Andy Lucas	Rep. Richard Lamm
Rep. Daniel Grove	Rep. Paul Morris
	Rep. Floyd Haskell

The committee spent considerable time looking into the strengths and weaknesses of the present system of county administration of public assistance programs. Concerning this question, the committee heard testimony and received assistance from representatives of the Colorado County Commissioners Association, employees of the State Department of Social Services and the State Division of Public Welfare, directors and employees of county departments of public welfare, officials from the federal office of Health, Education and Welfare, and representatives of the J. L. Jacobs Consulting Firm, which was recently granted a contract to conduct an in-depth study of alternative methods of public assistance administration. The committee wishes to express its appreciation to these agencies and persons who helped to enlighten the committee about the pros and cons of the various methods of welfare administration.

In discussing the question of protective services for the aged and mentally retarded, the committee benefitted greatly from the assistance and advice of members of the Governor's Committee on Implementation of Mental Health and Retardation Planning and the Metropolitan Commission on the Aging. Senator John Birmingham, who sponsored a bill on protective services in the 1967 session, also appeared several times before the committee to discuss the problems of protective service legislation.

The committee especially wishes to thank Con Shea, Director of the Department of Social Services and Charline Birkins, Director of the Division of Public Welfare, who attended most of the committee meetings and were extremely helpful in supplying information to the committee.

Bill drafting services were provided by Bob Holt of the Legislative Drafting Office. Dave Morrissey, principal analyst of the Council Staff, had primary responsibility for preparation of the research material with the able assistance of Kay Cochran, research assistant.

December, 1968

Lyle C. Kyle
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL.....	iii
FOREWORD.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	xiii
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION.....	1
Summary of County Expenditures for Welfare.....	1
County Welfare Levies.....	2
Caseloads.....	4
Administrative Discretion of Counties.....	13
Determination of Eligibility.....	13
Amounts of Assistance Granted.....	14
Merit System for County Welfare Employees.....	15
Federal Caseworker - Caseload Ratios.....	19
State Caseload Standards.....	19
General Assistance.....	20
Summary of Problems Encountered by Counties in Administration of Welfare.....	21
STATE ADMINISTRATION OF WELFARE -- FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.....	27
Comparison of Salaries -- County Welfare and State Employees.....	27
Possible Cost of Transferring County Welfare Personnel to State Civil Service.....	32
Advantages of State Administration.....	37
Need for Local Participation in Welfare Programs.....	39
PROTECTIVE SERVICES.....	41
Who is in Need of Protective Services?.....	41
Types of Protective Services Which May be Offered.....	42
Protective Services for the Mentally Retarded....	42
Protective Services for the Aged.....	44
Protective Service Pilot Projects in Colorado.....	46
Denver Welfare Department Protective Services Program.....	46
Rural Colorado Protective Services Project.....	48

	<u>Page</u>
Questions to be Resolved -- Protective Services	
Legislation.....	50
WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM (WIN).....	53
Community Work and Training (CW&T).....	53
Title V, Economic Opportunity Act.....	54
Characteristics of WIN Program.....	55
Colorado's WIN Program.....	55
CHILD CARE FACILITIES.....	57
Financing of Child Care.....	57
Day Care Centers.....	58
Location of Day Care Facilities.....	59
Need for Child Care for Low Income Families.....	59
Current Use of Day Care Centers.....	61
Pros and Cons of Various Child Care	
Arrangements.....	63
Summary and Comments -- Day Care Centers.....	66
Alternative Proposals to Expand Child Care	
Services for AFDC Recipients.....	67

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
I TOTAL EXPENDITURES OF COLORADO COUNTIES FOR WELFARE, BY PROGRAM -- FISCAL YEARS 1967-68 THROUGH 1969-70.....	3
II COUNTY WELFARE FUND LEVIES AND LEVY LIMITS.....	5
III AVERAGE MONTHLY CASELOADS, BY CATEGORY -- FISCAL YEARS 1960-61 THROUGH 1966-67.....	7
IV RELATIONSHIP OF AVERAGE MONTHLY CASELOADS INVOLVING AGED AND PERMANENTLY DISABLED (GROUP I) TO CASES INVOLVING CHILDREN (GROUP II) -- FISCAL YEAR 1967-68.....	10
V AMOUNTS ALLOWED IN AND, ADC, AND AB ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR BASIC REQUIREMENTS.....	16
VI RELATIONSHIP OF PER CAPITA ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME TO PER CAPITA EXPENDITURES FOR WELFARE -- BY COUNTY.....	22
VII COMPARISON OF THE RANGE OF SALARIES OFFERED UNDER THE COUNTY WELFARE EMPLOYEES MERIT SYSTEM WITH COMPARABLE SALARIES PAID UNDER STATE CIVIL SERVICE.....	28
VIII COST OF TRANSFERRING COUNTY WELFARE PERSONNEL FROM PRESENT MERIT SYSTEM PAY PLANS ONTO CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES, COMPUTED ON A MONTHLY BASIS.....	33
IX NUMBER OF LICENSED DAY CARE CENTERS, BY COUNTY, AS OF JANUARY, 1968.....	60
X TYPE OF CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS MADE FOR CHILDREN OF ADC MOTHERS WHO ARE EMPLOYED OR IN TRAINING PROGRAMS IN SEVEN SAMPLE COUNTIES -- JANUARY, 1967 TO PRESENT.....	62
XI CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS MADE BY ADC MOTHERS WHO ARE EMPLOYED OR ON WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS -- DENVER DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE.....	64

COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Historically, there has been a gradual shift from local responsibility for public assistance to state and federal programs. The depression of the 1930's marked a period of major change when the resources of local government were unable to meet the needs of mass unemployment. In 1935, the federal government instituted a system of grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act to provide federal funds for Old Age Assistance, Aid to Dependent Children, Aid to Needy Disabled, and Aid to Blind. In Colorado, the state assumed the entire burden of the nonfederal share of expenditures of the Old Age Pension, while for other categorical programs both the state and counties participate with the federal government in meeting the costs of these programs.

Colorado counties are now going through another transition in public assistance administration. In 1965, Congress adopted P.L. 89-99, "Medicare" and "Medicaid" -- Titles XVIII and XIX of the "Social Security Act." Title XVIII provides a broad-based program of medical care for all persons 65 years of age and over, while Title XIX is designed to assist the states in providing medical services for low-income families. The Forty-sixth General Assembly is implementing a Title XIX program for the categorically needy, beginning January 1, 1969. The nonfederal share of expenditures will be financed entirely from state monies. If the counties were participating in this program, and the county share of an equalization formula was 20 percent of nonfederal costs, the counties would have to contribute about 4.5 million dollars in fiscal year 1969-70. Not only are the counties relieved of this burden, but Title XIX is expected to reduce county General Assistance expenditures by \$1,729,000 or 42.6 percent. That is, for fiscal year 1967-68, the counties spent \$4,057,000 for General Assistance, while for 1969-70, the county General Assistance costs are not expected to exceed \$2,328,000. Thus the new medical programs are having a substantial impact on county public assistance programs.

For fiscal year 1967-68, the counties spent over \$13.6 million for all public assistance programs. For 1969-70, county expenditures for public assistance probably will exceed \$14 million, despite the estimated decline in General Assistance costs. The savings in General Assistance monies will be offset by the increasing demands of federally-aided programs. As explained in the accompanying report, county commissioners or county boards of welfare have limited policy-making authority with respect to the administration of federally-aided categorical programs. Thus the burden of public assistance is increasing for welfare services over which the counties can exercise little control while decreasing for General Assistance, the primary county program. In view of the continuing financial burden of public assistance

to the counties, coupled with a relative decline in local authority, the committee recommends that the General Assembly enact legislation which would: 1) provide for state assumption of 100 percent of the costs of the nonfederal share of all public assistance expenditures; and 2) charge the Department of Social Services with responsibility for administration of all public welfare programs in Colorado. For the convenience of the General Assembly, the accompanying staff report outlines some of the problems encountered by the counties in the local funding and administration of public assistance programs.

Protective Services

A major area of inquiry of the committee during 1968 involved the need for protective services, especially for the aged and mentally retarded. For the mentally retarded, protective services would include: supervision of living conditions, assistance in obtaining medical care, referral to proper institutions and agencies for vocational training, etc., and help in finding employment. With the assistance of protective services, a retarded person can function in the community. Without such services, institutional care may be necessary. Similarly, an aged person may remain relatively independent for a much longer period if some assistance is provided. Supportive care in the form of assistance in planning a diet, obtaining groceries, and managing finances are some of the kinds of protective services that could be beneficial to elderly persons. The Committee on Welfare endorses the concept of providing protective services for aged and mentally retarded citizens of Colorado.

If the General Assembly elects to implement a program of protective services for the physically and mentally handicapped, a number of questions must be considered in developing a program. What kind of assistance or services are to be provided and to whom? Should services be limited to recipients of welfare or other poor persons who can meet an income test? Financially independent persons can establish a trust fund or arrange for guardianship of their money, but the private sector of the community simply does not provide services necessary to meet personal and physical needs. Would a proposed program include these persons, provided payment is made? How are protective services to be initiated? Would a caseworker be given authority to identify persons in need, or should the program be limited to those persons designated by a formal court proceeding? The committee believes that any proposed legislation must spell out in detail the conditions under which protective services would be instituted.

Work Incentive Programs (WIN)

In 1967, Congress amended Title IV of the Social Security Act to require that participants in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, 16 years of age and over, would be provided with an opportunity to participate in work and training activities. The program is mandatory, and failure to participate can result in forfeiture of federal aid. Provision is made, however, for protective payments for children of families refusing to participate in work opportunities. For 1969-70, the Department of Social Services is requesting over \$4.7 million for WIN programs in Colorado. Of this amount, the federal government will fund about \$3.7 million; the state share is estimated at \$618,000; and the county share -- \$405,000.

Child Care. Part and parcel of the development of the WIN program is the provision of child care services for participants in work and training projects. The Department of Social Services estimates that child care will have to be provided for 2,320 children whose parents will be participating in WIN projects. Of the \$4,749,000 in estimated expenditures for the WIN program, child care services will account for \$1,447,000 or 30.5 percent of the total program costs. Although child care services must be provided, there would appear to be a number of alternatives in the types of child care services that can be made available. Cost of child care will depend on the types of facilities provided, as well as the utilization of professional personnel. Details on the need for expanding existing facilities or the construction of new child care centers have not been completed by the Social Services staff. In any event, the General Assembly will need to give careful consideration to proposed expenditures for these programs.

At the final meeting of the Committee on Welfare, the Director of the Department of Social Services presented a package of proposed legislation which will be considered by the Governor in making his recommendations to the Forty-seventh General Assembly. The primary purpose in reviewing the department's proposals was to enable the members of the Welfare Committee to become familiar with welfare and related legislation which may be submitted by the Executive Department. However, the committee offers no specific recommendations on the proposed bills.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATION

Section 119-1-13, C.R.S. 1963, charges the county departments of public welfare with the administration of all forms of public assistance in their respective counties, including home relief, indoor and outdoor care for those in need, Aid to Dependent Children, Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, the care and treatment of dependent and handicapped children, and other such welfare activities as may be delegated to it by the state division of public welfare and approved by the county board. Each county also is required to establish a county department of welfare. However, two or more counties may, with the approval of the Division of Public Welfare, unite and form a district department of welfare. County departments are administered under the direction of the county commissioners who make up the respective county boards of welfare. District board members are selected from the boards of county commissioners of participating counties.^{1/}

Currently, 56 counties maintain their own welfare staffs. The remaining seven counties have formed three district departments of welfare: 1) Gunnison and Hinsdale; 2) Rio Grande, Conejos, and Mineral; and 3) Clear Creek and Gilpin. The counties in these three districts share the expense of welfare staff services. In the case of Gunnison and Hinsdale, Hinsdale County merely contracts for the services of Gunnison personnel and reimburses Gunnison for the staff time spent on the Hinsdale caseload. As of January 1968, the county welfare departments employed 1,657 persons. An additional 145 positions were vacant, and county welfare directors had requested the creation of 93 new positions in counties.

Summary of County Expenditures for Welfare

Budget estimates prepared by the Department of Social Services suggest that counties will continue to spend more than \$14 million for welfare during fiscal year 1969-70. Although the counties will have a rather mild increase in the total burden of welfare costs (4.6 percent) from fiscal 1967-68 to 1969-70, a drastic shift in the proportionate amount of monies expended for individual programs is expected. This shift in the type of expenditures is particularly important to the counties. In general, expenditures for county General Assistance probably will decrease, while the county share of costs for federally-aided categorical programs and county administration is expected to increase significantly. Of course, General Assistance is 100 percent county financed and county commissioners do control the expenditures of this program. On the other hand, federal and state rules and regulations leave little discretion to individual counties with

^{1/} Colorado Revised Statutes of 1963, Sections 119-1-9 and 10.

respect to the administration of categorical programs -- Aid to Dependent Children (ADC), Aid to Blind (AB), etc.

Changing Pattern of Expenditures. In 1967-68 General Assistance amounted to nearly 30 percent of all county expenditures for welfare, or a total of \$4,057,141. This General Assistance expenditure is estimated to decrease by 42.6 percent in 1969-70 to \$2,328,000, or only 16.3 percent of the county share of welfare cost. Table I graphically illustrates these estimated changes in county expenditures for welfare programs from fiscal year 1967-68 to 1969-70. The implementation of Title XIX of the Social Security Act by the Colorado General Assembly, as well as the increase in the Aid to Dependent Children caseload and rising county administrative costs, account, in large measure, for the expected changing pattern of county welfare expenditures. The Title XIX medical assistance program for welfare recipients is expected to replace and provide funds for medical care for a number of persons formerly aided under county General Assistance programs. For instance, in fiscal year 1967, more than 68 percent of the county General Assistance funds were used for medical care and hospitalization. A large portion of these expenditures will no longer be needed. Of the \$4,043,597 spent by counties on General Assistance in fiscal year 1966-67, \$1,081,138.09 or 26.7 percent was spent on hospitalization; another \$1,264,148 or 31.3 percent on drugs and doctors; and \$830,623 or 10.6 percent on payments to county hospitals. Total supplementation payments to persons receiving other welfare assistance amounted to \$1,054,941 and it can be assumed that a considerable percentage of this amount was for medical expenses.

Utilizing 1967-68 as a base year, the counties are expected to provide major increases in county funds in 1969-70 in three areas: 1) ADC -- \$885,000, an increase of 16.7 percent; 2) county share of administrative costs -- \$801,800, an increase of 42.5 percent; and 3) child welfare -- \$458,000 in additional funds, an increase of over 51 percent. These estimates are based on the budget request of the Department of Social Services and are subject to revision by the Governor and the General Assembly. In any event, the county share of program costs for the categorical programs depends on the level of financing provided at the state level. Similarly, state funding is based on federal requirements and financing.

