

Department of Youth Services

OVERVIEW

The Department of Youth Services (DYS), a cabinet level agency, is managed by a director who is appointed by the Governor. The department's role is to enhance public safety through the confinement of juvenile felony offenders and the provision or support of various institutional and community-based programs to aid in the rehabilitation of youth. The department operates nine institutions, seven community corrections facilities (CCFs), seven regional parole offices, two residential treatment centers, and has contractual oversight of two privately-run facilities. The department has over 2,000 staff and a total FY 2001 budget estimated at \$259.7 million, of which \$236.0 million, or 90.0 percent, is drawn from the state's GRF.

In the course of protecting Ohio's public safety from youthful offenders, judges commit male and female juveniles between the ages of 12 and 18 to the department for various lengths of time, but no later than their 21st birthday. Judges impose a minimum stay as prescribed by law. For felonies of the third, fourth, and fifth degree, that stay is a minimum of six months. For the more serious felonies of the first and second degree, the minimum stay is one year. The department no longer receives 16 and 17 year old homicide offenders. Under Am. Sub. H.B. 1 of the 121st General Assembly, which took effect January 1, 1996, longer minimum commitments were established for more violent crimes. The minimum commitment for these offenses is 1 year-to-3 years. In addition, a minimum 3-year length of stay is imposed on any youth who uses a firearm in the commission of their offense, and a minimum 1-year length of stay is imposed on any youth who possesses a firearm during the commission of the offense.

On January 1, 2002, Am. Sub. S.B. 179 of the 123rd General Assembly will go into effect. There are a number of changes to the state's juvenile law that will go into place at that time. The first of those changes is that a 10 or 11 year old may be committed to the department for murder, a violent felony of the first or second degree, and arson. At this time, the department does not expect this to involve a large number of youth. Youth will also be eligible for blended sentences. A blended sentence will be one in which a juvenile court is able to impose an adult disposition, but suspend the sentence until the juvenile sentence is served. If a youth successfully completes their juvenile sentence, the adult portion of the sentence remains suspended. If a youth, however, commits a new felony, a violent first-degree misdemeanor, or engages in conduct that creates a substantial risk to the safety or security of the institution, community, or victim, the adult sentence can be triggered. Another change will require that a sentence for a mandatory gun specification be served consecutively with the sentence for the underlying offense.

RECLAIM Ohio

The RECLAIM Ohio (Reasoned and Equitable Community and Local Alternatives to the Incarceration of Minors) program, launched as a pilot in January 1994 and implemented statewide in 1995, provides juvenile courts with funding to develop community-based programs for juvenile offenders. In doing so,

the program is intended to reduce the number of commitments sentenced to the custody of the department.

Funding is allocated to counties through a formula based upon each county's proportion of statewide felony delinquent adjudications. Each month, counties are debited 75 percent against a per diem allocation for youth placed in departmental institutions and 50 percent for youth placed in community corrections facilities (CCFs). Any funds remaining after the county's commitments to the department are then remitted to counties and used by juvenile courts to support the development and operation of rehabilitation programs at the local level. Courts may use the funds to purchase or develop a broad based spectrum of community-based programs for adjudicated felony delinquent youths who would otherwise have been committed to the custody of the department. Such programs include day treatment, intensive probation, electronic monitoring, home-based services, residential treatment reintegration, and transitional programs. In 1999, counties retained \$25.6 million in RECLAIM Ohio funding for local programs.

A "contingency" fund in the program, which represents up to five percent of the total RECLAIM Ohio allocation, allows courts to commit youth to the custody of the department or CCFs, even if a county has exhausted its allocation. The law also provides for a category of commitments called "public safety beds" for which the counties are not debited. Public safety beds are provided for youth that are committed for very serious offenses like murder, manslaughter, rape, arson, and gun specifications.

Parole Operations

The department supervises juveniles released from its institutions through the Division of Parole, Courts, and Community Services, which operates seven field offices. Parole operations are divided into two branches: Community Residential Services and Non-Community Residential Services. Private and public vendors provide these services. Over time, the fiscal emphasis on residential services has decreased, while the funding to non-residential services has increased.

Juvenile Court Subsidies

The department also operates a subsidy program that provides funding to juvenile courts to divert youth from the juvenile justice system and assist in the cost of operating county detention centers, as well as county rehabilitation and treatment centers.

Contract Services

Private contract services are utilized by the department in its Community Based Options program (CBOP) to provide specialized treatment services, including transitional services, for juveniles needing mental health and sex offender services. Currently, the department has a contract for a 22-bed transitional residential program that provides short-term stays of 90 days-to-180 days.

Executive Recommendation

The executive recommendation essentially reduces the level of GRF funding that the department requires to continue existing services in each fiscal year of the next biennium. The department will have to make many changes in its internal operations, specifically in relation to institutional expenses, and modify its plans for providing state financial assistance to various county-based facilities and programs. In FY 2002, the executive recommendation for GRF funding is only \$1 million over the department's estimated FY

2001 GRF expenditures. The executive's recommendation for FY 2003 follows with a \$10 million bump over the FY 2002 recommended level of GRF funding. Because the vast majority of the department's funding comes from GRF, these relatively small increases mean that the department will not be able to maintain its current level of services. Cuts will have to be made. Costs will have to be reallocated. Some planned activities will be cancelled, delayed, or phased-in. In order to live within this constrained GRF budget and maintain their existing level of institutional services, the department is looking to close one of older and less efficient facilities by FY 2003. By closing a facility, the department gains greater flexibility in trying to maintain institutional services in the second fiscal year the next biennium. In addition, the department will have to realign its plans for various subsidy programs that assist county and juvenile courts. The subsidy program for county rehabilitation and treatment centers will be eliminated and the operationalization of several county detention centers and CCFs currently under construction will most likely be delayed and their openings phased-in.

Another major area of change for the department is that the executive has recommended that it take control of the state's federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs. This will involve transferring around \$10 million in federal funding and six full-time employees from the Office of Criminal Justice Services, which current has administrative responsibility for these federal grant programs.

ADDITIONAL FACTS AND FIGURES

Table 1: Department of Youth Services Staffing Levels*											
Program	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
RECLAIM Ohio	1701.35	1653.25	1838.40	2161.6	2162.40	2077.60	2072.40	2184.90	2096.90	2096.60	1925.60
Parole	178.00	170.00	214.50	215.00	215.00	210.50	216.00	211.00	211.00	211.00	211.00
Administration	205.50	226.50	217.50	236.50	238.50	242.50	250.25	229.50	225.50	225.50	225.50
Totals	2084.85	2049.75	2270.40	2613.10	2615.90	2530.60	2538.65	2625.40	2533.40	2533.10	2362.10

*The staffing levels displayed in the above table represent full-time equivalents (FTEs). The number of FTEs for FYs 2001, 2002, and 2003 are estimates.

- The cuts in GRF funding resulting from the executive recommendation will require the department to cut its institutional staff financed through the RECLAIM Ohio program by 171 FTEs. To accomplish this, the department plans to close an older institution that is not operating efficiently. At this time, parole and administrative staff will be largely unaffected.
- In FY 2000, primarily as a result of activating the new Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility, the number of institutional staff financed through the RECLAIM Ohio program increased.
- The drop in the number of institutional personnel financed through the RECLAIM Ohio program that occurred in FY 1998 was primarily attributable to the closing of the department’s Training Institute of Central Ohio (TICO).
- The jump in the number of institutional personnel financed through the RECLAIM Ohio program that occurred in FY 1996 was tied to the opening of the Ohio River Valley Youth Center and the Opportunity Center, as well as an expansion at the Scioto Juvenile Correctional Center that required the hiring of additional juvenile correction officers.
- The increase in the number of institutional personnel financed through the RECLAIM Ohio program that occurred in FY 1995 was due to the addition of juvenile correction officers that were spread throughout the department’s institutions. Parole staff also increased as a result of additional social workers that were hired into the department’s regional offices.

Table 2: Total Departmental Commitments by Fiscal Year											
Type	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000*
New	2,525	2,512	2,361	2,325	2,388	2,237	2,211	2,078	1,959	1,885	1,761
Recommitments	496	510	520	482	443	440	431	378	308	278	249
Prior Discharge	198	225	187	201	172	125	116	87	93	91	66
Revocations	384	507	461	526	630	608	616	616	635	524	551
Total	3,603	3,754	3,529	3,534	3,633	3,410	3,374	3,159	2,995	2,246	2,196

*Numbers reflect preliminary estimates.

Note: Totals do not reconcile completely with Table 4, but are believed to be generally accurate.

- Table 2 above shows that, as a proportion of the department’s institutional intake, revocations upon breaking parole conditions are an increasing part of total annual commitments. In FY 1990,

revocations represented almost 11 percent of total commitments; in FY 2000, they represented slightly over 25 percent.

Table 3: Statewide Adjudications by Felony Level by Fiscal Year**									
Felony	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000*
Murder	40 (0.3)	56 (0.4)	25 (0.2)	22 (0.1)	35 (0.2)	17 (0.1)	2 (>0.1)	1 (>0.1)	0 (0)
Felony 1	1,662 (10.8)	1,671 (11.6)	1,769 (12.2)	1,920 (12.5)	1,979 (12.5)	1,298 (8.6)	805 (6.1)	614 (5.0)	662 (6.1)
Felony 2	2,084 (13.5)	1,976 (13.7)	1,866 (12.9)	2,073 (13.5)	2,168 (13.7)	2,446 (16.2)	2,136 (16.2)	1,746 (14.3)	1,422 (13.1)
Felony 3	4,428 (28.7)	4,073 (28.3)	3,908 (27.0)	3,945 (25.7)	4,016 (25.3)	2,859 (18.9)	1,899 (14.4)	1,734 (14.2)	1,400 (12.9)
Felony 4	7,206 (46.7)	6,616 (46.0)	6,917 (47.8)	7,367 (48.1)	7,659 (48.3)	5,300 (35.1)	3,733 (28.3)	3,336 (27.4)	3,117 (28.7)
Felony 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,176 (21)	4,619 (35.0)	4,754 (39.0)	4,277 (39.3)
Total	15,420	14,392	14,485	15,327	15,857	15,096	13,194	12,185	10,878

* Based on preliminary information

**Numbers in parentheses are percentages. Due to rounding error, percentages may not total 100.

- The total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent rose gradually from FY 1993 to FY 1996, when it then peaked. Since that time, total annual felony adjudications have dropped dramatically. It could be argued that one reason for that drop has been the overall decline in the juvenile crime rate.

