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The Council of State Governments “is a true marketplace of ideas,” Oklahoma Gov. Brad Henry, CSG’s 2007 president, said in December at the organization’s Annual State Trends and Leadership Forum in Phoenix.

This issue of State News magazine underscores Gov. Henry’s proclamation with articles on a wide array of state governance issues.

As 2007 unfolds, states are faced with many of the same challenges and concerns that were addressed in 2006. During the Phoenix meeting, for example, CSG’s research staff conducted a survey of more than 100 state government officials representing 33 states, Puerto Rico and Canada.

We share those preliminary findings this month in our State Sources section. While there are many concerns, health care and the uninsured, education and the future of energy emerged as the leading issues.

CSG Health Policy Analyst Sean Slone addresses part of the health care challenge in an article on state programs that track environmental factors affecting wellness. The results of these tracking programs can provide information that can be used to improve public health.

During the Phoenix meeting, CSG’s governing board gave its final stamp of approval for a national Justice Center that will help state leaders with resources in developing criminal justice policy. The Justice Center has evolved from the Eastern Regional Conference Criminal Justice program to a national center.

Martha Plotkin, director of communications for the new center, writes about the nonpartisan work and research the center provides state leaders.

This month State News publishes its annual State Capitols Guide, providing party control maps, a listing of the top elected officials in each state and the dates of state legislative sessions.

In other articles this month, State News reports on:

- How some states are discovering that prepaid debit cards are more convenient for consumers and less costly for states.
- A study this year that will look at the effectiveness of privatizing state child welfare services.
- An analysis of the potential unintended consequences of requiring electronic monitoring of sex offenders.
- The success many alumni of CSG’s Toll Fellows leadership program experienced in the November 2006 elections.
- And a look at how the growth of megaregions, such as the Northeast corridor between Washington, D.C., and Boston, will impact the nation’s transportation network.

— Jack Penhoff is CSG associate director of communications and senior editor of State News magazine.
Kaiser Report Suggests Ways to Decrease Levels of Uninsured

Declining employer-sponsored health insurance, which has hit low-income workers and their families harder than any other demographic, has driven the latest increase in the uninsured, the Kaiser Family Foundation said in a recent report.

The report found 80 percent of newly uninsured people are living below or near poverty, and the uninsured rate in the nation reached 18 percent in 2005. More than one-third of uninsured Americans fell below the federal poverty level the same year—$19,971 for a family of four.

Low-income Americans, whose financial means are thinly stretched to meet basic needs, are also in poorer health and have higher rates of chronic disease and disability than those at higher incomes.

In the report, the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured explains a set of core issues related to structuring coverage for low-income Americans. Its goal is to provide a foundation, grounded in evidence, for developing sound public policies for covering the low-income population.

The report’s conclusions include the following:

- Expanding publicly sponsored health insurance offers the most targeted and efficient strategy toward achieving coverage and access for low-income uninsured Americans.
- Basing eligibility for publicly sponsored health coverage on low income, without categorical restrictions, could substantially reduce rates of uninsured.
- Financing determined by enrollment and utilization directs public dollars most efficiently to meet health coverage and care needs. Federal matching of state spending permits the cost of coverage to be shared and can promote national priorities while preserving state policy discretion.


CSG Releases Graduated Driver Licensing Toolkit

Young people die in car crashes three times more often than from firearms, the second most common cause of death, a toolkit from The Council of State Governments reports. However, despite the considerable risk young people on the road pose to themselves and other drivers, comprehensive graduated driver’s licensing (GDL) systems can reduce needless driving-related tragedies.

The report says an ideal GDL system consists of three stages:

- A supervised learner’s period that lasts at least six months;
- An intermediate period that allows unsupervised driving in less risky situations; and
- Full licensure.

Although most states have some components of a GDL, no state has them all.

A study of states with GDL systems considered “good” by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) showed that these systems reduced the number of fatalities among 15- to 17-year-old drivers by more than 19 percent. If the same rate of lives saved could be applied across the country it would mean saving an average of 4.6 lives in each state, every year.

To find out what’s included in a model GDL law and for the complete toolkit, visit [www.healthystates.csg.org](http://www.healthystates.csg.org). To find out how your state compares to others in two aspects of a GDL system, see this month’s Snapshot on page 7.

Pew Center Backgrounder Discusses Impact of Internet

A recent backgrounder from the Pew Research Center says that Americans initially thought the Internet would grant citizens access to more information, thus increasing participation in politics. But, the report says, that assumption may be flawed.

The report addresses assertions about the Internet’s effect on fundraising, advertising and mobilization; partisanship; and voter apathy and participation.

Someday, the report predicts, politicians may master the new media, like John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan did with television. However, the Internet’s main strength in political campaigns has been making baby steps, not giant leaps. Grassroots initiatives, activists use of small email lists and Web sites, small donors contributions online, and the emerging role of bloggers to tell stories and debate issues could be this technology’s grandest contributions.

Visit [http://pewresearch.org/obdeck/?ObDeckID=85](http://pewresearch.org/obdeck/?ObDeckID=85) to read the backgrounder, *The Internet and Politics: No Revolution, Yet.*
AAMVA Analysis Estimates State Expenditures of $11 Billion for Real ID

An analysis by the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators estimates that bringing states in compliance with the Real ID Act will cost states an estimated $11 billion to implement. The report adds that because requirements have not been entirely fleshed out, states were unable to estimate how much several elements of the act may cost, which means this number could be a low estimate.

AAMVA estimated costs from multi-state surveys. Forty-seven of 51 polled jurisdictions responded. Key findings from the surveys are:

- Re-enrollment will cost states an estimated $8.48 billion. States based this analysis on the assumption that to implement Real ID, all 245 million driver’s license or ID holders must be re-credentialed within five years of May 2008. Re-credentialing will require an in-person visit by every current cardholder as well as new applicants. Alternative renewal processes, like Internet and mail renewals, will be lost during the re-enrollment period.
- Verifying each identification document will cost states about $1.42 billion. Only one of the contemplated five electronic systems that could facilitate verification is available nationally. System development, programming, testing and training will take considerable time and investment that will exceed the deadlines or funds provided by Congress.
- Design requirements will cost an estimated $1.11 billion, to incorporate security features like a single security configuration. AAMVA says this will maximize cost by minimizing state flexibility in card production and design.
- Support costs will total an estimated $40 million. The Real ID requirements stipulate security clearances on all employees involved in the production and issuance process and mandatory fraudulent document recognition training.

The AAMVA analysis recommends that Congress and the Department of Homeland Security should extend the compliance deadline, which the organization calls unrealistic.

To view the full report, including all recommendations and key findings, visit www.aamva.org and search for Real ID.

Health Care, Education Top Concerns for Policymakers

Concerns over long-term health care needs, the growing number of uninsured and underinsured individuals and increased spending on health care weigh heavily on the minds of many state government officials, according to a recent survey conducted by The Council of State Governments.

During CSG’s annual meeting in Phoenix Nov. 30–Dec. 3, more than 100 state government officials representing 33 states, Canada and Puerto Rico responded to a survey asking participants to rank the importance—on a scale of one to five, with five being most important and one being least important—of 15 vital trends that state governments will have to address over the next five years. Escalating health care challenges was the top concern.

Trends in education—including disparities in educational achievement, public school finance and work force preparation—ranked second. The uncertain energy future, challenges to public safety and information security, and economic transformation were the next three most important trends.

Private sector attendees ranked the trends differently, with concerns over an uncertain energy future grabbing the number one spot followed by health care, outdated critical infrastructure, economic transformation and expanding globalization.

CSG policy and research staff will use the survey results to plan future publications and provide technical assistance for state government officials. For additional findings and information, contact the research@csg.org.
Traffic Laws Affect Young Drivers

Most states have some components of graduated driver’s licensing systems, including such things as passenger restrictions for young drivers. Fifteen states have no passenger restrictions on young drivers, as shown in the bottom map above. Information for the chart was obtained from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.

Other laws impact teen drivers. One such law is the enforcement of adult safety belt laws in the United States. The top map shows which states have primary enforcement of safety belt laws and which states have secondary enforcement.

For more information about GDL systems, check out the toolkit at www.healthystates.csg.org.
Tracking environmental factors that affect wellness, such as how air quality in school buildings affects children with asthma, can lead policymakers to answers about how to improve public health.

By Sean Slone
Since 2002, CDC has funded demonstration projects in more than 20 states, which have served as models for a nationwide environmental public health tracking program.

Environmental public health tracking is an important tool for many states are employing to integrate health and environmental data and discover the connections that may exist between them. The results of tracking projects can provide valuable information that can be used to improve public health and to shape public policy.

Childhood asthma in schools is the focus of a project in Massachusetts that has helped to substantiate one such connection while also helping to lay the groundwork for a national effort to track environmental exposures and their relationships to the distribution of disease. The Massachusetts Department of Public Health received a grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to fund a three-year project to monitor asthma in children using school health records.

According to a 1999 report, Massachusetts has some of the worst school buildings in the nation. Many suffer from poor indoor air quality resulting from moisture and mold problems that can trigger asthma attacks. Asthma accounts for an estimated 14 million missed school days a year nationally, making it the leading cause of school absenteeism due to chronic illness.

“I think the impetus (for the tracking project) really was that asthma rates have grown significantly both in Massachusetts and nationally,” said Suzanne Condon, principal investigator for the project and associate commissioner at the Massachusetts Department of Public Health. “We think the indoor environment probably plays some role based on what we had seen to date and we thought that this was the perfect set of questions that needed to be answered and could be answered through the use of environmental public health tracking.”

Since 2002, CDC has funded projects like the one in Massachusetts in more than 20 states, which have served as models for a nationwide environmental public health tracking program and have built capacity to track environmental hazards and the diseases they may cause. In August, 16 states, including Massachusetts, were awarded funds to implement statewide tracking networks that will be components of CDC’s National Environmental Public Health Tracking Network. States will use the grants to improve information technology, expand laboratories, train public health workers and develop better ways to communicate information to decision makers.

Putting Tracking Data Into Action

The Massachusetts program gathered school health records—which contain demographic data, immunization and past medical histories—and information about the administration of medication at school. School nurses also received electronic data reporting forms requesting the number of children with asthma by grade and gender. No personally identifying information was used. The reported prevalence of asthma among 760 participating schools during the program’s first year was 9.2 percent. Some individual schools showed asthma rates as high as 30 percent.

The state’s tracking program then conducted indoor air quality assessments at schools, checking for evidence of mold or moisture problems, as well as for carbon dioxide and particulate matter. Linking these assessments with the asthma data revealed a statistically significant association between the presence of moisture problems in a school and the prevalence of asthma. Ninety percent of schools with moisture or mold problems were found to have prevalence of asthma in the high range.

Data gathered from the Massachusetts asthma project will eventually be used to remedy problems at individual schools and to shape public policy at the state level.

“For every school building that we went into where we identified problems, we published a report specific to that school and told people what we thought the remedies were that needed to be put in place,” Condon said.

The Department of Public Health is sharing that information and its summary report with school superintendents, local health officials and state lawmakers.

“We’ve developed these new guidelines that we’re hoping will become formal regulations (in 2007),” Condon said. “One requirement may be that once a mold or moisture source is identified in a school building, that within 30 days they have to propose some kind of a corrective action plan.”

Condon said her department will also be involved in determining whether these action plans are up to snuff. “A corrective action plan that might say ‘we’re going to wipe down this surface with a disinfectant’ (to solve a mold problem) would be one that we’d say ‘no, that’s not going to remedy it...’ So I think there’s that kind of dialogue that has to go on.”

Building the Tracking Network

Condon believes tracking data can play an important role in improving health around the country, especially on a regional basis.

“I’ve been a proponent of having better surveillance data established for a variety of different outcomes but not necessarily a national system for every outcome,” she said. “It may be that asthma is a much bigger problem in Massachusetts or in New England and therefore we need to focus on really trying to figure out what’s going on. In another state there might be a different outcome that’s a bigger problem.”

The national tracking network will incorporate data sources from hundreds of city, county, state and federal agencies that monitor environmental hazards, environmental exposures and health effects. The network will be flexible in design so states and localities will be able to track their own priorities.

Access will be based on the roles of the different kinds of users who will log onto the network. Computer science and health
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experts putting together the secure, Web-based network are facing many challenges in making sure these data sources are tied together seamlessly. Among them: aging and incompatible databases, the cost of data acquisition and differing data organization methods and standards.

Legal Hurdles Faced by Tracking Projects

States also face privacy concerns in dealing with tracking data. One Massachusetts project to track developmental effects in Berkshire County and the presence of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in the environment has been hampered by a federal law that protects the privacy of school records by not allowing them to be shared with public health officials in ways that might identify children, Condon said.

“Obviously if you’re doing environmental research, the address and location of an individual is very important in terms of trying to make decisions,” she said.

The law, known as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), is making data collection difficult for other states and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as well, Condon says.

But state laws can also regulate whether public health agencies may use data and for what purpose. These laws vary from state to state and sometimes within each state. Some states have attempted to address confidentiality issues in new laws governing environmental public health tracking programs. More than 30 states are participating in a project to assess privacy and security laws and business practices that affect the exchange of electronic health information.

Tracking Data and Public Health Concerns

Despite these challenges, Condon believes tracking data is helping to make public health officials’ jobs easier.

“Clearly, having surveillance data available has really made a tremendous difference in our ability to even carry out the day-to-day work,” she said. “I think that having this type of tracking data or surveillance data available to states allows you to better respond to public, legislative, media and all sorts of inquiries.”

As one example, Condon cites a recent inquiry from a legislator concerned about a train station and the possible impact of diesel emissions on the rate of asthma in the community.