County Welfare Levies

County funds for welfare purposes are financed through the property tax, which is also the primary source of financial support for all other county functions. The amount of tax that can be levied by a county for welfare purposes is determined by its per capita assessed value as provided in 119-3-6, C.R.S. 1963, as follows: (See page 4)

Table I

TOTAL EXPENDITURES OF COLORADO COUNTIES
FOR WELFARE, BY PROGRAM*
Fiscal Years 1967-68 Through 1969-70

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Program	<u>County Share of Expenditures -- Fiscal Year</u>			<u>Estimated Per- centage Increase or Decrease</u>
Program	1967-68 <u>Actual</u>	1968-69 <u>Est.</u>	1969-70 <u>Est.</u>	
Aid to Dependent Children Percentage of Total Ex- penditures	\$ 5,294,864 38.6%	\$ 5,890,000 42%	\$ 6,180,000 43.2%	+16.7
Aid to Needy Disabled Percentage	1,459,808 10.7%	1,474,000 10.4%	1,262,000 8.8%	-13.6
Child Welfare Percentage	891,701 6.5%	1,020,000 7.2%	1,350,000 9.4%	+51.4
Aid to Blind Percentage	53,902 .4%	54,000 .4%	41,700 0.3%	-22.6
Tuberculosis Assistance Percentage	34,352 .3%	60,000 .4%	51,400 0.4%	+49.6
Work Incentive Program Percentage	---	161,468 1.0%	405,340 2.8%	New Program
General Assistance Percentage	4,057,141 29.7%	3,164,000 22.4%	2,328,000 16.3%	-42.6
County Administration Percentage	1,886,488 13.8%	2,282,000 16.2%	2,688,350 18.8%	+42.5
Totals or Average	<u>\$13,678,256</u>	<u>\$14,105,468</u>	<u>\$14,306,790</u>	<u>+ 4.6%</u>

*Source: Department of Social Services.

<u>Per Capita Assessed Value</u>	<u>Mill Levy Limit</u>
\$ 800 or less	6.0 mills
800 - 1,000	5.5
1,000 - 1,200	5.0
1,200 - 1,400	4.5
1,400 - 1,600	4.0
1,600 - 2,000	3.5
2,000 - 2,600	3.0
2,600 or more	2.5

Per capita assessed value is determined each year by dividing a county's current assessed value by the State Planning Division's most recent population estimate for that county. Welfare levy limits may be exceeded for good cause upon approval of the Colorado Tax Commission. In 1966, fourteen counties exceeded the statutory mill levy limit. The number of counties now exceeding the statutory mill levy limit has reached 18 -- Archuleta, Bent, Conejos, Costilla, Delta, Denver, Gilpin, Huerfano, Las Animas, Montezuma, Montrose, Morgan, Otero, Prowers, Pueblo, Rio Grande, Saguache, and Weld. (See Table II.)

Caseloads

While the total caseload of public assistance recipients has not fluctuated in Colorado over the past seven years (74,072 cases in fiscal 1960-61 and 73,076 cases in fiscal 1967-68), there have been observable shifts in the several categories of aid (see Table III). For example, the Old Age Pension caseload, which has traditionally accounted for a large part of the total caseload, has declined since 1960. From fiscal year 1960-61 to fiscal year 1966-67, for instance, the average monthly OAP caseload has decreased by 20.7 percent. The major factor contributing to the decline of the OAP caseload was the adoption of the Medical Assistance to the Aged program (MAA) in 1964. The General Assembly enacted MAA to meet the needs of OAP recipients for long-term nursing home care. The \$10,000,000 limit to the Old Age Pension Medical Fund contained in Article XXIV, Section 7, Colorado Constitution, restricts the amount of money available for nursing home care to pensioners. Thus, recipients of the OAP program, if confined to nursing homes for periods in excess of two months, have been transferred to the MAA program in order to continue to receive medical assistance. Therefore, all former OAP recipients and applicants for OAP in need of long-term nursing home care were automatically transferred to the MAA program. With adoption of MAA, the pension caseload dropped from 49,364 in 1963-64 to 44,416 in 1964-65.

The MAA program absorbed 4,011 former OAP recipients into its caseload during its first year of operation. The introduction

Table II
County Welfare Fund Levies
and Levy Limits

	<u>Maximum Welfare Levy</u>	<u>1967 Welfare Levy</u>
Adams	3.50	3.00
Alamosa	3.50	2.40
Arapahoe	3.00	1.48
Archuleta	2.50	3.00*
Baca	2.50	.76
Bent	3.00	4.00*
Boulder	3.00	2.02
Chaffee	3.50	.60
Cheyenne	2.50	1.00
Clear Creek	2.50	1.00
Conejos	4.00	5.00*
Costilla	3.50	5.38*
Crowley	3.00	3.00
Custer	2.50	1.50
Delta	4.00	4.50*
Denver	3.00	4.50*
Dolores	2.50	2.00
Douglas	2.50	.75
Eagle	2.50	1.00
Elbert	2.50	.85
El Paso	4.00	4.00
Fremont	4.00	3.20
Garfield	2.50	N.A.
Gilpin	2.50	3.50*
Grand	2.50	N.A.
Gunnison	3.00	1.00
Hinsdale	2.50	1.00
Huerfano	4.50	6.00*
Jackson	2.50	1.50
Jefferson	3.50	.95
Kiowa	2.50	1.00
Kit Carson	2.50	1.92
Lake	2.50	.83
La Plata	3.00	2.55
Larimer	3.00	3.00

Table II
(Continued)

	<u>Maximum Welfare Levy</u>	<u>1967 Welfare Levy</u>
Las Animas	3.50	6.00*
Lincoln	2.50	1.30
Logan	2.50	1.40
Mesa	3.50	3.40
Mineral	2.50	.50
Moffat	2.50	1.70
Montezuma	3.50	3.60*
Montrose	3.50	4.00*
Morgan	2.50	3.50*
Otero	3.50	4.09*
Ouray	2.50	1.00
Park	2.50	1.00
Phillips	2.50	1.12
Pitkin	2.50	.11
Prowers	3.00	3.85*
Pueblo	4.00	7.10*
Rio Blanco	2.50	.40
Rio Grande	3.00	3.50*
Routt	2.50	2.50
Saguache	2.50	3.50*
San Juan	2.50	1.50
San Miguel	2.50	.75
Sedgwick	2.50	1.25
Summit	2.50	1.04
Teller	3.00	2.00
Washington	2.50	1.00
Weld	3.00	4.10*
Yuma	2.50	1.90

*Counties exceeding maximum welfare levy limits
as established by 119-3-6, C.R.S. 1963.

Table III
 AVERAGE MONTHLY CASELOADS, BY CATEGORY
 Fiscal Years 1960-61 Through 1966-67

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Total All Categories</u>	<u>Old Age Pension</u>	<u>Aid to Dependent Children</u>	<u>Aid to the Needy Disabled</u>	<u>Aid to the Blind</u>	<u>Tuberculosis Assistance</u>	<u>General Assistance</u>	<u>Child Welfare</u>	<u>Aid to Dependent Children Unemployed Parents</u>	<u>Medical Assistance to the Aged</u>
1960-61	74,072	52,334	7,804	5,662	304	230	3,712 <u>a/</u>	4,026	---	---
1961-62	73,884	51,180	8,447	5,662	277	253	3,441 <u>a/</u>	4,624	---	---
1962-63	74,420	49,996	9,314	5,756	273	232	3,658 <u>a/</u>	5,191	---	---
1963-64	75,172	49,364	10,104	5,941	272	200	3,531 <u>a/</u>	5,760	---	---
1964-65	77,856	44,416	10,771	8,448	278	196	3,457 <u>a/</u>	5,990	---	4,300
1965-66	76,082	42,930	11,744	6,384	261	190	1,817 <u>b/</u>	6,057	280	5,672
1966-67	73,271	41,483	12,197	6,751	253	175	1,745 <u>b/</u>	7,302	1,101	6,040
1967-68	<u>73,076 c/</u>	<u>40,195</u>	<u>13,158</u>	<u>7,036</u>	<u>227</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>1,352</u>	<u>2,875</u>	<u>1,051</u>	<u>6,046</u>
Percent Change from 1960-61	-1.3%	-23.2%	+68.6%	+24.3%	-25.3%	-33.5%	<u>d/</u>	<u>d/</u>	---	---

a/ Also includes cases receiving vendor payments for medical care only.

b/ Since 1965 G.A. cases receiving vendor payments for medical care only have not been included in the average monthly caseload figures.

c/ Includes 473 persons participating in Title V of the Social Security Act.

d/ Figures not comparable.

of the MAA program also had some impact on the caseloads of the Aid to Needy Disabled (AND) and Aid to Blind (AB) programs as some former recipients of these two categories of aid were also transferred to the MAA program because it provides broader medical coverage and receives a greater degree of federal participation. Beginning January 1, 1969, Title XIX will replace the MAA program. Pensioners residing in nursing homes will have their medical needs taken care of by Title XIX and their personal needs by an OAP grant.

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The AFDC category is the only group or class of welfare recipients in which there appears to be a sustained increase in the number of recipients. AFDC incorporates both the Aid to Dependent Children Program and Aid to Dependent Children with an Unemployed Father, commonly referred to as ADC-U in Colorado. In 1961, Congress extended the scope of the ADC program to include unemployed parents, and the title of the program was revised to AFDC. Congress also amended the Social Security Act in 1967, limiting the coverage of ADC-U to families with unemployed fathers, rather than either or both parents. The ADC-U program was included in the Colorado plan in 1966. The average monthly caseload for ADC in 1960-61 was 7,804 or 10.5 percent of the total average monthly caseload in that year. In fiscal year 1967-68 the average monthly caseload for ADC was 13,158 and for ADC-U -- 1,051. Thus total AFDC cases represent 19.4 percent of the total average monthly caseload of all categories of recipients handled by county departments in 1967-68. Since 1960-61, AFDC average monthly caseloads have increased by 82.1 percent.

Under Section 402 of Title IV of the Social Security Act "...A State plan for aid and services to needy families with children must provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them...." (emphasis supplied). This section has been interpreted to mean that, if the state plan for AFDC includes unemployed fathers, all counties must participate in the program. However, according to Division of Welfare data for fiscal year 1966-1967 only 31 counties aided one or more families under the program, and in fiscal year 1967-1968 only 27 counties participated. While some counties may have no eligible recipients it appears unusual that less than half of all the counties in the state are currently participating in the program.

Variations Among Counties in Types of Cases. A substantial difference exists in the types of cases handled by urban and rural counties. In other words, ADC cases are not equally distributed in all counties in comparison to the total county caseload. Table IV attempts to establish a relationship between the number of welfare cases involving the aged and permanently disabled (Group I) and cases involving children (Group II). In general, aged and permanently disabled cases may be classed as permanent cases. Once a person is placed on OAP there is very

little likelihood that the individual will ever get off the welfare rolls. In other words, there is little chance that a pensioner's resources will change to the degree that he will no longer be dependent on welfare. At the same time, the individuals in Group I may need little casework service. If a pensioner is provided with a monthly grant, he often can remain independent for a considerable period of time. On the other hand, there is much more turnover of Group II cases than there is of Group I. If child care services are provided, and the parent can find employment, the Group II family may be able to leave the welfare rolls. Thus, in general, the cases involving children must be classed as service cases, while the majority of aged and permanently disabled cases are non-service in nature. Non-service cases do not require the same level of social work skills as service cases.

In 18 counties, the percentage of cases involving children (ADC, ADC-U, and child welfare) -- Group II -- was less than 10 percent of Group I cases -- OAP, AB, and MAA. In only one of these 18 counties -- Larimer -- is there a significant urban population. On the other hand, in counties with the percentage of Group II cases exceeding 35 percent of the Group I cases, six of these ten counties have large urban populations: Adams, Arapahoe, Denver, El Paso, Pueblo, and Weld. In two-thirds of all the counties, the percentage of Group II cases to Group I cases is less than 20 percent. Again, only two urban counties are in this group -- Larimer and Mesa. In any event, in most rural counties, the major portion of welfare cases include Old Age Pensioners or other permanent type cases. Urban counties, on the other hand, have a substantial number of Group II cases in which a larger portion of recipients have some chance of becoming self-sufficient.

Table IV

RELATIONSHIP OF AVERAGE MONTHLY CASELOADS INVOLVING
AGED AND PERMANENTLY DISABLED (GROUP I) TO
CASES INVOLVING CHILDREN (GROUP II)*

Fiscal Year 1967-68

<u>County</u>	<u>Average Monthly Caseload</u>		<u>Percent Group II is to Group I</u>
	<u>Group I</u>	<u>Group II</u>	
	<u>OAP, MAA, AND, and AB</u>	<u>ADC, CW and ADC-U</u>	
	<u>0.0% to 9.8%</u>		
Baca	278	13	4.6
Cheyenne	97	4	4.1
Custer	82	5	6.0
Delta	1,259	91	7.2
Dolores	57	4	7.0
Elbert	148	8	5.4
Fremont	1,423	137	9.6
Gilpin	44	3	6.8
Hinsdale	3	--	---
Kit Carson	273	18	6.5
Larimer	2,282	224	9.8
Ouray	64	6	9.3
Park	72	6	8.3
Phillips	194	15	7.7
Pitkin	34	2	5.8
San Miguel	62	6	9.6
Sedgwick	137	11	8.0
Yuma	466	43	9.2
No. of Counties 18	6,975	596	8.5
	<u>10.1% to 18.7%</u>		
Alamosa	411	66	16.0
Chaffee	373	50	13.4
Clear Creek	109	12	11.0
Costilla	420	59	14.0
Crowley	247	44	17.8
Douglas	154	16	10.3
Garfield	503	57	11.3
Grand	47	6	12.7
Gunnison	102	12	11.7
Huerfano	784	130	16.5
Kiowa	59	6	10.1
La Plata	791	103	13.0
Lincoln	241	34	14.1

Table IV
(Continued)

Average Monthly
Caseload

<u>County</u>	<u>Group I</u>	<u>Group II</u>	<u>Percent Group II is to Group I</u>
	<u>OAP, MAA, AND, and AB</u>	<u>ADC, CW and ADC-U</u>	
Logan	632	90	14.2
Mesa	2,304	365	15.8
Mineral	16	2	12.5
Moffat	199	26	13.0
Montrose	846	145	17.1
Rio Blanco	116	16	13.7
Rio Grande	495	68	13.7
Routt	201	37	18.4
San Juan	16	3	18.7
Summit	30	4	13.3
Teller	125	18	14.4
Washington	180	29	16.1
No. of Counties 25	9,401	1,398	14.9

21.1% to 27.0%

Archuleta	144	34	23.6
Boulder	1,820	446	24.5
Conejos	661	145	21.9
Eagle	109	23	21.1
Jefferson	1,847	498	26.9
Lake	100	27	27.0
Las Animas	1,560	355	22.7
Montezuma	567	129	22.7
Otero	1,154	299	25.9
Prowers	655	143	21.8
No. of Counties 10	8,617	2,099	24.4

30.0% to 67.2%

Adams	1,741	1,171	67.2
Arapahoe	1,589	522	32.8
Bent	307	97	31.6
Denver	14,161	6,972	49.2
El Paso	2,832	1,213	42.8
Jackson	22	8	36.3
Morgan	708	233	32.9
Saguache	270	81	30.0

Table IV
(Continued)

<u>County</u>	<u>Average Monthly Caseload</u>		<u>Percent Group II is to Group I</u>
	<u>Group I</u>	<u>Group II</u>	
	<u>OAP, MAA AND, and AB</u>	<u>ADC, CW and ADC-U</u>	
Pueblo	3,679	1,422	38.6
Weld	<u>2,680</u>	<u>967</u>	<u>36.0</u>
No. of Counties 10	27,989	12,686	45.3
Grand Total	52,982	16,779	31.6

*Source: Department of Social Services.

Administrative Discretion of Counties

Although the counties contribute about \$14 million per year for welfare programs, county boards of Welfare have little actual influence in determining what programs they will participate in, how much assistance will be given, or who will be eligible to receive assistance. All of these decisions are made at the state or federal level and incorporated into various state plans. One of the first conditions for participation in a categorical grant-in-aid program is that the program will be uniform and administered statewide. The federal government could withhold aid to Colorado's categorical programs if a single county refused or failed to administer these programs in accordance with federal requirements. For this reason, the State Division of Public Welfare maintains a field supervisory staff and a quality control unit. Both of these sections are charged with the responsibility of ensuring that county welfare departments are acting in compliance with state plans. Two federally-aided programs in which the county exercises discretion in deciding whether or not to participate are the Food Stamp and Donated Foods Programs. A county may elect to participate in one or the other or neither of these programs. No state or county funds are involved in the operation of either of these programs, except cost of administration.