Table 4: Statewide Commitments by Felony Level**									
Felony	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000*
Murder	29 (1.0)	14 (0.5)	14 (0.5)	12 (0.4)	6 (0.2)	2 (0.1)	3 (0.1)	5 (0.2)	1 (> 0.1)
1st Degree	424 (14.3)	422 (13.8)	473 (15.8)	536 (19.1)	505 (19.0)	400 (15.9)	319 (13.7)	231 (10.3)	275 (12.5)
2nd Degree	422 (14.2)	433 (14.1)	473 (15.8)	416 (14.9)	426 (16.0)	414 (16.4)	392 (16.8)	357 (15.9)	337 (15.3)
3rd Degree	1,007 (33.9)	1,103 (36.0)	993 (33.1)	834 (29.8)	769 (29.0)	550 (21.8)	429 (18.4)	369 (16.4)	340 (15.5)
4th Degree	1,090 (36.7)	1,090 (35.6)	1,050 (35.0)	1,004 (35.8)	956 (35.9)	832 (33.0)	680 (29.2)	648 (28.9)	652 (29.7)
5th Degree	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	323 (12.8)	505 (21.7)	636 (28.3)	591 (26.9)
Total*	2,972	3,062	3,003	2,802	2,662	2,521	2,328	2,246	2,196

* Based on preliminary information.

**Numbers in parentheses are percentages. Due to rounding error, percentages may not total 100.

Note: Totals do not reconcile completely with table 2, but are believed to be generally accurate.

- To things stand out from Table 4 above. First, total annual commitments have declined, which is one result that the department had hoped to achieve as a result of the RELCAIM Ohio program. Second, with the enactment of Am. Sub. H.B. 1 of the 121st General Assembly, juvenile courts were given a wider range of sanctions for sentencing juveniles to the commitment of the Department of Youth Services. An obvious result is that fewer juveniles are being sanctioned as third degree felons and larger numbers are being sentenced as fourth and fifth degree felons.

Table 6: Number of Youth Committed for Felony Sex Offenses			
Calendar Year	# Sex Offenders Committed	# Offenders Committed	Percentage Sex Offenders
1990	113	3,603	3.0%
1991	152	3,534	4.3%
1992	177	3,633	4.9%
1993	190	3,410	5.6%
1994	157	3,374	4.7%
1995	180	3,159	5.7%
1996	168	2,995	5.6%
1997	176	2,246	7.8%
1998	207	2,196	9.4%
1999	217	2,246	10.0%
2000	197	2,196	9.0%

- Table 6 above shows that the number of juvenile sex offenders committed to the department has risen in the last ten calendar years. This, however, only tells part of the story. These juvenile offenders also affect the size of the department's average daily population. They serve longer sentences and there are sometimes delays releasing them back into the community because of the relatively few specialized treatment beds available.
- In the last three calendar years, the number of juvenile sex offenders committed to the department has been nearly double the number committed in FY 1990.
- In FY 1996, the department converted the Riverview Juvenile Correctional Center into a facility specifically for the treatment of male sex offenders. Another treatment unit has been established at the Ohio River Valley Youth Center, which typically houses 30–to–35 male sex offenders.

Table 7: Descriptions of Department of Youth Services Institutions

Institution	Built	Calendar Year 2000 Population	Security Level	Programs & Specialized Youth Populations
Circleville	1994	253	Maximum	Admissions/evaluation center.
Cuyahoga Hills	1969	378	Medium	Security risk; age 16 and older.
Freedom Center	1956	22 females	Minimum	Residential treatment center; drug and alcohol treatment.
Indian River	1973	254	Maximum	Houses felony 1 and 2 offenders, age 12 to 21; high risk or behavioral management problem youth.
Marion	1999	183	Maximum	Sex offender unit. Behavioral management problems unit.
Maumee	1966	120	Minimum	Two units: Drug Traffickers' Unit and Substance Use Specific Unit. Requires substance abuse programming for all residents.
Mohican	1935	162	Medium	Southern Ohio youth; substance abuse treatment & mental health units.
Ohio River Valley	1996	256	High	Substance abuse/mental health units.
Opportunity Center	1995	37	Mixed	MRDD; special needs groups regardless of felony level.
Riverview	1968	133	Maximum	Serious female offenders.
Scioto	1993	258: females	Maximum	Male sex offenders.
Private Facilities*				
Female Initiative for Rehabilitation and Skills Training (FIRST)	1999	26:females	----	Treatment facility for female offenders.
Lighthouse Youth Center–Paint Creek Youth Center	1986	49	---	Private non–profit residential treatment facility; felony 1 and 2 male offenders.

*Private facilities do not have a security level.

- Table 7 above illustrates the position taken by the department that, especially after RECLAIM Ohio went into effect, it has needed to expand the number of higher–end security beds to accommodate a larger concentration of serious juvenile offenders.
- While most of the department’s institutions are relatively new (built in the last 15 years), there are still several institutions in operation that are quite old (i.e., Maumee, Mohican, and Freedom Center). Maintaining the physical plant of these older institutions can be quite costly.

ANALYSIS OF EXECUTIVE PROPOSAL

The Department of Youth Services activities can be classified into a series of seven programs. Each program series is described in this section along with LSC fiscal staff’s analysis of the impact of the executive–proposed budget on those activities in FYs 2002 and 2003. Those seven program series include:

- **RECLAIM OHIO**
- **PAROLE**
- **TRANSITIONAL SERVICES**
- **INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES**
- **JUVENILE COURT SUBSIDIES**
- **ADMINISTRATION**
- **DEBT SERVICE**

The table below represents the executive–recommended funding level for each of those seven program series.

Program Series	FY 2002	FY 2003
RECLAIM, Ohio*	\$162,433,054	\$166,076,711
Parole	\$ 16,848,527	\$ 17,420,220
Transitional Services	\$ 748,391	\$ 847,970
Institutional Services*	\$ 40,288,524	\$ 42,508,087
<i>Juvenile Court Subsidies</i>	\$ 25,206,483	\$ 28,020,915
Administration	\$ 15,219,599	\$ 16,359,335
Debt Service	\$ 17,376,700	\$ 18,739,900
Total funding: Department of Youth Services	\$278,121,278	\$289,973,138

*Note: 25 percent of RECLAIM Ohio funds are used to support Institutional Services.

What follows is our more detailed discussion of each of the department’s seven program series.

RECLAIM OHIO

Program Series 1

Purpose To provide Ohio’s 88 juvenile courts with funding to develop or purchase local programs and services or purchase state secure incarceration.

RECLAIM OHIO

Program Description: The RECLAIM Ohio (Reasoned and Equitable Community and Local Alternatives to the Incarceration of Minors) program, launched as a pilot program in January 1994 and implemented statewide in 1995, provides funding to juvenile courts for the purpose of developing community–based programs for juvenile offenders.

RECLAIM Ohio allocates money to each of the 88 counties based on its projected number of felony adjudications. When a juvenile court adjudicates a youthful offender as delinquent, it has the choice of sending him or her to a state institution, in which case the court would have to return some of the state funds given to them by the department to pay for that

youth’s care and custody in a state institution. If a juvenile judge chooses to keep the youth in their county for placement or treatment, the county retains the state funds given to them by the department. The idea behind the program is to increase county involvement and responsibility for delinquent youth, as well as reduce the number of commitments to state institutions. By giving judges the option of treating youthful offenders locally, counties are able to retain state funds that may be used for the development of local correctional options, developing community corrections facilities (CCFs), or contracting directly with private organizations.

Before the department parcels out RECLAIM Ohio funding to the local governments, it first takes back 25 percent of that money. This 25 percent is transferred over to support their institutions. While this money does not show up as part of the department’s budget request for its Institutional Services program series, it must be recognized that RECLAIM Ohio contributes roughly \$40 million annually in state GRF that also finances the cost of running state institutions.

Funding Source: GRF.

Line Items: The following table shows the rather large long GRF line item that is used to fund RECLAIM Ohio, as well as the Governor’s recommended funding levels.

Fund	ALI	Title	FY 2002	FY 2003
GRF	470-401	RECLAIM Ohio	\$162,433,054	\$166,076,711
Total funding: RECLAIM Ohio			\$162,433,054	\$166,076,711

Implication of the Executive Recommendation: The RECLAIM Ohio program, which includes funds needed for the operation of institutions, institutional programs, private facilities, and community corrections facilities (CCFs), received less than the department calculated its future cost of doing business would be by \$1.0 million in FY 2002 and \$9.0 million in FY 2003. The department believes that this level of funding will require one of its existing institutions to be closed before the start of FY 2003. As shown in the table below, RECLAIM Ohio received most of the requested continuation funding and a portion of its requested expansion funding.

At this point in time, the department has not publicly announced which institution could be closed. It will most likely be an older institution that is not operating efficiently. Closure of the institution would occur by the end of FY 2002 and will eliminate the equivalent of 171 full-time staff. Employees will be offered early retirement buyouts, transfers to other understaffed institutions (such as the Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility), or perhaps placement in local programs serving juvenile delinquents. The department will be working with due diligence to minimize the number of staff layoffs.

One potential consequence of such a closure is that the level of institutional crowding at other departmental facilities may rise. The department reports that one thing that will help with crowding is the transfer of staff to the Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility, which is currently operating at half its capacity (approximately 150 youth). Also easing the institutional crowding situation will be the addition of 120 new beds to the Ohio River Valley Youth Center, which is more than the likely number of beds that will be lost when this older institution is closed. The Ohio River Valley Youth Center provides a more cost-effective method of dealing with crowding than trying to keep open an older and more inefficient facility.

An issue likely to concern counties is that the recommended funding level for RECLAIM Ohio will make it impossible for the department to fund the CCFs that are being built, but

not yet opened. Four CCFs currently under construction will be most affected. At some point during the biennium, construction will be completed but there will not be enough funding to open or fully open these CCFs, which are located in Greene, Montgomery, Stark, and Erie counties and are intended to provide services to 26 counties.

Despite this somewhat bleak fiscal picture, the department still believes it can deliver its current level of institutional services uninterrupted. This would include education, mental health, substance abuse, and food services. The table below summarizes the difference between what the department requested to continue existing services, as well as funding to expand or undertake new initiatives, compared with the executive recommendation.

