CHAPTER IX
THE ENVIRONMENTAL LINKAGES AND THE FUTURE
OF THE REALITY HOUSE PROGRAM

Adult corrections is a state and federal responsibility. Necessary appropriations are made at the state and federal level agencies for this purpose. When innovative programs like Reality House are opened as an alternative to incarceration, one of the objectives is to reduce crime and recidivism and thereby help to relieve the pressure on state and federal penal institutions.

The Omnibus Act of 1968 provided funds for creating and evaluating new programs with the idea that state or local governments would take them over and administer them as part of their crusade against crime. However, the Omnibus Act has not provided any mechanisms for offsetting the additional financial burden assumed by these local governments should they decide to take over these programs. Are the state agencies obligated to pay the per diem cost of those referred by them to these programs? Or are the local governments supposed to meet the entire responsibility themselves? Where do the local governments get funds for the additional responsibility? When part of the pressure is diverted from the state and federal penal institutions to the community-based rehabilitation programs what is the concommitant obligation of the former to the latter: No one knows answers to these questions.
Under these circumstances, it is imperative that the Reality House Program establish a legitimate place in the criminal justice system for itself so that it can get an adequate flow of resources for its operation. In an effort to accomplish this objective, the program has established a number of linkages with the environment.

Community Education in Corrections

For an innovative and experimental program like Reality House to earn and establish its legitimate place in the community, it is necessary that it maintains an open door policy and engages in continuing community education in corrections. Reality House has been active in both of the areas since the time of its inauguration. The activities of the program in this regard: (1) have been multi-pronged from training potential corrections workers to providing professional assistance to other residential treatment centers; (2) have aimed at multiple audiences--from the state legislators to the local high school and college classroom students; and, (3) have a considerable attention from various civic and church groups to local news media.

In regard to Community education in corrections, the Reality House program has been the focus of a great deal of community interest and received considerable coverage by the news media over the years. During the early days of the program, both the Columbia Daily Tribune and the Columbia Missourian published a series of articles giving a big boost to the concept of Community Residential Treatment Centers. The managing editor of the Columbia Tribune (who himself has been on the Board of Directors of Reality House) wrote a series of full
page articles and a number of editorials extolling the philosophy and practical utility of the community treatment centers. Whenever an opportunity has arisen to draw the attention of the community to the program, there have always been headline news reports and editorials in support of the program. The Missourian regularly sends its journalism students to study various aspects of the program including the life sketches of individual residents and they publish these reports in the newspaper.

Similarly, the local KOMU-TV and radio stations have from time to time aired short news features on the program and interviews with the director, staff members, and the residents in active support of the Reality House program.

Also, innumerable presentations have been given to various classes at Missouri University and other educational institutions. Also a very complementary article appeared in the LEAA bulletin, "Target." The staff and the residents have also given a number of other local presentations to various local audiences during the past six years.

Also, invitations were extended to several local groups to visit the program and, as a result, the representatives from several agencies did visit the Reality House program. Those included were: Missouri University Schools of Social Work and Religion, Recreation Department, Mid-MO, church and civic groups. A member of Boone County Jail Board visitors visited Reality House on January 24, 1972, and gave a favorable report of the program to the local circuit court. (She subsequently was elected to the Board of Directors of Reality House.)
Assisting Other Programs

When Reality House began, the only other programs of its type in Missouri were located in Kansas City and St. Louis. Since that time, representatives from the Missouri towns of Springfield, Farmington, and Hillsboro, as well as communities from other states, have visited Reality House to study the program in operation and several have invited its director to visit their communities to set up a similar program. Thus, Reality House served as a model in all of these cases and provided technical assistance and support.

In addition, the program also shared experiences with representatives from the Minnesota Home School in Saukcenter, the Port in Rochester, Minnesota, and the Pre-Trial Development Project in Kansas City. They all spent a few days living in the program and observing the treatment approaches.

Also, the former director of the program provided consultant services to the Missouri Board of Training School Group Home Projects. The placement officer of the training school group homes visited Reality House on January 4, 1972, to discuss the program with the director. The primary purpose of this visit was to gather information so as to make plans in their next budget for implementing several Reality House type programs throughout Missouri state. Subsequently, the directors of both the agencies had several discussions concerning plans of a community based program development and future relationship between the two agencies.