Determination of Eligibility

The entire section 3000 of Chapter IV of the Handbook of Public Assistance Administration, Bureau of Public Assistance, deals with the factors that must be considered in determining the eligibility of an applicant for a category of aid. Under Federal regulations, a certain amount of resources and earned income may be disregarded in determining a person's eligibility for assistance. A county cannot adopt more restrictive standards. Section 2200 of Chapter IV of the Handbook outlines the requirements concerning eligibility determination that must be included in state plans. A state plan must provide guidelines for the initial determination of eligibility, as well as periodic redeterminations. Each state plan must be approved by the Bureau of Public Assistance to assure that it is compatible with federal laws and regulations. Once the plan is approved, the state is responsible for seeing that the counties are carrying out their programs in accordance with the state plan. As a result of this process, the county has no voice in establishing the eligibility requirements for persons applying for assistance. The state division ensures that counties are complying with the state plan through periodic checks by the field supervisory staff and the quality control unit. Any person who has been determined ineligible by a county to receive assistance has the right to appeal his case to the State Board of Social Services and the state division will conduct a thorough review of the case to determine if the county based

its denial for assistance on provisions in the state plan. Following these guidelines, the county has little to say as to who is eligible and who is not eligible to receive assistance.

Amounts of Assistance Granted

The several titles of the federal Social Security Act which establish the various categories of assistance (OAP, AB, AND, ADC, etc.) set certain maximum amounts on assistance which is subject to federal participation. However, these amounts found in the federal act and subsequent amendments do not represent a definition of need or a recommended standard of living. (See section 5300, Part IV, Public Assistance Handbook.) The first section of each of the five public assistance titles of the Social Security Act authorizes grants to states to enable each state to furnish assistance "as far as practicable under the conditions of such state." In this manner each state is allowed to establish its own standards of assistance, set within federal maximums, and subject to approval of HEW authorities.

Section 4320.02 of the Colorado State Division of Public Welfare Staff Manual (state plan) outlines the federal requirements regarding standards of assistance:

4320.02 *FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

*The Federal Handbook of Public Assistance Administration, Part IV; 4131, requires the state to establish and uniformly apply throughout the state a standard with respect to the amount of assistance. In such standard, the State must provide a combined standard for the cost of all basic consumption items such as food, clothing, personal needs, and household equipment. The State then can add to this combined standard those extra allowances applicable to shelter cost, special circumstances, and special requirements of individuals.

With respect to special requirement items, the State must specifically describe the circumstances affecting the need of individuals which will be recognized by the inclusion of additional consumption items for all individuals in those circumstances. Differentiation can be made for necessary alternate living arrangements; such as, costs for room and board or restaurant meals, etc.

The state plan outlines, for example, the amounts to be paid to categorical recipients of AB, AND, and ADC payments. In

setting these standards the State Board of Social Services reviews information and data available from such sources as the United States Departments of Agriculture and Labor, the National Industrial Conference Board, and other sources and authorities with respect to components of the assistance needs and amounts necessary to cover these needs. Table V, taken from the staff manual, shows these standards of assistance for basic requirements and these standards apply statewide.

In addition to setting standards of assistance for basic needs which are applicable statewide, the State Board establishes standards for shelter costs. In order to take into account variations in the cost of shelter, utilities, and certain other requirements in different areas of the state, counties have been classified in three zones and shelter standards have been set accordingly. The State Board also has set standards to meet the needs of individuals who are in "special circumstances". The cost of nursing home care for AB and AND recipients is an example of such services. Needless-to-say, the availability of funds is considered in determining the level of allowances for food, clothing, and shelter. And finally, the State Board established standards of payments for individual special needs of recipients to include adult education, job training, etc.

Although it is up to the county to determine the existence and extent of need by computing the individual or family requirements and deducting available income, benefits must conform with the state plan. In other words, the county has little to say about the amount of the grant once the determination of eligibility for receiving assistance has been made. Nevertheless a case-worker can influence the amount of a grant by providing funds for vocational training, child care, etc. Allowances are then made to cover these special costs. However, again the amounts budgeted for such expenses must be in compliance with the standards in the state plan.

In the end then, it is the state, by requiring that the counties act in compliance with the state plan, that determines the amount of assistance a recipient shall receive. A county cannot make a payment to a recipient which is less than that required in the state plan. And in order for a county to extend more assistance to categorical recipients than is allowed in the state plan, a county must turn to its General Assistance fund for such supplemental payments.

Merit System for County Welfare Employees

All county welfare employees are included in a merit system. Section 119-1-12, C.R.S. 1963, requires the State Division of Public Welfare to establish and maintain a merit system for the selection, retention, and promotion of employees of the county departments of public welfare. The merit system is under the direc-

Table V

AMOUNTS ALLOWED IN AND, ADC, AND AB ASSISTANCE
GRANTS FOR BASIC REQUIREMENTS

NUMBER OF ADULTS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN										
	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>
0	XXX	\$ 26	\$ 52	\$ 78	\$104	\$130	\$156	\$177	\$198	\$219	\$240
1 living alone	38	XXX									
1 living with others	34	60	86	112	138	164	185	206	227	248	269
2	64	90	116	142	168	189	210	231	252	273	294

tion of a three-man council. Briefly, federal law requires that as a condition for receiving federal grant-in-aid monies for the various public assistance programs authorized under the Social Security Act, a state must establish a merit system for all welfare workers administering federal assistance payments.^{2/}

Approval of County Welfare Positions. Although county welfare boards must approve the creation of new county welfare positions, there are so many federal and state regulations and guidelines, such as the caseload standards, caseworker-supervisor ratios, etc., discussed below, that the approval of the county commissioners is in reality nothing more than a rubber stamp endorsement of a decision made at another level. The state pays approximately 35 percent of county administrative expenses, the federal government pays about 48 percent and the remaining 17 percent is paid by the county. The state approves requests for county welfare positions under the direction of the division director. The State Board of Social Services does not review requests for new positions of the individual counties. However, the State Board does exercise some control over the total number of new county welfare positions authorized, because the board must approve the department's budget request before it is submitted for consideration by the Governor, the Joint Budget Committee, and the General Assembly.

Selection of Employees. County commissioners must give final approval to employment of persons in their respective county welfare departments. However, here too their hands are tied by policies and procedures established by the Merit System Council. The commissioners must select persons to fill these positions from a register of names supplied to them by the Civil Service Commission of people who have passed the examinations, met the necessary requirements, and who have expressed an interest in working in that county. If a registry is available, the county must fill its vacancies from the list of names. If no one on the register accepts the position or no register is available for that county, the county may appoint someone on a provisional basis. In order to become a permanent employee, the person must pass the examinations and finish highest in the merit competition.

Compensation. The Merit System Council issues a list of county compensation schedules to be used by the counties in determining salary schedules. The county boards of welfare may select one of three options for payment of professional personnel (administrative, technical, and social service staff). Similar to state civil service employees, county welfare personnel participate in a six-step salary increment program for each position.

^{2/} "Social Security Act," Title XVI, Section 1602 (a) (5).

The over-all compensation plan for professional personnel of county welfare departments lists nine steps. Thus a county may choose to pay a beginning employee the salary listed in step one, step two or step three.

An even broader range of salary schedule options is given for clerical, stenographic and related positions. In order to allow for the difference in wage rates, the Merit System Council provides optional compensation plans for metropolitan and non-metropolitan counties. In general, the entry level compensation for clerical workers in the counties selecting the metropolitan plans are higher than those offered in other pay plans. On the other hand, the compensation plan offered in the non-metropolitan list offers the widest range of choices in the selection of compensation schedules. In selecting a pay schedule, the counties must utilize the same consecutive steps for each position offered in the compensation schedule.

Whenever the State Board of Social Services determines that there is a need for an increase in compensation for county welfare employees, based on recommendations by the Civil Service Commission and the Merit System Council, the counties are informed of the increase and directed to adjust their welfare compensation plans accordingly. A five percent cost of living increase, for example, is usually effected by instructing the counties to drop the lowest step on their salary schedules and add a new step on the top as each step represents an increment of approximately five percent.

Many county commissioners object to having the state dictate compensation plans for county welfare employees. Members of the County Commissioners Association expressed opposition to the recently adopted Merit System Compensation Plan at the July meeting of the Legislative Council Committee on Welfare. They contended that: 1) the salary schedules do not reflect the cost of living in the different counties; 2) schedules do not take into consideration the county's ability to meet its share of the administrative expense; and 3) the compensation plan for welfare employees is out of line (often higher) with the salaries paid to other county employees. Hence considerable friction exists between welfare employees and other county employees housed in county court houses.

It has been reported that some counties have neglected to grant either the annual salary increment which is recommended or the bi-annual merit increase which is required by the Merit System Council. The only way that welfare employees in these counties have advanced from step one on the county compensation plan is that the state has required a statewide salary increase and the county has been forced to drop the lowest step on its compensation plan.

Federal Caseworker - Caseload Ratios

Federal government regulations have a substantial impact on the personnel practices of county welfare departments. Caseworker-caseload and caseworker-supervisor ratios established by the federal government must be met as a condition to receiving maximum federal grant-in-aid funds. For example, for caseworkers participating in administration of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, the federal government requires that the caseload for each caseworker should not exceed 60 cases.^{3/} In addition, the federal standards for caseworker to supervisor ratios are established at five to one for all categories of cases. The federal government also has regulations establishing minimum educational requirements for caseworkers administering federally-aided categorical programs. For example, a beginning caseworker must have a college education, and a person in a supervisory capacity must have a bachelor's degree as well as a minimum of two years experience in a social work position or the equivalent in graduate training in an accredited school of social work.^{4/}

State Caseload Standards

The State Division of Public Welfare has established guidelines for the maximum caseloads an individual worker can carry, and these ratios have been approved by HEW. The caseworker-caseload ratios are based on the average time a caseworker must spend with various classes of recipients. The ratios established by the division are as follows: All service cases (ADC, ADC-U, and Child Welfare, and cases in other categories requiring services), 60 cases per worker; OAP non-service cases, 500 cases per worker; MAA, AND, AB and GA (General Assistance) non-service cases, 180 cases per caseworker; and food stamp and donated food cases, 300 cases per worker. All categories of cases require the same five to one ratio of caseworkers to supervisors. If these ratios are not achieved, the amount of federal reimbursement of personnel expense for service caseworkers drops from seventy-five percent of cost to 50 percent of cost.^{5/} Fortunately, both vacant and filled positions are counted in determining whether a county is meeting caseworker standards. On paper, it may appear that a county has sufficient staff to handle its caseload, but the actual number of cases a caseworker is handling may far exceed established ratios because of vacant positions. Rural

^{3/} Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Handbook of Public Assistance Administration, Part IV, Section 4675.

^{4/} Ibid., Part III, Section 4200.

^{5/} Ibid., Part IV, Section 4260.

counties, in particular, find it extremely difficult to recruit caseworkers who meet federal and state requirements.

General Assistance

The single welfare matter in which county boards of welfare exercise sole decision-making authority is in the granting of General Assistance. The county property tax is the only source of revenue for this program. Neither the federal government nor the state participate in the financing of General Assistance. Since the General Assistance program is financed 100 percent with county funds, responsibility for setting the amount of the General Assistance fund, determining eligibility requirements for receiving such assistance, and final approval of applicants for aid lies with the county commissioners. Section 119-3-6. C.R.S. 1963, limits the property tax revenues that can be used to support the local share of all welfare programs, however.

The amount of General Assistance varies greatly from county to county since the tax base is different in each county. Generally it can be said that the more affluent counties have more funds available for General Assistance and the poorer counties have relatively smaller General Assistance budgets. In the small counties, where funds are limited, the county commissioners maintain a rather tight control on General Assistance expenditures. In some counties, the entire board of commissioners may either approve or deny each application for assistance. In other counties, the commissioners may require the welfare director to contact a member of the board to obtain authorization for a payment. On the other hand, in the larger, wealthier counties, the commissioners may merely establish guidelines outlining income and resource requirements to be used in determining eligibility and listing items the county will and will not pay. The county departments merely follow these guidelines in authorizing payments. In these counties, the commissioners seldom act on individual cases unless a special request for review is made.

Summary of Problems Encountered by Counties
in Administration of Welfare

Perhaps the major problem facing counties in the administration of welfare is the same issue that federal and state governments have difficulty in resolving, namely, providing funds to support programs. Eighteen counties now exceed their statutory property tax mill levy limits, the only source of county funds to support welfare programs. Even more important is that the counties with the smallest per capita adjusted gross income must put forth the greatest effort to meet the county share of welfare obligations. Table VI lists an index of the effort made by counties to meet welfare expenditures. The four counties with per capita adjusted gross incomes of less than \$1,000 are putting forth the most effort in support of welfare programs. In fact, the index of effort listed in Table VI reveals that the five counties putting forth the greatest effort -- Costilla, Huerfano, Saguache, Conejos, and Las Animas -- are making five times the effort of the 23 counties with the least county expenditures for welfare in relation to county adjusted gross income. In other words, the counties with the least ability to pay have the highest number of welfare cases in relation to total population.

For the poorer counties of the state, the lack of county funds may not only prevent the provision of services normally made available under county General Assistance programs, but also may keep these counties from meeting standards required by the federal government. State plans for categorical programs are supposed to be applicable in all subdivisions of the state. Furthermore, the lack of services in these counties also may encourage welfare recipients or potential welfare recipients to migrate to areas in which services and assistance are available, suggesting that an unfair burden may be placed on another county. The increasing mobility of welfare recipients may aggravate the migration problem.

Other problems with respect to the administration of welfare programs by counties include:

(1) Recent trends in county welfare expenditures show an increase in the costs of welfare services and cases in programs in which the county boards of welfare can exercise the least control. In other words, General Assistance expenditures are declining, while categorical program expenditures are increasing.

