1995

Montana's welfare system: State versus county control.

Jerry Grimes
The University of Montana

Maureen and Mike

MANSFIELD LIBRARY

The University of **MONTANA**

Permission is granted by the author to reproduce this material in its entirety, provided that this material is used for scholarly purposes and is properly cited in published works and reports.

*** Please check "Yes" or "No" and provide signature ***

Yes, I grant permission x

No, I do not grant permission ______

Author's Signature [illegible]

Date 5/12/95

Any copying for commercial purposes or financial gain may be undertaken only with the author's explicit consent.

MONTANA'S WELFARE SYSTEM:
STATE VERSUS COUNTY CONTROL

by

Jerry Grimes

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Public Administration

University of Montana

1994 - 1995

Approved by

Jonathan Tompkins

Chairman, Board of Examiners

Dean, Graduate School

May 12, 1995

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview of the Structure of Montana's Welfare Offices

The complexity of administrative arrangements in a federal system is clearly illustrated in the case of public assistance programs. It is not unusual in Montana, for example, for federal programs to be delivered by county welfare offices staffed with workers who are employed by the state. To accomplish this, Montana statute (53-2-3, MCA) establishes in each county of the state:

> ... a county department of public welfare, which shall consist of a county board of public welfare and such staff personnel as may be necessary for the efficient performance of the public assistance activities of the county.

County welfare offices are currently responsible for the administration of three federal public assistance programs: Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamps, and Medicaid. In order to staff these offices, the county commissioners are mandated to select and appoint such staff as are necessary from a list of qualified persons furnished by the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS):

> The staff personnel of each county department are directly responsible to the county board, but the department of social and rehabilitation services may supervise such county employees in respect to the efficient and proper performance of their duties. The county board of public welfare may not dismiss any member of the staff personnel without the approval of the department of social and rehabilitation services. The department may request the county board to dismiss any member of the staff personnel for inefficiency, incompetence, or similar cause. The final authority for dismissal is the county board (53-2-303, MCA).

The costs of operating county welfare offices generally fall into two expenditure categories, benefit and administration. The cost distribution for benefit expenditures in county welfare offices (with the exception of the state-assumed counties which are identified below) is as follows:

	County	State	Federal
AFDC	7%	22%	71%
Food Stamps	0%	0%	100%
Medicaid	0%	29%	71%

The administrative costs incurred by each county (with the exception of the state-assumed counties which are identified below) are funded as follows:

	County	State	Federal
Personnel	50%	0%	50%
Other Admin.	50%	0%	50%

The county's share of the costs in both of these areas is funded by levying up to 13.5 mills through a local property tax. Until 1993, a county could request "grant-in-aid" once it reached the limit of 13.5 mills. The state would then be responsible for any additional allowable poor fund expenditures. Grant-in-aid is no longer an available option.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, many Montana counties experienced difficulty in providing adequate funding for these offices. In 1982, for example, the following counties exceeded the 13.5 mill limit and requested grant-in-aid totaling $3,673,279: Deer Lodge ($320,410); Cascade ($1,109,654); Silver Bow ($1,092,189); Lewis & Clark ($620,979); Lincoln ($109,532); Park ($92,433); Missoula ($337,700); Mineral ($10,612); and Granite ($9,770).

In response to the demonstrated financial need, the 1983 Montana Legislature authorized what has since been called "state-assumption." This statute, which has had subsequent revisions, allows any county government to transfer to the state **all** responsibility for the three federally mandated welfare programs. In return for this transfer of responsibility, the counties are required to transfer 9 mills of their property tax to the state general fund.

Forty four counties have chosen to continue their responsibility for public assistance and are labeled as "state-supervised." Twelve counties have opted to transfer welfare responsibility to the state. They are called "State-Assumed" and include Cascade, Deer Lodge, Flathead, Lake, Lewis & Clark, Lincoln, Mineral, Missoula, Park, Powell, Ravalli and Silver Bow Counties. All of the nonfederal share for both benefits and administration of the welfare programs in these counties are paid from the special state revenue account established with the local nine mill levy. Any budget shortfall in this account is funded through a state general fund appropriation.

The distribution of costs for benefit expenditures in state-administered counties is as follows:

Program	County	State	Federal
AFDC	0%	29%	71%
Food Stamps	0%	0%	100%
Medicaid	0%	29%	71%

The administrative costs incurred by state-administered counties are funded as follows:

Admin. Costs	County	State	Federal
Personnel	0%	50%	50%
Other Admin.	0%	50%	50%

Total benefit expenditures for state fiscal year 1994 (SFY94) are presented in Attachment 1. State-supervised counties issued 48.29% of the state's $48,747,793 in AFDC benefits; 50.76% of the $284,082,644 in Medicaid benefits; and 47.65% of the $53,846,165 in Food Stamp benefits.

Problem Statement

Montana's use of two distinctly different administrative structures to operate welfare offices across the state creates three problems:

1. The administrative structure utilized in 44 counties is statutorily contradictory, confusing, and ineffective;
2. The structure in these 44 state-supervised counties exposes the state to potential federal financial sanctions and possible lawsuits with limited control of the process; and
3. The structure for 12 state-administered counties is centralized and provides little or no local control of programs.

These problems, which are discussed in detail in Chapters II and III, give rise to the underlying purpose of this paper.

Purpose

This paper compares the administrative differences between state-assumed and state-supervised counties in Montana to determine whether total state-assumption or total de-assumption would (1) better clarify the administrative and supervisory structure of the welfare delivery system and (2) result in a more efficient and effective operation of the state's welfare offices.

To assess this, I will:

- review the appropriate Montana Codes to determine legislative intent and statutory requirements,
- evaluate historical precedents regarding responsibility for determining staffing levels,

- consider the current political paradigm dictating reductions in government size and government spending,
- evaluate structural changes that have occurred at the county level during the past several years (i.e., county combinations),
- consider programmatic changes and expectations that have occurred as the result of legislative and judicial action,
- review the Legislature's ability to adequately fund and staff state-assumed offices, and
- discuss the need to ensure continued community input and accountability in both structural options.

Methodology

The following methodology was used to achieve the purposes identified above.

> First, during the past eighteen months, I engaged in informal interviews and discussions with county commissioners and county welfare staff throughout the state using fourth generation evaluation techniques. These discussions were used to identify administrative and supervisory deficiencies within the current Montana welfare delivery system and to assess political support or opposition to the two available options. These results of those discussions form the basis for the majority of this paper.
>
> Second, data from the most current state fiscal years was obtained from the agency's statistical bulletins to illustrate the total benefit expenditures for the AFDC,

Medicaid, and Food Stamp programs. This information shows the magnitude and complexity of the programs involved and illustrates the potential financial risk to the state if federal sanctions were imposed as the result of state or county non-compliance.

Third, an agency spreadsheet was evaluated to determine the average work load that eligibility staff are responsible for in each of the county welfare offices in Montana. This information illustrates staffing inequities overall between the state-assumed and state-supervised county operations. It also illustrates inequities that exist from county to county particularly within the state-supervised offices. The resulting information provides insight into the need for greater control of FTEs.