On behalf of the Board of Training Schools, the Board of Directors of Reality House and the program director met with the Senate and House Appropriations Committee members of Region III together with their chairman "Lucky" Cantrell on January 26, 1972, to specifically discuss the
merits and advantages of the community based residential treatment centers.

Reality House has been providing training and experience for potential corrections workers. The Port Project hired a second year graduate student in Social Work who served his practicum placement at Reality House. Two of the staff members at the Monroe home project are former resident staff members at Reality House. One former resident staff is now heading a group home for boys in Nebraska, one is working with the Division of Youth Services, and one has become a counsellor at Reality House.

All of these former staff members have been able to secure better positions partly as a result of their experiences at Reality House.

The Board of Directors of Reality House were also active educating and mobilizing the support of the state legislature. Two of the Reality House Board directors appeared before the Senate Appropriations committee on December 16, 1971 and described the costs and benefits of operating such programs as an alternative to incarceration. E.J. "Lucky" Cantrell, chairman of the appropriations committee was so much impressed with the idea, that he made a special visit to Reality House and expressed his full support to the program. The state Legislature appropriated in the amount of $10,000 in the State Board of Probation and Parole budget of 1972 specifically to be paid to Reality House.

Subsequently, the field of interaction between the state legislators and Reality House moved to another level as a result of Reality House's membership in MACRTC. By virtue of its membership in this association, Reality House continued its interactions with the state legislators but as a representative of halfway houses as opposed to an independent agency.
Political Linkages

In August of 1973 Reality House joined the Missouri Association of Community Residential Treatment Centers. The objectives of the MACRTC are:

(1) To help its members function more effectively via the exchange of information and the study of management and treatment with the goal of helping the socially handicapped achieve a positive position in the community,

(2) To develop and implement a program of public information and education in the field of community residential treatment programs,

(3) To foster and encourage the development of community residential treatment programs for the socially handicapped in places where such programs do not exist,

(4) To foster and encourage the use of all methods of community-based treatment as an alternative to institutionalization or incarceration,

(5) To obtain adequate financial support from governmental agencies utilizing community residential treatment centers,

(6) To be well aware of any discriminatory laws or practices pertaining to the socially handicapped as to make this information public,

(7) To serve as an aid in obtaining qualified personnel for the staffing of member agencies.

The Association held its first meeting in Columbia during October 5-6, 1973. Senator John Schneider of St. Louis was the guest speaker and he argued in favor of establishing a close working relationship between the association and the state legislature and for a better and effective utilization of community resources. At this meeting, the Association decided to work in the following areas:
(1) Establishing communication channels throughout Missouri at all levels of criminal justice agencies,

(2) Developing common standards for all halfway houses in the state.

(3) Exploring funding possibilities for halfway houses,

(4) Establishing a political base for the Missouri Association of Community Residential Treatment Centers.

On October 23, 1973, the director of the Department of Corrections was informed by the Association of its decision to play an active role in developing improvements in the criminal justice system where community treatment is concerned. The association extended its helping hand to the Department in accomplishing some of its goals. November 15, 1973, was tentatively set as the date the two agencies would meet to discuss problems of mutual concern. Before this meeting, the Board of Directors of MACRTC got together to develop the association's strategy for the upcoming meeting with the Division. They decided to focus their discussion on the following areas:

(1) Attempting to find out George Camp's position (Director, Department of Corrections) on private halfway houses,

(2) Convincing the Missouri Department of Corrections that their image of halfway houses as taking only the easy cases was incorrect,

(3) Finding out whether MDC is opposed to private halfway houses,

(4) Pointing out to MDC that they were making decisions without adequate knowledge of halfway houses' operation,
(5) Pointing out to MDC that other states have experimented with similar halfway houses and failed.

The meeting was held between the political resource committee of the MACRTC and the representatives of the Division of Corrections. On January 30, 1974 the political resource committee presented their impressions of the meeting to MACRTC. In this report, the following points were made:

(1) It is felt that MDC does not consider MACRTC a viable and important source.

(2) Strong indications prevail that MDC does not consider private community residential treatment centers as important community resources for the improvement of Missouri Correctional problems.

(3) MDC sees itself as the only agency that can solve correctional problems.