(2) The development of cooperative programs to formulate welfare districts which could allow for more economic and efficient use of county welfare personnel alone will not solve the problem of poor counties. For instance, if a welfare district were formed in the San Luis Valley, the district probably would be hard pressed to meet its financial obligations, since the district would be made up of some of the poorest counties in the

Table VI

RELATIONSHIP OF PER CAPITA ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME TO
PER CAPITA EXPENDITURES FOR WELFARE

-- By County --

County	(1) Estimated Population 1967A/	(2) Average No. Welfare Recipients -- 1967B/	(3) Per Capita Adjusted gross IncomeC/	(4) Per Capita County Expend- itures for WelfareD/	(5) Index of County Ef- fort Col. (4) + Col. (3)	(6) Percent of Pop- ulation Receiv- ing Public AssistanceE/
Costilla	3,700	683	\$ 482	\$10.66	2.212	18.5%
Huerfano	8,000	1,532	958	15.16	1.582	19.2
Saguache	4,300	566	998	10.34	1.361	13.2
Conejos	8,300	1,301	687	8.90	1.295	15.7
Las Animas	16,800	2,996	1,197	15.26	1.275	17.8
Bent	6,800	670	1,279	8.68	.679	9.9
Crowley	3,400	422	1,328	8.55	.644	12.4
Gilpin	800	73	1,734	10.92	.630	9.1
Pueblo	122,900	8,699	1,882	10.59	.563	7.1
Weld	81,000	5,828	1,672	9.21	.551	7.2
Montezuma	13,600	1,066	1,485	7.92	.533	7.8
Rio Grande	11,500	933	1,283	6.77	.528	8.1
Otero	24,800	2,306	1,501	7.68	.512	9.3
Routt	6,300	362	1,594	8.01	.503	5.7
Prowers	13,200	1,232	1,646	8.12	.493	9.3
Delta	15,300	1,670	1,368	6.64	.485	10.9
Cheyenne	2,700	114	1,522	6.80	.447	4.2
Yuma	8,600	555	1,517	6.61	.436	6.5
Teller	3,000	195	1,426	6.14	.431	6.5
Denver	477,000	40,470	2,530	10.83	.428	8.5
Kiowa	2,200	95	1,854	7.75	.418	4.3
Montrose	20,400	1,390	1,485	6.21	.418	6.8
Morgan	19,400	1,541	1,735	7.21	.416	7.9
Washington	5,900	272	1,487	6.15	.414	4.6
Archuleta	2,700	266	1,623	6.49	.400	9.9

Table VI
(Continued)

County	(1) Estimated Population 1967 ^{A/}	(2) Average No. Welfare Recipients -- 1967 ^{B/}	(3) Per Capita Adjusted gross Income ^{C/}	(4) Per Capita County Expend- itures for Welfare ^{D/}	(5) Index of County Ef- fort Col. (4) + Col. (3)	(6) Percent of Pop- ulation Receiv- ing Public Assistance ^{E/}
Jackson	1,600	59	\$1,849	\$ 6.65	.360	3.7%
Larimer	70,000	4,128	1,953	6.67	.346	5.9
Mesa	53,000	3,564	1,918	6.58	.343	6.7
La Plata	18,100	1,152	1,691	5.72	.338	6.4
Dolores	1,700	82	1,758	5.85	.333	4.9
Fremont	21,600	1,958	1,370	4.46	.326	9.1
Custer	1,200	104	1,114	3.52	.316	8.7
Park	1,600	82	1,580	4.96	.314	5.1
El Paso	202,000	6,268	1,711	5.02	.293	3.1
Ouray	1,700	82	1,321	3.76	.283	4.8
Moffat	6,900	325	1,767	4.96	.281	4.7
Alamosa	10,000	689	1,681	4.70	.280	6.9
Clear Creek	3,600	158	2,410	6.47	.268	4.4
Sedgwick	3,800	180	1,854	4.92	.265	4.7
Elbert	3,900	191	1,159	2.97	.256	4.9
Phillips	4,200	241	1,886	4.66	.247	5.7
Baca	6,300	346	1,345	3.30	.245	5.5
Lincoln	4,900	294	1,800	4.41	.245	6.0
Logan	20,000	936	1,735	4.22	.243	4.7
Eagle	5,400	227	2,181	4.62	.212	4.2
San Juan	950	40	1,760	3.63	.206	4.2
Adams	163,000	5,504	2,102	4.26	.202	3.4
Boulder	110,000	3,218	2,378	4.69	.197	2.9
Kit Carson	7,300	316	1,774	3.44	.194	4.3
Rio Blanco	5,000	177	1,862	3.55	.191	3.5

Table VI
(Continued)

County	(1) Estimated Population 1967A/	(2) Average No. Welfare Recipients -- 1967B/	(3) Per Capita Adjusted gross IncomeC/	(4) Per Capita County Expend- itures for WelfareD/	(5) Index of County Ef- fort Col. (4) + Col. (3)	(6) Percent of Pop- ulation Receiv- ing Public AssistanceE/
San Miguel	2,100	92	\$1,557	\$2.89	.186	4.4%
Hinsdale	150	5	1,547	2.75	.178	3.3
Garfield	14,000	665	2,173	3.82	.176	4.8
Summit	1,900	38	1,925	3.16	.164	2.0
Chaffee	9,800	550	1,919	2.63	.137	5.6
Gunnison	6,400	173	1,628	1.97	.121	2.7
Lake	9,000	168	2,322	2.69	.116	1.9
Arapahoe	139,000	3,282	2,952	2.89	.098	2.4
Grand	3,700	77	2,192	1.93	.088	2.1
Douglas	6,500	212	2,116	1.70	.080	3.3
Jefferson	209,000	3,343	2,642	1.75	.066	1.6
Mineral	550	24	1,957	.97	.050	4.4
Pitkin	3,200	45	3,781	1.13	.030	1.4

A/ Division of Accounts and Control, State Budget Office.
 B/ Figures from 1966-67 Colorado Public Welfare Fiscal Report.
 C/ Fiscal year ended June, 1967.
 D/ Fiscal year 1966-67.
 E/ Column (2) + Column (1).

state. Furthermore, wealthy counties will be unwilling to form districts with poorer counties if it means an added expense to these counties.

(3) Nationally, there is increased concern that the level of assistance provided to various classes of welfare recipients is not uniform. Pensioners receive a larger payment than other classes of recipients. Title XVI of the Social Security Act is optional; however, if the federal government should require implementation of Title XVI, the cost of the ADC, AB, and AND programs would increase substantially. Needless-to-say, unless the formulae for county participation change, a substantial increase in the level of the local share of costs could result. The property tax may not provide the necessary flexibility to support added program costs resulting from changes in national policy.

(4) The continued up-grading of staff, with corresponding increases in salaries, also is making it exceedingly difficult for many rural counties to meet administrative costs. Again, these program improvements are the result of changes in federal and state policy. In view of the variation in types of cases handled by different counties, especially the higher percentage of nonservice cases in rural counties compared to urban counties, the federal-state staff requirements may be too stringent for a county administered program.

(5) Rural counties and some urban counties are encountering difficulty in recruiting and keeping staff. Even with higher salaries, the college graduate may not be willing to settle in the rural parts of the state, particularly in the distressed counties of the San Luis Valley.

(6) The welfare needs of nonresidents or transients passing through the state are now funded from the county General Assistance program. County officials have expressed concern that this responsibility should be borne in part by the state.

(7) Although the reduction in the number of patients in state hospitals has resulted in savings in state expenditures, county welfare departments have sustained an increase in caseloads to meet the needs of persons released from these institutions. Institutional care is far more expensive than supporting an individual in the local community; however, the counties are faced with meeting part of the support of some persons for which they were not responsible in previous years. Perhaps this is an area in which the state could assume the entire obligation.

(8) Over-all, county caseloads have remained fairly stable. Nevertheless, increased services required by federal and state governments have resulted in substantial increases in costs of administration for counties.

STATE ADMINISTRATION OF WELFARE --
FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

In 1968, the General Assembly enacted legislation to implement Title XIX of the Social Security Act. In considering this legislation the General Assembly could have required the counties to finance part of the cost of the Title XIX program. If the General Assembly exercised this option, an equalization formula (similar to the "School Foundation Act") would have to have been implemented. Rather than placing an additional burden on the counties, the General Assembly elected to finance the non-federal share entirely from state funds. Thus, in a sense, the General Assembly already has taken steps to increase state participation in meeting the welfare problems of Colorado citizens. Perhaps the first step in relating county welfare administration to a state program is a comparison of the salaries of county welfare workers to salaries of comparable positions in state government. Such a comparison plus the possible total cost of the transfer of county welfare workers to the state payroll follows:

Comparison of Salaries -- County
Welfare and State Employees

The staff of the State Civil Service Commission reviewed the job specifications of county welfare positions and assigned a state civil service grade, reflecting comparable responsibilities, to each position. On the basis of this information, a comparison can be made between salaries paid to state employees and salaries paid to county welfare workers (see Table VII). In general, for professional employees, the salary range for county personnel contained in Table VII lists the lowest and highest amount that can be paid for a given position. However, in some instances, where a position exists in only a few counties, the salary range is based on the salary schedule actually in effect. For instance, starting pay scales for welfare positions in Denver are at the maximum allowed by the Merit System Council. Altogether, 38 counties have elected to pay their professional employees at the minimum rate permitted by the Merit System Council.

In order to make a realistic comparison of clerical employee salaries of county welfare workers with similar positions in state government, the actual schedule for metropolitan counties, as well as an intermediate range of salaries for non-metropolitan counties, have been included in Table VII. An intermediate range of salaries for non-metropolitan counties was utilized because only a few of the counties -- Archuleta, Crowley, Delta, Logan, Montrose, Ouray, and Prowers -- utilize the lowest salary schedule.

Table VII

COMPARISON OF THE RANGE OF SALARIES OFFERED UNDER THE COUNTY WELFARE EMPLOYEES MERIT SYSTEM
WITH COMPARABLE SALARIES PAID UNDER STATE CIVIL SERVICE

Administrative, Social Service, and Technical

(1) Class Title	(2) Possible Civil Service Grade Effective July, 1968	(3) Present Pay Range Steps 1 - Seniority Merit System 1/	(4) Proposed Pay Range Under Civil Service	(5) Percent Difference Between Entry Level Salaries	(6) Dollar Differ- ence in Entry Level Salaries Col. (4) minus Col. (3)
Director (Denver) ^{2/}	36	\$1,122 - \$1,463	\$1,185 - \$1,588	+ 5.6%	\$ + 63
Deputy Director (Denver)	31	897 - 1,173	928 - 1,244	+ 3.5	+ 31
Director V	31	858 - 1,173	928 - 1,244	+ 8.2	+ 70
Director IV	30	751 - 1,073	884 - 1,185	+ 17.7	+ 133
Assistant County Director	28	687 - 981	802 - 1,075	+ 16.7	+ 115
Director III	26	628 - 897	727 - 975	+ 15.8	+ 99
Director II	24	525 - 751	660 - 884	+ 25.7	+ 135
Director I	22	458 - 657	598 - 802	+ 30.6	+ 140
Special Project Director	30	821 - 1,173	884 - 1,185	+ 7.7	+ 63
Supervisor Social Services (D)	29	785 - 1,122	842 - 1,128	+ 7.3	+ 57
Supervisor Child Welfare Services II	28	751 - 1,073	802 - 1,075	+ 6.8	+ 51
Supervisor Child Welfare Services I	26	657 - 938	727 - 975	+ 10.7	+ 70
Supervisor Public Assistance (D)	27	718 - 1,026	764 - 1,023	+ 6.4	+ 46
Consultant on Community Services	27	718 - 1,026	764 - 1,023	+ 6.4	+ 46
Staff Development Specialist II (D)	28	751 - 981	802 - 1,075	+ 6.8	+ 51
Staff Development Specialist I (D)	27	628 - 897	764 - 1,023	+ 2.2	+ 136
Caseworker Supervisor III	26	657 - 938	727 - 975	+ 10.7	+ 70
Caseworker Supervisor II	25	601 - 858	693 - 928	+ 15.3	+ 92
Caseworker Supervisor I	24	550 - 785	660 - 884	+ 20.0	+ 110
Medical Social Consultant (D)	26	718 - 938	727 - 975	+ 1.3	+ 9
Administrative Aide	22	500 - 718	598 - 802	+ 19.6	+ 98
Group Worker Consultant	26	628 - 897	727 - 975	+ 15.7	+ 99
Senior Child Welfare Worker	24	601 - 858	660 - 884	+ 9.8	+ 59
Child Welfare Worker	23	525 - 751	628 - 842	+ 19.6	+ 103
Group Worker	23	525 - 751	628 - 842	+ 19.6	+ 103
Caseworker IV	23	525 - 751	628 - 842	+ 19.6	+ 103
Caseworker III	22	479 - 718	598 - 802	+ 25.0	+ 119
Caseworker Special Services	22	479 - 718	598 - 802	+ 25.0	+ 119
Caseworker II	21	438 - 628	570 - 764	+ 30.1	+ 132
Caseworker I	20	419 - 601	543 - 728	+ 29.6	+ 124

- 1/ Present pay ranges based on County Compensation Schedule A for administrative, social service, and technical employees, steps 1 (minimum) through seniority (maximum), except for positions that are unique to Denver.
- 2/ All positions which are included in Denver's staffing plan only are marked (D), and the salary range reflects the highest salary schedule option.

Table VII
(continued)

(1) Class Title	(2) Possible Civil Service Grade Effective July, 1968	(3) Present Pay Range Steps 1 - Seniority Merit System 1/	(4) Proposed Pay Range Under Civil Service	(5) Percent Difference Between Entry Level Salaries	(6) Dollar Differ- ence in Entry Level Salaries Col. (4) minus Col. (3)
Supervisor, Administrative Services (D)	28	\$ 785 - \$1,026	\$ 802 - \$1,075	+ 2.7%	\$ + 17
Supervisor, Research and Statistics (D)	28	751 - 981	802 - 1,075	+ 6.8	+ 51
Personnel Officer II (D)	28	751 - 981	802 - 1,075	+ 6.8	+ 51
Personnel Officer I (D)	25	628 - 821	693 - 928	+ 10.4	+ 65
Administrative Analyst II (D)	24	657 - 858	660 - 884	+ 4.6	+ 3
Administrative Analyst I (D)	22	550 - 718	598 - 802	+ 8.7	+ 48
Administrative Assistant	25	575 - 821	693 - 928	+ 20.5	+ 118
Supervisor, Business Office	22	525 - 751	598 - 802	+ 13.9	+ 73
Supervisor, Investigating Services (D)	22	575 - 751	598 - 802	+ 4.0	+ 23
Supervisor, Housing Services (D)	23	575 - 751	628 - 842	+ 9.2	+ 53
Employment Counselor II (D)	24	575 - 751	660 - 884	+ 14.8	+ 85
Employment Counselor I (D)	22	525 - 687	598 - 802	+ 13.9	+ 73
Research Analyst (D)	22	550 - 718	598 - 802	+ 8.7	+ 48
Data Processing Supervisor (D)	21	525 - 628	570 - 764	+ 8.6	+ 45
Resource Investigator	19	438 - 628	517 - 693	+ 18.0	+ 79
Project Director II	23	525 - 751	628 - 842	+ 19.6	+ 103
Project Director I	21	479 - 687	570 - 764	+ 19.0	+ 91
Housing Field Worker (D)	20	500 - 657	543 - 727	+ 8.6	+ 43
Recovery Agent (D)	18	438 - 575	492 - 660	+ 12.3	+ 54
Public Welfare Aide II	12	335 - 479	367 - 492	+ 9.6	+ 32
Public Welfare Aide I	10	280 - 400	333 - 447	+ 18.9	+ 53
Day Care Nursery Teacher	22	479 - 687	598 - 802	+ 24.8	+ 119
Home Economic Teacher II	21	479 - 687	570 - 764	+ 19.0	+ 91
Home Economic Teacher I	20	438 - 628	543 - 727	+ 24.0	+ 105
Day Care Nursery, Group Leader	20	400 - 575	543 - 727	+ 35.8	+ 143
Day Care Nursery, Teacher Aide	10	280 - 400	333 - 447	+ 18.9	+ 53
Homemaker (Metro.)	10	293 - 419	333 - 447	+ 13.7	+ 40
Home Aide	10	280 - 400	333 - 447	+ 18.9	+ 53

Table VII
(Continued)

COMPARISON OF THE RANGE OF SALARIES OFFERED UNDER THE COUNTY WELFARE EMPLOYEES MERIT SYSTEM
WITH COMPARABLE SALARIES PAID UNDER STATE CIVIL SERVICE