Fourth, projections were made to determine potential savings that could be realized by assigning one County Director to supervise multiple counties. Counties were identified that were within geographical proximity of each other. County Director salaries from these counties were determined and travel costs were estimated based upon several scenarios. The resulting costs were compared to current costs to determine whether combining counties would result in significant savings to the county budget. These projections were then compared with the realities of the past year to determine if county combinations had been formed. If not, what were the deciding factors other than financial.

To begin the process of arriving at a final recommendation, Chapter II examines the problems resulting from joint management of the welfare offices between SRS and the counties. These problems involve joint supervision of staff, staffing levels, financial responsibility, and the potential for federal sanctions as a result of agency non-compliance with federal regulations.

CHAPTER II

ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY DEFICIENCIES IN MONTANA'S STATE-SUPERVISED COUNTY WELFARE OFFICES

With Montana's use of a jointly administered structure in 44 counties, jurisdictional disputes are inherent. These conflicts center around who has (1) responsibility to provide direct supervision to the staff in these offices; (2) responsibility for determining staffing levels; (3) authority to make programmatic decisions; and (4) financial responsibility for certain administrative expenditures and costs resulting from federal sanctions or litigation. The purpose of this chapter is to describe and analyze the areas of conflict.

Supervision of Staff

As indicated in Chapter 1, the Montana Code Annotated (53-2-303) provides contradictory language in this area:

> The staff personnel of each county department are directly responsible to the county board, but the department of social and rehabilitation services may supervise such county employees in respect to the efficient and proper performance of their duties. The county board of public welfare may not dismiss any member of the staff personnel without the approval of the department of social and

> rehabilitation services. The department may request the county board to dismiss any member of the staff personnel for inefficiency, incompetence, or similar cause. The final authority for dismissal is the county board.

Attorney General Opinion No. 16, dated October 29, 1993, provides clarity to this issue. Attorney General Joseph P. Mazurek held that:

> County welfare department personnel are state employees for purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act, entitlement to employee benefits, and participation in employee-related programs. If county welfare department personnel are involuntarily terminated from employment and wish to pursue a grievance, they must follow the grievance procedure established by the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services unless the Department and the county have mutually agreed upon an alternative process.

Attorney General Mazurek's Opinion reiterated the Legislature's intent that there be a cooperative state-county administration of public assistance:

> While the Department has overall responsibility for the administration of public assistance programs, each county which has not transferred its public assistance and protective services to the Department is responsible for local administration of all public assistance operations in the county.

The Opinion also explained that the county board is authorized by law to select its staff personnel, but it must do so from a list of qualified persons furnished by SRS (Montana Code Annotated 53-2-304(1)). The staff are directly responsible to the county board, but SRS may supervise such county employees with regard to the efficient and proper performance of their duties (53-2-304-(1), MCA). The county board may not dismiss any member of the staff without SRS approval, but SRS may request the county to dismiss any member of the staff for inefficiency, incompetence, or similar cause. The final authority for dismissal is in the county board (53-2-304(1)). This provision, however, conflicts with 53-2-203(1)(d) which grants the Department the authority to "supervise the appointment, dismissal, and entire status of the public assistance personnel attached to county boards."

Because the statutes offer no definitive answer to this conflict, the Attorney General looked instead to agency practice and usage. He cited the agency practice of treating these employees as state employees for purposes of salary, benefits, and other employment-related issues; providing compensation and benefits in accordance with the state pay and classification program; establishment of the number of employees in the biennial state budget; classification of county welfare staff by the Department of Administration as state employees and the requirement that all changes in personnel or salary status must be authorized by the Department of Administration; and the fact that collective bargaining with labor unions is conducted by the Department and the resulting collective bargaining agreements list the State of Montana as the employer of workers in county welfare offices. For these reasons, the Attorney General found that the county welfare staff are state employees.

Concurrently, Family Assistance Division of SRS has taken a much more active role in the supervision of county offices. The two area supervisors have begun a concerted effort to participate in and coordinate county and regional planning and decision making activities, to conduct appraisals of county directors, and to involve county directors in decision making activities at the central office.

Some county commissioners have resisted this movement. Broadwater County, for example, recently challenged the requirement that they follow the SRS Personnel policies in regard to hiring a clerical support staff person. Following a public meeting, to which they had invited the press and the County Attorney, they reluctantly agreed to follow SRS procedures.

Even though most of the uncertainty in these areas has dissipated as a result of the Attorney General's Opinion and SRS actions, the statutes remain unclear and contradictory. Supervisory responsibility should be clarified through Legislative action. Total state-assumption would resolve this conflict by eliminating joint responsibility between the state and county commissioners.

Another related concern involves control of the scope of staff duties. Per federal regulation, SRS conducts a cost allocation between the three federal programs to determine the percentage of time that workers spend administering each of the programs. This is used to determine the distribution of the federal share of the administrative costs. The method that is currently utilized measures only the proportion of staff time spent on the AFDC, Medicaid, and Food Stamp programs. Counties have been instructed to submit a cost allocation plan to SRS if they use welfare staff to determine eligibility for county indigent programs. Otherwise, it is assumed that 100% of their time is spent in administering the three federal programs. Total state-assumption would eliminate the possibility that SRS staff are utilizing state time to administer county programs and would eliminate possible reductions in federal financial participation in administrative costs that could result if SRS staff are not allocating 100% of their time to administering federal programs.

Responsibility for Determining Staffing Levels

During the past ten years, staffing levels in state-supervised counties have been determined at the local level by county welfare boards. Typically, a county director would first convince the county commissioners that the need for additional staff justified the increase to the poor fund for the non-federal share of the administrative costs. The county commissioners would then send a written request to SRS seeking approval for the additional Full Time Equivalency (FTE) and an increase in the expenditure of federal funds that are included in the SRS budget appropriation. Since these FTEs are financed with 50% county funds and 50% federal funds, increased staff do not directly impact the state's general fund. Consequently, SRS has had little difficulty in getting Executive Budget and Legislative approval.

However, during the past six years there has been increased pressure to reduce the size of state government, regardless of the funding source. Requests from state-supervised counties now are scrutinized to determine appropriateness of the request and FTEs are limited for both state-assumed and state-supervised counties.

To monitor the equitable allocation of staff, SRS utilizes a report from TEAMS (The Economic Assistance Management System) to determine staffing levels by county. This report provides an unduplicated case load count by county (i.e., assistance units). Attachment 2 presents the average assistance unit per worker by county and is formatted with state-supervised and state-assumed counties in separate groupings. Overall, the assistance unit average is relatively consistent between state-supervised and state-assumed counties. However, within the state-supervised counties there are a number of counties with exceptionally high or low averages. As FTEs become vacant, SRS is now taking an active role in shifting FTEs to establish equity between both state-supervised and state-assumed counties.