DYS RECLAIM Ohio Funding						
			FY 2002		FY 2003	
Funding	Line Item	Requested	Recommended	Requested	Recommended	
Continuation	470-401	\$163,418,163	\$160,394,798	\$175,119,614	\$165,786,776	
Expansion	470-401	\$ 9,050,000	\$ 2,038,256	\$ 16,629,234	\$ 289,935	
Total		\$172,468,163	\$162,433,054	\$191,748,848	\$166,076,711	

Earmarking: None.

Permanent and Temporary Law: Temporary law instructs the department in how to calculate the amount of money necessary to fund its RECLAIM Ohio program (line item 470–401), which includes computing the number of “state target youth” pursuant to section 5139.01 of the Revised Code, and ensuring that the amount of funding per state target youth is not less than \$98 per day and not less than \$20,000 per year. The temporary law was first inserted in the department’s budget by Am. Sub. H.B. 152 of the 120th General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1994 and 1995.

PAROLE

Program Series 2

Purpose To ensure public safety through parole supervision, while assisting youth in developing competency and accountability.

PAROLE

Program Description: The Division of Parole, Courts, and Community Services operates seven field offices. Upon release from a departmental institution, the length of a juvenile’s parole supervision is determined based on recidivism risk. Parole operations are divided into two branches: Community Residential Services and Non–Community Residential Services. Private and public vendors provide these services. Over time, the fiscal emphasis on residential services has decreased, while the funding to non–residential services has increased.

Funding Source: GRF.

Line Items: The following table shows the lone GRF line item that is used to fund the department’s parole operation, as well as the Governor’s recommended funding level.

Fund	ALI	Title	FY 2002	FY 2003
GRF	472-321	Parole Operations	\$16,848,527	\$17,420,220
Total funding: Parole Operations			\$16,848,527	\$17,420,220

Implication of the Executive Recommendation: The department estimated the future cost of continuing its current parole operation at \$19.1 million in FY 2002 and \$19.9 million in FY 2003. These amounts would have allowed the department to maintain current programs and personnel. The executive recommendation was short of that calculated cost by \$2.3–to–\$2.5 million in each fiscal year.

The department’s funding request was also intended to cover contractual increases and inflationary adjustments. The executive recommendation did not really fund any of those items. Fortunately, parole caseloads are not expected to grow and may actually decline over the next biennium, which should allow the department to avoid elimination of staff and maintain current activities.

One area where the department has no choice but to expand involves the distribution of cellular phones to parole officers. The department is under a contractual obligation with the parole officers’ union to provide cellular phones for safety reasons. Juvenile parole officers are unarmed and may be in situations where they have no one to provide them with assistance. For this reason, the union asked for and the department agreed to provide cellular phones to the parole officers, thus allowing them to call for emergency assistance. This should occur on July 1, 2001. To provide 120 parole officers with cellular phones, \$54,000 will be necessary in FY 2002 and \$47,000 will be necessary in FY 2003, for a total of \$101,000. This cost includes the purchase of the phones (in the first year of the biennium) and the monthly service plans (in both years of the biennium).

The table below summarizes the difference between what the department requested to continue existing services, as well as funding to expand or undertake new initiatives, compared to the executive recommendation.

DYS Parole Operations					
		FY 2002		FY 2003	
Funding	Line Item	Requested	Recommended	Requested	Recommended
Continuation	472-321	\$19,074,609	\$16,848,527	\$19,931,867	\$17,420,220
Expansion	472-321	\$ 54,000	\$ 0	\$ 572,000	\$ 0
Total		\$19,128,609	\$16,848,527	\$20,503,867	\$17,420,220

Earmarking: None.

Permanent and Temporary Law: None.

Purpose To provide specialized treatment services, including transitional services, for juveniles needing mental health and sex offender services.

TRANSITIONAL SERVICES

Program Description: Transitional services started some years ago at a time when the department’s institutions were extremely crowded. The intent was to create programming options for problematic offenders that would ease them out of institutional settings and back into their communities. The department contracts with the private sector through its Community Based Options program, referred to as CBOP. CBOP is intended to provide specialized treatment services, including services to transition youth in need of mental health and sex offender services out of institutions. Both mental health and sex offender populations present significant challenges for treatment.

Funding Source: GRF.

Line Items: The following table shows the lone GRF line item that is used to fund this program series, as well as the Governor’s recommended funding level.

Fund	ALI	Title	FY 2002	FY 2003
GRF	470-402	Community Program Services	\$748,391	\$847,970
Total funding: Transitional Services/CBOP			\$748,391	\$847,970

Implication of the Executive Recommendation: In its budget request, the department was looking for \$1.6 million in each fiscal year in order to contract for 22 short-term beds for sex offenders. The executive recommended funding for only 47 percent of the FY 2002 amount and 53 percent of the FY 2003 amount. This has placed the department in the situation where they must significantly reevaluate their approach to this program. This amount of funding does not approach what is needed to continue existing service levels. Thus, the department is currently searching for other alternatives within existing institutions and possibly its parole program to deal with these offenders.

The table below summarizes the difference between what the department requested to continue existing services, as well as funding to expand or undertake new initiatives, compared to the executive recommendation.

DYS Private Contracted Services (CBOP)					
		FY 2002		FY 2003	
Funding	Line Item	Requested	Recommended	Requested	Recommended
Continuation	470-402	\$1,598,391	\$748,391	\$1,597,970	\$847,970
Total		\$1,598,391	\$748,391	\$1,597,970	\$847,970

Earmarking: None.

Permanent and Temporary Law: None.

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES

Program Series 4

Purpose To provide corrective and rehabilitative services to youth in departmental institutions and administer the state's federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs.

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES

Program Description: The department currently operates 11 facilities, including nine institutions and two residential treatment centers. These facilities offer a variety of programs and services, including educational services, substance abuse treatment, sex offender programs, medical services, mental health services, therapeutic and community services programs, and social services.

Funding Source: 1) various federal grants, for such things as juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, education, school breakfast and lunch, drug treatment, aftercare reimbursements, and community service; 2) basic and vocational education payments transferred from the Department of Education; 3) child support payments; 4) transferred funds from other state agencies for residential treatment, parenting and pregnancy prevention, and community service programs; and 5) payments from employees utilizing institutional cafeterias. (Not noted here is an extremely large amount of GRF money that supports the department's institutions that is drawn from the RECLAIM Ohio program, but is not explicitly part of this program series. It is embedded in the appropriations for the RECLAIM Ohio program. Based on the executive budget, RECLAIM Ohio would contribute roughly \$40 million in each fiscal year to the financing of the department's institutional costs.

Line Items: The following table shows the line items that are used to fund the state institutional services program series, as well as the Governor’s recommended funding level.

Fund Group	ALI	Title	FY 2002	FY 2003
FED	470-607	Criminal Justice Federal Programs	\$10,584,798	\$11,025,908
FED	470-604	Juvenile Justice/Delinquency Prevention	\$ 5,159,202	\$ 5,998,092
FED	470-601	Education	\$ 1,298,156	\$ 1,334,122
FED	470-603	Juvenile Justice Prevention	\$ 2,973,733	\$ 2,973,733
FED	470-606	Nutrition	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,800,000
FED	470-610	Rehabilitation Programs	\$ 83,500	\$ 83,500
FED	470-614	Title IV-E Reimbursements	\$ 5,700,000	\$ 5,700,000
FED	470-617	Americorps Programs	\$ 407,860	\$ 418,444
Total Federal Funding			\$29,007,249	\$30,333,799
GSF	470-613	Education Reimbursement	\$ 8,461,407	\$ 8,817,598
GSF	470-602	Child Support	\$ 450,000	\$ 400,000
GSF	470-605	General Operational Funds	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000
GSF	470-609	Employee Food Service	\$ 143,349	\$ 146,933
GSF	470-621	Wellness Program	\$ 192,954	\$ 197,778
Total General Services Funding			\$ 9,257,710	\$ 9,572,309
SSR	470-612	Vocational Education	\$ 2,012,665	\$ 2,090,392
SSR	470-618	Help Me Grow	\$ 10,900	\$ 11,587
SSR	470-623	Residential Treatment Services	\$ 0	\$ 500,000
Total State Special Funding			\$2,023,565	\$ 2,601,979
Total funding: State Institutional Services			\$40,288,524	\$42,508,087

Implication of the Executive Recommendation: The executive recommendation essentially granted the department’s requested level of funding for the purpose of delivering institutional services and disbursing grants through its new role as administrator of the state’s federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs. Thus, the department should be able to maintain the current level of services and grants that are being financed through these non–GRF revenue streams.

The key difference between the department’s request and the executive’s recommendation involves the federal grant moneys that the department receives from the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (DRC) for residential treatment services. The department requested roughly \$2.1 million in appropriation authority (line item 470–623) for each of the two next fiscal years and the executive only provided \$500,000 in the second fiscal year – 2003. As DRC currently reserves 5 percent of its annual federal Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth–in–Sentencing Incentive program funding for the Department for Youth Services, we would expect the latter to receive at least \$700,000 in each of the next two fiscal years. There is some degree of flexibility in how these funds can be spent; they would not have to be used for residential treatment services.

DYS Institutional Services					
		FY 2002		FY 2003	
Funding	Fund Group	Requested	Recommended	Requested	Recommended
Continuation	GSF & SSR	\$13,438,279	\$11,281,275	\$13,931,467	\$12,174,288
Expansion	FED	\$29,007,249	\$29,007,249	\$30,333,799	\$30,333,799
Total		\$42,445,528	\$40,288,524	\$44,265,266	\$42,508,087

Earmarking: None.

Permanent and Temporary Law: Temporary law associated with the department’s Fund 479 (line item 470–609, Employee Food Service) notwithstanding section 125.14 of the Revised Code, which allocates the proceeds from the transfer, sale, or lease of excess and surplus supplies, to then permit moneys deposited in Fund 479 collected as reimbursement for state surplus property to be used to purchase any food operational items. Existing permanent law, which creates the fund in section 5139.86 of the Revised Code, already specifies that all of its moneys shall be used to purchase food, supplies, and cafeteria equipment for the department’s institutions. Thus, the temporary law is consistent with existing permanent law, as well as current practice. The temporary law was first inserted in the department’s budget by Am. Sub. H.B. 298 of the 119th General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1992 and 1993.