“And when we looked at the asthma data that we now have available to us, in fact that area of that community has the lowest rate of asthma and the town itself wasn’t particularly elevated compared to the statewide rates,” she said. “So there was an opportunity for us to help a legislator respond to a constituent concern in a very factual and comprehensive manner.”

Translating Tracking Data Into Public Policy

The work of the Massachusetts tracking program may be making an impact on state policy in other ways. State Sen. Diane Wilkerson and others introduced legislation in 2005 aimed at reducing asthma and other health effects from cleaning products used in schools, hospitals and other facilities.

She also introduced legislation to establish a statewide environmental illness incidence registry to record incidences of asthma and other environment-influenced illnesses. This data could then be used by the state Bureau of Environmental Health Assessment to conduct an annual survey of each illness and to recommend and implement appropriate preventive and control measures.

Neither bill won final passage but the asthma tracking project may prompt legislators to revisit these issues and consider other policy options as well.

Florida Lead Poisoning Program

Florida’s tracking program, another CDC-funded demonstration project, linked sets of existing data to examine the relationships between childhood lead poisoning and developmental disabilities.

“We recognized the opportunity to use Florida lead data that we had been collecting and monitoring since 1993 as part of
the Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program,” said Dr. David Johnson of the Florida Department of Health. “We also teamed up with Dr. Keith Scott at the University of Miami, who has been maintaining a developmental disabilities database for public school children since the late 1980s.”

The project focused on three developmental disabilities that may be connected with elevated blood lead levels—mental retardation, autism and behavioral disorders. Johnson said the preliminary results provided crude estimates and are still being analyzed but they “suggested an increased risk of developing selected disabilities for children with elevated blood lead levels compared to children with little or no lead detected in their blood.”

The Florida tracking program has also identified socio-economic characteristics that may also influence the distribution of developmental disabilities. Researchers discovered that parents’ low education levels are highly predictive of developmental disabilities and are in turn associated with factors that could expose children to lead poisoning, such as living in public housing.

Johnson believes these findings can help public health officials target at-risk populations.

“One of the end goals of the tracking project is to implement prevention through intervention,” he said. To that end, the tracking program worked to develop lead poisoning risk assessment questionnaires and lead screening guidelines. These elements became part of legislation passed in 2006 by the Florida legislature.

The legislation (Senate Bill 1324) established a screening program for early identification of people at risk for lead poisoning, provided for maintaining screening records and reporting cases of lead poisoning, and launched a comprehensive educational program on lead poisoning prevention.

State Sen. Durell Peaden, who chairs the Health Care Committee, steered the legislation through the process. He said the effort is part of a statewide commitment to environmental tracking in Florida.

“Certainly the transparency and follow-up for any kind of infectious process, any kind of etiology for cancers process, toxicity and things like that—everybody’s in tune to that,” he said. “As far as inventories for brain tumors and other things like that, we’ve been involved in (those) in our area. It’s something we’re always vigilant about in the legislature and certainly with our health officers—the Department of Health and the Agency for Health Care—we’ve had full support along with the support from (outgoing) Governor (Jeb) Bush.”

Moreover, Peaden said, there’s a dedication to “improving the quality of health care at every socioeconomic level” in Florida. He said it’s also incumbent upon states to make sure the principles of environmental public health tracking data analysis are ingrained in the curricula of medical and graduate schools.

“(We have) to make sure that we have the people in place that are trained to observe these,” he said. Developing the environmental public health tracking work force is one of five key goals identified by the national tracking effort, but an aging work force in the field and other factors may provide challenges, experts say.

Johnson at the Florida Department of Health said the state is also tracking selected cancers, birth defects and asthma. He’s optimistic that these efforts can also help shape policy decisions and he hopes the future will further enhance the state’s tracking program.

“We are hopeful that in the future the program will be expanded to include other health outcomes and a biomonitoring piece that will allow us to more clearly assess exposure in the general population,” he said. “This would really help to confirm or refute some of our findings, and help bring it all together.”

What Other States Are Doing

Biomonitoring is proving to be an important tool in environmental public health tracking efforts. A biomonitoring effort in New York City allowed health department officials to trace one patient’s high level of mercury poisoning to a skin lightening product imported from the Dominican Republic. City officials issued alerts and press releases to health care practitioners and ordered stores to stop selling similar products.

California in 2006 became the first state to establish a comprehensive, statewide program to measure and catalogue human exposure to chemicals. Its biomonitoring program will screen blood and urine specimens from 2,000 volunteers for a variety of contaminants every two years. The results will be analyzed to better understand how people react to exposure to cleaning supplies, pesticides, cosmetics and other everyday chemicals.

California was also among the states that received one of the 2002 CDC grants to fund a tracking program project. It allows researchers and the public to more easily access data on where and when specific pesticides may be contributing to adverse public health effects.

Wisconsin’s tracking program used geographically specific estimates of toxic air pollutant concentrations to calculate corresponding community-based cancer risk estimates. Findings were used to compel an industrial facility to change its manufacturing process to eliminate emissions of trichloroethylene (TCE), a solvent that causes serious health problems and may cause cancer.

TCE from industrial sources was also a concern in one New York community where that state’s tracking program tabulated the rates of birth defects, low birth weight and premature births within the community compared to statewide rates. The community found an excess of cardiac defects and low birth weights. The tracking program was able to provide information about prenatal care to the community and medical providers.

Tracking data is helping state public health officials make decisions that can save lives. Washington state can now warn citizens faster and more accurately about mercury levels in fish. And Maine can warn pregnant women about high arsenic levels in well water.

But tracking projects are also helping to virtually disprove suspected environmental concerns as health factors in some cases. In New Hampshire, scientists investigated a suspected cancer cluster around a former mill town with a large solid waste incinerator and found that the observed cancer incidence was actually less than expected for similar communities.

The CDC hopes the national tracking network will be ready to launch in 2008. In the meantime, it’s clear that research gained from state projects like these is already influencing environmental public health policy around the country and is helping the national tracking network become a reality.

—Sean Slone is a health policy analyst with The Council of State Governments.
For 20 years, the Henry Toll Fellowship Program has been developing leaders in state governments. Results from the recent elections bear out the success of this program, as once again many Toll Fellow alumni have aspired to and attained great new heights.

Among the Tolls winning higher office in November, two women are blazing new ground in their states. Sue Bell Cobb, a member of the 2004 Toll class, was elected the first female chief justice in Alabama Supreme Court history. At the same time, Colleen Hanabusa, Class of 2000, became the first woman selected as senate president in Hawaii.

Four other Toll alumni were elected lieutenant governor. Brian Krolicki, a 2001 Toll Fellow, was elected to the second highest office in Nevada; Anthony Brown, Class of 2000, was elected in Maryland; Sean Parnell, Class of 1998, will serve in Alaska; and Jari Askins, Class of 1997, will serve as lieutenant governor for Oklahoma. In addition, Todd Staples, a member of the 2001 Toll Fellows class, was elected commissioner of agriculture in Texas.

Toll Fellow alumni are also making news on the federal stage. Mary Peters, a 1994 Toll Fellow, was recently named by President Bush as his appointee to fill the position as U.S. Secretary of Transportation. Former Washington, D.C., Police Chief Terrance Gainer, a member of the 1992 Toll class, was selected by new Democratic Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid to serve as the U.S. Senate sergeant-at-arms.

Also in Washington, all five Toll alumni serving in the U.S. House of Representatives were re-elected. Those individuals are Tim Murphy of Ohio, Hilda Solis and Adam Schiff of California, Barbara Cubin of Wyoming and Henry Cuellar of Texas.

The Henry Toll Fellowship Program was founded in 1986 on the premise that if states are to meet tomorrow’s challenges, they must prepare for them today. Named for former Colorado Sen. Henry Toll, CSG founder, the program serves to equip talented state policymakers with the skills and strategies to meet the challenges ahead. Aimed at developing leaders from all three branches of state government, the program agenda includes a lineup of dynamic speakers, leadership training and countless opportunities for networking and relationship building.

The Toll Fellowship Program includes leadership and time management methods for different personality types, policy and state governance discussions and a session dedicated to effectively preparing for and leading during a crisis.

In addition to focusing on modern day issues and leadership challenges, the Toll Fellows Program also encourages each class to reflect on the nation’s founding principles and the role they continue to play in serving the public. To this end the program includes a session annually on historic leadership roles as seen through the eyes of Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, as portrayed by Don Hickey and Bill Barker.

The Toll Fellowship Program is recognized as one of the nation’s best leadership development programs and is a hallmark service of The Council of State Governments. The 2007 Henry Toll Fellowship Program will be held Sept. 29 through Oct. 4; applications are available online at www.csg.org, keyword: Tolls.

—Krista Rinehart is the Henry Toll Fellows program manager.

Regional Leadership Programs

The Council of State Governments offers leadership programs through its regions.

The Eastern Regional Conference offers the Robert J. Thompson Eastern Leadership Academy. In the Midwest, legislators are provided training through the Bowhay Institute for Legislative Leadership Development.

The Western Legislative Academy focuses on strengthening personal development skills for effective lawmaking.

The Southern Legislative Conference provides leadership training opportunities through the Center for the Advancement of Leadership Skills.

For more information on these programs, visit www.csg.org and click on the Leadership Development link.
CSG’s two top leaders in 2007 appear, at first glance, to be a study of contrasts.

Besides their obvious gender difference, CSG President Gov. Brad Henry and Chair State Rep. Deborah Hudson are from different parts of the nation and are in different political parties.

They do share one thing in common, however: They are extremely popular with their constituents.

In November, Henry, a Democrat, was re-elected to his second term as Oklahoma’s governor with 66.5 percent of the vote. Meanwhile Hudson, a Republican, was swept into her seventh two-year term in the Delaware House with 65 percent of the votes.


Serving as chairs at the regional level during 2007 are William Cusano, member of the National Assembly, Quebec, in the East region; State Sen. Patricia Birkholz, Michigan, in the Midwest; Speaker Glenn Richardson, Georgia, in the South; and State Rep. Jeff Morris, Washington, in the West.

The diversity in CSG’s leadership reflects the organization. In announcing the President’s Initiative for 2007, Henry said one of the benefits of CSG “is that it is a true marketplace of ideas, an organization that encourages a diversity of opinions on some of the most important and challenging policy issues facing states today.”

The challenge that CSG must address for 2007, Henry said, is sustainable energy.

“In the wake of what has been a decades-long absence of a cohesive federal energy policy, it is only fitting that Americans now turn to what have constantly been laboratories of innovation and creative—state governments, of course.”

More than 60 percent of our nation’s oil comes from foreign sources, Henry said, a situation that has “created a dangerous dependence on a number of foreign nations that are openly hostile to the United States.”

In addition to the security threat posed by relying on foreign oil imports, Henry said the United States’ economy could suffer if the oil supply is disrupted. And, the governor said, there are environmental concerns.

He cited a Rand Corporation study that said with little cost the United States could, by 2025, obtain up to 25 percent of its energy from renewable sources such as ethanol, biodiesel, solar, wind, geothermal and hydroelectric. Those fuels now account for only 6 percent of our nation’s energy usage.

Among the energy issues CSG will consider in 2007, Henry said, will be a look at best practices regarding renewable electricity and fuel sources, including clean coal technology, shale oil, coal-to-diesel and nuclear power.

In addition, CSG will address questions such as how to strike a proper balance between exploitation of resources and environmental preservation.

More about Henry’s initiative will be highlighted during the year with articles in State News magazine, on the CSG Web site and in separate publications.

—Jack Penchoff is CSG associate director of communications
CSG’s new Justice Center will help state leaders identify ways to use their resources with greater effectiveness, efficiency and accountability. It will focus on improving the response to people with mental illnesses who are in contact with, or at risk of contact with, the criminal justice system, charting safe and successful return of prisoners to the community, and using justice reinvestment strategies to increase public safety.

By Martha Plotkin

States looking for effective, data-driven strategies for increasing public safety and strengthening communities have a new resource: The Council of State Governments’ new Justice Center. CSG’s governing board voted Dec. 3, 2006, to transform the Eastern Regional Conference’s (ERC) Criminal Justice program into a prominent national entity.

Massachusetts Rep. Michael Festa and Texas Presiding Judge Sharon Keller have served as chair and vice-chair, respectively, of a charter group that has helped guide the ERC Criminal Justice Program’s transition into the Justice Center.

“Over the past 10 years, the Criminal Justice Program served CSG members in all four regions, launching and coordinating various national initiatives such as responses to crime victims, racial disparities, and other complex justice-related issues,” said Festa. “The Justice Center will expand on this solid foundation of work, providing a nonpartisan source of information that is based on the best thinking from the field.”
CSG’s outgoing president, Vermont Gov. Jim Douglas, convened the charter group in August 2006 to help draft the Justice Center’s bylaws and provide direction on the center’s priorities. The members include state legislative leaders, judges, corrections administrators, juvenile justice agency directors, mental health professionals and law enforcement officials. Together, they represent a national cross-section of the senior-level state officials who shape criminal justice policy. Justice Center staff will support them and other CSG members who will be appointed to the center’s board of directors (a full list of the board of directors will be posted soon on the center’s Web site at www.justicecenter.csg.org.

The center has received broad support from within CSG. New York Assemblyman Jeffrion Aubry and Kansas State Rep. Ward Loyd, co-chairs of CSG’s Public Safety and Justice Task Force, have been key participants in the Charter Group.

The center’s 25-person staff has offices in New York City, located with the ERC, and in Bethesda, Md. The staff will continue to work closely with CSG initiatives managed out of the headquarters’ office—such as the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision and the Interstate Compact for Juveniles—and with CSG affiliates, such as the American Parole and Probation Association.

The Issues

The Justice Center will remain focused on such complex issues as improving the response to people with mental illnesses who are in contact with, or at risk of contact with, the criminal justice system; charting the safe and successful return of prisoners to the community; and using justice reinvestment strategies to increase public safety, reduce spending on corrections and improve conditions in the neighborhoods to which most people released from prison return.