Conversely, if counties attempt to lower administrative costs by reducing staffing, SRS will be required to become more involved in determining adequate local staffing levels to ensure equitable administration of programs across county lines. This could mean that SRS would have to take a proactive approach if a state-supervised county were to allow staffing levels to drop to unacceptably low levels.

In recent history, SRS has only once been involved in litigation over a county's staffing level. In 1982, SRS filed a suit in State District Court to require Sanders County to hire a County Director. Members of the County Welfare Board unsuccessfully argued that they could assume these duties. The court ruled that the county must hire a County Director and they must choose this individual from a list of qualified applicants supplied by SRS.

In line with the effort by Governor Racicot to eliminate mid-level managers and to reduce administrative costs, SRS encouraged county commissioners to consider the possibility of sharing a county director between multiple counties and/or the development of Regional Directors. During the 1993 Legislative Session an early retirement bill was passed that would facilitate this movement. Within SRS, 25.5 FTE chose to retire. This included 9 County Directors.

During the past year, additional combinations were finalized in a total of four areas. The counties of Hill, Liberty, Blaine and Chouteau hired a Regional Manager in February 1994. They are currently in the early stages of establishing a working Human Services Advisory Council and determining the scope of its authority.

Beaverhead, Jefferson, and Silver Bow; and Broadwater, Park, and Meagher have also consolidated the duties a county director for each of their districts. In addition, the counties in each of the five SRS Regions are establishing regional management teams.

However, some counties have been reluctant to consolidate. Recently, Richland County requested that an Eligibility Examiner III be promoted for 25% of her time to the County Director position. They argue that they need to reduce administrative costs and that there is not a need for a full time director. They have evaluated the feasibility of a county combination (combining the position with one or more other counties) and determined that they do not wish to do so at this time.

Over the past year, several other counties have considered and rejected the option of sharing a county director. For example, Rosebud County chose to hire a full time County Director; Madison County decided to continue funding a full time County Director position rather than to combine with Beaverhead; and several combinations were unsuccessfully proposed with Richland County.

While these county commissions are seriously interested in reducing administrative costs, they have determined that the work load warrants a full time director, they have either not been able to find acceptable combinations, or they have been unwilling to turn the control of their local office over to a county director with partial loyalties to another county. Each Commission has indicated an awareness that regionalization may be forced by the Legislature. However, they prefer to wait and see what the Legislature mandates rather than take the initiative at this time. If state-assumption were to occur, SRS would likely establish county combinations in all three of these counties and would save considerable administrative costs in the process.

Attachments 3-1 through 3-4 provide examples of potential savings to counties through consolidation of County Director positions. State-assumption would allow SRS to implement additional county combinations. Again, while there would be no savings to the state general fund, there would be savings to local tax payers and increased efficiency as a result of a reduction of FTEs needed to operate county offices.

The problems described above are inherent in a system that provides jointly administered programs between the state and county. To reduce or eliminate inequitable staffing levels and to more efficiently utilize authorized FTEs, SRS feels justified in exerting control over staffing levels at the county level. Total state-assumption would clearly place these responsibilities with SRS.

Programmatic Responsibility

Most county commissioners in state-supervised counties argue against state-assumption primarily because they do not want to relinquish their control of public assistance programs. They point to the escalation of General Relief expenditures in state-assumed counties during the 1980s as an example of poor program management. They fear that the same thing will happen in their county if the state administers their poor fund programs.

These concerns are well-founded to the extent that the state has failed to control and reduce expenditures in state assumed counties. However, this has not been the result of SRS inaction or incompetence. It resulted from constitutional restrictions which were corrected in 1993 with HB 427. Prior to this change, the Constitution treated General Relief as an entitlement program. If an individual living in any of the state-assumed counties met the constitutional definition of "indigent," SRS was required to provide assistance. The Legislature made several attempts to limit the state's constitutionally based obligations, but each of these attempts were overturned by the courts. The latter directed SRS to continue providing benefits and directed the Legislature to provide the necessary funding.

However, as a result of the ever-increasing pressure to reduce expenditures to the poor, the Montana Constitution was amended in 1991 so that General Relief could no longer be viewed as an entitlement. As a result, HB 427, enacted by the 53rd Legislature, amended Title 53 of the Montana Codes Annotated to eliminate the State General Relief Assistance and General Relief Medical programs in the twelve state assumed counties. It did, however, allow these twelve counties to levy up to an additional 4.5 mills from the county poor fund to finance local indigent programs.

HB 427 also provided that the indigent programs in state-supervised counties were no longer mandated. As a result, the county general assistance and county medical programs are now optional. These changes should allow the state to exert greater control over expenditures in state- assumed counties, thereby removing one of the fears regarding lost control held by the other 44 counties.

In reality, local control of the AFDC, Food Stamp and Medicaid programs is non-existent. While funding and cost distribution for the three federal programs vary between state-assumed and state-supervised counties, all program eligibility policies and guidelines are established by the state from federal regulations and are consistently applied by all county offices, regardless of whether the office is state-supervised or state-assumed. Consequently, an applicant for AFDC, Medicaid and/or Food Stamps from Yellowstone County will find the same eligibility criteria and benefit level as he or she would find in Lincoln County. However, as discussed earlier, the provisions of joint administration of the programs in a state-supervised county can cause jurisdictional roadblocks that could disrupt the consistent application of policy statewide. As stated earlier, state-assumption would provide clear supervisory authority to prevent and/or resolve this problem.

Financial Responsibility

SRS issues the pay check to all staff employed in the county welfare offices. In state-supervised counties, the non federal share of these costs are then billed to the counties on a monthly basis. The counties reconcile these costs against other operating costs that they have incurred during the month, such as rent, utilities, and supplies.

Over the past several years, some counties have refused to accept expenses in two areas that the state has passed on to them through this county billing process. In the first instance, SRS, with legislative approval, installed a new computer system (TEAMS) used by county staff to determine eligibility for AFDC, Medicaid, and Food Stamps. Although state and federal funds were used to develop and implement the system, on-going computer costs are now being billed to the counties. A number of the counties are refusing to pay these expenses, citing a letter from then Governor Stephens indicating that "[f]unding for the development and implementation of the computerization is provided by the state and federal governments." However, in Attorney General

Opinion No. 26, dated June 22, 1994, Attorney General Mazurek states that "the letter does not indicate an obligation on the State's part to finance these costs in perpetuity." The Attorney General found that the on-going costs are "administrative costs" and, as such, the non federal share is the responsibility of the county.

The second instance of challenged expenses involves postage costs that are incurred for the mailing of food stamp coupons. In 1991, SRS entered into a contract with Sacramento Services Development Corporation to package and mail designated food stamp coupon allotments to all authorized recipient households in Montana. Prior to this contract, SRS contracted with entities throughout the state to manually distribute coupons. Following the change in delivery methods, several counties refused to pay their identified postage costs. SRS continues to pursue payment of these charges using many of the same arguments set forth in Attorney General Opinion No. 26 citing 53-2-304(2):

> [T]he county board of public welfare shall reimburse the department of social and rehabilitation services from county poor funds ... the full amount of the department's administrative costs [non federal share] which are allocated by the department to the county for the administration of county welfare programs and not reimbursed to the department by the federal government.