Meanwhile, in 1974, MDC was awarded a grant of $2.2 million for Community Treatment Centers. This grant program did not mention anything about using the existing halfway facilities nor did it have any input from them or their association. The Board of Directors of MACRTC decided to have a meeting with Corrections representatives about this matter and, if failing to convince them of the important contributions halfway houses could make in this regard, to send a representation to the Appropriations Committee of the Missouri Legislature.

Corrections officials reiterated their position that they would contract for the halfway houses' facilities on an individual basis and soon send the contract forms to them.
A letter followed the contract forms on April 7, 1974, from Haynes, Director of the Division of Corrections, to the Missouri Association of Community Residential Treatment Centers president suggesting that if an MDC inmate is working while he is in the program, he has to pay 50 percent of the $8.80 per diem rate currently paid by the Division.

The Association president became very upset about this communication and he wrote a letter to the Division asking them to stop playing games with the halfway houses and warning that if Corrections did not adopt a reasonable stance, halfway houses would not accept referrals from corrections. The association urged its members to stand united and requested that the Division arrange a meeting with its officials to discuss the problem. There was no reply to this request. As a result, the association advised its members not to accept referrals from the Division of Corrections until the dispute over per diem rates was settled.

At this point, the Association contacted some senators and explained the dispute between Corrections and the Association to them. The Association requested that state senate amend the bill in order to remove its ambiguities and anomalies, if any.

Senator Conway introduced S.B. No. 594 making it obligatory on the part of the Division of Corrections to pay 90 per cent of the actual per diem cost of the individual halfway house. The amendment reads as follows:

Payment for housing, supervision and services shall be made at the end of each month on a per diem basis for each inmate housed during the month. Per diem payments by the Division shall be made on the basis of actual per diem costs of the halfway house receiving
inmates. The per diem payments shall not exceed ninety per cent of the actual per diem costs of the operating agency. The per diem costs shall be subject to review and approval of the Division.

Payments made by the inmates shall be applied toward meeting the actual per diem costs of the halfway house providing services to the inmate. Any funds collected from the inmate for this purpose when combined with payments received by the Division which exceed the actual per diem costs of the halfway house shall be deducted from the amount to be paid by the division to the halfway house (Letter not dated from the President of Halfway House Association).

The Association represented its case before the Senate Subcommittee hearings stressing the following points:

(1) For the last several years, halfway houses served both Corrections and the Board of Probation and Parole without charging them for the services rendered,

(2) Passage of Bill 594 would help reduce overcrowding in prisons,

(3) Hitherto, halfway houses have been funded by several sources. Many of these sources are drying up. Now sources of financial help are needed,

(4) Residents in halfway houses are productive members of society, not a tax burden,

(5) Most of the inmates are in need of transitional help,

(6) Halfway houses have already been established in the communities and can serve the needs of Corrections (February 4, 1976, Personal Notes).

George Camp, Deputy Director of Social Services, also appeared before the Senate Subcommittee and testified on behalf of the Division of Corrections in favor of the Bill.
The Senate Subcommittee gave its approval to the Bill. However, the Bill was too far down on the calendar to be considered in the 1975-76 session. Therefore, Senator Conway and others decided to include it in House Bill 1130, which provides for an increase in the amount of funds the State of Missouri pays to counties and St. Louis for the cost of incarcerating prisoners in local penal institutions. The Bill was passed to come into effect from August 13, 1976.

The Economic Environment

In December 1971, after losing Board of Probation and Parole sponsorship by becoming an independent agency, the obvious alternative for obtaining local match money was the city of Columbia in which the program was located. This was the logical choice for two other reasons: (1) At the time of the request, about forty percent of the residents in the program were from Columbia; and; (2) As per the intent of the federal legislation, the funding responsibility of such programs is to be assumed by the local communities. At the same time that Reality House approached the city for funds, the MMCCJ wrote a letter of recommendation, indicating their commitment to the program and explaining the need for local support.