“I am very excited to be part of this initiative,” said Keller. “The center is unique in its efforts to take on issues that are at the intersection of the criminal justice system and such other disciplines as public health. The staff is committed to bringing truly diverse disciplines and perspectives together to ensure that suggested policy reforms and other consensus-driven strategies will be practical and effective.”

To implement the findings from key research reports, the Justice Center will maintain its coordinating role for the Criminal Justice/Mental Health Consensus Project and the Re-Entry Policy Council. According to Festa, an initiative to help states build more meaningful partnerships with community and faith-based organizations is underway. Other emerging efforts include developing strategies for identifying and addressing untreated alcohol and substance abuse problems among people receiving medical care in emergency rooms, as well as coordinating briefings on specific immigration issues with which states are currently grappling.

“The hallmark of the Justice Center is its translation of data and research into recommendations that are workable and applied easily to policy and program design,” Festa added.

Serving the States

“We all know that there is a need for trusted sources of information that are based on available evidence and the latest innovations in the field; the Justice Center helps fill that gap,” Keller said. “The staff and their expert consultants also provide a wide range of services and technical assistance to policymakers and front-line professionals in many states.”

The Justice Center—funded primarily through a range of federal agency and private foundation grants—helps state leaders identify ways to use their resources with greater effectiveness, efficiency and accountability. Staff also provides guidance during the implementation of these recommendations, and evaluates the outcomes of the efforts. Increasingly, these efforts are connected to important work at the community and neighborhood levels and involve practitioners from a broad range of disciplines.

The Justice Center draws on the expertise of officials from all branches of state government. This commitment to comprehensive solutions is reflected in such projects as the Judges’ Criminal Justice/Mental Health Leadership Initiative involving state chief justices, the mental health courts program, prisoner re-entry efforts, partnerships with directors of corrections, and many others.

“I am so pleased to be involved in the center’s work to help state supreme court chief justices who want to establish, or have established, a statewide task force to address the involvement of people with mental illnesses in the criminal justice system,” said Keller.

The initiative recognizes that chief justices are uniquely positioned to convene leaders from all three branches of state government and to encourage them to develop statewide, cross-system strategies that will improve outcomes for people with mental ill-
The members of the Council of State Governments charter group who have helped guide the ERC Criminal Justice Program’s transition into the national Justice Center are:

- Massachusetts Rep. Michael E. Festa, vice chairman of the Committee on State Administration and Regulatory Oversight, chairman
- Texas Judge Sharon Keller, presiding judge, Court of Criminal Appeals, vice-chairman
- New York Assemblyman Jeffrion L. Aubry, chair, corrections committee, member
- Michael Buenger, state court administrator, Missouri, member
- Commissioner Edward Flynn, Springfield, Mass., Police Department, member
- Peter Gilchrist, district attorney, Mecklenburg County, N.C., member
- Connecticut Rep. Michael Lawlor, chair, judiciary committee, member
- Nevada Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie, chair, health and human services committee, member
- Kansas Rep. Ward Loyd, chair, Three R’s committee, member
- Texas Rep. Jerry Madden, chair, corrections committee, member
- Dr. James S. Reinhard, commissioner, Virginia Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services, member
- Tom Stickrath, director, Ohio Department of Youth Services, member
- Delaware Sen. Liane Sorenson, minority whip, member
- Ashbel T. Wall, director, Rhode Island Department of Corrections, member
- Florida Sen. Stephen R. Wise, chair, criminal justice committee, member

The center is unique in its efforts to take on issues that are at the intersection of the criminal justice system and such other disciplines as public health.

—Texas Presiding Judge Sharon Keller

Evidence of this impact includes the results of the Consensus Project’s multiyear effort to study and report on issues related to people with mental illness who come into contact with the criminal justice system. Federal lawmakers were made aware of that work, resulting in a new grant program under the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act (MIOTCRA). Grant recipients in more than 15 states are currently working to improve their communities’ response to individuals with mental illnesses involved in the criminal justice system, and Justice Center staff and consultants will continue to provide these grantees with guidance and technical assistance.

The Justice Center provides a number of other services to CSG members and other policymakers, including online resources, publications, on-site technical assistance, peer-to-peer learning opportunities, forums for education and information exchange, government affairs support, communications services and more.

For more information about the Justice Center, see www.justicecenter.csg.org.

—Martha Plotkin is the director of communications for CSG’s Justice Center.
Plastic Payments

Some States Move to Debit Cards for Child Support

States are discovering that using prepaid debit cards is more convenient for consumers, and less costly for states.

By Mary Branham Dusenberry

States are increasingly migrating from paper to plastic when it comes to child support payments they disburse.

More than a dozen states have launched prepaid debit/credit cards for these payments, and 30 states have issued RFPs (Requests for Proposals) for the cards, according to Jonathan Weiner, president of Prepaid Media, which provides business-to-business, integrated media and information services to emerging industries. One of its focuses is the growing network branded prepaid and stored value card industry.

“The main premise is moving from a paper-based payment system to an electronic-based payment system,” Weiner said.

States have found the use of credit cards for child support payments to be more convenient for customers and less costly to states.

“This is the biggest, most important issue for states today—how to reduce their costs as well as improve services,” said T. Jack Williams, senior vice president, strategic programs with Tier Technologies, which provides financial transaction processing for several states.

“Some people who receive child support don’t have bank accounts,” said Janece Rolfe, communications manager for the Texas Office of Attorney General, Division for Families and Children. “They’re not able to use direct deposit, so they still get paper checks in the mail. There’s a risk of it getting lost or stolen.

“The debit card,” she said, “is more secure and saves tax dollars because we save 50 cents per disbursement.”

Texas began converting child support payments that go through the state disbursement system from checks to debit cards in May and has rolled out the program throughout the state, Rolfe said.

Unlike many states, Texas allows the recipient to decide whether to move to the debit card and Rolfe said about 150,000 people are using it. Through educational outreach about the program,
提前的付款卡能为各州带来多种好处，包括成本降低以及服务提升。

然而，大约有12,000更多的人从纸质支票转向直接存款。

“我们也看到了这是一个胜利，因为我们推动电子化。”Rolfe说。“我们大约每月支付1500万张支付卡。大约70％的支付是电子传输……要么直接存款，要么直接存款。”

密歇根州也在将其纸质支票改用借记卡和直接存款来支付儿童抚养费。

“邮寄纸质支票对国家来说成本很高。我们需要保存支票，并通过邮寄来发送它，”Marilyn Stephen，儿童抚养支付支持机构的主任说。

她说直接存款是消费者的第一选择。

电子支付——要么直接存款，要么借记卡——让资金快速和容易地到达消费者手中，甚至在灾难发生后也是如此。Stephen说，飓风“卡特里娜”带来的影响非常大。

许多人无家可归，并从该地区撤出。“我同事在路易斯安那州的时候说，‘我们需要帮助金’”Stephen说，在得到支持资金的消费者中。“我们有一个州级的语音应答系统，消费者可以在其中跟踪支出，”她说。

德里卡的卡片可以在销售点使用，也可以在ATM机上使用。“你可以花费的最多，”Williams说。

“当某人第一次获得他们的借记卡时，他们会去ATM机存他们的钱。他们在一个地方不要那么多现金。”她说。

“我们已经通过灾难准备性演习来确保不会出现资金短缺，”Stephen说。特别是在灾难中，他们需要资金进入账户。”

密歇根州在2005年11月开始实施三州计划，并在2006年1月开始正式推出。Stephen说，希望该州的各州儿童抚养费支付资金能够进行电子转移。

“滚动式地推出支付系统对于让每个县的消费者确定，我们提供良好的客户服务，对可能没有收到信件或者通知的消费者来说很熟悉。”她说道。

对借记卡的反应是好的，Stephen说。“我同意电子支付转移资金的潮流。”她说。

Weiner在过去的基本上有两类产品——信用卡和借记卡。

“预付是这张三脚凳的第三条腿，”他说。“信用卡在该地区，由银行发行给消费者。借记卡是由银行发行给消费者的。”

“预付卡的分布是不同的。第三方公司正在分布这些卡，即使银行也不能成为发行者。”

这些来自的公司，正在越来越多地在预付借记卡上发行，如美国红十字会，该机构为灾民提供灾害救济，如“卡特里娜飓风”受害者。如今，各州都在参与这个运动。

这儿是它们的工作：卡被发送给消费者。当一个儿童抚养支付被发送给州支付中心，钱被自动加载到卡片上，以供消费者使用。银行发行的卡片通常会每月提供对卡户的报表，以便他们追踪支出。

“卡片的用法可以在销售点或者在ATM机上。”Williams说。“你不能花得比你有的更多，但是它看起来感觉像一张信用卡。”

大多数州允许一次或两次免费交易，消费者可以随时将卡从银行取走。Williams说，大多数人都使用他们的PIN来取钱。

“当某人第一次拿出他们的钱，他们到ATM取。他们去ATM机取。他们不想在一次取那么多现金。”他说。“在接下来的四到六个月内，他们开始使用他们的卡片来开始金融。”

Weiner认为，行业正在用卡来支付。

“灾难后几年将看到实质进展，”他说。

Prepaid借记卡可以为多个目的带来好处，包括儿童抚养支付，如南卡罗来纳州并没有使用预付支持卡分配单元，根据Williams，各州正在使用预付借记卡来支付失业福利，救济计划，监狱释放资金和税收退款。各州，如许多企业，也可以考虑使用预付借记卡来支付健康储蓄账户，他说。

密歇根州，例如，也使用预付借记卡来支付其对贫困家庭的援助。

新科技将允许各州提高未来的课程。

“我们有全省范围的语音应答系统，可以让客户确定余额，”Stephen说。“他们也会收到每次支出的信件。”

“我们讨论会包括研究州的案例，”Williams说。“与我们讨论将包括案例研究，各州已经实施了计划，其成功和挑战可能在不同的地方被进行。”

他指出，讨论将包括研究州的案例，其成功和挑战可能在不同的地方被进行。

Weiner，其组织赞助的ProPay Card Expo，认为各州的使用处于早期阶段。

他说，讨论将包括案例研究，各州已经实施了计划，其成功和挑战可能在不同的地方被进行。

Weiner，他的组织赞助的Prepaid Card Expo，说，政府将提升州和联邦政府在使用预付支付卡的计划，该计划使用预付媒体来支付分配。想要查看更多信息，请访问www.prepaidcard-expo.com

He said the discussions will include case studies of states that have implemented programs, their successes and things that could have been done differently.

Prepaid debit cards can benefit states in several ways, according to Williams. In addition to the state disbursed child support payments—only South Carolina does not have a consolidated child support disbursement unit, according to Williams—states are using the prepaid debit cards for things like unemployment benefits, entitlement programs, prison release funds and tax refunds. States, like many businesses, may also consider using the prepaid debit cards for health savings accounts, he said.

Michigan, for instance, also uses prepaid debit cards for its aid to needy families program.

New technology will allow states to enhance programs in the future.

“We have a statewide voice response system that a customer can check a balance,” said Stephen. “They also receive in the mail an account sheet every month. They can keep track of it on a month by month basis as well.

“Lots of other states have converted to debit cards. Some of those cards are putting in place a system to alert the customer when money is loaded, through text, phone call, e-mail,” she said.

“That piece of alerting the customer when money is loaded is the next big thing for us.”

She stressed that the change in child support payments is a national trend. Cost, convenience and efficiency are among the reasons for the trend.

“Being able to work more efficiently is something we always strive for,” Rolfe said. “We know that sending out child support this way is a more efficient way to operate.”