Again, even though the Attorney General has provided direction, final clarification may be required from the courts. Total state-assumption would eliminate this conflict because the county commissioners would not approve or deny expenditures by a state-assumed county welfare office.

Another issue regarding financial responsibility involves the risk of federal financial sanctions. SRS must adhere to federal regulations while administering the public assistance programs. Failure to do so may result in financial sanctions against the state. For example, food stamp program regulations at 7CFR275.23, mandates that:

> [F]or any fiscal year in which a State agency's payment error rate exceeds the payment-error tolerance level, the State agency shall pay or have its share of administrative costs reduced by an amount equal to the difference between its payment error rate less such tolerance level as a quantity, multiplied by the total value of the allotments issued in the fiscal year by that State agency.

While it is outside of the scope of this paper to explore the size of the state agency's potential sanction, other states have had multi-million dollar sanctions assessed against them as a result of their high error rates. Fortunately, Montana has escaped this experience to date.

But, if sanctions were applied against SRS, Attorney General Opinion No. 26 clarifies that "counties bear all the costs associated with the administration of public assistance which are not reimbursed to SRS by the federal government." Consequently, the potential costs due to sanctions would be shared by all counties, with the state being responsible for only the portion allocated to the state-assumed counties.

However, a valid complaint, and possible legal action, could be initiated against the state by counties if the state fails to take reasonable action to prevent sanctions. For example, if one county consistently obtains a high error rate and the state fails to intervene by providing adequate training, adequate computer processing capability, ensuring adequate staffing levels, and taking other reasonable actions, the non offending counties might be justified in challenging the charges allocated to them. Therefore, SRS must take an active role in monitoring compliance with federal regulations and taking corrective action to ensure that a small number of counties do not place all counties at risk of financial sanctions.

The same problem arises in other areas. For example, SRS must ensure equal treatment of clients statewide and compliance with civil rights statutes to prevent federal sanctions and possible litigation. If it does not, financial penalties could be assessed against all counties - not just the offending county.

At the present time, SRS continues to take appropriate actions to preclude the levying of sanctions by the federal agencies. Nonetheless, the potential for such problems occurring would be greatly reduced if all county programs were state-assumed. In addition, authorizing legislation for state-assumption could provide a clear statement that a county's liability for the administration of public assistance programs is limited to the on-going annual amount required for state-assumption. For example, if a statewide levy is established at 8 mills for state-assumption and a federal sanction is assessed that requires funding beyond the 8 mills, the shortfall would be taken from the state general fund rather than being shared with counties.

In summary, all of the above concerns could be eliminated if total state-assumption were to occur. However, there are several inherent problems with state-assumption. These will be discussed in Chapter III.

CHAPTER III

ADMINISTRATIVE DEFICIENCIES IN MONTANA'S STATE-ASSUMED COUNTY WELFARE OFFICES

In the twelve state-assumed counties, SRS is solely responsible for the administration of the public assistance programs. The eligibility process is identical to the procedures used in the state-supervised counties. However, there are administrative differences between the two structures. In state-assumed counties, supervision of county operations come directly from the Area Supervisor in the Family Assistance Division. There is no involvement with county commissioners. In these twelve counties, the conflicts described in Chapter II resulting from the joint administration of state-supervised counties is absent.

The structure used in state-assumed counties works effectively, except for two problems. With the removal of the county commissioners from the supervisory loop, obtaining and maintaining adequate staffing levels has been difficult and obtaining community input for such things as determining program direction has been problematic.

Staffing

Staffing continues to be a significant problem. The Legislature has granted only minimal increases in FTEs over the past 10 years, even though case loads have increased significantly. The following chart illustrates the increased case load and levels of expenditures by program over the past 5 years.

OBLIGATIONS	SFY94	SFY89	% CHG.
All PA	$408,736,477	$223,796,619	82.6%
AFDC	$48,945,741	$37,309,456	31.2%
Medicaid	$301,592,347	$149,975,277	101.1%
Food Stamps	$55,413,520	$35,507,662	56.1%
AVG. MONTHLY CASES			
AFDC	11,861	9,361	26.7%
Medicaid	51,367	27,182	89.0%
Food Stamps	27,600	21,082	30.9%

In comparison, 388.55 FTEs were authorized in SFY89 and 386.90 FTEs were authorized statewide in SFY94.

The Montana Legislature has been reluctant to authorize new FTEs during a period when the administration is attempting to reduce the size of state government. In addition, there is a revenue shortfall between the revenue generated by the 9 mill state-assumption levy and the total program and administrative costs. Even though the need for additional staff is obvious, SRS does not generally request additional FTEs to administer the on-going programs in the twelve state-assumed counties because of these political realities.

Not coincidentally, staff morale and turnover have become serious problems in the state-assumed counties. Lewis and

Clark County, for example, has had turnover of 5 out of 18 non supervisory staff in the past six months.

Total de-assumption, however, would not alleviate the problems related to inadequate staffing. The following chart shows the estimated number of mills and revenue needed to fund the public assistance programs in the state-assumed counties during SFY1994.

County	Revenue	Mills
Cascade	$1,470,885	14.04
Deer Lodge	359,905	37.79
Flathead	1,222,397	9.83
Lake	532,695	13.27
Lewis & Clark	981,099	12.89
Lincoln	517,271	18.44
Mineral	108,384	12.43
Missoula	1,729,256	12.71
Park	270,018	10.53
Powell	117,948	9.27
Ravalli	498,917	13.58
Silver Bow	1,098,849	19.94

To de-assume these counties would put even more pressure on the local tax payers. As the above chart illustrates, counties would have difficulty providing the current funding levels, let alone trying to provide additional funding to increase staffing levels. Clearly, without some type of grant-in-aid option, de-assumption would not alleviate the existing staffing problems. Instead, it would exacerbate the problem.

Community Input and Accountability

In addition to the problems encountered as a result of inadequate staffing, responsiveness to both local community and client needs have decreased. During the past 10 years, the state-assumed county offices have become relatively autonomous. There are no organized structures for the input of ideas from those outside of SRS.

The lone exception has been in the area of welfare reform. In the late 1980s, SRS implemented reforms to its employment and training programs. To implement and monitor the program, which is named JOBS, local on-going task forces were mandated by the state. Also incumbent upon this reform was the need to coordinate existing training and support resources. In order to incorporate local needs, planning and implementation of current welfare reform efforts will rely heavily upon this same structure. Community task forces and local involvement are being utilized in both state-assumed and state-supervised counties. Families Achieving Independence in Montana (FAIM) is a significant effort to obtain community input and involvement in the administration of public assistance programs. This effort will go beyond welfare reform and will eliminate the isolation that has occurred as a result of state-assumption in the past.

In another effort to both coordinate and influence program direction, SRS has over the past several years encouraged the formation of HRACs (Human Resource Advisory Councils) when multiple county combinations were developed. Ideally, these councils would oversee the regional administration of programs and could have the authority to manage staff levels and submit waiver requests to operate under different criteria from the remainder of the state. To date, the HRACs have not developed to this point and their current value is questionable.