County Clerical and Related Classes

(1) Clerical Class Titles	(2) Possible Civil Service Grade Effective July, 1968	(3) Intermediate Pay Range -- County Welfare Employees	(4) Proposed Pay Range Under State Civil Service	(5) Percent Differ- ence Between Col. (3) and Col. (4)	(6) Dollar Differ- ence in Entry Level Salaries Col. (4) minus Col. (3)
Clerk-Steno IV	17	\$458 - \$601-B	\$469 - \$628	+ 2.4%	\$ + 11
	17	400 - 525-C	469 - 628	+ 17.3	+ 69
Clerk-Steno III	14	419 - 550-B	405 - 543	- 3.3	- 14
	14	366 - 479-C	405 - 543	+ 10.7	+ 39
Clerk-Steno II	11	383 - 500-B	350 - 469	- 8.6	- 13
	11	320 - 419-C	350 - 469	+ 9.4	+ 30
Clerk-Steno I	9	350 - 458-B	317 - 425	- 9.4	- 33
	9	293 - 383-C	317 - 425	+ 8.2	+ 24
Clerk-Typist III	13	383 - 500-B	386 - 517	+ .78	+ 3
	13	320 - 419-C	386 - 517	+ 20.6	+ 66
Transcribe Machine Typist II	13	383 - 500-B	386 - 517	+ .78	+ 3
	13	335 - 438-C	386 - 517	+ 15.2	+ 51
Transcribe Machine Typist I	11	350 - 458-B	350 - 469	0	0
	11	306 - 400-C	350 - 469	+ 14.4	+ 44
Clerk-Typist II	10	335 - 438-B	333 - 447	- .60	- 2
	10	293 - 383-C	333 - 447	+ 13.7	+ 40
Clerk-Typist I	8	306 - 400-B	302 - 405	- 1.3	- 4
	8	280 - 366-C	302 - 405	+ 7.9	+ 22
Clerk IV	18	479 - 628-B	492 - 660	+ 2.7	+ 13
	18	400 - 525-C	492 - 660	+ 23.0	+ 92
Clerk III	13	400 - 525-B	386 - 517	- 3.5	- 14
	13	350 - 458-C	386 - 517	+ 10.3	+ 36
Clerk II	10	335 - 438-B	333 - 447	- .60	- 2
	10	293 - 383-C	333 - 447	+ 13.7	+ 40
Clerk I	7	293 - 383-B	288 - 386	- 1.7	- 5
	7	268 - 350-C	288 - 386	+ 7.5	+ 20
Principal Personnel Clerk	16	438 - 575-B	447 - 598	+ 2.1	+ 9
Personnel Clerk	13	383 - 500-B	386 - 517	+ .78	+ 3
Assistant Business Office Supervisor	17	438 - 575-B	469 - 628	+ 7.1	+ 31
	17	383 - 500-C	469 - 628	+ 22.5	+ 86
Accounting Clerk	16	438 - 575-B	447 - 598	+ 2.1	+ 9

B - Maximum salary schedules used by the Adams, Arapahoe, Denver, and Jefferson County Departments of Public Welfare.
C - Salary schedules used by 14 of the counties for their clerical and related staff. Chosen because it represents the "middle ground" between the higher and lower salary step plans on Schedule C and thus gives the truest picture of average percentage and dollar changes.

Table VII
(continued)

(1) Clerical Class Titles	(2) Possible Civil Service Grade Effective July, 1968	(3) Intermediate Pay Range -- County Welfare Employees	(4) Proposed Pay Range Under State Civil Service	(5) Percent Differ- ence Between Col. (3) and Col. (4)	(6) Dollar Differ- ence in Entry Level Salaries Col. (4) minus Col. (3)
Tabulation Equipment Operator	15	\$438 - 575-B	\$425 - 570	- 3.0%	\$ - 13
Duplicating Equipment Operator	11	419 - 550-B	350 - 469	- 16.5	- 69
Accounting Machine Operator	13	400 - 525-B	386 - 517	- 3.5	- 14
Clerk-Bookkeeper	13	400 - 525-B	386 - 517	- 3.5	- 14
Senior Key Punch Operator	12	366 - 479-B	367 - 492	+ .27	+ 1
Key Punch Operator	10	350 - 458-B	333 - 447	- 4.9	- 17
Switchboard Operator II	12	400 - 525-B	367 - 492	- 8.3	- 33
Switchboard Operator I	10	350 - 458-B	333 - 447	- 4.9	- 17
Delivery Clerk	11	366 - 479-B	350 - 469	- 4.4	- 16
Drafting Clerk	11	366 - 479-B	350 - 469	- 4.4	- 16
Commodity Clerk II	12	366 - 479-B	367 - 492	+ .27	+ 1
Commodity Clerk II	12	320 - 419-C	367 - 492	+ 14.7	+ 47
Commodity Clerk I	8	306 - 400-B	302 - 405	- 1.3	- 4
	8	268 - 350-C	302 - 405	+ 12.7	+ 34
Messenger Clerk	7	293 - 383-B	288 - 386	- 1.7	- 5
Data Conversion Equipment Operator	11	366 - 479-B	350 - 469	- 4.4	- 16
Homemaker (Non-Metro.)	10	268 - 350-C	333 - 447	+ 24.3	+ 65
Home Aide	10	268 - 350-C	333 - 447	+ 24.3	+ 65
Day Care Nursery Teacher Aide	10	268 - 350-C	333 - 467	+ 24.3	+ 65
Average				10.0%	

In general, salaries at the entry level for professional county welfare employees are significantly less than salaries paid for similar responsibilities in state government. A beginning caseworker under state employment, starting at grade 20, would receive \$543 per month, compared to the minimum entry salary under the Merit System Council of \$419 per month. For this position, the state salary is nearly 30 percent greater. Salaries for clerical employees, on the other hand, are more competitive with state salaries. In a number of instances, state salaries for clerical positions may even be less than salaries offered to certain clerical personnel under the county merit plan. In total, however, the starting salaries for both professional and clerical county welfare personnel are about 10 percent less than salaries for comparable State Civil Service positions.

Possible Cost of Transferring County Welfare Personnel to State Civil Service

As previously stated, entry level salaries are about 10 percent higher under State Civil Service. Table VIII illustrates the cost of three possible options for transferring county welfare employees to a state program. First-of-all, under Option I, if the county welfare workers simply were transferred to the equivalent grade level of State Civil Service (the same level of responsibility), without regard to tenure and experience, there would only be a slight increase in expenses for personnel services -- roughly three percent statewide. The difference in personnel expenditures in individual counties for welfare workers, however, would range widely. Some welfare worker salaries could even decrease in specific counties -- Arapahoe, Costilla, Denver, Eagle, Jackson, Kiowa, Summit and Teller.

On the other hand, personnel expenses for welfare workers in Ouray County would increase 32 percent and over 20 percent in Chaffee, Lincoln, Logan, Phillips, Prowers, San Juan, and San Miguel Counties. Under Option I, no consideration would be given to county welfare employees with respect to experience acquired under county administration, except, of course, with respect to being placed in a position with similar responsibilities at the state level.

Option II. A second option for transferring county welfare employees to State Civil Service could provide for the transfer of county welfare workers to state positions at the same relative level of responsibility as provided in Option I; however, a condition would be set forth that the worker must be placed in a step that would permit the individual to receive at least the same salary he presently receives under the county merit plan. This plan would mean an increase in personnel costs of local welfare workers of a little over nine percent.

Table VIII

COST OF TRANSFERRING COUNTY WELFARE PERSONNEL FROM PRESENT MERIT SYSTEM PAY PLANS
ONTO CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES, COMPUTED ON A MONTHLY BASIS

(1) County	(2) Present Salary +4.4% Social Security a/	(3) Civil Service +6% P.E.R.A. Option I b/	(4) Percentage Difference Between Present Mer- it System Salary and Option I	(5) Civil Service +6% P.E.R.A. Option II c/	(6) Percentage Difference Between Present Mer- it System Salary and Option II	(7) Civil Service +6% P.E.R.A. Option III d/	(8) Percentage Difference Between Present Mer- it System Salary and Option III
Adams	\$ 45,522	\$ 46,250	1.60%	\$ 49,026	7.70%	51,958	14.14%
Alamosa	3,558	4,232	18.94	4,232	18.94	4,421	24.26
Arapahoe	39,446	38,760	- 1.74	41,929	6.29	43,712	10.81
Archuleta	1,654	1,948	17.78	1,981	19.77	1,981	19.77
Baca	1,551	1,611	3.87	1,704	9.86	1,784	13.73
Bent	4,456	4,879	8.82	4,975	11.65	5,500	23.43
Boulder	30,166	31,124	3.18	32,210	6.78	34,260	13.57
Chaffee	3,276	4,028	22.95	4,028	22.95	4,075	24.39
Cheyenne	1,065	1,109	4.13	1,150	7.98	1,358	27.51
Clear Creek	1,767	2,037	15.28	2,057	16.41	2,267	28.30
Conejos	7,055	7,849	11.25	7,919	12.25	8,275	17.29
Costilla	4,428	4,407	- .47	4,704	6.23	4,918	11.07
Crowley	1,880	2,204	17.23	2,204	17.23	2,473	31.54
Custer	948	987	4.11	1,043	10.02	1,190	25.53
Delta	7,205	8,515	18.18	8,594	19.28	9,279	28.79
Denver	348,783	331,327	- 5.0	368,437	5.64	391,089	12.13
Dolores	966	987	2.17	1,063	10.04	1,208	25.05
Douglas	982	1,053	7.23	1,089	10.90	1,244	26.68
Eagle	1,686	1,646	- 2.37	1,772	5.10	2,055	21.89
Elbert	1,562	1,718	9.99	1,718	9.99	1,880	20.36
El Paso	75,324	83,080	10.30	84,562	12.26	90,688	20.40
Fremont	12,773	14,885	16.53	15,048	17.81	15,473	21.14
Garfield	4,380	4,898	11.83	4,963	13.31	5,405	23.40
Gilpin	1,227	1,406	14.59	1,406	14.59	1,531	24.76
Grand	1,193	1,396	17.02	1,396	17.02	1,469	23.13

- a/ Present personnel costs to the counties were figured on the basis of July 1968 salaries of all filled, vacant, and approved requested positions.
- b/ Option I brings Welfare employees under Civil Service salaries, on the equivalent grade at Step I.
- c/ Option II brings Welfare employees under Civil Service Compensation plan with no reduction in salary from their present merit pay.
- d/ Option III brings Welfare employees under the Civil Service compensation plan on the equivalent grade and on the same salary step they were on under the Merit System.

Table VIII
(Continued)

(1) County	(2) Present Salary +4.4% Social Security a/	(3) Civil Service +6% P.E.R.A. Option I b/	(4) Percentage Difference Between Present Mer- it System Salary and Option I	(5) Civil Service +6% P.E.R.A. Option II c/	(6) Percentage Difference Between Present Mer- it System Salary and Option II	(7) Civil Service +6% P.E.R.A. Option III d/	(8) Percentage Difference Between Present Mer- it System Salary and Option III
Gunnison - Hinsdale	\$ 1,436	\$ 1,611	12.19%	\$ 1,611	12.19%	\$ 1,850	28.83%
Huerfano	11,096	12,312	10.96	12,703	14.48	13,671	23.21
Jackson	656	634	- 3.35	667	1.68	850	29.57
Jefferson	40,344	40,597	.63	43,370	7.50	45,713	14.31
Kiowa	717	700	- 2.37	735	2.51	937	30.68
Kit Carson	2,450	2,557	4.37	2,629	7.31	3,125	27.55
Lake	2,657	2,860	7.64	2,953	11.14	3,026	13.89
La Plata	8,376	9,216	10.03	9,511	13.55	10,405	24.22
Larimer	34,661	38,503	11.08	39,415	13.72	42,822	23.55
Las Animas	18,314	18,776	2.52	19,891	3.15	21,417	16.94
Lincoln	2,330	2,876	23.43	2,893	24.16	2,946	26.44
Logan	7,149	8,769	22.66	8,769	22.66	9,420	31.77
Mesa	22,544	25,429	12.80	25,539	13.52	27,121	20.30
Mineral	574	634	10.45	634	10.45	700	21.95
Moffat	2,500	2,762	10.48	2,762	10.48	2,988	19.52
Montezuma	6,008	7,702	17.71	7,072	17.71	7,595	26.41
Montrose	7,008	8,160	16.44	8,181	16.74	9,096	29.79
Morgan	23,476	25,371	8.07	25,816	9.97	27,342	16.47
Otero	16,232	18,611	14.66	18,724	15.35	20,390	25.62
Ouray	745	987	32.48	987	32.48	987	32.48
Park	914	1,053	15.20	1,071	17.18	1,180	29.10
Phillips	2,396	2,910	21.45	2,910	21.45	3,078	28.46
Pitkin	933	954	2.25	987	5.88	1,170	25.40
Prowers	7,026	8,504	21.04	8,504	21.04	9,028	28.49
Pueblo	63,969	64,882	1.43	68,134	6.51	74,677	16.72
Rio Blanco	894	1,036	11.59	1,036	11.59	1,071	19.80
Rio Grande	5,782	6,417	10.98	6,549	13.27	6,913	19.56
Routt	4,011	4,801	19.70	4,801	19.70	5,096	27.05
Sagauche	3,538	4,084	15.43	4,050	14.47	4,377	23.71
San Juan	522	634	21.46	634	21.46	700	34.10
San Miguel	893	1,076	20.49	1,076	20.49	1,170	31.02
Sedgwick	1,569	1,815	15.68	1,815	15.68	2,013	28.30
Summit	1,021	987	- 3.33	1,037	1.57	1,181	15.67
Teller	1,689	1,684	- .20	1,776	5.15	2,024	19.83
Washington	3,024	3,132	3.57	3,336	10.32	3,621	19.74

Table VIII
(Continued)

(1) County	(2) Present Salary +4.4% Social Security <u>a/</u>	(3) Civil Service +6% P.E.R.A. Option I <u>b/</u>	(4) Percentage Difference Between Present Mer- it System Salary and Option I	(5) Civil Service +6% P.E.R.A. Option II <u>c/</u>	(6) Percentage Difference Between Present Mer- it System Salary and Option II	(7) Civil Service +6% P.E.R.A. Option III <u>d/</u>	(8) Percentage Difference Between Present Mer- it System Salary and Option III
Weld	\$ 46,008	\$ 50,292	9.31%	\$ 51,875	12.75%	\$ 56,372	22.53%
Yuma	4,872	5,565	14.22	5,602	14.98	6,110	25.41
	<u>\$ 148,147</u>	<u>\$ 158,773</u>		<u>\$ 164,122</u>		<u>\$ 178,601</u>	
Monthly Grand Total	\$ 961,187	\$ 990,599	3.06%	\$ 1,049,265	9.16%	\$ 1,121,675	16.70%
Annual Grand Total	\$11,534,244	\$11,887,188		\$12,591,180		\$13,460,100	

Option III. A third option may reflect the truest picture of the actual differences in total personnel costs between the present county merit system plan and salary expenses of State Civil Service. Option III simply would transfer county personnel to State Civil Service at the same grade (responsibility) and step (longevity) as the employees have under the county merit system. The statewide increase in cost of welfare salaries under this proposal would exceed 16 percent.

For calendar year 1967, county welfare administrative costs amounted to \$10,043,951. The federal government reimbursed the counties about 48 percent of this cost; state share was a little less than 35 percent; and the county share exceeded 17 percent. Although these figures are based on respective shares of total administrative costs, the estimates reflect to a large degree the relative contribution for personnel expenses. For instance, of the \$10,043,951 for administrative expenses, personnel costs accounted for \$9,320,341, over 92 percent of all administrative costs. In any event, for 1967, if the state assumed the county share of personnel costs of about 17 percent, the state would have to have funded an additional \$1,706,700 -- the approximate county share of welfare personnel expense. In other words, the state share would increase from 35 percent to about 52 percent of total personnel expenditures.