Temporary law associated with the department’s Fund 175 (line item 470–613, Education Reimbursement) states that all of its moneys must be used for the operational costs of providing educational services to youth supervised by the department, including, but not limited, teacher salaries, maintenance expenses, and equipment purchases. The use of any of the fund’s money for capital expenses is explicitly prohibited. The temporary law was first inserted in the department’s budget by Am. Sub. H.B. 298 of the 119th General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1992 and 1993.

Under the executive–proposed budget control of the state’s federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs, which includes around \$10 million in federal grants and six full–time staff, is transferred from the Office of Criminal Justice Services to the Department of Youth Services, effective July 1, 2001. Temporary law to that effect is included in the department’s budget and the state’s federal juvenile justice efforts are to continue uninterrupted by the transfer of this function. The department assumes all of the Office of Criminal Justice Services’ obligations, business, rules, orders, determinations, pending actions or proceedings, and the like with respect to this function. The employees transferred to the department retain their positions and all benefits.

JUVENILE COURT SUBSIDIES

Program Series 5

Purpose To provide funding for county detention centers and to provide funding to juvenile courts for the purpose of developing and implementing non-secure community programs for at-risk, unruly, and delinquent youth.

JUVENILE COURT SUBSIDIES

Program Description: This program series represents subsidies that are distributed to counties and juvenile courts. There are currently three major subsidies that the department provides. The first is the Rehabilitation Subsidy (line item 470-501), which funds rehabilitation and treatment centers. The funds are used to pay for the operation and maintenance costs of these centers, which were developed to specifically deal with non-felony juveniles. These rehabilitation and treatment centers are also drawing state financial assistance from the department’s Youth Services Block Grant program (line item 470-510). In a sense, this has created a “double dip” for those counties that have buildings dedicated for their programs. The second subsidy is the Detention Centers program (line item 470-502), which pays for up to one-half of the operating costs of county detention centers. The third subsidy is the aforementioned Youth Services Block Grant program, which provides funds to all juvenile courts for non-secure community programs emphasizing prevention, diversion, and correctional services.

Funding Source: GRF.

Line Items: The following table shows the GRF line items that are used to fund these subsidies, as well as the Governor’s recommended funding levels.

Fund	ALI	Title	FY 2002	FY 2003
GRF	470-501	Rehabilitation Subsidies	\$ 0	\$ 0
GRF	470-502	Detention Subsidies	\$6,225,468	\$6,498,015
GRF	470-510	Youth Services	\$18,981,015	\$21,522,900
Total funding: Juvenile Court Subsidies			\$25,206,483	\$28,020,915

Implication of the Executive Recommendation: The executive recommendation has three fiscal effects. First, the Rehabilitation Subsidy (line item 470-501) is eliminated. The elimination of this funding, which historically involved about \$2.0 million, will only affect 19 counties, as most counties do not have such facilities (the affected counties are listed in the table below). The majority of these facilities are in small and medium sized counties. Some might argue that, in a sense, this removes a “penalty” for counties that do not have physical structures to house their rehabilitation programs.

Counties Affected by Elimination of Rehabilitation Subsidy					
Allen	Athens	Carroll	Columbiana	Cuyahoga	Geauga
Greene	Hamilton	Holmes	Lawrence	Lorain	Miami
Montgomery	Ross	Stark	Tuscarawas	Warren	Wayne
Washington					

With regard to the Detention Centers subsidy, the department needed funding to continue

assisting 38 existing county facilities and bring four new county facilities on line. The executive recommendation does not fully fund that plan. The department believes it can maintain its existing level of financial assistance to currently operating county detention centers, but that the operationalization of new county detention centers will most likely need to be phased-in. This would affect new facilities being constructed in Clinton, Fairfield, Hancock, and Logan counties.

The Youth Services Block grant program which funds programs that serve non-felony juveniles more or less received continuation funding under the executive budget. The department believes that they will be able to maintain their existing subsidy levels in this area.

The table below summarizes the difference between what the department requested to continue existing services, as well as expand or undertake new initiatives, compared with the executive recommendation.

DYS Independent Juvenile Court Subsidies					
		FY 2002		FY 2003	
Funding	Fund	Requested	Recommended	Requested	Recommended
Continuation	GRF	\$30,023,321	\$25,101,207	\$30,494,405	\$28,080,915
Expansion	GRF	\$ 1,689,808	\$ 105,276	\$ 3,572,288	\$ 0
Total		\$31,713,129	\$25,206,483	\$34,066,693	\$28,020,915

Earmarking: None.

Permanent and Temporary Law: The intent of the executive budget is to eliminate the department's Rehabilitation Subsidy program by repealing its authority under existing permanent law to provide financial assistance to county rehabilitation and treatment centers. As currently written, however, the executive budget contained in H.B. 95 of the 124th General Assembly, incorrectly repeals the department's authority in existing permanent law to provide financial assistance to county detention centers, a program funded through its Detention Centers subsidy. So, the bill as written repeals the department's authority to operate its Detention Centers subsidy program, but contains an appropriation for this repealed program, and does not repeal, as the executive intended, the department's authority to operate its Rehabilitation Center subsidy program. The bill does, however, eliminate the Rehabilitation Center subsidy's appropriation.

Purpose To provide oversight of departmental institutions, private facilities, community corrections facilities, transitional services, and parole operations, as well as the administration of county subsidies.

ADMINISTRATION

Program Description: The department is responsible for managing nine institutions, seven community corrections facilities, seven regional parole offices, two residential treatment centers, and has contractual oversight of two private facilities.

Funding Source: GRF.

Line Items: The following table shows the line items that are used to fund the department’s administrative operation, as well as the Governor’s recommended funding level.

Fund	ALI	Title	FY 2002	FY 2003
GRF	470-401	RECLAIM Ohio	\$ 0	\$ 0
GRF	472-321	Parole Operations	\$ 0	\$ 0
GRF	477-321	Administrative Operations	\$14,964,599	\$16,095,397
GRF	477-406	Interagency Collaborations	\$ 255,000	\$ 263,938
Total funding: Administration			\$15,219,599	\$16,359,335

Implication of the Executive Recommendation: The department calculated the future cost of continuing its current administrative operation at \$16.9 million in FY 2002 and \$17.7 million in FY 2003. These amounts would have allowed the department to continue administration at current levels. The executive recommendation was short of that calculated cost by roughly \$1.7 million in FY 2002 and \$1.3 million in FY 2003. Despite the reduced funding the department believes that it can get by. However, it will not be able to take on any planned new initiatives, such as fully meeting the American Correctional Association standards or the recommendations of the Governor’s Management Improvement Commission.

The table below summarizes the difference between what the department requested to continue existing services, as well as expand or undertake new initiatives, compared to the executive recommendation.

DYS Administration Funding					
		FY 2002		FY 2003	
Funding	Fund	Requested	Recommended	Requested	Recommended
Continuation	GRF	\$16,851,799	\$15,219,599	\$17,696,767	\$16,359,335
Expansion	GRF	\$1,168,477	\$ 0	\$1,778,602	\$ 0
Total		\$18,020,276	\$15,219,599	\$19,475,369	\$16,359,335

Earmarking: None.

Permanent and Temporary Law: None.

DEBT SERVICE

Program Series 7

Purpose To provide payment on debt issued by the Ohio Building Authority in support of the state’s juvenile correctional building program.

DEBT SERVICE

Program Description: This program/line item picks up the state’s debt service tab that must be paid to the Ohio Building Authority (OBA) for its obligations incurred as a result of issuing bonds that cover the department’s capital appropriations. The appropriation authority and actual spending levels are set and controlled by the Office of Budget and Management, and not by the department.

The moneys made available as a result of these bonds have financed the design, construction, renovation, and rehabilitation phases of various departmental capital projects, as well as the construction and renovation costs associated with local projects (community corrections facilities, county detention centers, and the like).

Funding Source: GRF.

Line Items: The following table shows the lone GRF line item that is used to fund debt service payments, as well as the Governor’s recommended funding level.

Fund	ALI	Title	FY 2002	FY 2003
GRF	470-412	Lease Rental Payments	\$17,376,700	\$18,739,900
Total funding: Debt Service			\$17,376,700	\$18,739,900

Implication of the Executive Recommendation: Under the executive recommendation for debt service funding, the state should have no trouble meeting its legal and financial obligations.

Earmarking: None.

Permanent and Temporary Law: Temporary law stipulates that the moneys contained in GRF line item 470–412, Lease Rental Payments, are for payments to the Ohio Building Authority for the purpose of covering the principal and interest on outstanding bonds issued to finance the state's juvenile correctional building program. The temporary law was first inserted in the department’s budget by Am. Sub. H.B. 111 of the 118th General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1990 and 1991.

PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY LAW

This section of our analysis describes permanent and temporary law provisions contained in the executive budget that will directly affect the Department of Youth Services.

Permanent Law Provisions

County Subsidies (ORC 2151.34, 2151.341, 2152.43, 5139.281, and 5139.31)

The executive budget repeals the department's authority to provide financial assistance to county detention centers, which is currently funded through its GRF line item 470–502, Detention Subsidies. This was not the executive's intention. The executive's intention was to repeal permanent law in section 5139.28 of the Revised Code that contains the department's authority to provide financial assistance to county rehabilitation and treatment centers. The GRF line item in the department's budget that funds this subsidy program, however, was as intended eliminated (line item 470–501, Rehabilitation Subsidy). Not all counties, however, will be affected by the elimination of this subsidy, which totals around \$2.0 million annually. Currently, 19 counties qualify for this rehabilitation and treatment center subsidy.

Definition of “Comprehensive Plan” (ORC 181.51(D))

Under existing permanent law, a “comprehensive plan” for the purposes of sections 181.51 to 181.56 of the Revised Code means, among other things, a document that includes “all” of the functions of the criminal and juvenile justice systems of the state or a specified area of the state. The executive budget proposes to change the “all” to “any” of the functions of the criminal justice and juvenile justice systems of the state or a specified area of the state. The permanent law change would appear to give the state and local governments greater flexibility in determining how “comprehensive” criminal justice and juvenile justice plans must or should be.