For SRS to adapt to the changing needs of its customers and benefactors (i.e., the tax payers and the Legislature), input from outside SRS is essential. This could be accomplished through community task forces or advisory councils. Or, it could be accomplished through involvement of county commissioners. However, it is not necessary for state-assumption to occur to reach this goal, as the problem can exist in either state-assumed or state-supervised counties. It's just more likely to occur in state-assumed counties. SRS offices need to accept the need for change and take the action through one or more of the available options. Total state-assumption would allow SRS to more effectively mandate this type of activity.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Summary

Joint administration of the public assistance programs is statutorily contradictory, confusing and ineffective. It also exposes SRS to potential financial risks from either federal financial sanctions or potential litigation with little control of the process.

Joint responsibility between the county and the state for supervision of the non-assumed counties causes confusion and frequent jurisdictional conflicts. Counties are dissatisfied with the funding mechanism for the administration of the programs and, as a result, counties have challenged some of the costs that are passed on to them. SRS has difficulty controlling the scope of activities of the staff in the county offices. Staffing levels are inconsistent between state-supervised counties and staff are not efficiently allocated. All of these shortcomings could be resolved through total state-assumption.

However, there are shortcomings of total state-assumption. While SRS has done a good job in equitably allocating available staff resources, it has failed to obtain adequate staff in state-assumed counties. Nevertheless, as indicated in Chapter IV, de-assumption would make this problem even worse. In addition, state-assumption has made it more difficult to obtain community input and support. Even though this problem exists in all county offices, it is even more accentuated in state-assumed counties because of the lack of involvement by county commissioners. However, if SRS mandated that counties develop a mechanism for input, this problem could be adequately resolved without resorting to total de-assumption.

Joint management of the state-supervised county welfare offices carries with it numerous problems. State-assumption can resolve these issues and can mandate development of mechanisms to obtain community input.

The one remaining roadblock for state-assumption is funding. The current mechanism could continue to be used by levying a local property tax at a rate comparable to last fiscal year's expenditures. A second method would be for the Legislature to establish a statewide levy that would equalize the expenditures across the state. During the 1993 Legislative session, a statewide levy of 8 mills was proposed. Another option would be to eliminate the property tax as the revenue source for public assistance programs and to appropriate the necessary funds from the state general fund. This option, although perhaps less politically palatable, would correct per capita inequities that currently exist between counties.

Recommendation

Based on the analysis in Chapters II and III, it is recommended that state-assumption should be actively pursued by SRS. Regardless of the funding source, state-assumption would be a significant improvement over the current structure for four reasons.

State-assumption would eliminate the confusion that may result because of joint supervision of the staff by the county and the state. State-assumption would remove the responsibility from County Commissions and would make SRS solely responsible.

State-assumption would allow SRS to manage staffing levels equitably between county offices. Current inequities between counties would be eliminated as county commissioners are removed from this process. In addition, county combinations could be pursued without the influence of territorial turf battles. This would result in more efficient use of limited staff resources.

Programmatic consistency would be enhanced through state-assumption. SRS, solely responsible for the administration of the public assistance programs, could more aggressively manage and direct procedural and eligibility processes at the local level.

Finally, state-assumption would provide clarity to issues revolving around financial responsibility. The problems involving allocation of administrative costs would be eliminated. SRS would be responsible for all costs associated with administering the public assistance programs. In addition, SRS would have direct control of factors that influence whether financial sanctions are applied by federal agencies and control of procedural practices that expose the state to risk of litigation.

ATTACHMENT 1

STATE OF MONTANA
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL & REHABILITATION SERVICES
STATE FISCAL YEAR 1994

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE BENEFIT EXPENDITURES

County	AFDC	PROGRAM Medicaid	Food Stamps
Beaverhead	$378,078	$3,451,524	$538,615
Big Horn	$2,005,398	$4,462,261	$2,006,481
Blaine	$823,078	$2,481,930	$727,224
Broadwater	$209,945	$1,245,253	$223,525
Carbon	$305,932	$3,183,927	$438,050
Carter	$22,390	$580,627	$41,141
Cascade	$4,741,878	$28,672,627	$5,083,481
Choteau	$96,880	$1,896,785	$138,347
Custer	$758,182	$5,871,362	$846,229
Daniels	$37,191	$591,052	$39,745
Dawson	$380,305	$3,025,136	$462,128
Deer Lodge	$778,013	$4,554,363	$891,567
Fallon	$70,920	$846,445	$84,154
Fergus	$239,258	$5,401,205	$377,439
Flathead	$3,068,629	$20,058,976	$3,936,427
Gallatin	$1,222,438	$9,555,504	$1,709,393
Garfield	$14,207	$419,492	$27,030
Glacier	$2,525,528	$5,751,688	$2,431,233
Golden Valley	$22,620	$98,082	$31,782
Granite	$100,702	$539,478	$152,897
Hill	$1,565,350	$7,675,514	$1,678,737
Jefferson	$254,109	$2,254,493	$345,706
Judith Basin	$62,122	$170,310	$53,276
Lake	$2,238,312	$9,714,960	$2,082,938
Lewis&Clark	$2,361,549	$15,902,166	$2,944,156
Liberty	$3,930	$460,984	$24,389
Lincoln	$1,648,546	$6,884,030	$1,856,672
Madison	$129,111	$1,700,741	$186,751
MacCone	$33,407	$571,338	$42,610
Meagher	$35,198	$718,612	$90,595
Mineral	$345,780	$1,558,182	$378,898
Missoula	$5,272,344	$26,547,829	$5,978,813
Musselshell	$172,128	$1,744,017	$270,087
Park	$545,427	$4,247,394	$749,485
Petroleum	$1,858	$75,611	$2,767
Phillips	$194,559	$1,612,752	$276,256
Pondera	$428,847	$2,607,752	$494,087
Powder River	$32,002	$754,985	$47,097
Powell	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Prairie	$15,359	$443,122	$28,458
Ravalli	$1,187,683	$0,070,736	$1,668,884
Richland	$364,701	$3,767,901	$595,415
Roosevelt	$2,316,267	$7,648,464	$2,111,780
Rosebud	$077,310	$2,004,000	$051,173
Sanders	$600,147	$3,226,635	$711,975
Sheridan	$62,975	$1,271,835	$98,949
Silver Bow	$2,001,478	$17,307,615	$2,006,617
Stillwater	$129,372	$2,205,316	$226,023
Sweetegrass	$83,840	$1,050,000	$123,338
Teton	$100,060	$2,005,307	$211,404
Toole	$162,681	$1,724,834	$189,772
Treasure	$17,848	$59,492	$29,883
Valley	$613,710	$3,380,400	$800,804
Wheatland	$94,502	$855,120	$117,978
Wibaux	$10,400	$400,431	$41,000
Yellowstone	$6,183,112	$37,673,080	$6,702,663
Institutions		$17,440,613	
NOCO Breakdown		($733,277)	
TOTAL	$48,945,741	$301,592,346	$55,413,520