Mary Branham Dusenberry is the managing editor for State News.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Lt. Governor</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
<th>Attorney General</th>
<th>Secretary of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Bob Riley (R)</td>
<td>Jim Folsom jr. (R)</td>
<td>Kay Ivey (R)</td>
<td>Troy King (R)</td>
<td>Beth Chapman (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Sarah Palin (R)</td>
<td>Sean Parnell (R)</td>
<td>Tom Boutin</td>
<td>David W. Marquez (R)</td>
<td>Sean Parnell (R)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>Togiola Tufafofo (D)</td>
<td>Aitofofe T.F. Suna (D)</td>
<td>Velega Savai Jr. (R)</td>
<td>Malaetai Mauga Togafau</td>
<td>Ipulasi A. Suna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Janet Napolitano (D)</td>
<td>Jan Brewer (R)</td>
<td>Dean Martin (R)</td>
<td>Terry Goddard (D)</td>
<td>Jan Brewer (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Mike D. Beebe (D)</td>
<td>Bill Halter (D)</td>
<td>Martha Shoffner (R)</td>
<td>Dustin McDaniel (D)</td>
<td>Charlie Daniels (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Arnold Schwarzenegger (R)</td>
<td>John Garamendi (D)</td>
<td>Bill Lockyer (R)</td>
<td>Jerry Brown (D)</td>
<td>Debra Bowen (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Bill Ritter (D)</td>
<td>Barbara O’Brien (R)</td>
<td>Cary Kennedy (D)</td>
<td>John Suthers (R)</td>
<td>Mike Coffman (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>M. Jodi Reel (R)</td>
<td>Michael Fedele (R)</td>
<td>Denise L. Nappier (R)</td>
<td>Richard Blumenthal (D)</td>
<td>Susan Bylsiewicz (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Ruth Ann Minner (D)</td>
<td>John Carney Jr. (D)</td>
<td>Jack Markell (D)</td>
<td>Joseph Biden III (D)</td>
<td>Harriet Smith Windsor (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Adrian Fenty (D)*</td>
<td>Edward Reiskin**</td>
<td>Lasana Mack*</td>
<td>Robert J. Spagnotti (D)</td>
<td>Sherryl Hobbs Newman (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Charlie Crist (R)</td>
<td>Jeff Kottkamp (R)</td>
<td>Alex Sink (D)</td>
<td>Bill McCollum (R)</td>
<td>Sue M. Cobb (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Sonny Perdue (R)</td>
<td>Casey Cagle (R)</td>
<td>W. Daniel Ebersole (D)</td>
<td>Thurbert E. Baker (D)</td>
<td>Karen Handel (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>Felix Camacho (R)</td>
<td>Mike Cruz (R)</td>
<td>Yasela Pereira (D)</td>
<td>Douglas Moylan (R)</td>
<td>Mike Cruz (R)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>C.L. “Butch” Otter (R)</td>
<td>Jim Risch (R)</td>
<td>Ron G. Crane (R)</td>
<td>Lawrence Wasiend (D)</td>
<td>Ben Ysursa (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Rod Blagojevich (D)</td>
<td>Patrick Quinn (D)</td>
<td>Alexander Giannoulias (D)</td>
<td>Lisa Madigan (D)</td>
<td>Jesse White (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Mitch Daniels (R)</td>
<td>Bedzy Stillman (R)</td>
<td>Richard E. Murdock (D)</td>
<td>Steve Carter (R)</td>
<td>Todd Rokita (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Chet Culver (D)</td>
<td>Patty Judge (D)</td>
<td>Michael L. Fitzgerald (D)</td>
<td>Tom Miller (D)</td>
<td>Michael Mauro (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Kathleen Sебelius (D)</td>
<td>Mark Parkinson (D)</td>
<td>Lynn Jenkins (R)</td>
<td>Paul Morrison (D)</td>
<td>Ron Thornton (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Ernie Fletcher (R)</td>
<td>Stephen B. Pence (R)</td>
<td>Jonathan Miller (D)</td>
<td>Gregory D. Stumbo (D)</td>
<td>C.M. “Trey” Grayson (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Kathleen Babineaux Blanco (D)</td>
<td>Mitch Landrieu (D)</td>
<td>John Kennedy (D)</td>
<td>Charles C. Foti (D)</td>
<td>Al Ater (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>John Baldacci (D)</td>
<td>Beth Edmonds (D)**</td>
<td>David Lemoine (D)</td>
<td>G. Steven Rowe (D)</td>
<td>Matthew Dunlap (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Martin O’Malley (D)</td>
<td>Anthony G. Brown (D)</td>
<td>Nancy K. Kopp (D)</td>
<td>Douglas F. Gansler (D)</td>
<td>Mary Kane (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Deval Patrick (D)</td>
<td>Timothy P.Murray (D)</td>
<td>Timothy P. Cahill (D)</td>
<td>Martha Coakley (D)</td>
<td>William Francis Galvin (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Jennifer Granholm (D)</td>
<td>John Cherry (D)</td>
<td>Robert J. Kleine (D)</td>
<td>Mike Cox (R)</td>
<td>Terri Lynn Land (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Tim Pawlenty (R)</td>
<td>Carol Molnau (R)</td>
<td>Tom Hanson (D)</td>
<td>Lori Swanson (D)</td>
<td>Mark Richie (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Haley Barbour (R)</td>
<td>Amy Tuck (R)</td>
<td>Tony E. Reeder (R)</td>
<td>Jim Hood (D)</td>
<td>Eric Clark (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Matt Blunt (R)</td>
<td>Peter Kinder (R)</td>
<td>Steve Steelman (R)</td>
<td>Jeremiah W. Nixon (D)</td>
<td>Ron Camahan (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Brian Schweitzer (D)</td>
<td>John Bohlinger (R)</td>
<td>Janet Kelly (D)</td>
<td>Mike McGrath (D)</td>
<td>Brad Johnson (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Dave Heineman (R)</td>
<td>Rick Shehry (R)</td>
<td>Shane Osborn (R)</td>
<td>Jon Bruning (R)</td>
<td>John A. Gale (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Jim Gibbons (D)</td>
<td>Brian K. Krolick (R)</td>
<td>John Kennedy (D)</td>
<td>Charles Cortez Masto (D)</td>
<td>Ross Miller (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>John Lynch (D)</td>
<td>Theodore L. Gatsas (D)**</td>
<td>David Lemoine (D)</td>
<td>Catherine Provencher (I)</td>
<td>William Gardner (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Jon Corzine (D)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Kelly Ayotte (D)</td>
<td>Nina Mitchell Wells (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Bill Richardson (D)</td>
<td>Diane Denish (D)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Zulma Farber (D)</td>
<td>Mary Herrera (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Eliot Spitzer (D)</td>
<td>David A. Paterson (D)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Gary King (D)</td>
<td>Andrew M. Cuomo (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Michael F. Easley (D)</td>
<td>Beverly Perdue (D)</td>
<td>Richard H. Moore (D)</td>
<td>Roy Cooper (D)</td>
<td>Elaine Marshall (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>John Hoeven (R)</td>
<td>Jack Dalrymple (R)</td>
<td>Kelly Schmidt (R)</td>
<td>Wayne Stehemi (R)</td>
<td>Alvin A. (Al) Jaeger (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>Benigno Repeki (Covenant)</td>
<td>Timothy Villagomez (Covenant)</td>
<td>Antoinette S. Calvo (D)</td>
<td>Matthew T. Gregory</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Ted Strickland (D)</td>
<td>Lee Fisher (D)</td>
<td>Richard Cordray (D)</td>
<td>Marc Dann (D)</td>
<td>Jennifer L. Brunner (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Brad Henry (D)</td>
<td>Jari Askins (D)</td>
<td>Scott Meacham (D)</td>
<td>W.A. Drew Edmondson (D)</td>
<td>M. Susan Savage (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Ted Kulongoski (D)</td>
<td>Bill Bradbury (D)*</td>
<td>Randall Edwards (D)</td>
<td>Hardy Myers (D)</td>
<td>Bill Bradbury (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Ed Rendell (D)</td>
<td>Catherine Baker Knoll (D)</td>
<td>Robert P. Casey Jr. (D)</td>
<td>Tom Corbett (R)</td>
<td>Pedro Cortes (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Anibal Acevedo-Vila</td>
<td>Ferdinand Bonilla (PDP)</td>
<td>Juan Carlos Mendez Torres (D)</td>
<td>Roberto J. Sanchez-Ramos</td>
<td>Ferdinand Bonilla (PDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Donald L. Carieri (R)</td>
<td>Elizabeth H. Roberts (D)</td>
<td>Frank T. Caprio (D)</td>
<td>Patrick C. Lynch (D)</td>
<td>A. Ralph Mallis (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Mark Sanford Jr. (R)</td>
<td>R. Andre Bauer (R)</td>
<td>Thomas Ravenel (R)</td>
<td>Thomas McMaster (R)</td>
<td>Mark Hammond (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Mike Rounds (R)</td>
<td>Dennis M. Daugaard (R)</td>
<td>Vernon L. Larson (R)</td>
<td>Larry Long (R)</td>
<td>Chris Nelson (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Phil Bredesen (R)</td>
<td>Douglas S. Wilder (D)</td>
<td>Dale Sims (D)</td>
<td>Robert E. Cooper Jr. (D)</td>
<td>Riley Darnell (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Rick Perry (R)</td>
<td>David Dewhurst (R)</td>
<td>Susan Combs (R)</td>
<td>Greg Abbott (R)</td>
<td>Roger Williams (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Virgin Islands</td>
<td>John delongh Jr. (D)</td>
<td>Greg Francis (D)</td>
<td>Bernice A. Turnbull (D)</td>
<td>Kerry Drue (D)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>John Huntsman Jr. (R)</td>
<td>Gary Herbert (R)</td>
<td>Edward T. Alter (R)</td>
<td>Mark Surtlief (R)</td>
<td>Gary Herbert (R)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>James Douglas (R)</td>
<td>Brian Dubie (R)</td>
<td>Jep Spaulding (D)</td>
<td>William H. Sorrell (D)</td>
<td>Deborah Markowitz (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Tim Kaine (D)</td>
<td>William T. Bolling (D)</td>
<td>J. Braxton Powell</td>
<td>Robert F. McDonnell (R)</td>
<td>Katherine Hanley (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Christine Greigoe (D)</td>
<td>Brad Owen (D)</td>
<td>Michael J. Murphy (D)</td>
<td>Rob Mckenna (R)</td>
<td>Sam Reed (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Joe Manchin III (D)</td>
<td>Earl Ray Tomblin (D)**</td>
<td>John D. Perdue (D)</td>
<td>Darrell V. McGraw Jr. (D)</td>
<td>Betty Ireland (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Jim Doyle (D)</td>
<td>Barbara Lawton (D)</td>
<td>Dawn Sass (D)</td>
<td>J.B. Van Hollem (R)</td>
<td>Douglas La Follette (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Dave Freudenthal (D)</td>
<td>Max Maxfield (R)*</td>
<td>Joe Meyar (R)</td>
<td>Pat Crank (R)</td>
<td>Max Maxfield (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Secretary of state. **Senate president. In Tennessee, Speaker of Senate. ***Duties performed by lieutenant governor. *Mayor. **Mayor/city administrator. *Was appointed acting Deputy Chief Financial Officer for the Office of Finance and Treasury in November 2005. #Beginning with the November 3, 2009 general election, this office will be filled.