Juvenile Justice Coordinating Councils (ORC 181.51(I) and 181.56(D))

The executive–proposed budget expands existing permanent law permitting a county or counties to form a criminal justice coordinating council to include authority to form a juvenile justice coordinating council. The permanent law change reflects the proposed take–over of the state's federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs by the Department of Youth Services. While the cost of establishing and maintaining a juvenile justice coordinating council are unclear, what is clear is that those costs are only triggered if those local governments opt to form such a council.

Juvenile Justice System Duties (ORC 181.52)

Under existing permanent law, the Office of Criminal Justice Services is required to perform various duties in relation to the juvenile justice system in Ohio, including administration of any grants that are made available through federal juvenile justice acts. The executive budget proposes to transfer these juvenile justice system duties and related federal grants to the Department of Youth Services. This would mean that, effective July 1, 2001, over \$10 million in annual federal administrative and program dollars and six full–time juvenile justice staff will be transferred to the Department of Youth Services.

Metropolitan County Criminal Justice Services Agencies (ORC 181.54(A) and (B)(5))

Under existing permanent law, a metropolitan county criminal justice services agency must administer within its services area any federal criminal justice acts or juvenile justice acts that the Office of Criminal Justice administers. The executive–proposed budget amends that permanent law to extend that requirement to include any federal criminal justice acts or juvenile justice acts that the Department of Youth Services administers. The intent of this permanent law change is simply to ensure that existing administrative arrangements between the state and a metropolitan county criminal justice services agency in regard to federal juvenile justice program funding continue after the Department of Youth Services takes control.

Administrative Planning Districts (ORC 181.51(F) and 181.56(A) to (C))

Existing permanent law requires the office to establish administrative planning districts (APDs) that group contiguous counties in which no county has a metropolitan county criminal justice services agency. The executive–proposed budget amends that existing permanent law to limit the office’s duty to establish APDs solely for criminal justice programs and creates the requirement that the Department of Youth Services discharge a similar duty with regard to juvenile justice programs. The permanent law change reflects the proposal under the executive–recommended budget that the Department of Youth Services take control of the state’s federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention funding. The department could opt to use the APDs already in place through the efforts of the Office of Criminal Justice Services or create their own APDs.

Temporary Law Provisions

Ohio Building Authority Lease Payments (Section 109)

Temporary law stipulates that the moneys contained in GRF line item 470–412, Lease Rental Payments, are for payments to the Ohio Building Authority for the purpose of covering the principal and interest on outstanding bonds issued to finance the state's juvenile correctional building program. The temporary law was first inserted in the department’s budget by Am. Sub. H.B. 111 of the 118th General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1990 and 1991.

RECLAIM Ohio (Section 109)

Temporary law instructs the department in how to calculate the amount of money necessary to fund its RECLAIM Ohio program (GRF line item 470–401), which includes computing the number of “state target youth” pursuant to section 5139.01 of the Revised Code, and ensuring that the amount of funding per state target youth is not less than \$98 per day and not less than \$20,000 per year. The temporary law was first inserted in the department’s budget by Am. Sub. H.B. 152 of the 120th General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1994 and 1995.

Employee Food Service and Equipment (Section 109)

Temporary law associated with the department’s Fund 479 (line item 470–609, Employee Food Service) notwithstanding section 125.14 of the Revised Code, which allocates the proceeds from the transfer, sale, or lease of excess and surplus supplies, in order to permit moneys deposited in Fund 479 collected as reimbursement for state surplus property to be used to purchase any food operational items. Existing

permanent law, which creates the fund in section 5139.86 of the Revised Code, already specifies that all of its moneys shall be used to purchase food, supplies, and cafeteria equipment for the department's institutions. Thus, the temporary law is consistent with existing permanent, as well as current practice. The temporary law was first inserted in the department's budget by Am. Sub. H.B. 298 of the 119th General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1992 and 1993.

Education Reimbursement (Section 109)

Temporary law associated with the department's Fund 175 (line item 470–613, Education Reimbursement) states that all of its moneys must be used for the operational costs of providing educational services to youth supervised by the department, including, but not limited, teacher salaries, maintenance expenses, and equipment purchases. The use of any of the fund's money for capital expenses is explicitly prohibited. The temporary law was first inserted in the department's budget by Am. Sub. H.B. 298 of the 119th General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1992 and 1993.

Financial Assistance for Juvenile Detention Facilities (Section 109)

Temporary law specifies that financial assistance provided to county detention centers pursuant to section 5139.281 of the Revised Code has to be in the amount of 50 percent of the approved annual operating cost, but cannot exceed \$156,928 in a fiscal year (GRF line item 470–502). The temporary law was first inserted in the department's budget by Am. Sub. H.B. 152 of the 120th General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1994 and 1995.

Federal Program Transfer from the Office of Criminal Justice Services (Section 109)

Under the executive–proposed budget control of the state's federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs, which includes around \$10 million in federal grants and six full–time staff, is transferred from the Office of Criminal Justice Services to the Department of Youth Services, effective July 1, 2001. Temporary law to that effect is included in the department's budget and the state's federal juvenile justice efforts are to continue uninterrupted by the transfer of this function. The department assumes all of the Office of Criminal Justice Services' obligations, business, rules, orders, determinations, pending actions or proceedings, and the like with respect to this function. The employees transferred to the department retain their positions and all benefits.

REQUESTS NOT FUNDED

The difference, or variance, between what the Department of Youth Services requested for its biennial budget and the Governor's recommended funding level is summarized in the tables below for six of the department's seven program series. The seventh, debt service, was fully funded by the executive budget.

RECLAIM OHIO

Program Series 1

Continuation Funding: As is evidenced in the table below, the department's RECLAIM Ohio program received less GRF funding than it calculated would be needed by \$3.0 million in FY 2002 and \$9.3 million in FY 2003. Assuming all other conditions remain the same (e.g., inflation, juvenile crime, and adjudication rates), the department believes that this level of funding will allow it to maintain the current county per diem rate. This funding level will also allow the department to support only eight of its existing nine institutions. In order to make that level of funding work, especially in FY 2003, the department decided that one institution would be shut down by the beginning of FY 2003. This will eliminate 171 full-time staff, as well as equipment, maintenance, and other operating costs. Closing the institution, which is estimated to cost around \$9 million annually to run, will greatly alleviate the budget deficit especially in the second year of the biennium. While the department has made no public statements about which institution will be closed, all indications are that it will be an older facility that is running at less than peak efficiency. The announcement of which institution will be closed is to come later in the year.

Expansion Funding: As is evidenced in the table below, the department's RECLAIM Ohio program received \$2.0 million of expansion funding in FY 2002 and \$239,935 in FY 2003. Based on the relatively large shortfall in continuation funding, however, the department will not undertake any expansions or new initiatives. All of the RECLAIM Ohio funding will be used to shore-up the current service delivery system. This is likely to translate into the department not being able to activate 4 new community correctional facilities (CCFs) currently under construction in Erie, Greene, Montgomery, and Stark counties or the 120 new beds at the Ohio River Valley Youth Center. It may be possible for the department to open some portion of these facilities sometime during the second fiscal year of the biennium. For instance, at the Ohio River Valley Youth Center, the 120 new beds are in four separate units. The department will probably open one unit at a time, as funding and the need for beds make necessary. A similar kind of approach is likely to be used with the CCFs. A second effect is that the department will probably find it necessary to delay planned increases of educational staff salaries. A third effect is the likely delay or cancellation of other several other projects, including upgrades related to MARCs (the Multi-Agency Radio Communication System), implementation of a statewide fitness program, and plans to use telepsychiatry/teleconferencing.

RECLAIM Ohio GRF Funding						
Funding Level	FY 2002			FY 2003		
	Requested	Recommended	Difference	Requested	Recommended	Difference
Continuation	\$163,418,163	\$160,394,798	(\$3,023,365)	\$175,119,614	\$165,786,776	(\$ 9,332,838)
Expansion	\$ 9,050,000	\$ 2,038,256	(\$7,011,744)	\$ 16,629,234	\$ 289,935	(\$16,339,299)

PAROLE OPERATIONS

Program Series 2

Continuation Funding: As is evidenced in the table below, the department’s parole operation received less GRF funding than it calculated would be necessary to continue existing services by \$2.2 million in FY 2002 and \$2.5 million in FY 2003. At this time, the department feels that it can stretch resources in order to maintain parole operations at current levels, and that the possibility of having to lay off as many as 20 or so parole officers can be avoided.

Expansion Funding: Even within the limits set by the executive recommended funding level, there is one new initiative that will go forward under a binding agreement with the union that represents the department’s parole officers. Under that agreement, the department will provide a cellular phone to every parole officer by July 1, 2001. Other proposed new initiatives, such as inflationary adjustments and the implementation of the Refocus program will, in all likelihood, be impossible to undertake. The Refocus program is a system to deal with violations of parole conditions that would have permitted graduated levels of sanctioning juveniles. Currently, when parole is violated, a parole officer wishing to sanction a juvenile may have no other recourse than to send the youth back to a departmental institution. The Refocus program would have emphasized “in-between” options for dealing with juvenile violators, including increased drug testing, extension of parole, house arrest, or additional surveillance.

Parole Operations GRF Funding						
Funding Level	FY 2002			FY 2003		
	Requested	Recommended	Difference	Requested	Recommended	Difference
Continuation	\$19,074,609	\$16,848,527	(2,226,082)	\$19,931,867	\$17,240,220	(\$2,511,647)
Expansion	\$ 54,000	\$ 0	(\$ 54,000)	\$ 572,000	\$ 0	(\$ 572,000)

TRANSITIONAL SERVICES (CBOP)

Program Series 3

Continuation Funding: As is evidenced in the table below, the executive recommendation did not give the department enough money to continue funding 22 sex offender contract beds. The executive recommendation is roughly one-half the amount needed. Thus, at best the department will only be able to contract for 11 beds, and as a result, has started to explore other options to see if there is a way to get the same kind of services at more cost-effective prices.

Expansion Funding: The department did not request any expansion funding for its transitional services program.

Transitional Services/CBOP GRF Funding						
Funding Level	FY 2002			FY 2003		
	Requested	Recommended	Difference	Requested	Recommended	Difference
Continuation Funding	\$1,598,391	\$748,391	(\$850,000)	\$1,597,970	\$847,970	(\$750,000)

STATE INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES

Program Series 4

Continuation Funding: As is evidenced in the table below, the non-GRF component of the department’s institutional services program received less funding than necessary to continue existing services by \$2.2 million in FY 2002 and \$1.7 million in FY 2003. Despite this difference, the department believes it can continue to deliver current levels of service. The key reason for the difference between the requested and

recommended funding level appears to be tied to the future timing, amounts, and purpose of a 5 percent federal grant set aside that comes from the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

Expansion Funding: The department did not request any non-GRF expansion funding for its institutional services, all of the needs of this program series were covered as continuation funding.