ATTACHMENT 2

AVERAGE CASELOAD BY COUNTY COMBINATIONS

13-Feb-95
G:\DATA\AF\ABO\MISC\SAFTEANA
STATE SUPERVISED COUNTY FTE
STAFFING PATTERNS

CO	NON-ASSUMED COUNTIES / COUNTY	Jul '94 Actives	Jul '94 Apps	Aug '94 Actives	Aug '94 Apps	Sept '94 Actives	Sept '94 Apps	Oct '94 Actives	Oct '94 Apps	Nov '94 Actives	Nov '94 Apps	Dec '94 Actives	Dec '94 Apps	7/94 - 12/94 TOTAL CASELOAD	AVG. ACTIVES PLUS APPS	TOTAL COUNTY DIRECTOR	ALL FTE'S EXCEPT CTY. DIR.	CASE AVG. WITHOUT COUNTY DIRECTOR	CASE AVG. WITH COUNTY DIRECTOR	COUNTY
1	Beaverhead	488	39	498	43	509	34	485	43	470	47	488	43	3,193	532.2	0.00	3.00	177.39	177.39	Beaverhead
2	Big Horn	1175	187	1161	89	1144	94	1128	87	1108	118	1140	85	7,468	1244.3	1.00	8.00	155.54	138.26	Big Horn
3	Blaine	600	34	586	39	585	42	581	38	601	43	624	38	3,833	638.8	0.00	7.00	91.26	91.26	Blaine
4	Broadwater	229	15											0	0.0	0.00	0.00			Broadwater
5	Carbon	410	28	385	42	380	41	395	35	377	46	391	35	2,587	431.2	1.00	3.00	143.72	107.78	Carbon
6	Chouteau	184	4	175	17	173	16	188	9	183	7	184	13	1,155	192.5	1.00	3.00	64.17	48.13	Chouteau
9	Custer/Prairie	748	77	1029	102	1030	93	1028	83	1043	84	1024	85	9,408	1087.7	1.00	8.00	177.94	152.52	Custer/Prairie
11	Dawson	399	35	408	41	409	38	408	33	404	33	418	28	2,649	441.5	1.00	4.00	110.38	88.30	Dawson
13	Fallon	229	18	228	15	227	14	224	26	230	18	230	13	1,470	245.0	1.00	2.50	98.00	70.00	Fallon
14	Fergus/Jud. Bas./Muss/Wheat	1308	59	1291	78	1282	83	1298	84	1337	81	1337	78	8,322	1387.0	1.00	10.00	138.70	126.09	Fergus/Jud. Bas./Muss/Wheat
16	Gallatin	1452	100	1443	1481	1480	118	1480	117	1484	118	1478	120	9,531	1588.5	1.00	11.50	138.13	127.08	Gallatin
18	Glacier	1472	114	1481	106	1410	138	1371	107	1453	73	1508	129	9,451	1575.2	1.00	11.50	136.97	126.01	Glacier
21	Hill	1219	125	1204	122	1245	127	1152	101	1162	112	1180	102	7,951	1325.2	0.00	12.00	110.43	110.43	Hill
22	Jefferson	434	23	424	20	418	21	424	23	403	33	430	21	2,674	445.7	0.00	3.00	148.56	148.56	Jefferson
29	Madison	198	18	199	22	208	13	199	22	211	25	218	21	1,351	225.2	1.00	1.50	150.11	90.07	Madison
37	Pondera/Teton/Toole	852	82	823	73	801	77	833	72	831	89	839	83	5,425	904.2	1.00	7.00	129.17	113.02	Pondera/Teton/Toole
42	Richland	570	46	532	56	512	52	524	47	501	54	509	43	3,444	574.0	0.00	4.50	127.56	127.56	Richland
43	Roosevelt/Sheridan	1583	128	1545	162	1557	155	1553	139	1581	150	1597	118	10,228	1704.7	1.00	10.00	170.47	154.97	Roosevelt/Sheridan
44	Rosebud	687	63	673	64	667	43	648	69	658	66	682	66	4,404	734.0	1.00	5.50	133.45	112.92	Rosebud
45	Sanders	585	59	577	65	591	58	588	65	590	55	600	60	3,891	648.5	1.00	3.50	165.29	144.11	Sanders
48	Stillwater/Sweet Grass	380	39	387	39	387	24	392	28	375	28	348	23	2,460	410.0	1.00	3.75	109.33	88.32	Stillwater/SG
53	Valley/Phillips	520	46	808	48	793	54	805	42	805	58	808	52	4,834	805.7	1.00	7.50	107.42	94.78	Valley/Phillips
56	Yellowstone	5540	665	5533	746	5585	686	5584	680	5584	700	5704	541	37,503	6250.5	1.00	43.75	142.87	139.68	Yellowstone
	Extra													0						Extra
	N/A Subtotal	21,279	1,934	21,415	2,139	21,501	2,033	21,272	2,037	21,387	2,037	21,730	1,809	140,472	23,371	17.00	171.50	133.95	117.08	N/A Subtotal

CO	ASSUMED COUNTIES / County	Jul '94 Actives	Jul '94 Apps	Aug '94 Actives	Aug '94 Apps	Sept '94 Actives	Sept '94 Apps	Oct '94 Actives	Oct '94 Apps	Nov '94 Actives	Nov '94 Apps	Dec '94 Actives	Dec '94 Apps	7/94 - 12/94 TOTAL CASELOAD	AVG. ACTIVES PLUS APPS	TOTAL COUNTY DIRECTORS	ALL FTE'S EXCEPT CTY. DIR.	CASE AVG. WITHOUT COUNTY DIRECTOR	CASE AVG. WITH COUNTY DIRECTOR	ASSUMED COUNTIES County
7	Cascade	4270	389	4204	443	4216	383	4231	420	4307	433	4312	413	28,188	4684.7	1.00	36.50	128.35	124.92	Cascade
12	Deer Lodge/Powell/Granite	1208	82	1200	115	1182	128	1219	181	1234	116	1253	80	8,007	1334.5	1.00	9.40	141.97	128.32	Deer Lodge/Pow/Gran
15	Flathead	3420	321	3340	357	3290	354	3382	298	3431	350	3505	332	22,399	3733.2	1.00	27.25	137.00	132.15	Flathead
24	Lake	1685	183	1702	180	1655	149	1654	176	1668	166	1712	136	11,078	1846.0	1.00	13.00	142.00	131.86	Lake
25	Lewis & Clark	2808	239	2811	247	2847	258	2586	237	2817	229	2801	270	17,060	2843.3	0.00	21.00	135.40	135.40	Lewis & Clark
27	Lincoln	1277	121	1271	183	1281	140	1288	153	1257	177	1290	150	8,548	1424.7	1.00	10.00	142.47	129.52	Lincoln
32	Missoula	4800	536	4815	546	4753	541	4810	457	4740	532	4778	474	31,784	5297.3	1.00	37.00	143.17	139.43	Missoula
34	Park/Meagher	890	65	1014	122	1018	107	1017	97	1015	126	1030	108	6,771	1128.5	1.00	10.00	112.85	102.58	Park/Meagher/Broadwater
36	Powell													0	0.0					Powell
41	Ravalli	1448	141	1449	143	1448	137	1450	139	1459	144	1458	142	8,566	1594.3	1.00	11.50	138.64	127.56	Ravalli
47	Silver Bow	3462	186	2477	220	2512	185	2520	219	2559	195	2574	171	16,287	2714.5	1.00	19.00	142.87	135.73	Silver Bow
	S/A Subtotal	23,998	2,289	24,053	2,519	23,912	2,380	24,166	2,375	24,397	2,476	24,511	2,284	150,362	26,601	9.00	194.65	136.47	128.74	S/A Subtotal
	State Total	45,277	4,894	45,468	4,658	45,413	4,413	45,438	4,412	45,784	4,513	46,241	4,093	290,834	49,972.33	26.00	366.15	136.46	127.43	State Total