Based on Table VIII, welfare salaries under the Merit System Council could total \$11,534,244, if all positions were filled. The state share of this amount would be \$4,036,985. Under Option I, Table VIII, the state share of expense for salaries of local welfare workers could increase by \$2,144,353 or 53.11 percent; under Option II, the state's share could increase to \$2,510,428 or 62.19 percent; and under Option III the possible increase in salaries could amount to \$2,962,267 or a 73.37 percent increase in the state share of cost of welfare salaries. Again, these figures reflect the total cost of positions rather than an actual estimate of cost.

Advantages of State Administration

Supporters of a proposal for the state to assume responsibility for administration of county welfare programs in Colorado base their arguments on the problems encountered by a number of counties in meeting the local share of welfare expenditures. They also point out that counties have little actual control over the scope of welfare programs in their respective jurisdictions and thus cannot keep these programs within the limits of available revenues. These difficulties facing county governments have been summarized in a preceding section. In addition to assuming the burdens of the counties, there are a number of positive advantages of a state program that could improve the over-all administration of welfare in Colorado.

(1) In 1966, the Management Analysis Section, Division of Accounts and Control, conducted a "Feasibility Study of Central Payments for State Old Age Pensions." Old Age Pensioners represent a rather permanent group of assistance recipients. Very seldom does a pensioner's status change to the degree that he can leave the welfare rolls. Thus, in a sense, the OAP has the same permanency as Social Security. A single regional federal office handles the entire distribution of Social Security payments for a multi-state area, suggesting that the much smaller program of OAP payments also could be distributed from the state office in Denver. This was the recommendation of the Management Analysis Section.

At the time the study was made, some of the larger counties were considering the acquisition of data processing equipment. Uncoordinated purchases of data equipment could be expensive for Colorado citizens. The smaller counties, on the other hand, must continue to process warrants by addressograph equipment, checkwriters and typewriters.^{6/} A single state system probably would reduce the amount of equipment and personnel needed to process pension checks in the 56 welfare counties and districts. Furthermore, the state supervisory agency must keep a record of the status of pensioners in the staff office. Thus there is some duplication of effort on the part of state and county offices. A single state computer system could provide accurate, up-to-date data on OAP recipients, permitting improved statistical analysis. Finally, the central payment of pension checks would provide a base upon which the administration of other categories of assistance could be added. For instance, the

^{6/} "Feasibility Study of Central Payment for State Old Age Pensions", Management Analysis Study, Colorado Division of Accounts and Control, pp 2-3.

Aid to Needy Disabled is rather permanent group of welfare recipients and could be incorporated rather easily into a central payment program.

There is a gradual trend to eliminate welfare payments based on a budget of individual family need by substituting a system of payments according to standards of need. In other words, a family of a given size would be allowed so much money for heat, food, clothing, etc. A standardized budget would facilitate a system for the centralized payment of welfare assistance.

(2) A considerable portion of the supervisory time of state staff is spent in explaining to county boards of welfare (county commissioners) the federal and state regulations that must be met by the counties. Again, federal categorical programs must be applied uniformly throughout the state. Of course, county commissioners are responsible for policy at the local level, but a change of direction at the local level would contravene federal law and regulations. Lack of program uniformity theoretically could result in forfeiture of federal funds for an entire categorical program in Colorado. State administration would eliminate the time devoted by state staff in attempting to keep welfare programs uniform throughout the state.

(3) Despite federal requirements that categorical programs be administered in all jurisdictions of the state, the so-called "ADC-U" program is not being administered in every jurisdiction. Briefly, ADC-U simply is one of the factors of eligibility recognized by the federal government in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program. State administration would eliminate the conflict between local objectives and federal law. In some instances, local communities simply do not have the resources to comply with federal requirements.

(4) The current allocation of clerical and casework personnel into 56 counties or districts provides very little flexibility in administration. County personnel have their own merit system program and cannot be transferred from one county or district to another county without being taken off one payroll and placed on another. State administration would provide an opportunity to restructure the state welfare program to make the most effective use of the welfare staff. The young caseworker, in a relatively small county, also would have a better opportunity for advancement.

(5) Nationally, there is increasing evidence of support for a basic "income maintenance" program. The gradual phasing-in of a state administered program could eliminate abrupt dislocation of local welfare programs as the result of possible changes in federal policy.

Need for Local Participation in Welfare Programs

Local participation in meeting part of the cost of welfare programs probably is an essential factor in continuing administration of welfare at the local level. In other words, if the local unit of government is not involved in bearing part of the burden of cost, are the advantages of local administration lost? For instance, with 100 percent state financing of the non-federal share, could state administrators justify continued operation of county or district offices? Would county welfare boards retain the interest in providing an economical welfare operation to the same degree under a state financed program that commissioners presently give to a program supported, in part, by property taxes?

At present, the counties exercise considerable flexibility in the administration of General Assistance programs. Although the scope of General Assistance programs probably depends on the amount of money available, counties nevertheless can utilize considerable initiative in formulating these services. For instance, Boulder County operates a modified "medically indigent" program. The county is making funds available to some families meeting with a medical disaster. If the General Assembly were to eliminate the local General Assistance programs, the uniform program adopted by the state might fall far short of what some counties are presently able to provide.

The county share of welfare costs is financed through the property tax. Traditionally, the assessed valuation of property increases at about 3.0 percent per year in Colorado. Thus some growth is provided to meet increasing costs of government. However, the demands on the property tax to support county, municipal, and school activities is substantial. Thus there is considerable reluctance on the part of county commissioners to increase the welfare levy of the county. Also, 18 counties now exceed the statutory mill levy limit for welfare. These limitations on the amount of local funds available for welfare programs act as a depressant to expanding welfare services. In particular, the expenditures for county General Assistance are restricted by these limitations. State assumption of all costs could eliminate this control factor, at least to some degree.

PROTECTIVE SERVICES

There are several categories of people with mental or physical disabilities who can live and function in a community setting provided they are given some assistance. Protective services or guardianship services are designed to furnish disabled persons with help in managing certain aspects of their lives which they are unable to handle on their own. In the past, there have been two alternatives for the provision of protective or guardianship services: 1) the families, relatives, friends, or religious and charitable organizations have assisted these individuals; or 2) when such help was not available, or when such assistance was not sufficient, the persons have been institutionalized. Today, a number of public and private agencies provide services to the aged, infirmed, and other handicapped persons: courts and law enforcement agencies, public health nursing services, county welfare departments, etc. In providing services to these handicapped individuals, all the various agencies must utilize the services of a caseworker. However, there is no single agency charged with responsibility for obtaining proper medical care, management of finances, guidance in securing employment, obtaining food and clothing, and other assistance for the mentally and physically disabled.

Who is in Need of Protective Services?

An HEW pamphlet describes persons in need of protective services as aged and disabled adults who because of physical or mental limitations are unable to act on their own behalf; are seriously limited in ability to manage their own affairs; are neglected or exploited; or living in an unsafe or hazardous condition.^{7/} The problem is particularly acute for the aged. For instance, chronic conditions which limit the activity of many persons are much more prevalent with increased age. Only two persons out of 100 under age 17 have physical or mental disabilities which severely limit their activities, while 49 persons out of 100, over age 65, are incapacitated to some degree, according to national figures.^{8/} In any event, the need for protective services is particularly acute for older persons. A poorly functioning older person often is no longer wholly self-reliant. Nevertheless, he may still be able to function in a semi-independent environment. Without assistance, these persons can be

^{7/} Protective Services for Older Persons, James Burr, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, P.A. Report No. 54.

^{8/} Chronic Conditions and Activity Limitations, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, series 10 No. 17.

subject to exploitation, self neglect, and may pose a danger to themselves and their neighbors. Examples of persons in need of protective services are: mentally retarded, confirmed alcoholics, persons with brain damage, senile or psychotic, blind, and persons with severe physical infirmities.

Types of Protective Services Which May be Offered

Perhaps there are two basic aspects to protective service: 1) preventive and supportive services, and 2) custodial or managerial services in which certain everyday aspects of living of an individual need to be entrusted to a guardian. Preventive and supportive services follow the traditional programs provided by social workers. For example, one of the first steps a protective services caseworker may take is to enlist the aid of relatives and friends to assist a recipient. Other supportive services include: referral to community resources; securing safe living arrangements; obtaining adequate medical diagnoses, including psychiatric diagnoses; assistance in planning appropriate use of funds to prevent exploitation; and home management aids to assist the individual in planning a proper diet and maintaining clean living quarters.

When an individual is incompetent to the degree that the planning program involved in supportive services does not meet the needs of the individual, guardianship services may prove beneficial. Such services include: assisting an elderly client to close his home and move into a protected environment; obtaining services of law enforcement officials to remove an older client from a situation that is harmful; arranging for protective payments for an incompetent individual to provide for the payment of food and rent; assisting the court in finding an individual to serve as a guardian or simply arranging for the welfare department to serve in a guardianship capacity.

Protective Services for the Mentally Retarded

Until recent years, families kept a retarded relative in their own home. If they chose to institutionalize him, they usually severed relations with him. Currently, there is a transition taking place in the area of mental retardation. The new concept is to place retarded persons in community center programs whenever possible, rather than in institutions. Most community centers are day care facilities only which provide retarded persons academic and vocational training. The individuals participating in these programs usually return to a boarding home or foster care situation in the evening. The community care plan, with an accompanying guardianship program, offers an alternative to institutional care.

The use of community centers enhances the opportunities of mentally retarded persons to participate in pre-vocational training and often to even find employment. For the most part, retarded persons can function in the community, but they do require certain kinds of protective services. The kind of guardianship needed for the mentally retarded is a program providing safeguards for their persons: 1) the supervision of living conditions -- such as helping people find housing accommodations; 2) assistance in referring these people to the proper institutions or governmental agencies; 3) help in finding jobs; 4) assistance in obtaining medical care; etc.

One group of mentally retarded persons who could benefit from a program of protective services are persons who have been institutionalized and released. Authorities in the area of mental retardation report that in cases where some after care has been provided, the incidence of return to an institution is greatly reduced. At present the state institutions for the mentally retarded provide some aftercare to patients, but such services are limited to the year following release from the institution. Some mentally retarded persons are recipients of AND; hence, some protective services are provided by welfare case-workers on a continuing basis. But, for the most part, the institutions must rely on the boarding and nursing homes where these people reside to keep them informed of any problems. A program of protective services, similar to those described for persons in community centers, for patients released from an institution would probably enable these people to continue to live in the community and greatly reduce the number returning to institutions after having been released.

A second group of mentally retarded persons in need of some kind of guardianship services are mentally retarded persons who have never been institutionalized but whose families no longer are able to look after them. Many parents and relatives of retarded persons have expressed concern about who will take care of a retarded son or daughter after they are gone. Representatives of agencies concerned with the mentally retarded explain that the problem of guardianship is much more acute for adults who are mentally retarded than for children. Presently, there are adequate laws providing for the guardianship of minors but no similar provisions exist for adults.

Estimated Demand for Service. It is difficult to calculate exactly how many persons would qualify for protective services in the mentally retarded categories. However, the following figures may serve as a guideline to determining the numbers who would benefit from such services. Currently, there are between 1,400 and 1,500 persons of all ages enrolled in 23 community centers serving retarded persons in the state. In addition there are over 2,480 persons at the three state institutions for mentally retarded (Ridge State Home and Training School, 1,040; the State Home and Training School at Grand Junction, 840;

and over 600 at the Mental Retardation Center at the State Hospital in Pueblo). The Division of Mental Retardation estimates that if additional community center facilities and protective services were made available, some 300 persons could be released from the three state facilities for the mentally retarded. Each year following, another 100 to 150 patients also could be released into the community.

Based on federal methods for determining the percentage of the population that is mentally retarded, approximately 35,000 persons in Colorado are retarded to some degree. Of this amount, 85 percent may be classed as mildly retarded; 11 percent moderately retarded; three percent severely retarded; and one percent profoundly retarded.^{9/}

Figures indicate that 3,880 of the approximately 35,000 persons in the state who are retarded are in one of the state supported institutions or community centers. This means that a number of retarded persons either are enrolled in some kind of a private institution or school or have been absorbed into the regular public school program because they are only mildly retarded. Furthermore, it is difficult to estimate the percentage of adult persons in need of protective services. However, the large majority of retarded adults may be mildly retarded only, and able to find jobs and function on their own in society. Nevertheless, a number of persons in addition to those in state institutions and community centers might benefit from a program of protective services.

Protective Services for the Aged

Many older persons become senile, arthritic, or otherwise handicapped which prevents them from continuing to live in the community without some assistance. Traditionally, these individuals have been placed in nursing homes which is costly and not always necessary. Oftentimes these persons could go on living in their own homes if they were furnished with some kind of protective services. For example, these older persons might require assistance in doing their grocery shopping in order to assure that they receive a proper diet. Or, perhaps, it might be wise to encourage them to move to a boarding situation where their meals would be prepared for them. Other aged persons may be completely incapable of managing their own financial affairs and need someone to assume guardianship of their property and finances.

^{9/} Colorado population figures based on data distributed by the State Budget Office. Colorado population July, 1968, is estimated at 1,995,000.

The need for protective services is not limited to the indigent elderly. There are aged persons who are economically self-sufficient but unable to care for their own physical needs. These persons, who are financially independent, can establish a trust fund or arrange for the guardianship of their money; however, the private sector of the economy simply does not provide services to meet personal and physical needs other than by institutional care. As a final resort, the lawyers or relatives may have no recourse but to place these individuals in a nursing home. It is possible that if protective services were available through an agency such as the Division of Welfare, these people could pay for services rendered.

Several samples have been made of the number of older persons who might qualify for protective services. It is estimated that three percent of the population 65 and over in Jefferson County would qualify for some kind of protective services, while the Denver Department of Welfare officials believe that 18 percent of the pensioners in Denver could qualify for protective services, including financial guardianship.10/

10/ Committee on Welfare, Colorado Legislative Council, "Minutes of Meeting," June 12, 1968.

Protective Service Pilot Projects in Colorado

Currently, there are two protective service projects in operation in Colorado. Both pilot projects are attempting to determine the need for, and the feasibility of, providing such services. One project is funded entirely with federal monies, while the cost of the other program is being absorbed into the normal operating expenses of the Denver Welfare Department. The two programs serve as good examples of the vast differences in the kinds of protective service programs that can be implemented. The Denver program is a protective payment program, for the most part, while the other project is designed to determine the types of personal needs of aged and handicapped persons in rural areas.

Denver Welfare Department Protective Services Program

In January of 1965, the Denver Department of Welfare embarked on a program of protective services for adult recipients of welfare, namely, Old Age Pensioners and recipients of the Aid to Needy Disabled Program. In order for Denver to initiate this program, the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) waived certain federal requirements with respect to Old Age Assistance and AND.^{11/} Approval of the pilot project also was granted by the State Division of Public Welfare. For the most part, the Denver program involves a system of protective payments or so-called "restrictive payments." Briefly, restrictive payment means that the local welfare department acts in the capacity of a voluntary guardian for persons whom the department believes are being financially exploited or who are unable to manage their own finances.

Basically, the protective payment program in Denver is provided to three groups of pensioners and AND recipients:

- 1) persons with physical or mental conditions which limit their ability to handle their own financial problems;
- 2) recipients in need of institutional care but who are unwilling to accept the conditions of such care; and
- 3) pensioners and AND recipients constituting a worry, hazard, or nuisance to the community. Again, the program of the Denver Department of Welfare restricts protective services to persons on the welfare roles.