Note: If no party affiliation is listed, the position is either nonpartisan or appointed. Data reflects officials known as of December 11, 2006.
## 2007 Legislative Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Duration of session</th>
<th>Limitation on length of session</th>
<th>Legislative Web site</th>
<th>Bill-status information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>March 6–June 18</td>
<td>30 L in 105 C</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legislature.state.al.us/">http://www.legislature.state.al.us/</a></td>
<td>(334) 242-7826; H: (334) 246-7627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Jan. 16–May 16</td>
<td>12 L C</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legislature.state.ak.us/">http://www.legislature.state.ak.us/</a></td>
<td>(907) 465-4648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Jan. 8–April (no limit on session length)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.az.us">http://www.leg.state.az.us</a></td>
<td>(602) 542-3559; H: (602) 542-4221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Jan. 8–March</td>
<td>60 C (b)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/">http://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/</a></td>
<td>(916) 445-4252; H: (916) 445-3614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Dec. 4, 2006–Sept. 12, 2007</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legis.state.ca.gov/">http://www.legis.state.ca.gov/</a></td>
<td>(510) 682-6107; H: (510) 682-7771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Jan. 10–May 10</td>
<td>120 C</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.co.us">http://www.leg.state.co.us</a></td>
<td>(303) 866-3055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Jan. 3–June 6</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.co.us">http://www.leg.state.co.us</a></td>
<td>(860) 240-0555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.dccouncil.washington.dc.us">www.dccouncil.washington.dc.us</a></td>
<td>(202) 724-8050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Jan. 9–June 30</td>
<td>June 30</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.de.us">www.leg.state.de.us</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (302) 744-4114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>March 6–May 4</td>
<td>60 C (b)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.fl.us">www.leg.state.fl.us</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (850) 488-4371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Jan. 8–March (40 days)</td>
<td>40 L</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.ga.us">www.leg.state.ga.us</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (808) 587-0700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Jan. 17–May (60 days)</td>
<td>60 L (b)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov">www.capitol.hawaii.gov</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (208) 332-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Jan. 8–March</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.id.us">www.leg.state.id.us</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (217) 782-3944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Jan. 8–April (60 days)</td>
<td>odd: 6 C or April 29, even: 30 C or March 14</td>
<td><a href="http://www.in.gov/legislative">www.in.gov/legislative</a></td>
<td>(317) 232-0404; H: (317) 232-9856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Jan. 8–April 29</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.ia.us">www.leg.state.ia.us</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (505) 281-5129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Jan. 8–April</td>
<td>odd: None; even: 90 C (b)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kslegislature.org">www.kslegislature.org</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (785) 296-2149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Jan. 2–March 30</td>
<td>odd: 30 L; even: 60 L</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lrc.state.ky.us">www.lrc.state.ky.us</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (888) 829-0021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>April 30–June 28</td>
<td>even: 60 L in 85 C; odd: 45 L in 60 C</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.la.us">www.leg.state.la.us</a></td>
<td>(800) 868-2456; H: (800) 868-3178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Dec. 6, 2006–June 20, 2007</td>
<td>3rd Wed. of June; 3rd Wed. of April</td>
<td>janus.state.me.us/legis</td>
<td>(207) 287-1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Jan. 10–April 9</td>
<td>90 C</td>
<td><a href="http://mlis.state.md.us/">http://mlis.state.md.us/</a></td>
<td>(410) 946-5490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Jan. 3–Dec. (meets all year)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.state.maus/legis">www.state.maus/legis</a></td>
<td>S: (617) 722-1276; H: (617) 722-2798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Jan. 3–May 21</td>
<td>120 L or 1st Mon. after 3rd Sat. in May</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.mn.us">www.leg.state.mn.us</a></td>
<td>(651) 296-0504; H: (651) 296-6646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Jan. 2–April 1</td>
<td>125 C (f); 90C (f)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.ms.us">www.leg.state.ms.us</a></td>
<td>(601) 359-3719 (in session) or (601) 359-3135 (out of session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Jan. 3–May 30</td>
<td>May 30</td>
<td><a href="http://www.moga.state.mo.us">www.moga.state.mo.us</a></td>
<td>(573) 751-4666; H: (573) 751-2979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Jan. 1–April (90 days)</td>
<td>90 L</td>
<td>legstate.mt/css</td>
<td>(406) 444-8200 (in session) or (406) 444-3064 (out of session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Jan. 3–June (90 days)</td>
<td>odd: 90 L; even: 60 L</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unicam.state.ne.us">www.unicam.state.ne.us</a></td>
<td>(402) 471-2271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Start/End</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>See Web Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Feb. 5–June 4</td>
<td>120 C</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.ne.us">www.leg.state.ne.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Jan. 3–July 1</td>
<td>45 L</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/ie">www.gencourt.state.nh.us/ie</a></td>
<td>S: (603) 271-3420; H: (603) 271-2548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Jan. 9, 2007–Jan. 2008 (meets all year)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.njleg.state.nj.us">www.njleg.state.nj.us</a></td>
<td>(609) 292-4840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Jan. 16–March 17</td>
<td>odd: 60 C; even: 30 C</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.nm.us">www.leg.state.nm.us</a></td>
<td>(505) 986-4600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Jan. 24–July (no limit on session length)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/">www.ncga.state.nc.us/</a></td>
<td>(919) 733-7779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Jan. 9–March 30 (80 days)</td>
<td>80 L in the biennium</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legis.nd.gov/">www.legis.nd.gov/</a></td>
<td>(888) 635-3447 (in session) or (701) 328-2916 (out of session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Jan. 2–Dec. (meets all year)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legislature.state.oh.us">www.legislature.state.oh.us</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (614) 466-8842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Feb. 5–May 25</td>
<td>last Fri. in May</td>
<td><a href="http://www.isb.state.ok.us">www.isb.state.ok.us</a></td>
<td>S: (405) 521-5659; H: (405) 521-2733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Jan. 8–June (no limit on session length)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.leg.state.or.us">www.leg.state.or.us</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (503) 986-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Jan. 2–Dec. (meets all year)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legis.state.pa.us">www.legis.state.pa.us</a></td>
<td>S: (717) 787-5920; H: (717) 787-2342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Jan. 2–June</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ri.gov/legislature">www.ri.gov/legislature</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (401) 222-3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Jan. 9–June 7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.scstatehouse.net">www.scstatehouse.net</a></td>
<td>(800) 922-1539 (in session) or (803) 734-2060 (out of session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Jan. 9–March 26</td>
<td>odd: 40 L; even: 35 L</td>
<td><a href="http://legis.state.sd.us/index.aspx">http://legis.state.sd.us/index.aspx</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (605) 773-3251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Jan. 9–May</td>
<td>90 L (g)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.capitol.state.tn.us">www.capitol.state.tn.us</a></td>
<td>(615) 741-0927 (in session) or (615) 741-3511 (out of session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Jan. 9–May 28</td>
<td>140 C</td>
<td><a href="http://www.captiol.state.tx.us">www.captiol.state.tx.us</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (512) 463-1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Jan. 15–March 2</td>
<td>45 C</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legislature.utah.gov">www.legislature.utah.gov</a></td>
<td>S: (801) 538-1588; H: (801) 538-1029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Jan. 10–Feb. 24</td>
<td>odd: 30 C (b); even: 60 C (b)</td>
<td><a href="http://legis.state.va.us">legis.state.va.us</a></td>
<td>S: (804) 698-7410; H: (804) 698-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Jan. 8–April 22</td>
<td>odd: 105 C; even: 60 C</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wa.gov">www.wa.gov</a></td>
<td>S &amp; H: (360) 786-7573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Jan. 10–March 10</td>
<td>60 C (b)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legislature.wv.gov">www.legislature.wv.gov</a></td>
<td>(304) 347-4836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Jan. 3–Dec. (meets all year)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legis.state.wi.us">www.legis.state.wi.us</a></td>
<td>(608) 266-2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Jan. 9–March 14 (40 days)</td>
<td>odd: 40 L; even: 20 L; biennium: 60 L</td>
<td><a href="http://legisweb.state.wy.us">legisweb.state.wy.us</a></td>
<td>(307) 777-7881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>90L (h)</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.cmmlie.gov.mp/">http://www.cmmlie.gov.mp/</a></td>
<td>S: (670) 664-5103; H: (670) 664-8846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Jan. 8–June 30 and Aug. 20–Nov. 13</td>
<td>5 mo.: 4 mo.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.senadorpr.us/">http://www.senadorpr.us/</a></td>
<td>(787) 723-4112 (Office of the Director) or (787) 723-5021 (Office of Legislative Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Virgin Islands</td>
<td>Jan. 9–meets all year</td>
<td>None</td>
<td><a href="http://www.senate.gov/vi">www.senate.gov/vi</a></td>
<td>(340) 693-3501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **L**—Legislative days
- **C**—Calendar days
- **(a)**: No constitutional rule or statutory provision however, by legislative rule regular sessions shall be adjourned sine die no later than Saturday of the week during which the 100th day from the beginning of each regular session falls. The Speaker/President may by declaration authorize the extension of the session for a period not to exceed seven additional days. Thereafter the session can be extended only by a majority vote of the House/Senate.
- **(b)**: Session may be extended by vote of members in both houses. Arkansas 2/3 vote; Florida 3/5 vote; session may be extended by vote of members in each house. Hawaii: petition of 2/3 membership or a maximum 15-day extension; Kansas 2/3 vote; Virginia 2/3 vote for 30 C extension. West Virginia may be extended by the governor.
- **(c)**: Odd-numbered years not later than Wednesday after first Monday in June; even-numbered years not later than Wednesday after first Monday in May.
- **(d)**: Constitution encourages adjournment by May 31.
- **(e)**: Legislative rules say formal business must be concluded by Nov. 15 of the 1st session in the biennium, or by July 31 of the 2nd session in the biennium.
- **(f)**: 90 C sessions every year except the first year of a gubernatorial administration during which the legislative session runs for 125 C.
- **(g)**: 90 legislative days over a two year period. During special sessions members will be paid up to 30 legislative days further days will be without pay or per diem.
- **(h)**: Before April 1 and 30, after July 31.
- **(i)**: Legislative provision for session in odd-numbered years however legislature may divide, and in practice has divided, to meet in even-numbered years as well.
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Questions regarding the best service delivery approaches for working with families whose children have been victims of child maltreatment continue to challenge state and federal agencies. To find the most pertinent answers, state policymakers and child welfare administrators need reliable information on the effectiveness of service privatization. Although several states have privatized some aspects of their systems, this approach is not well-tested.

Enter the National Quality Improvement Center on the Privatization of Child Welfare Services (QIC PCW), directed by the University of Kentucky College of Social Work in partnership with Planning and Learning Technologies.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ Children’s Bureau funded the center in October 2005, and QIC PCW works to increase knowledge about the use of public/private partnerships in child welfare service delivery. Currently, the center is assessing the efficiency of privatization, providing funding for states to test the impact of privatization on organizational and client outcomes, and serving as an information clearinghouse regarding public/private partnerships in child welfare.

What’s Happening Around the Nation

Public-private partnerships in child welfare are not a recent innovation. Once it became a popular notion that public child
welfare services were a necessary function of government, public child welfare agencies relied on private agencies to provide discrete services such as family counseling or foster care. Today, however, some states’ child protection agencies, while maintaining the ultimate responsibility, are considering returning an even greater share of services to the private sector. The most frequently contracted services include foster care services, including recruitment, training and monitoring, and family preservation and support services.

Three predominant features distinguish privatization from traditional subcontracting: shifting more core or mandated child welfare services to private agencies; transferring to those agencies case management and decision-making authority; and holding the private agencies responsible for achieving certain outcomes. For example, a certain percentage of children in their care must be reunified with their families or children must be able to return home within a specified time period. Additionally, private agencies are increasingly providing case management services for families that have abused or neglected their children. Social workers for these agencies develop case plans that families must follow to keep or regain custody.

While some may perceive that privatization is a trend in child welfare, it is important to understand how prevalent it really is. Through key informational discussions the QIC PCW held with public child welfare administrators in 45 states, the center documented a wide range of experiences. All states engage in some service and administrative subcontracting, but only a portion have shifted case management to the private sector, as is outlined in the accompanying table. While only one state reported actively planning for privatization, others contemplating privatizing some services may not have been ready to make plans public.

Nine states reported discontinuing privatization initiatives, typically due to concern that subcontractors were not producing desired outcomes for children. Some factors cited as precluding states from moving in the direction of privatizing services were:

- lack of capable providers
- funding limitations
- agency staff
- union employees
- political resistance
- state legislation
- few standards for monitoring quality.

Little Empirical Evidence, But Promising Practices Abound

For states and localities considering engaging the private sector more fully in the child welfare system, the challenges and strategies some states have already deployed provide a vast body of knowledge.

The QIC PCW facilitated forums with 12 of these states, as well as discussions with 191 stakeholders from across the country, including public and private providers, tribal representatives, child advocates, youth and judges. A detailed analysis of identified themes is beyond the scope of this article, but can be found on the QIC PCW Web site: www.uky.edu/SocialWork/QICPCW. States have taken dramatically different approaches, but are very willing to share their experience with others.

States identified a number of lessons and promising practices that span the early stages of weighing the appropriateness of privatization to address identified state needs, assessment of site readiness, and planning. They include the following tips:

- Identify stakeholders, particularly the community-based organizations, courts and tribes which play a critical role in provider achievement of performance indicators, and the working relationship between public and private workers on the front line.
- Find common ground: public and private providers should agree on objectives and desired outcomes.
- Include all stakeholders in planning and contract negotiating.

Other promising practices relate to program implementation and ongoing monitoring to assure quality service delivery and outcome achievement:

- Implement a contract monitoring process that balances appropriate levels of systemic and case level review without micromanagement;
- Identify systems that ensure positive outcomes. These systems should engage administrative and field staff in creative analysis of practice and outcome data, linking cost effectiveness with evidence-based practice that best promotes desired outcomes for families and children; and,
- Ongoing communication and management of the relationship between the public and private sectors that strives for true partnership in serving families and children, while recognizing the realities of the contractual relationship.

Proving the effectiveness of these strategies and rigorously evaluating how privatization impacts the quality of services will be crucial to the child welfare field. This research must include a selection of performance indicators which encourage moving children toward safety, permanency and well-being which can be used in testing performance-based contracting systems that link payment to outcome achievement.

Previous studies offer many recommendations on how to plan and implement privatization in child welfare. Unfortunately, much of this is based on case studies, and there is little empirical evidence on the efficacy of privatization in child welfare to date. Findings of studies are mixed and have limited generalizability. In most cases, overall spending increased with privatization, although many report this is due to more adequately funding the system and an increase in service accessibility in rural areas. While the jury is still out on the effectiveness of child welfare privatization, many states are moving toward more rigorous evaluation to inform the field.

One thing, however, is clear: State governments and child welfare administrators need data upon which to make decisions about how much maltreated children and families can benefit from further involvement by the private sector. Many questions need answers, from the philosophical—Are there certain child welfare services that are inherent governmental functions and should not be subcontracted to the private sector?—to the practical—What approach yields the best balance of financial incentives and disincentives to promote desired child welfare
Based on information collected over the past year, four topics rose to the top as most timely and relevant. Two go to the heart of promoting performance:

- The challenge to establish performance based contracting strategies to promote the achievement of mandated child welfare outcomes and share among the public and private sectors financial risk related to accountability. Examples of risk to private agencies are “no eject, no reject” state policies, which say that if a child is referred, an agency cannot reject him or discontinue services before problems are resolved. Some policies also require private agencies to take back, at no cost, children who must return to foster care because they were abused after returning home. These policies can pose such high financial risk that they discourage private agencies from participating.

- The need to identify contract monitoring mechanisms that best assure quality service delivery, responsible program administration and fiscal mechanisms that promote accountability while facilitating a collaborative public/private system.

Two topics focus on how key players must interact.

- We must examine partnership dynamics that best yield smoothly functioning, responsive and effective public/private service delivery systems, and accomplish appropriate levels of shared decision-making and accountability.

- We effectively engage external entities, including relevant courts, tribes and community-based agencies, which enables inclusive and responsive service delivery.

The Children’s Bureau and the QIC PCW National Advisory Board molded these areas of need into a demonstration project topic. Beginning in January 2007 three states will be funded to test innovative performance-based contracting and quality assurance systems within a privatized context. They are required to compare public versus private service delivery to enhance the usefulness of the findings. QIC PCW hopes this initiative will help policymakers understand how to build systems that promote accountability, performance and continuous quality improvement—in both privatized and traditional environments.

So, what do we know about the use of privatization to meet the needs of the nation’s children? The challenges of meeting families’ needs are great, and states struggle to improve outcomes with limited resources. Some are engaging the private sector in the work that had been within the purview of government. The underlying theory driving privatization is that the introduction of competition and accountability results in increased innovation, efficiency and performance. This is a subject that is debated in the child welfare arena, and we do not yet know the extent to which this theory rings true. There are certainly states and localities making great strides in public/private partnership. We need to continue to ask the right questions, and work hard to generate answers.

In collaboration with the Children’s Bureau, the QIC PCW will be facilitating opportunities for ongoing dialogue around the vast array of important questions, as well as providing technical assistance to states, and disseminating information as it evolves. The QIC PCW will also be administering research and demonstration grants in January or February 2007 to test innovative strategies for implementing performance-based contracting and quality improvement systems in the private sector.

—Crystal Collins-Camargo, Ph.D., is director of the QIC PCW and clinical assistant professor at the University of Kentucky.

### Privatization of the Case Management Function in Child Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Privatization</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Currently Privatizing Case</td>
<td>These states are currently relying on traditional arrangements in which the public</td>
<td>AL AK AR CA CT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Services</td>
<td>agency contracts for services on an ad hoc basis and a state public agency worker</td>
<td>GA ID IN KY LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continues to have primary responsibility for the case plan and its management. This</td>
<td>MA ME MN MS MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>states may have had some experience with contracting case management</td>
<td>NC ND NH NM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility, but they are no longer implementing this type of reform. This category</td>
<td>NJ OK OR PA RI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also includes Texas, which is the only state with near-term plans for large-scale</td>
<td>SC TX UT VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>privatization efforts.</td>
<td>VT WA WY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts Limited in Scope or Geographically</td>
<td>These states are currently privatizing case management functions for a target group</td>
<td>AZ CO MI MO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of children or a set of core services, but only on a limited basis geographically or</td>
<td>OH SD TN WI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for a specialized component of the child welfare delivery system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale Efforts</td>
<td>These states have large-scale efforts involving the privatization of the case</td>
<td>DC FL IL KS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management function (majority of service area).</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Call for Evidence-Based Policy

Sex Offender Electronic Monitoring Has Advantages, Problems

Electronic monitoring devices come with certain advantages, but are also accompanied by a host of problems, such as increasing officer workload, agency liability and large financial costs. Sex offender policies must avoid knee-jerk reactions and move toward rational evidence-based practices to most effectively protect our communities against sex-related crimes.