Even though it was not the policy of the city government to support human or social services programs at the time, they nevertheless decided to support the Reality House program. The reasons for such support were: members of the Reality House Board of Directors have had considerable political clout in the community and have talked about the program to the city council members in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANT PERIOD</th>
<th>FEDERAL</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPP</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep '70 - Sep '71</td>
<td>$35,546</td>
<td>$19,772</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep '71 - Aug '72</td>
<td>31,156</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep '72 - Aug '73</td>
<td>41,096</td>
<td>10,246</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep '73 - Aug '74</td>
<td>48,432</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep '74 - Dec '74</td>
<td>19,320</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan '75 - Dec '75</td>
<td>37,576</td>
<td>12,798</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan '76 - Dec '76</td>
<td>45,784</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$281,810</td>
<td>$52,816</td>
<td>$26,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTAL = $ 410,171
informal gatherings. The city council appropriated the money not because of their knowledge of Reality House or the treatment and rehabilitation concept, but because of their friendships with some members of the Board of Directors of Reality House and the influence and prestige of these members in the community.

According to one counsellor, "the first time when the city council funded Reality House in 1972, the city manager, without any information to the council, put the item on the agenda for the council's approval. The council approved it because it was customary to go along with the budget requests of the city manager. The city manager did it because he happened to be a good friend of the editor of Columbia Daily Tribune, who is on the Board of Directors of Reality House."

At this stage the moral commitment on the part of the city council to the Reality House program was minimal and the consideration for funding the program was influenced by the personal loyalties.

In 1973, the federal government made revenue sharing money available to the local governments. The city of Columbia earmarked a portion of this money to support human and social service agencies. But the city did not follow any systematic procedure in the distribution of this money. They held public hearings where the agencies presented their needs before the council and got funds. Reality House did not contest for this money at this time and so went without it for FY 1974. However, Reality House requested federal revenue sharing money for fiscal year 1975. Meanwhile, the city council, on finding its method of distributing funds unsatisfactory, established a Boone County Community Services Council, in
collaboration with the county government, to assess the social and human needs of the community in order of their priority and to recommend allocations to these services accordingly. Community Residential Treatment Centers were not high in the priority list of the Community Services Council. Therefore the request for revenue sharing money from Reality House was not considered by the CSC. However, the Board of Directors approached the council members privately and appeared before the council at the time of public hearings and got their money. Some of the CSC members and their staff felt that their recommendation, which was supposedly based on "valid data" was overridden, and therefore they criticized the council's decisions and questioned the utility of their elaborate need assessment efforts. As a result, some of the council members began taking a closer look at the Reality House program whenever the House requested funds.

In late 1975, Reality House asked the city council for a contingency appropriation in the amount of $6,508 over and above the $4,076 that had already been appropriated by the council for that year. This request by Reality House was warranted due to some unexpected developments. These were:

(1) The Law Enforcément Administration in Washington, D.C., decided that "project income" (in the case of Reality House, resident fees at $2.00 per day) could not be used to match federal LEAA grant funds. As a result, about $7,000 in project income was lost to Reality House as a source of matching funds.
(2) The $15,000 appropriated by the state legislature in the budget of the Board of Probation and Parole for purchases of services with Reality House was lost for 1976.

(3) The Division of Family Services went back on its word that "project income" or "client-fees" could be used to match Title XX monies.

Before this request for funds from Reality House was granted, one of the councilmen asked the assistant to the city manager to get information on the criminal activity of the residents of Reality House. The assistant to the city manager approached one of the city police detectives who made a list of incidents "from memory." The information was given to the councilman, who did not use it at the time of the Reality House's request for additional money but later passed it on to one of the crime commission members who circulated it among other commission members.

One of the crime commission members who is a member of the Reality House Board of Directors got his hands on this report and charged that it was full of errors and a misrepresentation. "Several of the persons listed had not been residents of Reality House for months when they got into trouble. Others had committed offenses while in residence (like using marijuana) and their arrests were arranged by the Reality House staff. It is clearly stated policy at Reality House not to condone any sort of illegal activity. The report left a distinctly false impression based on either slanted or outright false allegations" (tape recording, Crime Commission meeting, March 21, 1976).
The councilman answered the charges by saying that the report is "substantially correct and factual" and accused the Reality House board members of "attempting to cover up the failings of Reality House." He also chided the Board of Reality House for accepting parolees in the past who indulged in criminal activities in the community and noted that the Board "has changed its policy and now refuses to admit parolees to the program, taking only persons on probation as originally planned" (March 29, 1976, Columbia Tribune).