State Institutional Services Non-GRF Funding						
Funding Level	FY 2002			FY 2003		
	Requested	Recommended	Difference	Requested	Recommended	Difference
Continuation Funding	\$13,438,279	\$11,281,275	(\$2,157,004)	\$13,931,467	\$12,174,288	(\$1,757,179)

JUVENILE COURT SUBSIDIES

Program Series 5

Continuation Funding: As is evidenced in the table below, the department’s juvenile court subsidies received less funding than necessary by \$4.9 million in FY 2002 and \$2.5 million in FY 2003. This program series represents subsidies that are distributed to county juvenile programs. The department currently manages the following three programs: Rehabilitation and Treatment Centers, Detention Centers, and Youth Services Block Grant. The first subsidy funds bricks and mortar rehabilitation and treatment centers. These centers target their services at non-felony delinquents. These programs receive additional funding under the department’s Youth Services Block Grant program, which also target non-felony delinquents. In a sense, this has created a “double dip” for those 19 counties that have buildings dedicated to their rehabilitation and treatment programs. Under the executive budget, this program subsidy has been eliminated. The majority of these facilities are in small and medium sized counties. Some could see eliminating it as akin to removing a “penalty” for counties that do not have physical structures to house their rehabilitation and treatment programs.

The Detention Centers subsidy supports county detention operations. The department believes it can maintain close to their current level of subsidy funding in this area, but that there is little room for expansion. Opening four new detention centers currently under construction in Clinton, Fairfield, Hancock, and Logan counties may be delayed and their operations may have to be phased-in.

The Youth Services Block Grant subsidy provides funds to all juvenile courts for non-secure community programs that emphasize prevention, diversion, and correctional services. It was created to fund programs serving non-felony delinquents. The department believes that it can maintain the current subsidy levels in the Youth Services Block Grant program.

Expansion Funding: As is evidenced in the table below, the department’s juvenile court subsidies series received less expansion funding than requested by \$105,276 in FY 2002 and nothing in FY 2003. Realistically, this extremely small amount of additional money will not be allotted to expansions because it is totally insufficient to allow for actual expansion of these subsidy programs. It will instead be used to help the department maintain their current level of services.

Juvenile Court Subsidies GRF Funding						
Funding Level	FY 2002			FY 2003		
	Requested	Recommended	Difference	Requested	Recommended	Difference
Continuation Funding	\$30,023,321	\$25,101,207	(\$4,922,114)	\$30,494,405	\$28,020,915	(\$2,473,490)
Expansion Funding	\$ 1,689,808	\$ 105,276	(\$1,584,532)	\$ 3,572,288	\$ 0	(\$3,572,288)

ADMINISTRATION

Program Series 6

Continuation Funding: As is evidenced in the table below, the department’s administrative operation receives less GRF funding than it calculated would be necessary to continue existing services by \$1.6 million in FY 2002 and \$1.3 million in FY 2003. The level of continuation funding requested by the department was intended to cover personnel, equipment, and maintenance costs, as well as to upgrade computer systems and replace 25 percent of the department’s vehicles. At this time, the department has no intention of laying off any administrative personnel. Some of the other planned expenditures for equipment purchases, computers upgrades and vehicles replacements will most likely need to be delayed.

Expansion Funding: As is evidenced in the table below, the executive recommendation did not provide any expansion funds for the department’s administrative operations. One of the department’s requests for expansion funding was to provide for full implementation of staff pre–service training in cooperation with Columbus State Community College. A second expansion funding request was to implement a centralized business system. An additional portion to this request was to provide a cash match for federal funds. While the centralized business system is optional, the cash match is not. The department expects to delay filling staff positions or replacing vehicles in order to make sure that the \$381,477 needed in each fiscal year to match the federal funds is available. A third expansion funding request was to increase an existing agreement to fund a mental health juvenile project in a rural county and for supporting the department’s responsibility to the state’s Family and Children First initiative. Other than meeting the required state cash match to tap into federal funds for administrative expenses, it is highly doubtful that the department will be able to undertake any of these remaining initiatives.

DYS Administration Funding						
Funding Level	FY 2002			FY 2003		
	Requested	Recommended	Difference	Requested	Recommended	Difference
Continuation	\$16,851,799	\$15,219,599	(\$1,632,200)	\$17,696,767	\$16,359,335	(\$1,337,432)
Expansion	\$ 1,168,477	\$ 0	(\$1,168,477)	\$ 1,778,602	\$ 0	(\$1,778,602)

LSC Budget Spreadsheet by Line Item, FY 2002 - FY 2003

<i>Fund</i>	<i>ALI</i>	<i>ALI Title</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>Estimated 2001</i>	<i>Executive 2002</i>	<i>% Change 2001 to 2002</i>	<i>Executive 2003</i>	<i>% Change 2002 to 2003</i>
<i>DYS Youth Services, Department of</i>								
GRF	470-401	RECLAIM Ohio	\$ 147,960,057	\$156,118,064	\$ 162,433,054	4.0%	\$ 166,076,711	2.2%
GRF	470-402	Community Program Services	\$ 2,334,926	\$2,418,255	\$ 748,391	-69.1%	\$ 847,970	13.3%
GRF	470-404	Vocational Rehabilitation	\$ 0	\$268,435	\$ 0	-100.0%	\$ 0	N/A
GRF	470-412	Lease Rental Payments	\$ 13,251,131	\$16,300,000	\$ 17,376,700	6.6%	\$ 18,739,900	7.8%
GRF	470-501	Rehabilitation Subsidy	\$ 2,014,946	\$2,147,431	\$ 0	-100.0%	\$ 0	N/A
GRF	470-502	Detention Subsidies	\$ 6,211,139	\$5,963,264	\$ 6,225,468	4.4%	\$ 6,498,015	4.4%
GRF	470-510	Youth Services	\$ 21,243,779	\$21,755,698	\$ 18,981,015	-12.8%	\$ 21,522,900	13.4%
GRF	472-321	Parole Operations	\$ 16,873,690	\$16,920,721	\$ 16,848,527	-0.4%	\$ 17,420,220	3.4%
GRF	474-321	Facilities Activation	\$ 2,489,486	\$0	\$ 0	N/A	\$ 0	N/A
GRF	477-321	Administrative Operations	\$ 13,739,593	\$13,892,543	\$ 14,964,599	7.7%	\$ 16,095,397	7.6%
GRF	477-406	Interagency Collaborations	\$ 250,000	\$250,000	\$ 255,000	2.0%	\$ 263,938	3.5%
General Revenue Fund Total			\$ 226,368,747	\$ 236,034,411	\$ 237,832,754	0.8%	\$ 247,465,051	4.1%
175	470-613	Education Reimbursement	\$ 6,740,152	\$8,433,953	\$ 8,461,407	0.3%	\$ 8,817,598	4.2%
479	470-609	Employee Food Service	\$ 125,800	\$140,263	\$ 143,349	2.2%	\$ 146,933	2.5%
4A2	470-602	Child Support	\$ 599,262	\$499,800	\$ 450,000	-10.0%	\$ 400,000	-11.1%
4G6	470-605	General Operational Funds	\$ 0	\$10,000	\$ 10,000	0.0%	\$ 10,000	0.0%
4J7	470-619	Mental Health & Substance Abuse Treatment	\$ 309,078	\$0	\$ 0	N/A	\$ 0	N/A
523	470-621	Wellness Program	\$ 114,386	\$67,000	\$ 192,954	188.0%	\$ 197,778	2.5%
General Services Fund Group Total			\$ 7,888,678	\$ 9,151,016	\$ 9,257,710	1.2%	\$ 9,572,309	3.4%
321	470-601	Education	\$ 1,233,741	\$1,653,879	\$ 1,298,156	-21.5%	\$ 1,334,122	2.8%
321	470-603	Juvenile Justice Prevention	\$ 1,290,226	\$1,673,083	\$ 2,973,733	77.7%	\$ 2,973,733	0.0%
321	470-606	Nutrition	\$ 2,404,752	\$2,795,228	\$ 2,800,000	0.2%	\$ 2,800,000	0.0%
321	470-610	Rehabilitation Programs	\$ 217,775	\$696,826	\$ 83,500	-88.0%	\$ 83,500	0.0%
321	470-614	Title IV-E Reimbursements	\$ 5,827,094	\$5,542,089	\$ 5,700,000	2.8%	\$ 5,700,000	0.0%
321	470-617	AmeriCorps Programs	\$ 209,164	\$248,617	\$ 407,860	64.1%	\$ 418,444	2.6%
3U1	470-607	Criminal Justice Federal Programs	----	\$0	\$ 10,584,798	N/A	\$ 11,025,908	4.2%
3V5	470-604	Juvenile Justice/Delinquency Prevention	----	\$0	\$ 5,159,202	N/A	\$ 5,998,092	16.3%

LSC Budget Spreadsheet by Line Item, FY 2002 - FY 2003

<i>Fund</i>	<i>ALI</i>	<i>ALI Title</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>Estimated 2001</i>	<i>Executive 2002</i>	<i>% Change 2001 to 2002</i>	<i>Executive 2003</i>	<i>% Change 2002 to 2003</i>
DYS Youth Services, Department of								
Federal Special Revenue Fund Group Total			\$ 11,182,752	\$ 12,609,722	\$ 29,007,249	130.0%	\$ 30,333,799	4.6%
147	470-612	Vocational Education	\$ 1,883,836	\$1,911,569	\$ 2,012,665	5.3%	\$ 2,090,392	3.9%
4W3	470-618	Help Me Grow	\$ 0	\$10,000	\$ 10,900	9.0%	\$ 11,587	6.3%
5J7	470-623	Residential Treatment Services	\$ 1,462,391	\$0	\$ 0	N/A	\$ 500,000	N/A
State Special Revenue Fund Group Total			\$ 3,346,227	\$ 1,921,569	\$ 2,023,565	5.3%	\$ 2,601,979	28.6%
Total All Budget Fund Groups			\$ 248,786,404	\$ 259,716,718	\$ 278,121,278	7.1%	\$ 289,973,138	4.3%

General Revenue Fund

GRF 470-401 RECLAIM Ohio

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$133,866,918	\$137,993,236	\$147,960,057	\$156,118,064	\$162,433,054	\$166,076,711
	3.1%	7.2%	5.5%	4.0%	2.2%

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: ORC 5139; originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 152 of the 120th General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1994 and FY 1995.