By Matthew DeMichele, Brian Payne and Deeanna Button
Sex offenders have some of the lowest recidivism rates among all felons, according to 2003 figures from the Bureau of Justice Statistics. But government officials at all levels are arguing for increased sentences, longer parole and probation periods, additional supervision conditions, civil commitment and numerous other strategies to punish sex offenders.

There has been a recent flood of legislation targeting sex offenders, the most significant of which is the federal Adam Walsh Act. This act, and several at the state level, require community corrections agencies to develop and evaluate electronic monitoring devices for sex offenders. While 28 states have provisions stipulating that electronic monitoring can be used for sex offenders—following the lead of the Adam Walsh Act—several states have passed or are proposing legislation calling for sex offenders to wear electronic monitoring bracelets or anklets for the rest of their lives. Missing from this legislative push to expand electronic monitoring for sex offenders is discussion about potential unintended policy consequences and costs.

Sex Offender Supervision:
An Emotional Environment

Crime control policies often have unintended negative consequences. Few policy areas are generating more excitement, media coverage and political concern than those related to crime and justice. Whether it is newscasters displaying images of brutal homicides or discussing chemical castration for sex offenders, it seems the old journalistic adage of “if it bleeds it leads” holds true. This media attention fosters a sensationalized perception of sex offender issues, which potentially fosters an emotionally laden policymaking environment.

There are few who will argue on behalf of sex offenders. To be sure, these crimes violate social and cultural sensibilities—especially when perpetrated upon the young—and cause long-term pain and harm to their victims. This moral outrage against sex offenders necessitates cautious policy development and thoughtful, not knee-jerk, reactions. Just as one would not advocate fighting fires with untested and unproven liquids or devices, one should not wholeheartedly endorse untested strategies to control sex offenders.

Sex Offenders: Put on This Bracelet

Although labeled a registration and notification bill, the Adam Walsh Act contains several provisions that shift expectations for probation, parole and pretrial agencies that supervise offenders and defendants convicted or charged with a sex crime.

Cumulatively, this legislation may fail to consider the circumstances surrounding behaviors that constitute sexual offenses and realistic expectations for electronic monitoring. Sex offending is not something that takes place solely among strangers. Estimates from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in 2000 suggest that 96 percent of all sex crimes targeting children are committed by someone the victim knows. Half the offenders are family members who presumably commit the offense in their home. If this is the case, what can electronic monitoring do to protect potential victims? Before instituting such sweeping mandates for electronic monitoring—or other interventions—research is needed to determine if such an expensive and time-consuming intervention is effective at reducing sex offenses.

Experts estimate that the recently passed Proposition 83 would cost Californians up to $160,000 a day. This translates into an annual cost of more than $57 million, with the annual cost expected to grow to $100 million within 10 years. The cost of monitoring sex offenders in Wisconsin is estimated at up to a half billion dollars over a 20-year timeframe. The high cost stems partly from fees for the technology, but primarily from workload increases assigned to probation officers. Federal guidelines suggest probation officers supervising sex offenders maintain caseloads of about 25 offenders, though their caseloads are often around 40 sex offenders. Probation departments expected to monitor sex offenders around the clock would see their workloads escalate but would need to reduce each officer’s caseload substantially.

Electronic monitoring began in the U.S. in 1984 when Judge Jack Love of New Mexico was inspired by a Spiderman comic to utilize radio frequency and landline telephone technology on offender populations. Initial electronic monitoring devices required an offender to wear a bracelet or anklet emitting a radio signal that is detected by a receiver connected to a landline telephone. The transmitter and receiver are to remain within a certain distance of one another, and the telephone connection allows for sending messages to a central monitoring agency or community corrections officer. These systems are commonly known as home detention or house arrest programs, and provide information on the times when an offender is away from home. They do not provide any information about what offenders are doing while at home or where they are when they leave.

The technological community responded to the limitations of first generation devices and began incorporating cellular telephone technologies and global positioning satellites. Now, offenders are fitted with GPS devices—as mandated in the Adam Walsh Act—that can provide near real-time information regarding an offender’s location. Knowing where a sex offender travels throughout the day provides several advantages for community supervision. It is possible to reduce offending by preventing sex offenders from entering areas (exclusion zones) with heightened criminal opportunities, such as schools and playgrounds. Through analyzing the daily movements of an offender, a community supervision officer may uncover a pattern to an offender’s behavior and discern times at which the likelihood for re-offending escalates, and make case management adjustments.

There is no doubt that we live in an increasingly technological society, but we must avoid urges to hop on the latest technological bandwagon. Technological gadgetry should not lead the development of programs using electronic monitoring devices. Instituting any electronic monitoring conditions comes with numerous costs, considerations and potential pitfalls. There are equipment failures, damaged equipment, equipment maintenance, false alerts, dead zones (areas which a signal cannot be located), and several other everyday considerations.
that policymakers must calculate into any electronic monitoring policy.

**Electronic Monitoring: Can It Reduce Crime?**

Contemporary crime control policies need to move away from mythical perspectives on sex offenders and electronic monitoring and toward the evidence. The correctional field has followed the medical and professional fields by institutionalizing processes rooted in effective interventions. The National Institute of Corrections and its partners in 2004 developed a set of principles known as evidence-based practices. The underlying philosophy is simple: Correctional practices and programs must be supported by rigorous applied research and evaluations; no longer can correctional administrators and policy-makers defend practices by simply claiming that is “the way things have always been done.” There are no more excuses for failing to locate and implement effective correctional practices and policies, and programs using electronic monitoring devices are no different.

Before determining whether something works, we must define the expectations. Is electronic monitoring for sex offenders being passed to punish, to track, to rehabilitate or for some other purpose? According to evidence-based practices, the community corrections field should utilize a balanced approach between treatment, surveillance and accountability to prevent further abuse, hold offenders accountable and work toward long-term behavior change. The ultimate outcome for these agencies is measured through recidivism—the number of offenders re-arrested, reconvicted or revoked for a non-crime technical violation. What does the research community say about electronic monitoring? Do electronic monitoring devices improve case management and public safety? Do these devices bring about long-term behavior change?

There is little scientific research documenting the effectiveness of electronic monitoring devices with sex offenders or other offenders. Mark Renzema and Evan Mayo-Wilson in 2005 conducted the most thorough review thus far of research literature on electronic monitoring effectiveness. They found only three research reports met all their inclusion criteria as methodologically rigorous; one was from the United Kingdom. The overall assessment is that “applications of electronic monitoring as a tool for reducing crime are not supported by existing data,” according to their report in the *Journal of Experimental Criminology*.

A 2000 investigation—by James Bonta, Suzanne Wallace-Capretta and Jennifer Rooney—found slightly lower recidivism for high-risk offenders in a program using electronic monitoring devices. Most interesting about these findings is that the electronic monitoring component was not what reduced re-offending. Rather, high-risk offenders supervised with an electronic monitoring device seem to have a greater likelihood of completing treatment, with those who completed treatment performing better overall. Therefore, the offenders in the electronic monitoring program were more likely to complete treatment, and the interaction between these two interventions—cognitive-behavioral treatment and electronic monitoring—reduced recidivism.
The 2000 study tells us nothing, however, about how electronic monitoring affects the behavior of violent or sex-related offenders because these groups were excluded from the study. A 2002 study by Mary Finn and Suzanne Muirhead-Steves, however, compared the likelihood a violent offender would return to prison within four years of release. These researchers determined that electronic monitoring had little direct impact on reducing reincarceration or extension of offenders’ time in the community. Sex offenders supervised with electronic monitoring devices performed better than similar (based on criminal history) sex offenders not in the program. The authors, however, do not call for increased use of electronic monitoring for sex offenders. Instead, they call for more research on this topic—their sample was limited to 35 monitored sex offenders—to understand how this group experiences the monitoring sanction and conclude that electronic monitoring “does not appear to ensure greater community protection.”

A recent evaluation of more than 75,000 offenders supervised with electronic monitoring devices in Florida uncovered reduced revocations for new crimes, technical violations and absconding for sex offenders supervised with electronic monitoring devices. The findings need to be carefully accepted as the authors—Kathy Padgett, William Bales and Thomas Blomberg—acknowledge that sex offenders, regardless of being supervised with an electronic monitoring device, were the least likely of all types of offenders to have their supervision revoked due to a new crime or to abscond. Implicitly this calls into question the need to aggressively monitor all sex offenders in the same way.

Crime control policy must originate from scientific, not political, procedures. Science, although not infallible, has the potential to implement methodologically rigorous research to test criminological and criminal justice theories to understand the causes of crime and the most effective strategies to combat criminality. This is not to say that the public should not be outraged or that policymakers should not demand serious punishments for individuals committing sex crimes—especially those against society’s most vulnerable citizens. Nor are we arguing that electronic monitoring and the legislative push to developing such devices to supervise sex offenders is inherently erroneous. This article is intended to convey to the policymaking community a glimpse of what the research community has uncovered on sex offenders and electronic monitoring—to offer evidence for evidence-based sex offender policy.

Electronic monitoring technologies are only one possible supervision tool for sex offenders. These devices are not a panacea to sex offending or any other form of criminal behavior. They come with certain advantages, but are also accompanied by a host of problems such as increasing officer workload, agency liability and large financial costs. Sex offender policies must avoid knee-jerk reactions and move toward rational evidence-based practices to most effectively protect our communities against sex-related crimes.

—Matthew DeMichele is a research associate with the American Probation & Parole Association; Brian Payne is a professor at Old Dominion University; and Deeanna Button is a graduate student at Old Dominion University.

Conclusion: Electronic Monitoring A Tool, Not The Solution

What is reasonable to expect from community corrections? Community corrections, institutional corrections, the police and the entire justice system are not capable of ending all sex offending. This is not to say that nothing works with sex offenders. Rather, simply to point out that ending all of any type of offense may not be a realistic (or fair) goal for the justice system. If we consider one of the most powerful social institutions, the medical field, success is not measured by the eradication of all diseases or ending all cancer or diabetes. Instead, more incremental goals—such as uncovering new explanations for causes of diseases and continual research, development and implementation of new procedures, tools and strategies to lead to a more healthy society—are established.

The technological community responded to the limitations of first generation devices and began incorporating cellular telephone technologies and global positioning satellites. Now, offenders are fitted with GPS devices—as mandated in the Adam Walsh Act—that can provide near real-time information regarding an offender’s location.
The Hurricane Season Response After-Action Report evaluated how the Emergency Management Assistance Compact stood up to the challenges of the 2005 hurricane season. The report cited both the compact’s accomplishments and areas for improvement, but called its overall response-delivery outcomes successful.

By Beverly Bell

A final report on the performance of EMAC during the 2005 hurricane season praises the compact’s ability to facilitate the delivery of people and equipment during the catastrophic natural disasters of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

The 2005 Hurricane Season Response After-Action Report (AAR) outlines the compact’s substantial improvements since the 2004 hurricane season, which made the response to the overwhelming destruction in 2005 such a success story. The report cited the following accomplishments:

- The delivery of “valuable resources quickly and in unprecedented quantities to Member States engulfed in a disaster of catastrophic proportions.”
- Good communication between EMAC leadership, member states and the threatened Gulf Coast states well before the hurricane made landfall. This enabled early recruitment of personnel for EMAC A-Teams, the lead groups assigned directly to a disaster event and the affected state.
- EMAC staff and leadership who were “flexible, responsive and fully committed to supporting the A-Teams.” The report specifically refers to enhancements made to the broadcast and resource tracking systems in real time as requested by A-Team members in the field, which greatly helped them in executing their responsibilities.

The report also lists areas for improvement:

- Securing adequate funding for EMAC—the compact “is a proven and valuable component of the Nation’s response and recovery capabilities”… there should be “a base funding level to enable multi-year EMAC forward planning.”
- “A major educational and public awareness campaign is needed to ensure all relevant parties are fully cognizant of EMAC’s purpose, restrictions and operational parameters.”
An Unprecedented Response

In its 11-year history, EMAC had never handled disasters the size of hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Prior to 2005, the largest utilization of state-to-state mutual aid in the nation’s history took place the previous year. In 2004, four hurricanes—Frances, Ivan, Jeanne and Charley—hit the U.S. in a six-week period. More than 800 emergency management personnel from 38 EMAC-member states and California were deployed for 99 consecutive days to Florida, Alabama and West Virginia in support of hurricane operations.

In contrast, the 2005 civilian EMAC response was 23 times larger than that of 2004, totaling nearly 20,000 personnel. In addition, 46,500 National Guard personnel were deployed. EMAC had deployed the National Guard during other events, but not to this level.

“The EMAC system was tested during the worst natural disaster in our nation’s history,” says Robert Latham Jr., retired executive director of the Mississippi Emergency Management Agency. And though the system was stretched to its limits, it never failed to deliver. “Virtually every asset shortfall was met by EMAC,” says Latham.