ATTACHMENTS

3 - 1

3 - 2

3 - 3

3 - 4

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT STAFFING PATTERNS
VERSUS COUNTY COMBINATION OPTIONS

February 1994

CURRENT STAFFING PATTERNS

DAWSON

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salaries & Fringes
30140	1.00	14	$34,039
30141	1.00	11	$26,623
30142	1.00	10	$25,997
30143	1.00	9	$27,165
30144	1.00	8	$22,618
Total	5.00		$136,442

RICHLAND

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salaries & Fringes
30550	1.00	15	$40,508
30552	1.00	12	$30,817
30553	1.00	11	$26,623
30554	1.00	11	$26,583
30555	0.50	8	$11,837
30556	1.00	9	$21,973
	5.50		$158,341

PROPOSED COMBINATION

DAWSON

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salaries & Fringes
30140	0.50	15	$24,305
30141	1.00	11	$26,623
30142	1.00	10	$25,997
30143	1.00	9	$27,165
30144	1.00	8	$22,618
Total	4.50		$126,708

RICHLAND

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salaries & Fringes
30140	0.40	15	$16,203
30552	1.00	12	$30,817
30553	1.00	11	$26,623
30554	1.00	11	$26,583
30555	0.50	8	$11,837
30556	1.00	9	$21,973
Total	4.90		$134,036
Addit'l travel/Meals			$3,270
TOTAL			$137,306

Assumptions:
(1) CD spends 3 days per week in Glendive;
(2) All travel to Sidney is paid by Richland County.

Assumptions:
(1) CD spends 2 days per week in Sidney;
(2) All travel to Glendive is paid by Richland County;
(3) No overnight travel is projected:

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT STAFFING PATTERNS
VERSUS COUNTY COMBINATION OPTIONS

CURRENT STAFFING PATTERNS

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary & Fringes
[illegible]			
30580	1	15	$34,008
30581	0.5	11	$15,475
30582	1	11	$29,323
30583	1	11	$27,538
30584	1	11	$31,884
30586	1	9	$21,690
30587	1	8	$21,842
Total	6.5		$182,160

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary & Fringes
[illegible]			
30010	1.00	15	$33,069
30011	1.00	13	$32,380
30012	1.00	11	$28,904
30013	1.00	11	$29,947
30014	1.00	11	$28,680
30015	1.00	10	$23,506
30016	1.00	9	$25,748
30017	1.00	8	$20,415
30461	1.00	11	$25,734
TOTAL	9.00		$254,342

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary & Fringes
[illegible]			
30130	1.00	15	$40,380
30131	1.00	12	$33,106
30132	1.00	12	$29,607
30133	1.00	11	$28,655
30134	1.00	9	$24,333
30135	1.00	9	$24,287
30520	1.00	11	$31,682
TOTAL	7.00		$210,130

COMBINATION WITH ROSEBUD AND BIG HORN

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary & Fringes
[illegible]			
30010	[illegible]	16	[illegible]
30581	[illegible]	11	[illegible]
30582	[illegible]	11	[illegible]
30583	[illegible]	12	[illegible]
30584	[illegible]	12	[illegible]
30586	[illegible]	9	[illegible]
30587	[illegible]	8	[illegible]
Total	[illegible]		[illegible]
Addt'l Travel/Meals-[illegible]			[illegible]
Addt'l Travel/Meals-[illegible]			[illegible]
CD travel to Dir. Mtg.			[illegible]
TOTAL			[illegible]

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary & Fringes
[illegible]			
30010	[illegible]	16	$29,844
30011	[illegible]	13	$32,380
30012	[illegible]	11	$28,904
30013	[illegible]	11	$29,947
30014	[illegible]	11	$28,680
30015	[illegible]	10	$23,506
30016	[illegible]	9	$25,748
30017	[illegible]	8	$22,415
30461	[illegible]	11	$25,734
TOTAL	[illegible]		$245,117
CD travel to Dir. Mtg.			($167)
TOTAL			$244,950

(1) CD spends 4 days per month in [illegible] office; 2 days per month in [illegible].
(2) No overnight travel is projected; if [illegible], would [illegible] out [illegible].
(3) [illegible] and [illegible] are [illegible] to [illegible] 12.
(4) All travel to [illegible] Co. charged to [illegible] County; Travel to [illegible] Meeting is split 30/70 with Big Horn Co.

COUNTY COMBINATION WITH ROSEBUD AND CUSTER

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary & Fringes
[illegible]			
30010	0.30	16	$13,229
30581	0.50	11	$15,475
30582	1.00	11	$29,323
30583	1.00	12	$29,387
30584	1.00	12	$33,839
30586	1.00	9	$21,690
30587	1.00	8	$21,842
Total	5.80		$165,395
Addt'l Travel/Meals-Fat.			$660
Addt'l Travel/Meals-LD			$1,050
CD travel to Dir. Mtg.			[illegible]
TOTAL			$167,105

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary & Fringes
[illegible]			
30130	0.70	16	[illegible]
30131	1.00	12	$33,106
30132	1.00	12	$29,607
30133	1.00	11	$28,655
30134	1.00	9	$24,333
30135	1.00	9	$24,287
30520	1.00	11	$31,682
TOTAL	6.70		[illegible]
CD travel to Dir. Mtg.			[illegible]
TOTAL			$200,400

(1) CD spends 2 full days and 2 1/2 days per month in [illegible] office; 2 - 1/2 days per month in Lame Deer.
(2) No overnight travel is projected; if needed, would [illegible] out mileage.
(3) [illegible] and Shaw are [illegible] to [illegible]/grade 12.
(4) All travel to [illegible] Co. charged to [illegible] County; Travel to Director's Meeting is split 30/70 with Custer County.