Purpose: This line item was previously called Care and Custody. Under Am. Sub. H.B. 283 of the 123rd General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 2000 and 2001, the name was changed to RECLAIM Ohio. This line item is used to provide institutional placement and community program services to youths who have been convicted of a felony offense, and to any delinquent child, unruly child, or juvenile traffic offender who is under the jurisdiction of a juvenile court. The line item functions as the funding mechanism for the state's RECLAIM Ohio program, which is shorthand for Reasoned and Equitable Community and Local Alternatives to Incarceration of Minors. RECLAIM Ohio was launched as a pilot in January 1994 and taken statewide in 1995.

Various portions of the fund are to be set aside for the following specific purposes. Approximately 3 percent to 5 percent of the line item's annual appropriation is held as a contingency to ensure that a juvenile court can continue to commit felony delinquents to the department, even if it has exhausted its annual allotment of RECLAIM Ohio funding. This contingency also ensures that the department's institutions and county-run community corrections facilities (CCFs) are fiscally solvent.

Twenty-five percent of the fund is set aside to fund state institutions, privately contracted facilities, residential treatment centers, CCFs, as well as the program's administrative costs.

The department also determines and sets aside the amount of funds that are necessary to pay for "public safety beds," for which counties are not charged. These beds are reserved for certain violent felony offenders and certain offenders who have committed an offense while in the care and custody of an institution or CCF. Additional money is set aside to cover commitments from counties which account for one-tenth of one percent, or less, of statewide felony adjudications.

The remaining funds are allocated to counties on a monthly basis. On or before the 15th of the month, each county receives one twelfth of their annual funding allotment, minus 75 percent of the daily per diem cost for each youth they have committed to a departmental institution and 50 percent of the daily per diem cost for each youth they have committed to a CCF in the previous month that has not either met the requirements for a public safety bed or been placed with a Community Based Options program (CBOP) provider.

GRF 470-402 Community Program Services

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$2,986,638	\$2,924,576	\$2,334,926	\$2,418,255	\$748,391	\$847,970
	-2.1%	-20.2%	3.6%	-69.1%	13.3%

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: ORC 5139.07; originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 440 of the 114th G.A., which replaced the Ohio Youth Commission with the Department of Youth Services.

Purpose: Currently, the department uses this line item to fund transitional services under its Community Based Options program, also known as CBOP. Under CBOP, the department contracts for transitional and residential services for youths who would benefit from specialized programming. This allows for a 90-day "step-down" phase for higher-risk, multi-need youth as they near the end of their commitment to a state institution.

GRF 470-404 Vocational Rehabilitation

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$250,000	\$256,250	\$0	\$268,435	\$0	\$0
	2.5%	-100.0%	N/A	-100.0%	N/A

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 152 of the 120th G.A., the main appropriations act covering FY 1994s and FY 1995.

Purpose: This line item was used to support an interagency agreement with the Rehabilitation Services Commission (RSC) to provide vocational rehabilitation services and staff to mutually eligible clients. This GRF appropriation represented the state cash match that enabled RSC to draw on federal vocational rehabilitation services funding.

GRF 470-405 County Program Development

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$350,000	\$600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	71.4%	-100.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: originally established by Controlling Board in May 1995.

Purpose: Funds in this line item were used to award onetime Challenge Grants to juvenile courts that had been unable to realize funding through RECLAIM Ohio, because their commitment costs exceeded their allocations of state funding.

GRF 470-412 Lease Rental Payments

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$9,781,555	\$9,659,134	\$13,251,131	\$16,300,000	\$17,376,700	\$18,739,900
	-1.3%	37.2%	23.0%	6.6%	7.8%

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 111 of the 118th G.A., the main appropriations act covering FYs 1990 and FY 1991.

Purpose: This special purpose account funds debt service payments made to the Ohio Building Authority for its obligations incurred as a result of issuing the bonds that cover the department's capital appropriations. This account's appropriation authority and actual spending levels are set and controlled by the Office of Budget and Management, and not by the department. The moneys made available as a result of these bonds have financed the design, construction, renovation, and rehabilitation phases of various departmental capital projects, as well as the construction and renovation costs associated with community projects (community corrections facilities, county detention centers, and the like).

GRF 470-413 Preventive Maintenance

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$27,791	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-100.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 111 of the 118th G.A., the main appropriations act covering FYs 1990 and FY 1991; replaced GRF line item 470-708, Institutional Repairs.

Purpose: The purpose of this line item was to provide the department with discretionary funding that could be used to acquire contractual services, labor, materials, and replacement equipment for preventive maintenance projects within its institutions. Generally, institutional projects utilizing this line item cost less than \$20,000. The line item's purpose and funding were rolled into GRF line item 470-401, RECLAIM Ohio.

GRF 470-501 Rehabilitation Subsidy

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$0	\$0	\$2,014,946	\$2,147,431	\$0	\$0
	N/A	N/A	6.6%	-100.0%	N/A

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 283 of the 123rd General Assembly, the main appropriations act for FYs 2000 and FY 2001.

Purpose: This line item was created effective July 1, 1999 as a byproduct of separating the department's existing GRF line item 470-502, Detention Subsidies, into two subsidy accounts. The purpose of creating line item 470-501, Rehabilitation Subsidy, was to create a recognizable state revenue stream that provided financial assistance to county rehabilitation and treatment centers. The intent of the executive budget proposed for FYs 2002 and 2003 is to eliminate this subsidy for county rehabilitation and treatment centers.

GRF 470-502 Detention Subsidies

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$7,698,465	\$8,104,443	\$6,211,139	\$5,963,264	\$6,225,468	\$6,498,015
	5.3%	-23.4%	-4.0%	4.4%	4.4%

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: ORC 5139.281; established in current form by Am. Sub. H.B. 440 of the 114th G.A., which replaced the Ohio Youth Commission with the Department of Youth Services.

Purpose: Historically, this line item supported two programs: 1) a detention center subsidy; and 2) a rehabilitation and treatment center subsidy. The detention center subsidy supports these county facilities in meeting maintenance and operational expenses. Priority was given to funding for detention centers, and any residual funding was allocated to rehabilitation and treatment centers. Under Am. Sub. H.B. 283 of the 123rd General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 2000 and 2001, this line item was split into two GRF line items: 470-501, Rehabilitation Subsidy, and 470-502, Detention Subsidies. The intention was that line item 470-502 exclusively assist county detention centers.

GRF 470-510 Youth Services

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$21,593,549	\$21,274,368	\$21,243,779	\$21,755,698	\$18,981,015	\$21,522,900
	-1.5%	-0.1%	2.4%	-12.8%	13.4%

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: ORC 5139.34; established in current form by Am. Sub. H.B. 440 of the 114th G.A., which replaced the Ohio Youth Commission with the Department of Youth Services.

Purpose: The line item funds a subsidy program through which all juvenile courts receive moneys to provide services and programs to divert at-risk, unruly, and delinquent youths from entering the juvenile justice system. These funds are distributed according to a modified per capita formula that is specified in the Revised Code.

GRF 472-321 Parole Operations

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$16,384,994	\$16,274,217	\$16,873,690	\$16,920,721	\$16,848,527	\$17,420,220
	-0.7%	3.7%	0.3%	-0.4%	3.4%

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 117 of the 121st G.A., the main appropriations act covering FYs 1996 and FY 1997

Purpose: This item was created to consolidate funding for parole/aftercare operations previously funded through GRF line items 470-100, Personal Services, 470-200, Maintenance, and 470-300, Equipment. Under Am. Sub. H.B. 215 of the 122nd G.A., the main appropriations act covering FYs 1998 and 1999, some funding was shifted from GRF line item 470-402, Community Program Services, to line item 470-321, Parole Operations. The funding that was shifted reflected the portion of line item 470-402 that had traditionally financed the residential placement of paroled youth, and non-residential programs like GED preparation, substance abuse treatment, counseling, and the like for parolees. The amount of funding that was shifted totaled close to \$5 million annually.

GRF 474-321 Facilities Activation

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$27,783	\$0	\$2,489,486	\$0	\$0	\$0
	-100.0%	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	N/A

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 117 of the 121st G.A., the main appropriations act covering FYs 1996 and FY 1997.

Purpose: In the past, this line item has served at least two distinct one-time purposes. First, in FYs 1996 and 1997, this line item's funding was used to purchase equipment for the newly constructed Ohio River Valley Youth Center in Scioto County. In FY 2000, this line item's funding was used to provide start-up funding for the Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility, which replaced the department's Training Institution of Central Ohio, otherwise known as TICO.

GRF 477-321 Administrative Operations

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$13,656,263	\$13,845,951	\$13,739,593	\$13,892,543	\$14,964,599	\$16,095,397
	1.4%	-0.8%	1.1%	7.7%	7.6%

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 117 of the 121st G.A., the main appropriations act covering FYs 1996 and FY 1997

Purpose: This line item was created to consolidate funding for the department's central office operations that previously had been financed through GRF line items 470-100, Personal Services, 470-200 Maintenance, and 470-300, Equipment.

GRF 477-406 Interagency Collaborations

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$255,000	\$263,938
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	3.5%

Source: GRF

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 215 of the 122nd General Assembly, the main appropriations act covering FYs 1998 and FY 1999.

Purpose: This line item appears to serve two purposes. First, it assists with the department's role in the state's Family and Children First initiative. Second, it supports the department's involvement in what is termed the Linkages Project. This is a strategy to allow juvenile and adult courts to appropriately divert mental health and substance abuse offenders from jail, detention, and prison.

General Services Fund Group

175 470-613 Education Reimbursement

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$7,133,830	\$6,581,600	\$6,740,152	\$8,433,953	\$8,461,407	\$8,817,598
	-7.7%	2.4%	25.1%	0.3%	4.2%

Source: GSF: basic aid and special education program payments transferred from the Ohio Department of Education's budget.

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 111 of the 118th G.A., the main appropriations act covering FYs 1990 and FY 1991.