Some of those deployed in 2005 under EMAC:

- More than 1,300 search and rescue personnel from 16 states searched more than 22,300 structures and rescued 6,582 people.
- More than 2,000 health care professionals from 28 states treated more than 160,000 patients in the days and weeks after the storms, under the most primitive of conditions.
- Nearly 3,000 Fire/Hazmat personnel from 28 states
- 200 engineers from nine states
- More than 6,880 sheriff’s deputies and police officers from 35 states and countless local jurisdictions deployed across Louisiana and Mississippi—a total of 35 percent of all of the resources deployed.
- 112 animal rescue personnel from four states; one team alone sheltered approximately 1,500 animals.

The magnitude of the response revealed EMAC’s strengths and weaknesses. As a result, the 154-page AAR describes operational and administrative issues while providing nu-

How the EMAC After-Action Report was Developed

- 742 Completed Post-Deployment Surveys
- Two-day, facilitated focus-group discussions with 60 people from EMAC Advance Teams (A-Teams), and members of EMAC’s top leadership deployed to Washington, D.C. and the affected regions
- Two-day, facilitated focus group discussions with 150 individuals who were deployed to the devastated areas and who represented different disciplines; individuals came from all 48 assisting states
- Thousands of EMAC documents, including daily situation reports, Request-for-Assistance (Req-A) forms and other information from the EMAC database
- Several administrative and operational issues should be addressed, including 1) an electronic version of the Request for Assistance (Req-A) form, which is used by member states to formally request, offer and accept assistance; 2) greater accountability of deployed personnel, and 3) a new level of EMAC operations and larger A-Teams for catastrophic events.

The basis of the report, which took nearly a year to complete, is a post-deployment survey conducted two months after Katrina struck. More than 700 participants provided feedback on various operational elements, including what worked well and what procedures needed to be modified. This was followed up with facilitated focus groups and interviews with stakeholders and emergency responders who were deployed during the hurricanes Katrina and Rita responses.

The AAR focuses on hurricanes Katrina and Rita, which accounted for 97.3 percent of the 2005 missions and 99.6 percent of the personnel deployed during 2005. However, EMAC was activated 10 times that year; responding to one wildfire, one flood, one tropical storm, two winter storms and five hurricanes. These events generated 2,241 mission requests, resulting in the deployment of 66,207 personnel and countless pieces of equipment.
umerous recommendations to improve the compact. Most of the suggestions fall into three main areas: 1) education and training, 2) Web site and database, and 3) adequate funding for EMAC.

The Need for Education and Technology Upgrades

Education emerged early as a key concern in the AAR process. Surveys and interviews revealed representatives from various disciplines weren’t familiar with EMAC before Hurricane Katrina. This lack of knowledge resulted in problems with the mobilization and deployment processes for local first responders, which hampered some states’ response efforts.

EMAC leadership decided to act upon this before the AAR was published. An EMAC Advisory Group was established in June 2006. It’s comprised of individuals from national associations representing state and local emergency management, law enforcement, fire, public health, public works, EMS, the National Guard and elected officials. In addition, the National Guard Bureau, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security have been invited to name liaisons. The group serves as a vetting body for EMAC processes and procedures, assists with EMAC education and training for their respective disciplines and supports EMAC during major activations.

In addition, EMAC has increased its number of trained state personnel who can instruct other state staff in EMAC procedures. Since August 2005, 85 individuals have taken the “Train-the-Trainer” course for instructors, and 295 have completed the EMAC Field Course, a two-day class that explains all elements of the compact.

The EMAC Web site and database are also discussed prominently in the report. Considerable work has already been done on a recommended electronic version of the Request for Assistance or the Req-A form, which drives the entire EMAC process. This document is the legal agreement between a requesting and assisting state, but before the revised form is deemed acceptable, numerous hurdles must be overcome, including the legality of electronic signatures. Online training and exercises are also being developed to test the new Req-A process.

Rebuilt System Results in 2005 Response

Just three years ago, a small fee paid by each state sustained EMAC. This allowed for one part-time staffer. There was a Web site, but it offered only basic information and very limited functionality.

Had that type of backing persisted, it’s debatable what kind of coordination and facilitation the compact could have provided after the 2005 disasters. “We definitely would have seen a less robust response,” said Jeff Phillips, former chair of EMAC and the Emergency Operations Bureau Chief with the New Mexico Department of Public Safety.

The funding mechanism, however, changed in 2004 when the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) gave a three-year grant to EMAC to support enhancements and to help promote both interstate and intrastate mutual aid around the country. This allowed for the drastic overhaul EMAC conducted in 2005.

The entire EMAC system was revamped. The Web site was redesigned and the event broadcast infrastructure was significantly augmented. This included adding automated information fields for more accurate data and creating a comprehensive tracking component. Finally, the EMAC Operations Manual, which outlines all procedures and protocols, was thoroughly reviewed. Everything was finalized before hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

“The additional dollars enabled improvements on all levels,” says Phillips. “Member states’ understanding of the compact and their ability to implement EMAC were directly impacted by increased funding.”

Recognizing the benefits of a successful national mutual aid system that is built on EMAC, Congress authorized $4 million annually in the DHS budget to support the compact’s activities. While the funding was authorized, it was not appropriated in the FY 2007 DHS budget. Regardless, this show of support by Congress is a testament to EMAC’s successful response to the devastating events of 2005.

EMAC Belongs to the States

As the leading state-to-state mutual aid compact, EMAC belongs to the states. It is a vehicle for them to get help across state lines when a disaster is larger than one state can handle.

“Having been one of only a few states that has been the recipient of EMAC support for a catastrophic event, I can honestly say without hesitation that this asset, which supported our local governments and state for almost a year, resulted in reduced loss of life and expedited the recovery process,” said Latham.

The belief is that EMAC must remain as strong as possible because there is always the possibility that a catastrophe the size and scope of hurricanes Katrina and Rita could strike anywhere and at any time in the country.

—Beverly Bell is a policy analyst with the National Emergency Management Association.
By Alexis Perrotta and Petra Todorovich

According to Robert Yaro, president of the Regional Plan Association, thinking in terms of megaregions—areas that encompass overlapping commuter sheds, freight corridors and economic systems—can help policymakers address challenges in improving transportation.

The National Surface Transportation Commission is holding hearings across the country to determine how the nation will prioritize and fund the next generation of transportation investments. Many leaders in the field of transportation are preparing testimonies that identify a familiar list of challenges: the gas tax’s loss of purchasing power; aging infrastructure and expensive rehabilitation; states reaching their debt limits; population growth; and the need for increased transportation capacity to support the economy.

To address these concerns, new frameworks that seek to provide the capacity and flexibility to support a new generation of development, changing travel patterns and growing goods movement are being introduced. Just as the Interstate Highway System enabled the last 50 years of metropolitan development, the nation requires a system to support the additional 120 million people who will be added to the U.S. population by 2050, according to the census.

Regional Plan Association (RPA) is among the emerging network of transportation advocates making these arguments at the federal and state level. Robert Yaro, RPA’s president, in testimony before the commission in November, suggested a new framework that examines solutions for the next generation instead of the previous one. Yaro introduced the concept of megaregions. He said thinking in terms of megaregions can help leaders address the long list of transportation challenges that has become so familiar to policymakers.

What is a Megaregion?

The megaregion, as an idea, is becoming more mainstream. Megaregions are geographically larger than metropolitan areas. They encompass overlapping commuter sheds, freight corridors and economic systems. More than 70 percent of America’s projected population growth will take place in 10 or more megaregions across the nation.

For example, places like the Northeast megaregion, which stretches from Boston to Washington, D.C., and includes all the major cities, surrounding suburbs, second-tier cities and protected open spaces that residents consider part of their home, will experience growth. The Northeast, the oldest and densest megaregion in the country, is projected to add 18 million to 20 million new inhabitants by 2050 on top of an aging and congested infrastructure system that includes elements that are a century old.

“Nationally, metropolitan areas and megaregions must contend with the greater movement of goods and people within and among their regions. The key to accommodating this rising mobility is to provide greater choice and modal options for each trip,” said Yaro. “The New York region boasts the highest use of public transit anywhere in the country and yet our systems are struggling because of a history of taking on debt to cover operating costs and a lack of funding for capital improvements to expand capacity in the region.”

Other newer megaregions across the country exhibit different characteristics but similar growth pressures. Places like the...
Piedmont Atlantic Megaregion (Birmingham-Atlanta-Charlotte-Raleigh-Durham), the Texas Triangle (Dallas-Fort Worth-Houston-San Antonio-Austin), Southern California (San Diego-Los Angeles-Tijuana) and the Arizona Sun Corridor (Flagstaff-Phoenix-Scottsdale-Tucson) are among the fastest-growing areas of the country and are struggling to maintain quality of life in face of mounting population growth and associated traffic congestion and air pollution. (See map)

In Europe and Southeast Asia, “global integration zones” have attracted tens of billions of dollars in investments in high-speed rail and goods movement systems. Similar in size to America’s megaregions, global integration zones are considered multi-state regions with highly mobile work forces participating in the global economy. In this light, megaregions can be seen as the new competitive units in the world’s economy.

How Megaregions Help Solve the Problem

Thinking in terms of megaregions can help state and national leaders ensure the right transportation projects are built with stable funding over the next 20 and 50 years. This is because megaregions, like most of the next generation’s transportation needs, are multi-jurisdictional. They reflect where people live and work, not necessarily where state and county lines are drawn.

Millions of people cross state and even country lines on their daily commutes. Lawmakers are working to craft a transportation policy that follows the people and meets the needs of the economy. By doing so, major transportation investments can be seen as complementary rather than competitive.

In addition to being appropriately multi-jurisdictional, megaregions are large enough to encompass various concerns. Within a megaregion, for example, the problem of aging infrastructure is elevated beyond a collection of anecdotes into a finite, meaningful package of rehabilitation projects within an important corridor. They provide an appropriate scale at which to improve intercity rail services or implement high-speed rail to offset regional air congestion. They include highways and goods movement corridors that are appropriately analyzed at the megaregional scale.

Instead of determining which places should receive investment, the megaregion unit of analysis allows decision-makers to consider the larger picture and the connections between growing places. In terms of funding, the idea of megaregions can renew and reinvigorate the need for a national commitment. It quickly becomes apparent when viewing transportation investments at the megaregional level that broad-based, stable, national funding sources will be needed.

Over the last two decades, the federal government has moved many responsibilities that were once considered of national importance down to the states. The process of devolution has had mixed results.

Policymakers are examining various alternative financing mechanisms. Short-term answers are needed to increase investment to address the country’s enormous infrastructure needs and long-term options are necessary to consider a sensible supplement or alternative to the current motor fuels tax.

While the prospect for private investment in toll roads may help some states’ fiscal conditions and may pay for a large project here or there, the emergence of megaregions demands a long-term, high level commitment, both on the part of states and the federal government, to large-scale transportation infrastructure investment within a framework that recognizes where most Americans will live and how they will travel in the 21st century.

Increased fuel efficiency presents a concern for the long-term viability of the gas tax, the primary source of funding for the Highway Trust Fund.

“To combat the eroding value of the gas tax, and keep pace with the steady stream of investments needed to maintain and expand our surface transportation network, we should make a shift to an ad valorem gas tax—a percentage tax on the price of fuel,” said Yaro. “This model can raise a steadier stream of funds without requiring frequent increases.”

As policymakers address these issues, political fragmentation within and between states remains a hurdle to coordinated regional action. Agencies such as transportation, housing, environment, water and energy will need to work together.

About RPA

RPA was formed in 1929 to address land use and growth at the metropolitan scale. While RPA’s primary focus remains on the tri-state New York-New Jersey-Connecticut region, RPA does from time to time address national trends and policies. In the 1960s, for example, RPA led a national public education effort in support of creating the federal Urban Mass Transit Administration and its federal funding for transit systems across the country.

To meet the challenge of America’s projected population growth and the emergence of megaregions, RPA has convened the National Committee for America 2050 of regional planners, researchers and policymakers to promote an ambitious framework for America’s growth by mid-century. With this initiative, RPA has once again taken up the charge of addressing larger-scale issues of national importance, and hopes to impact federal and state governments by doing so.

More information on megaregions including the Northeast prospectus can be found at www.america2050.org.

—Alexis Perrotta is a senior policy analyst and Petra Todorovich is a senior planner at RPA.
Rural Population Stagnant, Urban Areas Grow

Dr. Chad Oliver, keynote speaker at the Agriculture and Rural Policy Task Force session professor of forestry and environmental studies at Yale University, informed attendees about trends in declining rural, resource-based communities.

"Over the last 50–75 years, rural population growth has remained stagnant, while urban areas have experienced significant gains," said Oliver.

His concern lies in the implications of growth patterns, which have contributed to the decline of rural communities and threatened the economic viability of those areas. He made three suggestions that would lead to reversal of the trends.

“There are three approaches to revitalizing rural communities and restoring ecosystems,” he said.

Continue reading “Rural Population Stagnant, Urban Areas Grow” »
Western Legislative Staff Leaders Share Best Practices

Lorne Malkiewich, director of Nevada’s Legislative Counsel Bureau; Dave Henderson, Oregon’s legislative administrator; and Pam Varni, director of Alaska’s Legislative Affairs Agency share best practices in legislative management.

What do the nonpartisan staff directors of 13 Western legislatures have in common? Quite a bit. Although each state organizes in its own unique way, most legislative service agencies are responsible for helping the legislative trains run on time—so that bills get drafted or research requests get answered or buildings get remodeled, among other things.

CSG/ERC Hosts Transportation Hearing

CSG/ERC, along with other regional and national transportation organizations, co-hosted the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission field hearing in New York in November 2006.

Participants discussed the current conditions, future needs and financing alternatives for the nation’s surface transportation system. Panelists from state transportation agencies, the transportation construction industry, labor and the private sector provided commissioners with information and insights into the demands that mature urban and rural transportation facilities and services place on the national system.