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT STAFFING PATTERNS
VERSES REGIONAL MANAGER CONCEPT

CURRENT STAFFING PATTERNS

Pondera			
Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary
1	0.34	15	$10,964
2	1.00	10	$20,010
3	1.00	11	$20,979
4	0.34	13	$8,890
5	0.25	8	$0
6	1.00	9	$18,458
	3.93		$79,301

Teton			
Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary
1	0.33	15	$10,642
4	0.33	13	$8,628
7	1.00	12	$24,207
8	1.00	9	$19,356
	2.66		$62,833

Toole			
Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary
1	0.33	15	$10,642
4	0.33	13	$8,628
9	1.00	12	$24,407
10	1.00	9	$18,458
	2.66		$62,135

Non-County Dir. FTE	8.25
Applic. + Cases Total	953.10
Average	115.53

Glacier			
Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary
11	1.00	15	$31,252
12	1.00	10	$0
13	1.00	10	$19,664
14	1.00	11	$19,810
15	1.00	12	$22,774
16	1.00	11	$21,871
17	1.00	9	$16,064
18	1.00	11	$21,332
19	1.00	11	$20,979
20	1.00	11	$20,979
21	1.00	7	$14,837
22	1.00	9	$16,858
23	1.00	10	$19,431
	13.00		$245,851

Non-County Dir. FTE	12.00
Applic. + Cases Total	1633.30
Average	136.11

* Statewide Non-Assumed County Average Caseload is 138.01
g:\data\la\jerryg\staff\beaverhead.wk3

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT STAFFING PATTERNS
VERSES REGIONAL MANAGER CONCEPT

Grade 16 as Regional Manager and Regional Lead Worker (Grade 13) in Pondera, Teton, and Toole.

Pondera

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary
1	0.17	16	$5,813
2	1.00	10	$20,010
3	1.00	11	$20,979
4	0.34	13	$8,890
5	0.25	8	$0
6	1.00	9	$18,458
	3.78		$74,150

Teton

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary
1	0.11	16	$3,590
4	0.33	13	$8,628
7	1.00	12	$24,207
8	1.00	9	$19,358
	2.44		$55,782

Toole

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary
1	0.11	16	$3,590
4	0.33	13	$8,890
9	1.00	12	$24,407
10	1.00	9	$18,458
	2.44		$55,345

	Pondera	Teton	Toole
Non—County Dir. FTE	8.25		
Applic. + Cases Total	953.10		
Average	115.53		
Potential Savings — Salaries	$5,151	$7,051	$6,790
Less Travel	$158	$97	$97
Actual Savings	$4,994	$6,954	$6,693

Glacier

Pos. No.	FTE Level	Grade	Salary
1	0.62	16	$21,200
12	1.00	10	$0
13	1.00	10	$19,664
14	1.00	11	$19,810
15	1.00	12	$22,774
16	1.00	11	$21,671
17	1.00	9	$16,064
18	1.00	11	$21,332
19	1.00	11	$20,979
20	1.00	11	$20,979
21	1.00	7	$14,837
22	1.00	9	$16,858
23	1.00	10	$19,431
	12.62		$235,799

Non—County Dir. FTE	12.00
Applic. + Cases Total	1633.30
Average	129.42
Potential Savings — Salaries	$10,052
Less Travel	$575
Actual Savings	$10,628

County	Cases	%	Non—Sup Staff	%	Work Hrs. Per Month
Pondera	953	36.85%	3.25	16.88%	27.01
Teton			2.00	10.39%	16.62
Toole			2.00	10.39%	16.62
Glacier	1633	63.15%	12.00	62.34%	99.74
Total	2586	100.00%	19.25	100.00%	160.00

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. Additional travel costs will only be increased by approximately 46 miles for each trip from the base at Cut Bank. Needed travel between Pondera, Teton and Toole was already budgeted. Travel will be distributed the same as the salary of the county director. Travel will consist of one trip each week to Pondera and Teton; one trip every other week to Toole
2. Salaries for the county director and the lead worker will be shared at the percentage of non supervisory staff in the four county combination (see above).

* Statewide Non—Assumed County Average Caseload is 136.01
g:\data\ts\jerryg\staff\beaverhead.wk3

BEAVERHEAD				
Pos. No.	Pos. Title	Pay Grade	FTE Level	Annual Salary
1	Co. Dir.	15	0.25	$8,700
2	EE	11	0.75	$19,882
3	EE	11	1.00	$25,330
4	EA	9	1.00	$24,068
5	EE	10	0.50	$12,350
				$90,330

JEFFERSON				
Pos. No.	Pos. Title	Pay Grade	FTE Level	Annual Salary
1	Co. Dir.	15	1.00	$38,912
2	EE	11	1.00	$27,025
3	EE	11	1.00	$26,657
4	EA	9	1.00	$24,267
				$116,861

BROADWATER				
Pos. No.	Pos. Title	Pay Grade	FTE Level	Annual Salary
1	Co. Dir.	15	1.00	$32,433
2	EE	11	1.00	$26,707
3	EA	8	1.00	$23,004
				$82,144

LEWIS & CLARK				
Pos. No.	Pos. Title	Pay Grade	FTE Level	Annual Salary
1	Co. Dir.	16	0.00	$0
2	EE	13	1.00	$30,118
3	EE	13	1.00	$30,364
4	AO	13	1.00	$31,652
5-21	EE/EA	7-11	18.00	$454,409
22	EA	8	1.00	$23,041
				$569,584

GALLATIN				
Pos. No.	Pos. Title	Pay Grade	FTE Level	Annual Salary
1	CoDir	16	1.00	$35,143

MADISON				
Pos. No.	Pos. Title	Pay Grade	FTE Level	Annual Salary
1	CoDir	15	1.00	$39,280

$933,342

* Salaries = PPP on 4/15/94; includes salary, longevity, and fringes.
** Questionable salaries are based on Susan Gosney, Karen Demmit and Margaret Hoagland's calculations.

ANALYSIS OF STAFFING PATTERNS

G:\DATA\FA\JERRYG\STAFF\BEAVERHEAD.WK4
10–May–94

Four County Region
Regional Manager with Lead Workers

BEAVERHEAD

Pos. No.	Pos. Title	Pay Grade	FTE Level	Annual Salary
1	RegMgr	16	0.20	$8,331
2	EE	12	1.00	$30,074
3	EE	11	1.00	$25,330
4	EA	9	1.00	$24,068
5	EE	10	0.50	$12,350
				$100,153

JEFFERSON

Pos. No.	Pos. Title	Pay Grade	FTE Level	Annual Salary
1	RegMgr	16	0.20	$8,331
2	EE	12	1.00	$30,074
3	EE	11	1.00	$26,857
4	EA	9	1.00	$24,267
				$89,229

SILVER BOW

Pos. No.	Pos. Title	Pay Grade	FTE Level	Annual Salary
1	RegMgr	16	0.60	$24,992
20	EE/EA	7–13	20.00	$579,343
				$604,335

The Regional Manager travel is estimated to be $226.24 per month (1 visit per week to Boulder & Dillon).

* Salaries = PPP on 4/15/94; includes salary, longevity, and fringes.
** Questionable salaries are based on Susan Gosney, Karen Demmit and Margaret Hoagland's calculations. $793,816