At this point the police chief, who is also a member of the Board of Directors of Reality House, intervened and the dispute was put to rest at a private meeting of all the parties concerned on April 12, 1976. In a statement issued after the meeting, the participants said they "agreed that parolees from the Board of Probation and Parole made poor subjects for residency in the Reality House program." And the councilman who was most critical of the Reality House program stated that he "is satisfied that the program is now being properly administered," and if the "issue was before the city council today, he would vote for continued Reality House funding" (April 13, 1976, Columbia Tribune).

However, it is evident in private conversation that the dispute and the accusations that the parties involved leveled against one another are still fresh in their memories. They are waiting for the "right" kind of opportunity to strike back at each other.

Subsequently, the police detective who supplied the information to the assistant to the city manager relating to the crimes
committed by the residents of Reality House, has been elected to the Board of Directors of Reality House! A clear evidence of cooptation!!

The Boone County Court: The Boone County government is another obvious immediate local source that Reality House could turn to for obtaining match money. The county government appropriated $9,000 to Reality House for FY 1972. However, Reality House used only $3,685 as outright grant from this appropriation during the FY 1972. Also, another $1000 from this appropriation was used as payments by the juvenile court for the care of juveniles housed at Reality House. The remaining amount was used in the following year, $4067 as direct grant, and $1238 for the services to juveniles at the rate of $2.00 per day. Hence, until recently, Reality House had not utilized the county government source for matching purposes as there was no need for such a thing. The program needed only to come up with as much each year as was required to match federal grants, and as long as this target amount was collected from one or the other of its several sources, the program did not have to bother utilizing the rest. For several years the grant from the Division of Probation and Parole and the residents' rent in the form of project income adequately provided the amount needed to match federal grants. However, due to the unforeseen circumstances mentioned earlier, the Division of Probation and Parole could not keep up its commitment to Reality House for the FY 1976. This put Reality House in a bind because it had lost its major source of match money. However, MMCCJ, Reality House and Boone County court entered into
an arrangement for overcoming this difficulty. The arrangement was that Boone County Court agreed to present to MMCCJ the necessary documents indicating that Reality House had received $10,000 without actually providing Reality House with that money. With these documents, Reality House could get the federal match money. In return for this favor, MMCCJ appropriated $10,000 over and above what they had planned to provide to the Juvenile Justice Center which is operated by the Boone County Court.

All of this dealing was possible because of the interlocking networks of the boards of directors of these agencies. The MMCCJ, the Reality House Board of Directors and the Boone County Juvenile Court consist of the same persons and they could therefore manipulate or coopt the other agencies in the field into going along with these deals.

The Present and Future Trends of the Reality House Program

The Reality House program has always lacked viable, stable and secure sources of funding. The program survived all along under the care and protection of MMCCJ, a superagency which has been distributing funds directly or indirectly to one and all of the agencies in this network. Whenever Reality House has needed funds, MMCCJ has come to the rescue. Members of the Board of Directors of Reality House have used personal influence (as in the case of city council of Columbia), political power (by line itemizing appropriations for Reality House in the Board of Probation and Parole's budget) or offices (as in the case of entering into a deal with Boone County Court) to get funds from various agencies for the
House. Though everyone on the Board, including the director of the program, knew that one day the LEAA's monies would dry up and that new sources of funding would have to be found, no permanent arrangements were made for meeting this need. As far back as February, 1974, the director of Reality House in his annual report cautioned the Board members that "currently, one of the most pressing needs of the program is to develop a future funding base. It appears inevitable that the funding pattern is going to have to be realigned and that no one government unit will be able in the future to assume the major financial responsibility. Thus, it is felt that diversification in funding with emphasis on reducing the LEAA share in favor of local funding is the most and perhaps only reasonable approach. A combination of state per diem payments by both the Missouri Department of Corrections and State Board of Probation and Parole, Columbia Revenue Sharing Funds, County General Revenue, LEAA funds, Resident Rent payments and, perhaps, private foundation funding are sources to be considered in combination with one another. There is currently a need to begin reducing LEAA funds." Subsequent to this report, for the fiscal year 1975 the picture looked optimistic as the city of Columbia granted $12,000, the State Board of Probation and Parole was forced to pay per diem rates to the tune of $12,798, the Division of Corrections paid $3665, and an amount of $5481 was collected from residents towards rent. The director expressed this optimism in his monthly report of October, 1975: "With the inclusion of $12,000 revenue sharing funds appropriated by the City of Columbia for the program's 1975 calendar year operation, 47.5 per cent of the
project's total budget will be met with local funds. As the program is approaching the 50 per cent federal funding level, this is felt to be a significant indication of the program's local financial support and strongly suggests that the program does have the potential within the next two to three years to achieve the 100 per cent local funding level. As the county of Boone was not requested to make an appropriation but has done so in the past it is projected that additional local funding will be available from this source in the future, and plans are to request each of the local funding agencies to increase their current level of funding for the 1976 calendar year. Thus, it is felt that the program has shown significant growth in this area, and that with continued effort, increased local funding is a feasible goal."