The commission was created by Congress as part of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act-A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) to study the current conditions and future needs of the nation’s surface transportation system; examine its current financing and long-term alternatives to replace or supplement current federal funding; and to make specific recommendations. The 12 members are the secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation as the chair, three members appointed by the president, two members appointed by the speaker of the House, two members appointed by the House minority leader, and two members each appointed by the Senate majority and minority leaders.

Contact David Ewing, CSG/ERC transportation consultant, for more information at ewing9@verizon.net.

ICAOS Elects New Officers

The Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision recently elected new officers for the coming year.

ICAOS, a CSG affiliate, was created by the states to ensure cooperative efforts in the transfer of supervised offenders. The organization provides states and their commissioners with oversight and assistance.

Each year these nonpartisan legislative staff directors of Western state legislatures share “inside” legislative management strategies and receive “outside” training from management experts. The Wyoming Legislative Service Office welcomed members of the CSG-WEST Legislative Service Agency/Research Directors (LSA/RD) to Jackson, Wyo., in October for two full days of professional development activities.

Staff leaders swapped notes on such matters as special sessions, budgets and topics coming up in 2007 sessions. Utah reported on the use of new technologies to enhance legislative communications, while Oregon discussed its citizens review of the legislature.

The University of Wyoming donated its top human resources expert to work with staff managers on developing best practices for supervising employees.

Oregon’s Legislative Administrator Dave Henderson chaired the meeting, and Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau Director Lorne Malkiewich served as vice chair. Henderson will chair the LSA/RD Committee in 2007–08 and Pam Varni, executive director of the Alaska Legislative Affairs Agency, will serve as vice chair.

Warren Emmer, director of the Division of Probation and Parole in North Dakota, is the new chairman; Eugenie Powers, director of Louisiana’s Probation and Parole, is the new vice-chairman; and Scott Taylor, community corrections chief in Oregon, is the new treasurer.

To learn more about ICAOS, visit www.interstatecompact.org.
Applications Available for Midwestern Leadership Institute

Applications for the 2007 Bowhay Institute for Legislative Leadership Development (BILLD) are now available. BILLD is the only leadership training program designed exclusively for newer state legislators in the Midwest. Regional lawmakers in their first four years of legislative service are encouraged to submit applications, which are due March 26.

Each year, BILLD awards fellowships to 36 select legislators in the Midwestern states and provinces to help them develop the skills they need to be effective leaders and policymakers. The 13th annual Bowhay Institute will be held July 13–17 in Madison, Wis. The intensive five-day program is conducted by the Midwestern Legislative Conference of The Council of State Governments, in cooperation with The Robert M. La Follette School of Public Affairs at the University of Wisconsin.

The annual fellowships are awarded on a competitive, nonpartisan basis by the BILLD Steering Committee, a bipartisan group of legislators from each state in the region. Applicants are evaluated on their leadership potential, including problem-solving skills, their dedication to public service and their commitment to improving the legislative process. Each fellowship covers tuition, lodging and meals. A nominal travel stipend is also offered to each participant.

For application materials, or more information, contact Laura A. Tomaka at (630) 925-1922 or visit CSG Midwest’s Web site at www.csgmidwest.org.

CSG Presents Three Private Sector Awards

Three private sector members of The Council of State Governments have been recognized for their exemplary partnership with CSG, the states and their communities.

Gov. Brad Henry, CSG president, presented the awards to the National Apartment Association, Holcim U.S. Inc. and Stateside Associates during the CSG Annual State Trends and Leadership Forum in Phoenix.

The National Apartment Association was recognized for creating the National Accessible Apartment Clearinghouse 12 years ago as a nonprofit organization. The clearinghouse provides a central resource for residents with physical disabilities to find apartment homes that meet their needs. The organization plays a vital role in bringing the private sector together with the public to meet their housing needs.

Shelly Cook, in left photo above, accepted the award on behalf of the National Apartment Association.

Holcim U.S. Inc. was recognized for two projects initiated by the company’s Theodore, Ala., plant to aid in rebuilding the local community after Hurricane Katrina. One project was rebuilding the Bayou Clinic, which was destroyed by Katrina. The clinic, which serves low-income residents in the Theodore community, burned down the day before it was scheduled to reopen. The Theodore plant and other local industries spearheaded a drive to raise $120,000 to restore the clinic. In addition, the company donated $50,000 to the clinic.

In the second project, Holcim provided cement for Habitat for Humanity to build 11 new homes for Theodore residents who were displaced by the hurricane. Holcim employees also provided volunteer labor on the building projects.

Joe McFalls, Holcim’s Theodore plant manager, in center photo, accepted the award on behalf of the company.

Michael Behm, senior vice president for Stateside Associates, was recognized as the CSG Associate Partner in Excellence. Behm serves on CSG’s environmental task force and actively participates in the meetings. In addition to suggesting topics and recommending speakers for the task force, Behm has made the resources of Stateside available to garner information in response to inquiries for assistance.

Brian Gordon, in photo at right, accepted the award for Behm, who was unable to attend.
This calendar lists meetings as designated by CSG’s Annual Meeting Committee. For details of a meeting, call the number listed. “CSG/” denotes affiliate organizations of CSG. Visit www.csg.org for updates and more extensive listings.

January 2007

Jan. 13–16 CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—2007 Southern Region Winter Seminar—New Orleans, LA—Royal Sonesta Hotel. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjjohnson@csg.org or visit www.nastd.org.

Jan. 26–28 CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—2007 Executive Board Meeting—Lexington, KY—Embassy Suites. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjjohnson@csg.org or visit www.nastd.org.

Jan. 26–28 CSG/National Association of State Personnel Executives (NASPE)—2007 NASPE Mid-Year Meeting—Dallas, TX—Crowne Plaza Dallas Market Center. Contact Marcia Stone at (859) 244-8181 or mstone@csg.org or visit www.naspe.net.

February 2007

Feb. 10–14 CSG/National Emergency Management Association—2007 NEMA Mid-Year Conference—Alexandria, VA—Alexandria Hilton Mark Center. Contact Karen Cobuluis at (859) 244-8143 or kcobuluis@csg.org.


April 2007


May 2007

May 5 CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—2007 Executive Board Meeting—Baltimore, MD—Sheraton Inner Harbor Hotel. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjjohnson@csg.org.

May 5–8 CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—2007 Eastern Region Seminar—Baltimore, MD—Sheraton Inner Harbor Hotel. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjjohnson@csg.org.

June 2007

June 10–13 CSG Spring National Committee and Task Force Meetings—San Juan, Puerto Rico. Contact Wanda Hines at (859)244-8103 or whines@csg.org.

June 10–14 CSG/National Association of State Chief Administrators (NASCA) & National Association of State Facilities Administrators (NASFA)—NASCA & NASFA National Conference and Resource Expo—Lake Tahoe, NV—Montbleu Hotel. Contact Marcia Stone at (859) 244-8181 or mstone@csg.org or visit www.nasca.org or www.nasfa.net.

June 16–20 CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—2007 Southern Region Summer Seminar—Mobile, AL—The Battle House Renaissance Hotel. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjjohnson@csg.org.

July 2007


July 14–18 CSG/Southern Legislative Conference—Williamsburg, VA. Contact Nai Hallman at the Southern Legislative Conference at (404) 633-1866 or visit www.slcatlanta.org for additional information.

July 21–25 CSG/National Association of State Personnel Executives—2007 Annual Meeting—Williamsburg, VA—Contact Lisa Collins at (859) 244-8179 or lcollins@csg.org or visit www.naspe.net.

August 2007

Aug. 11–15 CSG/Eastern Regional Conference—47th Annual Meeting and Regional Policy Forum—Quebec City, Quebec—Hilton Hotel. Contact Pamela Stanley at (646) 383-5711 or pstanley@csg.org or visit www.csgeast.org.

Aug. 25–27 CSG/Southern Governors’ Association (SGA)—33rd Annual Meeting—Biloxi, MS. Contact Liz Pundy at (202) 624-5897 or sgaweb@csg.org or visit www.southerngovernors.org.

Aug. 25–30 CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—30th Annual Conference and Technology Showcase—Minneapolis, MN—Hyatt Regency. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjjohnson@csg.org or visit www.nastd.org.

September 2007

Sept. 16–19 CSG/CSCW—Annual Meeting—Jackson Lake Lodge, WY. Contact Lolita Umutsa at (916) 533-4423 or csgwest@csg.org.

Sept. 16–19 CSG/National Association of State Treasurers—NAST Annual Conference—Sunriver, OR.

November 2007

Nov. 11–14 CSG Annual State Trends and Leadership Forum—Oklahoma City, OK. Contact Wanda Hines at (859) 244-8103 or whines@csg.org.

February 2008


March 2008

March 10–14 CSG/National Emergency Management Association—NEMA Mid-Year Conference—Washington, DC— JW Marriott. Contact Karen Cobuluis at (859) 244-8143 or kcobuluis@csg.org.

August 2008

Aug. 3–6 CSG/American Probation and Parole Association—33rd Annual Training Institute—Las Vegas, NV—Rio All-Suite Hotel. Contact Kris at (859) 244-8204 or visit www.appa-net.org.

Aug. 16–20 CSG/Southern Legislative Conference—Oklahoma City, OK. Contact Nai Hallman at the Southern Legislative Conference at (404) 633-1866 or visit www.slcatlanta.org for additional information.

December 2008

Dec. 4–7 CSG Annual State Trends and Leadership Forum—Omaha, NE. Contact Wanda Hines at (859) 244-8103 or whines@csg.org.
Although the federal government tends to get more attention, state officials are often on the front lines of cutting-edge trends and issues. On the other hand, sometimes in the community of state governments, the more things change, the more they stay the same.

In print since 1958, *State News* (formerly *State Government News*) has chronicled many of the changes … and continuities.

Here’s what we reported on:

---

**40 Years Ago—January 1967**

**Legislators See Marked Increases in Compensation**

A report prepared by The Council of State Governments and highlighted in the January issue of *State Government News* revealed sharp increases in state legislator compensation from raised salaries, per diems and living expenses over the previous three years. The report—“Legislative Structure, Organization and Services”—found the median compensation for a two-year period for a legislator was in the range of $5,800–$6,300. The equivalent range three years before was $3,900–$4,000, and one year before was $4,250–$4,800.

The report found increases in the combined compensation for three-fifths of the states over that three-year time span.

**Update**

A new study prepared by Dr. Keon S. Chi, editor-in-chief of CSG’s *Book of the States*, found that legislator salaries steadily increased in current dollars, but actually decreased by more than 6 percent in consumer-price adjusted dollars over the past 30 years.

The report also found lawmakers in “professional” legislatures received higher salaries than those in “hybrid” or “citizen” legislatures. Legislators in the eastern region were paid the highest salaries, while those in the southern region were paid the lowest salaries.

The study also found that the average salaries of state legislators have been lower than salaries of top officials in the executive and judicial branches. While this is not startling because the majority of the nation’s 7,400 state legislators are not paid as full-time state officials, it should be noted that salaries of full-time legislators in the professional legislatures have also been lower than the average salaries of top state executives and top judges and court administrators.


---

**25 Years Ago—January 1982**

**Forestry Growth Up to States**

A January 1982 *State Government News* article reported that demand for timber in the United States was expected to double over the next 50 years. That would lead to a shortage which could result in rising wood prices, greater dependence on wood imports and wider use of wood substitutes. The author, William Siegel, project leader in charge of the U.S. Forest Service’s National Research Program, predicted it would be up to states to take action to assure a stable timber supply.

He also reported that forestry means $14 billion and 500,000 jobs annually (at that time) to the South. The region at the time was producing only half the wood it could, and that half the pine acres harvested annually were not being adequately replanted. The Southern Governors’ Conference and the Southern Legislative Conference in 1981 approved a resolution calling for improved forestry management.

---

**10 Years Ago—January 1997**

**Tougher Rules Haven’t Cut Spending by Lobbyists**

*State Government News* reported on implementation of tougher rules for legislative lobbyists in the January 1997 issue. Dr. Keon S. Chi, editor-in-chief of CSG’s *Book of the States*, reported that more than 35 states had reformed their legislative ethics and lobbying laws over the previous three years.

Chi reported that the trend was to enhance public integrity with stricter codes of conduct for both legislators and lobbyists. States made changes in lobbyist registration, disclosure of legislator/lobbyist interactions, prohibited activities, entertainment, gifts and campaign contributions, and travel.

He found that the trend for the previous 10 years was toward creating more independent commissions to oversee lobbyist registration and enforcing lobbying laws.

**Update**

A 2005 report by The Center for Public Integrity found that lobbyists and their employers in 42 states reported spending nearly $953 million in 2004 attempting to influence state legislators and executive branch officials, up from the $904 million spent in 2003.

The center found that Alaska relaxed lobbyist registration requirements, while New Jersey enacted sweeping changes to lobbying regulations, which expanded the state’s reach over the activities of lobbyists. Other states, including Colorado, Florida, New York, North Dakota and Pennsylvania, also undertook efforts to change their lobbyist registration policies and procedures.

The center also found changes to disclosure laws, revolving door laws and lobbyist conduct laws. For more information on the report, visit www.publicintegrity.org/hiredguns/report.
The Henry Toll Fellowship Program is nationally recognized among all branches of state government. The program serves to equip talented state policymakers with the skills and strategies to meet the challenges ahead.

Sept. 29–Oct. 4, 2007
Application Deadline April 16

We ourselves feel that what we are doing is just a drop in the ocean. But the ocean would be less because of that missing drop.

—Mother Teresa

The Henry Toll Fellowship Program will convene Sept. 29–Oct. 4, 2007 in Lexington, Ky. Applications are available at www.csg.org, keyword “tolls” and must be postmarked by April 16, 2007 to be considered for the 2007 class. If you have any questions about the program or application process, contact Krista Rinehart at (859) 244-8249 or send an email to tolls@csg.org.

www.csg.org, keyword “Tolls”