Purpose: This line item supports educational services provided to youth within institutions operated by the Department of Youth Services.

216 470-620 Juvenile Conferences

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$0	\$72,894	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: GSF: funds provided by participating state agencies.

Legal Basis: originally established by Controlling Board on December 5, 1997.

Purpose: This line item provided one-time funding for the Governor's Juvenile Crime Summit. Funding was provided by state agencies, with the amount determined by the number of \$150 conference slots allotted to each state agency. Contributing agencies included the Office of Criminal Justice Services, the Supreme Court of Ohio, the Office of the Attorney General, the Adjutant General, the Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, the Department of Health, the Department of Human Services, the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, the Department of Public Safety, and the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

479 470-609 Employee Food Service

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$139,157	\$66,179	\$125,800	\$140,263	\$143,349	\$146,933
	-52.4%	90.1%	11.5%	2.2%	2.5%

Source: GSF: 1) moneys received from institutional cafeterias; and 2) moneys received from the sale of surplus property.

Legal Basis: ORC 5139.86; originally established by Controlling Board in March 1982.

Purpose: All of the moneys credited to Fund 479 are to be used to purchase food, supplies, and equipment for the department's institutions.

4A2 470-602 Child Support

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$95,557	\$298,621	\$599,262	\$499,800	\$450,000	\$400,000
	212.5%	100.7%	-16.6%	-10.0%	-11.1%

Source: GSF: child support collected from non-custodial parents on behalf of youth committed to the department's custody.

Legal Basis: originally established by Controlling Board on August 3, 1992.

Purpose: All of the moneys in Fund 4A2 are used by the department to defray to costs of providing programs and services to youth committed to a departmental institution. At this time, the department utilizes all of these moneys to pay for staff training.

4G6 470-605 General Operational Funds

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$27,767	\$4,145	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
	-85.1%	-100.0%	N/A	0.0%	0.0%

Source: GSF: gifts, bequests, awards from non-profit organizations or other non-federal agencies in the state, and other receipts such as the sale of recyclable products.

Legal Basis: established by Controlling Board in April 1994.

Purpose: While the department has flexibility in the use of these funds, most recently the moneys in Fund 4G6 have been used to purchase educational supplies and educational software for the department's institutions.

4J7 470-619 Mental Health & Substance Abuse Treatment

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$425,475	\$1,324,144	\$309,078	\$0	\$0	\$0
	211.2%	-76.7%	-100.0%	N/A	N/A

Source: GSF: GRF moneys transferred from under permissive temporary law from the Department of Mental Health's budget, as well as moneys transferred from the department's Fund 321, line item 470-614, Title IV-E Reimbursements.

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. S.B. 310, the supplemental appropriations act of the 121st G.A.

Purpose: These funds were used to support the Linkages Project, an effort jointly planned and coordinated by the departments of Rehabilitation and Correction, Mental Health, Youth Services, and Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services. This collaborative effort was for the purpose of creating a partnership with certain counties in the delivery of mental health and recovery (alcohol and substance abuse treatment) services to adult and juvenile offenders. Starting with FY 1997, funds flowed to demonstration or pilot projects in five counties (Cuyahoga, Hamilton, Lorain, Summit, and Trumbull).

523 470-621 Wellness Program

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$1,945	\$25,027	\$114,386	\$67,000	\$192,954	\$197,778
	1186.7%	357.1%	-41.4%	188.0%	2.5%

Source: GSF: funds transferred from the Department of Job and Family Services, formerly known as the Department of Human Services prior to its merger with the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, effective July 1, 2000.

Legal Basis: originally established through Controlling Board on December 15, 1997.

Purpose: All of the moneys in Fund 523 are used to deliver a parenting and pregnancy prevention program that targets female offenders housed at the department's Riverview Juvenile Correctional Center in Delaware County.

Federal Special Revenue Fund Group

321 470-601 Education

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$1,563,632	\$1,213,600	\$1,233,741	\$1,653,879	\$1,298,156	\$1,334,122
	-22.4%	1.7%	34.1%	-21.5%	2.8%

Source: FED: various federal education grants, including: 1) CFDA #84.013, Title I Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children; 2) CFDA #84.027, Special Education - Grants to States; and 3) CFDA #84.048, Vocational Education - Basic Grants to States.

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 111 of the 118th G.A., the main appropriations act covering FYs 1990 and 1991; replaced former federal line item 471-601.

Purpose: These federal moneys are used to support the department's institutional education program, which covers a wide variety of academic, vocational, special education, remedial, and individualized programming.

321 470-603 Juvenile Justice Prevention

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$452,726	\$1,029,011	\$1,290,226	\$1,673,083	\$2,973,733	\$2,973,733
	127.3%	25.4%	29.7%	77.7%	0.0%

Source: FED: various project specific federal criminal and juvenile justice grants, most notably CFDA #16.579, Byrne Memorial Criminal Justice Block Grant.

Legal Basis: originally established by Controlling Board on August 18, 1986.

Purpose: These federal funds are used for a variety of purposes related primarily to programs within the institutions, such as substance abuse.

321 470-606 Nutrition

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$2,272,569	\$2,108,730	\$2,404,752	\$2,795,228	\$2,800,000	\$2,800,000
	-7.2%	14.0%	16.2%	0.2%	0.0%

Source: FED: 1) CFDA #10.555, National School Lunch Program; and 2) CFDA #10.553, School Breakfast Program.

Legal Basis: originally established by Controlling Board in November 1976.

Purpose: These federal moneys represent reimbursement payments from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service for breakfasts and lunches served to eligible youth committed to the department's institutions. These moneys are used to support the department's institutional food services program.

321 470-610 Rehabilitation Programs

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$33,713	\$74,309	\$217,775	\$696,826	\$83,500	\$83,500
	120.4%	193.1%	220.0%	-88.0%	0.0%

Source: FED: CFDA #84.186, Safe and Drug-Free Schools - State Grants.

Legal Basis: originally established by Am. Sub. H.B. 291 of the 115th G.A., the main appropriations act covering FY 1984 and FY 1985.

Purpose: These federal funds are used to provide for substance abuse programming and education within the department's institutions.

321 470-614 Title IV-E Reimbursements

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$7,021,247	\$6,405,315	\$5,827,094	\$5,542,089	\$5,700,000	\$5,700,000
	-8.8%	-9.0%	-4.9%	2.8%	0.0%

Source: FED: 1) CFDA #93.658, Foster Care - Title IV-E; and 2) CFDA #93.778, Medicaid Assistance Program.

Legal Basis: originally established by Controlling Board on December 9, 1988.

Purpose: These moneys are used to help fund the placement of youth in non-institutional residential settings, such as treatment centers.

321 470-617 Americorps Programs

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$203,309	\$234,614	\$209,164	\$248,617	\$407,860	\$418,444
	15.4%	-10.8%	18.9%	64.1%	2.6%

Source: FED: CFDA #94.001, Corporation for National Community Service.

Legal Basis: originally established by Controlling Board on December 6, 1993

Purpose: AmeriCorps, created by the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, is a program under which young people perform paid work in community service projects in exchange for receiving financial help towards a college education. DYS was chosen by the Governor's Office to implement the program in Ohio. The department acts as a conduit for AmeriCorps grant funds, disbursing and monitoring grants to local organizations.

3U1 470-607 Criminal Justice Federal Programs

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,584,798	\$11,025,908
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.2%

Source: FED: CFDA #16.560, Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG); executive budget proposes to transfer control of the JAIBG grant program from the Office of Criminal Justice Services to the Department of Youth Services.

Legal Basis: newly created as part of the executive-recommended budget contained in H.B. 95, the main appropriations act of the 124th G.A.

Purpose: The major thrust of this relatively new federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention grant program is the development of accountability-based sanctions, the operation of juvenile detention and corrections facilities, and the treatment of juveniles placed in residential facilities. Starting with FY 2002, the executive-proposed budget moves control of the JAIBG program from the Office of Criminal Justice Services to the Department of Youth Services.

3V5 470-604 Juvenile Justice/Delinquency Prevention

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,159,202	\$5,998,092
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16.3%

Source: FED: various juvenile justice and delinquency federal grant programs, including: 1) CFDA #16.540, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention - Allocation to State; 2) CFDA #16.548, Title V - Delinquency Prevention Program; and 3) CFDA #16.549, Part E - State Challenge Activities; executive budget proposes to transfer control of this federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention funding from the Office of Criminal Justice Services to the Department of Youth Services.

Legal Basis: newly created as part of the executive-recommended budget contained in H.B. 95, the main appropriations act of the 124th G.A.

Purpose: The federal funding received under these various programs are disbursed to state and local agencies to support development of more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, accountability based sanctions, and rehabilitation programs in the area of juvenile delinquency and programs to improve the juvenile justice system.

State Special Revenue Fund Group

147 470-612 Vocational Education

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$1,703,709	\$1,455,879	\$1,883,836	\$1,911,569	\$2,012,665	\$2,090,392
	-14.5%	29.4%	1.5%	5.3%	3.9%

Source: SSR: vocational education program payments transferred from the Ohio Department of Education's budget.

Legal Basis: originally established by Controlling Board on January 9, 1984.

Purpose: All of the moneys in Fund 147 are used for the delivery of vocational education services and programs to youth committed to the department's institutions.

4W3 470-618 Help Me Grow

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$2,640	\$1,056	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,900	\$11,587
	-60.0%	-100.0%	N/A	9.0%	6.3%

Source: SSR: cash transferred from the Department of Health's GRF-funded Ohio Early Start program.

Legal Basis: originally established by Controlling Board on March 2, 1998.

Purpose: Under the department's community services program, envelopes containing information and coupons related to nutrition and the well-being of children are prepared by institutionalized youth. The department is essentially participating in the mail fulfillment component of the state's Family and Children First initiative known as Help Me Grow.

5J7 470-623 Residential Treatment Services

1998	1999	2000	2001 Estimate	2002 Executive Proposal	2003 Executive Proposal
\$0	\$0	\$1,462,391	\$0	\$0	\$500,000
	N/A	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	N/A

Source: SSR: moneys allocated annually from the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's federal Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth-in-Sentencing Incentive program grant.

Legal Basis: originally established by the Controlling Board on September 13, 1999.

Purpose: To date, all of the moneys in Fund 5J7 have been used to purchase contract beds for male sex offenders and serious female offenders.