^{11/} Project calls for the waiver of Title I, Section 3 (a) (1) (A) (i) and Title XIV, Section 1403 (a) (1) (A) (i) as permitted by Title XI, Section 1115, "Social Security Act."

Execution of Voluntary Guardianship. When a caseworker dealing with an Old Age Pensioner or Aid to Needy Disabled recipient finds that an individual's problems cannot be solved by normal means and believes that there is need for a guardian to handle the finances of the recipient, the case is referred for protective services. If the protective services staff finds that a voluntary guardianship is needed, the protective services caseworker consults with the individual and encourages the individual to agree to voluntary guardianship of his finances. Voluntary guardianship is authorized by section 153-9-13, C.R.S. 1963. Subsection (1) of section 153-9-13 states:

153-9-13. Voluntary estate procedure. (1)
A mentally competent person may file with the county court of the county of his residence, or if he is not a resident of this state, of the county in which some of his property is situated, a verified petition for the appointment of a guardian to assume, with respect to his property, the responsibilities, duties and obligations with respect to property generally imposed on the conservators of incompetent persons. Such petition shall be accompanied by a written statement signed by a licensed, practicing physician stating that, in his opinion, the petitioner was mentally competent at the time of signing the petition, but that by reason of old age, disease, physical infirmity, addiction to alcohol or drugs, or some other cause, petitioner is not able properly to manage, care for, or conserve his estate, and that such appointment would be in the best interests of the petitioner. The court shall then appoint some reputable person as guardian of the estate of said petitioner and letters of guardianship of a mentally competent person shall be issued as in cases of appointment of conservators. The guardian so appointed shall have, with respect to the property of such petitioner, all of the rights, privileges, authority and duties of the conservator of the estate of a mentally incompetent person.

The legal division of the Denver Department of Welfare makes the necessary arrangements for the department to act in a fiduciary capacity. A petition is prepared, a physician's statement is secured, and a pauper's oath is obtained. The Probate Court of the City and County of Denver presently waives all court costs with respect to the voluntary guardianship program of the department.

The Director of the Denver Department of Welfare acts in the capacity of conservator or guardian. A personal bond is executed, he signs an oath to carry out the duties of the fiduci-

ary, gives notice to creditors, and signs all reports to the court. The director authorizes the caseworker to sign checks necessary to meet the needs of the recipient. In general, the caseworker provides for the payment of rent, arranges for payment of food, and allows some spending money for the recipient. The caseworker also may accompany the recipient on shopping trips when it is necessary to purchase clothing.

Administration. Since enactment of the program in January of 1965, the number of restrictive payment cases in Denver has averaged about 30 cases. As of July 1, 1967, there were 26 protective service cases in Denver. One caseworker spends full-time on protective service cases; a casework supervisor spends roughly 20 percent of her time on protective services; and the legal staff also contributes to the project. The cost of the program has been absorbed into the regular budget for personnel of the Denver Welfare Department. Thus program costs have not been determined as such, but since only one employee is involved full-time, the total program costs to the Denver Welfare Department probably do not exceed \$10,000 per year. Since the program is included as part of the over-all administrative costs of the department, the state of Colorado is participating in the financing of this program as one aspect of the state's share of administrative costs. In general, county administrative costs are reimbursed as follows: the federal government pays about 48 percent; the state pays 35 percent; and the county share is about 17 percent. With respect to protective payments, Denver also absorbs the entire court costs for establishing the voluntary guardians for welfare recipients.

Rural Colorado Protective Services Project

The Rural Colorado Protective Service Project was authorized in July of 1967. The first six months of the program was devoted to hiring staff for the project, and a project director was hired in September. Beginning in January of 1968, the staff processed the first case. The project has been established on a district basis and includes the counties of Logan, Morgan and Weld. Morgan County is the headquarters for the project. According to department officials, the Rural Colorado Protective Services Project is one of two or three projects currently being tried in the United States by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Hopefully, the project will give an insight into the problems, costs, utilization of existing community services, demand, and other ramifications of providing protective services.

Administration. The budget of the Rural Colorado Protective Services Project calls for a director, three caseworkers, three homemakers, three case aides, and two stenographers. One caseworker, one case aid, and one homemaker are located in Weld and Logan counties. The rest of the staff is located in Morgan County, the headquarters county of the project. The total budget

estimate for the project for 1967-68 is \$78,705 and for 1968-69 is \$108,855. The staff will serve a total estimated population of 123,000. There are roughly 3,108 Old Age Pension and 494 Aid to Needy Disabled recipients in these counties.

Under the provisions of the federal grant, persons eligible for protective services under the Rural Colorado Project include not only welfare recipients, but potential welfare recipients. In other words, persons who because of physical or mental incompetence might waste their income or resources to the extent that they might need public assistance. In other words, a broad range of aged and handicapped adults could obtain services under this program.

Questions to be Resolved -- Protective Services Legislation

Although suggestions have been made that protective services could be initiated by providing additional funds for existing programs, proponents of the concept of protective services maintain that legislation is necessary to give agencies the specific authority to expand into this area. The legal base is particularly important if the agency or division is to perform as a voluntary guardian or conservator of finances. Secondly, statutory authority is necessary to give legal protection to caseworkers performing such tasks. In addition to the legal need for legislation, there are practical reasons as well. With a legislative mandate, agencies might be eligible for federal participation in the cost of administering protective services and a clear delineation of program scope would be made for budgetary purposes.

There are a number of philosophical problems that must be considered in relation to a program of protective services. If the General Assembly should consider the adoption of a protective services statute, it must first determine the kind of assistance or services to be provided and to whom. Would a program of protective services be limited to recipients of welfare only? Or should the program be extensive enough to include persons who can afford to pay for such assistance? Also, consideration needs to be given to whether such services could be initiated on a voluntary basis, i.e., would it be possible for an individual to simply request such services? Would caseworkers be given authority to identify persons in need? Or should cases be limited to those designated by a formal court proceeding?

Federal Participation. Traditionally, the federal government has provided the major share of monies for welfare programs in Colorado. Of course, there are a few exceptions, county General Assistance and the Class B Old Age Pension, for example. Nevertheless, for fiscal year 1969-70, of the total requested budget of the Department of Social Services (\$175,085,000), the federal government would be asked to provide over \$94,164,000 or 53.8 percent. Since Congress has not given specific authorization to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to provide permanent financing or grants for protective services, federal funds for financing a protective services program probably would be limited. Also, the establishment of a permanent program of protective services in Colorado might require waiver of certain federal regulations with respect to administration of grants-in-aid to recipients of certain categorical programs. As previously mentioned, Denver officials reported that certain federal requirements with respect to the Old Age Pension had to be waived in order to implement a pilot project. Federal regu-

lations do permit a legally appointed guardian to receive the check of a pensioner, however.^{12/}

The possible demand for protective services under a proposal such as Senate Bill No. 278, 1967 session, are unknown. For example, the 1960 census indicates that the Colorado population of persons 65 years of age and over was 155,265. The Division of Older Americans believes that the population of this group may have increased to as much as 180,000 persons. The Budget Office, on the other hand, estimates that in 1970, 162,000 persons in Colorado will be 65 and over. Nationally, persons with mental or physical conditions that limit major activities also may account for about 12 percent of the total population. Accurate data on just how many people are handicapped is not available. In any event, the demand for or the total number of persons that are in need of protective services is unknown.

^{12/} Handbook of Public Assistance Administration, Section 5230.

WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM (WIN)

In 1967, Congress adopted H.R. No. 12080 which provides, in part, a Work Incentive Program (WIN) for participants in the Aid to Families With Dependent Children Program. The WIN program is a mandatory program, and refusal to accept work or training can result in forfeiture of federal assistance. The federal requirement would, however, permit protective payments for the children of a parent refusing to participate in employment opportunities.^{13/} Basically, the WIN program appears to be an extension and integration of the demonstration work experience and training programs of Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act and the Community Work and Training Programs (CW&T) provided under Title IV of the Social Security Act.^{14/} In order to understand the development of the WIN program, a brief summary of the Title V and CW&T programs may be helpful.

The early 1960's marked the beginning of the development of manpower training programs by Congress. In 1961, the problems of unemployed in depressed areas of the country were attacked through the Area Redevelopment Act. The following year, Congress passed the Manpower Development and Training Act to meet the needs of "structural" and "hard core" unemployed throughout the nation. In the same year, 1962, Congress amended the Social Security Act to make federal funds available to state and local governments to provide work experience opportunities for welfare recipients -- Community Work and Training.

Community Work and Training (CW&T)

The Community Work and Training programs were designed to improve working habits, salvage skills (an example would be an ADC mother who acquired clerical skills prior to marriage but no longer can function at a level to meet demands of employers), and to develop new skills. CW&T requires state participation in financing at a level equivalent to that provided under ADC. Apparently, the requirements for state, or state and local, funding discouraged most states from establishing CW&T activities, since only 12 states elected to participate in Community Work and Training projects by August of 1967. Another drawback to the program was that work experience must have been acquired in jobs that

^{13/} "Summary of Social Security Amendments of 1967," Joint Publication, Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate and Committee on Ways and Means of the U.S. House of Representatives.

^{14/} "Social Security Act," Title IV, Section 409, as amended through December 31, 1965, p. 15.

would not result in the displacement of regular workers and would involve activities that had not normally taken place in the past.^{15/}

Title V, Economic Opportunity Act

Three years after the enactment of CW&T, 1965, Congress enacted Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act. Title V was a demonstration program and originally was scheduled to end in June of 1967, but was extended through June of 1968. Similar to CW&T, Title V was aimed at providing unemployed and under-employed parents with basic education, vocational instruction, work experience, social services, maintenance, and medical care. Hopefully, the program would motivate, educate and provide job skills to participants and particularly to adult recipients of the ADC and ADC-U programs.

The conditions under which federal grants could have been made for Title V projects were exactly the same as those for the Community Work and Training grants established under Title IV of the Social Security Act. In other words, Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act made direct reference to Section 409 of the Social Security Act which had set forth conditions under which the Community Work and Training programs could have been established.

Why Was Title V Enacted? Since the conditions under which Title V was administered (except for funding) were the same as provided under the Community Work and Training programs, a question may be raised as to why Congress believed it necessary to enact the Title V program. Perhaps, this may be answered, at least in part, by looking at the Colorado situation. In 1962, Congress amended the Social Security Act to provide additional assistance monies to states to encourage the development of Community Work and Training programs. The CW&T program was optional and Colorado was not obligated to establish this training program as a condition for continued participation in other federal welfare grant programs. Although the CW&T program was enacted by Congress in 1962, the State Board of Welfare did not take any action on this measure until the passage of the Title V program.^{16/} This may have been due, in part, to the differences in funding of the two programs. For instance, 100 percent federal

^{15/} Ibid., "Social Security Act," Subsection 409 (a) (1) (c), as amended through December of 1965.

^{16/} Resolution adopted by State Board of Welfare, October 1, 1965. (On October 8, 1965, the Governor, by Executive Order, authorized the State Board of Public Welfare to participate in ADC-U and CW&T programs.)

financing exists for Title V programs, while the CW&T program is funded on the same basis as the ADC and ADC-U assistance programs. In other words, Congress attempted to encourage the states to initiate, develop, and participate in the financing of work and training opportunities for AFDC recipients. Now, Congress not only requires state development of these activities through WIN as a condition for continued federal grants-in-aid for the AFDC program, but also requires that welfare recipients must participate in work and training as a condition for receiving cash assistance.

Characteristics of WIN Program

The County Welfare Departments would refer AFDC recipients to the local Employment Service Office. Hopefully a portion of these recipients could move directly into regular employment. For those participants who cannot qualify for regular employment, a training course would be established and participants would be eligible for up to \$30 per month in an incentive payment. Finally for those who cannot benefit from training, projects involving subsidized public and nonprofit private employment would be established.^{17/} Similar to CW&T, employment in this latter group must not displace regularly employed workers or involve an activity that is a normal function of the agency. Participants in the latter group would be payed by the employing agency. If the amount payed to the participant does not equal the welfare grant, plus 20 percent, the recipient is entitled to an additional amount from the welfare agency. Retirement, income taxes, etc., are to be withheld from the check payed by the employer.^{18/}

Colorado's WIN Program

In conjunction with the Division of Public Welfare and the Colorado State Employment Service, county welfare departments embarked on two WIN projects in the latter part of 1968. These projects are considered as pilot projects designed, in part, to identify all the problems related to the Work Incentive Program. The Denver program makes 400 training positions available to AFDC recipients, while 100 training slots have been established in Pueblo. Colorado has requested and received tentative approval to add another 500 training slots to the Denver and Pueblo projects. The State Division of Public Welfare and the Colorado

^{17/} Manpower Report to the President, United States Department of Labor, Transmitted to Congress April, 1968, p. 204.

^{18/} Op. Cit., "Summary of Social Security Amendments of 1967", p. 16.

State Division of Employment have formulated plans for nine WIN projects across the state scheduled to begin in July, 1969. The nine proposed projects are designed to encompass the qualified applicants in all the political subdivisions of the state. The budget request of the Colorado State Department of Social Services estimates that the WIN program for fiscal year 1968-69 will cost \$1,854,640. The federal share of this amount is estimated to be \$1,513,444 or 81.6 percent of the total cost. For 1969-70, the Department of Social Services is requesting \$4,749,680. Again the federal government will bear the major burden -- \$3,726,060 (78.4 percent), while the state share will amount to \$618,280 and the county share \$405,340.

CHILD CARE FACILITIES

An essential ingredient to the success of the Work Incentive Program for AFDC recipients is the provision for adequate child care arrangements. The following is an excerpt from a letter, dated February 9, 1968, from Mary E. Switzer, Administrator, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to all state welfare administrators, describing some of the implications for child care.

Provision of Child Care. -- The success of the work training program is dependent upon the provision of care for the children of the mothers in training or in employment. That is the special responsibility of the welfare agency. The law is clear that the welfare agency must arrange for the necessary child care as a condition of continued receipt of Federal funds for the entire AFDC program. The law is generous in its financing offer and in the provisions for the purchase of service. A welfare agency may provide day care itself, or may purchase this from voluntary nonprofit and other agencies and organizations. Arrangements are also possible with mothers of the neighborhood who have facilities which are suitable or which can be adapted for this purpose. The mother may be assisted to put her facilities in order and she is to be paid for her services. In view of the size of the job, all these resources will need to be utilized.

Day care facilities must be satisfactory if the mother is to be able to concentrate on her task of learning and working. Many States do not now have satisfactory standards for the day care arrangements of working AFDC mothers. Under the 1967 legislation, such provisions will need to be improved. Adherence will be expected to the usual standard applicable to day care in the States. The Children's Bureau is preparing for intensive work with the States on ways of developing good day care arrangements under the legislation.

Financing of Child Care

The federal share for financing child care, which is considered to be one of the supportive services of the WIN program, will be 85 percent from the effective date of the amended state plan until July 1, 1969. Thereafter, the federal share will be 75 percent and the state share 25 percent. As the federal regulations resulting from the new social security amendments have

not yet been published, it is unclear whether federal funds will be available under the aforementioned matching formula for the development of new child care facilities or merely for the purchase of child care services.

Day Care Centers

There are several different kinds of facilities which provide part or full-time day care supervision for children of working or nonworking parents. These facilities vary from day care homes to private kindergartens and centers for retarded children. Generally, however, the type of day care centers being discussed in this report are "group" facilities, which provide child care to five or more children under the age of 16. These group facilities differ from what has been designated by the Welfare Division as a "day-care home" which is merely a private home which receives from one to four children for regular day time care, but nevertheless, requires a license.

Chapter 22, 1967 Perm. Cumm. Supp. to C.R.S. 1963, designates the State Division of Public Welfare as the licensing authority for child care facilities. A special Governor's Advisory Committee on Licensing was appointed to establish rules and regulations relating to the licensing and operation of various kinds of day care facilities. The standards promulgated by the Advisory Committee and approved by the State Board of Social Services contain the following definitions which help to clarify the types of day care facilities referred to throughout the report:

"Children's Center -- includes a facility, by whatever name known, which is maintained for the whole or part of a day, but less than 24 hours per day, for the care of ten or more children between the age of two-and-one-half and sixteen years and not related to the owner, operator or manager, whether such facilities are operated with or without compensation for such care and with or without stated educational purposes. The term includes facilities commonly known as day care centers, day nurseries, nursery schools, pre-schools and play groups.

"Small Day Care Center -- Small Day Care Centers shall be known as centers which care for five to ten children, between the ages of two and sixteen years of age.

"Day Care Home -- A Day Care Home is a home which receives from one to four individual children for regular daytime care. Ages, birth to sixteen years -- not more than two children (including own) under 2 years of age".^{19/}

^{19/} Minimum Rules and Regulations for Day Care Centers, State Division of Public Welfare.

Location of Day Care Facilities

The Licensing Unit of the Division of Children and Youth, State Division of Public Welfare, publishes, a list of all the licensed children's and small day care centers. Based on the list of approved facilities published January 1, 1968, there was a total of 367 licensed day care centers across the state. These facilities include: 1) voluntary centers operated by a non-profit organization under auspices of a social agency, settlement group, church, etc., and; 2) proprietary or commercial centers operated for the financial profit of the owner, operator, or manager. Currently there are no child care centers which are operated by public agencies or financed through state or local government funds. From April 1966 to December 1967, a child care center located in the Sangre de Cristo Housing Project in Pueblo was operated by the Pueblo County Welfare Department and financed through federal and state funds. The center was operated on a pilot basis and served the children of welfare recipients. ADC mothers were employed as teachers' aides. The project was closed in December of 1967 due to lack of funds.

Of the 367 licensed child care centers only a handful are operated and financed by non-profit agencies. United Way funds help finance the operation of six of these centers in Denver and one each in Boulder, Pueblo, Colorado Springs, and Grand Junction. The remainder of the centers are proprietary or commercially operated on a profit basis. Table IX contains a breakdown of the number of licensed day care centers in each of the counties.

Need for Child Care for Low Income Families

There are several groups of people among those assisted by the Welfare Department who have a need for some type of child care program.

ADC Recipients. There are several situations in which an ADC mother may require some regular child care for her children: 1) An ADC mother may be completing or continuing her education and require child care while she attends classes. 2) An ADC mother may be involved in some type of work and training program. 3) An ADC mother may be employed part or full-time and require child care during her working hours.

Currently, when an ADC mother has need for child care, there is an allowance made in her individual budget for the specific purpose of purchasing child care services. The amount of money budgeted for this purpose depends on the nature of her needs and the type of child care she can obtain. A mother participating in a Title V Work and Training project has her child care expenses taken care of through federal Title V funds. Similarly, the new WIN program also will provide for the payment of child care. In fact, child care is a major expense of the WIN

Table IX

NUMBER OF LICENSED DAY CARE CENTERS,
BY COUNTY, AS OF JANUARY, 1968

<u>County</u>	<u>No. of Licensed Day Care Centers</u>
Adams	20
Alamosa	2
Arapahoe	25
Boulder	27
Clear Creek	1
Delta	4
Denver	47
Douglas	2
Eagle	1
El Paso	40
Fremont	2
Garfield	5
Gilpin	1
Gunnison	6
Jefferson	49
Kit Carson	2
La Plata	5
Larimer	20
Logan	1
Mesa	22
Moffat	1
Montezuma	2
Morgan	2
Otero	4
Ouray	1
Pitkin	8
Prowers	1
Pueblo	8
Rio Blanco	1
Routt	1
Sedgwick	1
Weld	<u>15</u>
Total	367

program. Of the \$4,749,680 request by the Department of Social Services for the WIN program, \$1,447,680 (30.5 percent) would be needed to pay for child care expenses.

Potential Recipients and Persons Formerly Receiving Public Assistance. A second category of low income persons who are in need of child care services are former and potential welfare recipients. In some instances, the number of applicants for welfare might be reduced if measures were taken to identify potential welfare recipients and extend certain services to them which could prevent their eventual entrance onto the welfare rolls. Child care is one of these services. The same type of help could be extended to families recently off of public assistance. Perhaps the welfare division could continue to offer this family certain supportive services, such as child care, in order to enable the family to establish enough financial stability that it will not have to revert again to public assistance.

Currently, the welfare division does not extend such services to families which might be identified as potential welfare recipients. However, in some instances, cash allowances have been made to families receiving no other assistance for such needs as child care in order to enable them to be relatively self-sufficient.

Current Use of Day Care Centers

In attempting to determine what types of day care facilities may need to be developed to accommodate the children of ADC mothers in the WIN program, the Council staff looked at the extent to which day care centers have been and are currently being used by ADC mothers in work and training situations. A sampling of records of ADC mothers from seven counties was taken to determine the type of child care arrangements these mothers made for their children.

Table X indicates that of a random sampling of ADC children in the state who required some type of child care, by far the largest proportion, 55 percent, were cared for in their own home. Home care may have been utilized for a number of reasons. Perhaps some of the mothers whose records were reviewed were attending classes, (adult education, GED, etc.) only a few hours a day and a home care arrangement was the simplest. Also, in many cases, there were older children in the home who could care for the younger children while the mother is away. In some cases, mothers of school age children may have been able to arrange their work or training hours to coincide with their children's school hours. Nevertheless it appears that a babysitting arrangement was a feasible solution to the child care problem for over half the children involved in the sample.

Table X

TYPE OF CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS MADE FOR
CHILDREN OF ADC MOTHERS WHO ARE EMPLOYED
OR IN TRAINING PROGRAMS IN SEVEN SAMPLE
COUNTIES -- JANUARY 1967 TO PRESENT

County	No. Families Using Some Kind of Child Care Arrangement	Number of Children								
		Licensed Day Care Facility	% of Total	Unlicensed Day Care Facility	Percent of Total Children	Day Care In Own Home	% of Total	Day Care By Relative	Total	
Adams	88	15	6%	10	4%	172	64%	73	27%	270
Conejos	6	--	--	--	--	8	67	4	33	12
Fremont	30	14	17	3	4	51	61	16	19	84
Las Animas	19	--	--	--	--	6	21	23	79	29
Morgan	29	19	18	1	.9	53	49	35	32	108
Pueblo	102	24	9	22	8	136	53	77	30	259
Weld	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>55</u>
Totals	291	83	10%	36	4%	448	55%	250	31%	817

Relative care was the second most prevalent child care arrangement. The use of relatives for child care was particularly high in the rural counties where close family ties have been preserved. This also may be a significant reason for the lack of day care centers in rural areas. The use of relatives for child care would be prominent in areas of high concentration of Spanish surnamed where the family unit has remained intact.

Licensed day care centers and homes were used by the 291 mothers, but not to the extent that either home care or care by a relative was used. By far the smallest percentage of the children were cared for in unlicensed day care facilities as caseworkers have undoubtedly told their clients to have their sitters obtain licenses.

From the figures in Table X it would appear that working ADC mothers are obtaining child care outside of day care facilities. We might then conclude that the need for day care facilities may not be too extensive. However, Table X does not provide an indication of how many mothers would have utilized child care services of day care centers if such facilities were available. Perhaps more mothers would use day care facilities if they were available, accessible, and reasonably priced.

Denver Department of Welfare. Because of its urban character and the fact that Denver has more welfare recipients in work and training situations than any other county, child care arrangements for Denver have been listed separately.

In Denver, the trend in child care arrangements is different than in the other counties surveyed (see Table XI). For example, in Denver 28 percent of the ADC children requiring child care in the sample taken were in day care centers. Only 10 percent of the ADC children in the other counties surveyed were in day care centers. While more use is made of day care centers, there is less reliance on relatives to provide child care. Yet, while Denver has a greater proportion of ADC children in day care centers than any other area, the Denver Department of Welfare reports that many more mothers desire to leave their children in such facilities but there simply is not room available. Particularly in the "target" areas, there are long lists of children waiting to be admitted to the centers located there. It would appear that if more facilities were available to these people at reasonable rates they would be filled.

Pros and Cons of Various Child Care Arrangements

In talking to various welfare authorities, it is readily apparent that there is no consensus on the "proper" or "ideal" type of child care arrangement. What may be a good arrangement for one child may not be good for another. As children's needs

Table XI

CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS MADE BY ADC MOTHERS WHO ARE
EMPLOYED OR ON WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS
DENVER DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE

Reason for Child Care & Time Period Inv.	No. of Families Inv.	Total No. Child. Inv.	Children In Day Care Centers		Children Cared For In Own Home		Unrelated Sitters Outside Of Home		Care By Relative		No Child Care Plan Needed	
			No.	% Of Total	No.	% Of Total	No.	% Of Total	No.	% Of Total	No.	% Of Total
ADC Mothers In EOA-Title V-Current	57	128	14	11%	41	32%	21	16%	29	23%	23	18%
Empl. or Comm. Work & Train. Mothers Feb. 16 - Mar. 16, 1968	67	172	37	22%	56*	33%	---	---	42	24%	37	22%
Empl. or Comm. Work & Train. Mothers Mar. 16 - April 16, 1968 (not same as above)	<u>51</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>43**</u>	<u>29%</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>34%</u>
Totals	175	446	94	28%	122	36%	21	6%	100	30%***	109	

337 in some child care arrangement

*Not clear whether sitter cared for children in their home or hers.

**Figure includes both day care centers and sitters outside the home.

***These percentages include only those children for whom some child care arrangements are made.

are different, the types of child care arrangements provided for them may need to be different.

Relative Care. As was indicated in the figures contained in Table IX, the option of using relatives for child care is greatest in those areas where family solidarity has been retained. Particularly in the urban areas, the family unit has not always remained together. Therefore, in these areas there is often a greater need for an alternate plan of child care. However, in many instances, if a relative is available to care for the children, this may be desirable. Since ADC children are products of broken homes, or homes where one parent is missing, the need for a feeling of belonging is oftentimes greater than in a family where both parents are present. Nevertheless, other factors may come into play that would make an alternate plan preferable. Take, for instance, a case of a preschool age child in a Spanish-speaking home. Although there may be a relative living in the home who is able to care for the child, this child may need exposure to the English language in order to be prepared to enter the public school system. For a child in this situation, a day care center with trained professionals may contribute more to preparing the child to compete in an English-speaking society.

Licensed Day Care Homes or Sitters. Much can be said for the concept of using neighborhood mothers to care for children of working mothers in the area. This idea of "block mothers" proposes to seek out those mothers who exhibit special talents in child care and use them as sitters for the working mothers. With proper training and adequate facilities, this can be a very effective arrangement, but without some guidance and direction it can even prove harmful to the children whose needs it seeks to serve. ADC mothers who have been forced to rely on other neighborhood women, often ADC recipients themselves, have voiced several complaints about such arrangements: these women are not always dependable; constructive or creative activities are not planned for the children, i.e., these women literally just "sit" with the children; the children often do not receive proper meals; etc. However, if care is taken in selecting the mothers for child care, proper training is given in nutrition, hygiene, first aid, etc., and if the facilities are suitably equipped for child care, then such a plan could indeed be a benefit to all involved.

Day Care Centers. Whereas very young children may best be cared for by individual sitters or in day care homes, day care centers offer the best educational opportunity for preschool age youngsters. Because of their group nature and trained staff, day care centers offer certain features that cannot be obtained in any other type of child care arrangement. In such a center a child is given the opportunity to interact with children of his own age in various group activities, certain individual projects may be planned for him, and he may receive special attention from

professionals in working with children. A day care center which attempts to employ the "headstart" concept of preparing a child emotionally, socially, and culturally for entrance into the schools could be of tremendous benefit to a child from a culturally disadvantaged home. Here he could gain exposure to other children, books, games, planned activities, etc., which he may not gain in his own home or neighborhood environment.

Summary and Comments -- Day Care Centers

A number of general remarks may be made concerning day care services available in Colorado:

(1) The vast majority of the centers are located in the urban areas of the state and there are few such facilities in the rural communities. About 75 percent of all the day care centers in the state are located in the counties containing a major urban center -- El Paso, Mesa, Pueblo, Weld, Larimer, Boulder, and the Denver Metropolitan Area. The Denver-Boulder Metropolitan Area alone contains 168 day care centers, or 46 percent of the total number of centers throughout the state.

(2) Of the 63 counties in the state, 31 do not have a licensed day care facility.

(3) In the larger urban areas, the day care centers appear to be located principally in the "middle-income" areas and few centers are located in the so-called "target" areas where there is a high concentration of low-income families and families receiving public assistance. For example, the Denver Welfare Department constructed a map of the location of day care centers in the City and County of Denver. A cursory examination of this map clearly indicates that the so-called "target" areas and the areas selected as "Model Cities Project Sites," are lacking in child care facilities. Of a total number of 47 centers located in the City and County of Denver, eight centers, five financed through United Way funds and three commercial facilities, are located in "target" areas.

Child care centers are commercial endeavors, for the most part, where there is an economic demand. Certainly, the need for child care centers is greater in the urban areas where both parents are more likely to work than in a rural area. However, it seems unlikely that there is no need for child care in 31 of the counties in the state. If the current emphasis in welfare is to motivate welfare recipients to self-help by encouraging them to participate in some kind of work and training program or by

assisting them in finding employment, there is need to expand facilities to allow these people to make adequate child care arrangements.

Alternative Proposals to Expand Child Care Services for AFDC Recipients

A number of programs could be instituted to improve child care services in the low-income areas of the state:

(1) Operators of licensed private day care centers could be encouraged to locate facilities in the areas where there is a high concentration of ADC or low income families.

(2) State and locally financed day care centers could be opened in "target areas." Such facilities could employ some professional staff as well as serve as a training center for local mothers, who after proper experience might be qualified to serve in responsible positions and also perhaps establish their own day care facilities. These state and locally developed facilities need not be entirely "tuition" free. Perhaps some kind of sliding fee schedule could be established which would charge a family according to its ability to pay.

(3) Special programs could be set up by the welfare department to train neighborhood mothers in child care to prepare them to open their own facilities. The services of many other public and private agencies could be utilized in developing such a program: the Health Department, adult education programs, the Red Cross, etc. Perhaps once these mothers have been properly trained the state or local community could make facilities available to them to set up centers or at least aid them in making their own facilities suitable for child care.

(4) Children from ADC homes located in the "target areas" could be transported from their own neighborhoods to day care centers outside of the poverty areas. Transportation could be provided by the centers themselves or neighborhood car pools could be arranged. This type of "bussing" arrangement could further the "Headstart" concept by exposing both the disadvantaged children and the children in the middle income areas, where the day care centers are primarily located to children of other cultural, economic, and ethnic backgrounds. A question exists as to whether private day care centers would participate in the program.

For fiscal year 1969-70, the personnel of the Department of Social Services expect that child care will have to be provided for 2,320 children whose parents will be participating in the WIN program. In many instances, the schools will eliminate the need for child care for these families while school is in session. Care by relatives also may reduce the demand for group

care services. Nevertheless, a substantial number of children will have to attend a child care center or facility. In target areas, where there is a shortage of child centers, division personnel must develop child care programs if the parents are to take advantage of employment and training opportunities.