However, the picture for the calendar year 1976 was gloomy. The chairman of the Board of Directors of Reality House, in his letter to the city council requesting funds, pointed out that:

(1) "An arbitrary decision was made by the Law Enforcement Administration in Washington, D.C. that "project income" (in our case, resident fees at $2.00 per day) could not be used to match federal LEAA grant funds. The effect of this ruling is that... over $7000 in project income...was lost to Reality House as a source of matching funds.

(2) "Reality House is the only program of its type to develop and receive funding through the Missouri General Assembly and it was expected, based on past funding received and the stated intentions of the parties involved, that funding in the amount of $15,000 would be received from the state for our '76 fiscal year.
via a contractual agreement with State Board of Probation and Parole which originated in 1974 and was received in 1975. However, this funding was lost during the final hours of the legislative session...the present effect is that Reality House is short (of) $15,000 projected for the '76 fiscal year.

(3) "Additionally, by action of the Executive Committee of the Mid-Missouri Council on Criminal Justice, plans were made to establish a contingency fund over and above the already appropriated $36,784.00 to protect the program in regard to the loss of state funding. However, the Council has been advised that such an additional appropriation would not be allowable under LEAA regulations regarding supplanting of funds.

(4) "We were initially advised that 'project income' or 'client fees' as defined by Title XX could be used to match Title XX monies. Later the Division of Family Services advised us that 'client fees' could not be used for match purposes."

This crisis was temporarily resolved by the Reality House board entering into the previously mentioned 'deal' with the Boone County Court and the MMCCJ.

However, the crisis continues for fiscal year 1977, with additional uncertainties. This time: (1) MMCCJ has cut its funding by 50 per cent; (2) a majority of members of the city council are opposed to funding Reality House; (3) There is a growing sentiment in the community against rehabilitation programs in general; and (4) the governor has vetoed the legislative appropriations to Reality House.
At this point, the future of funding possibilities of Reality House is uncertain. The staff is frustrated by the situation. They are uncertain about their future and are considering alternative employment. The Board of Directors seems to have reached a point where they would be happy to hand over the program if some state agency is willing to take over. The staff is against this move.

The Missouri Division of Family Services and the Title XX Money

However, there is some chance of rescue. Title XX funds are likely to be substituted for LEAA monies. Under the provisions of the Social Security Amendments of 1975 (Title XX), the federal government will match seventy-five percent (75%) of the funds for service programs conducted under the auspices of the Missouri Division of Family Services. The State of Missouri, in turn, created pertinent state statutes and regulations authorizing contractual services for the use of state and county monies in connection with federal/state programs as per sections 207-020 R.S., MO. and 207.010 R.S., MO.

The purpose of contractual social services is to provide the Division of Family Services with a mechanism whereby certain social services, needed by eligible Missouri residents, may be purchased from other public or private social service agencies.

Contractual social services are not, and were never intended to be, a type of grant-in-aid program. The system was designed to permit the Division of Family Services to reimburse a contractual
vendor for the actual costs of providing social services to eligible clients. Primary objectives of the contractual social service concept include:

(1) to obtain social services from additional sources, thus providing a diversity and a greater number of providers for those served by the Division of Family Services.

(2) to participate in a variety of community services on behalf of clients, thus providing public welfare's fair share for services which are properly the concern of more than one agency and assuring the availability of such services to individuals within the state or local agency's scope of responsibility.

(3) to insure that federal financial participation will significantly expand the availability of public social services to those clients eligible to receive them.

(4) to stimulate the development of alternatives to institutional care, "Residential Treatment Services" are one of several services that are eligible for federal funds through the Division of Family Services.

Four parties are seeking Title XX funds: Reality House, the City of Columbia, the Division of Probation and Parole, and the Missouri Association of Community Residential Treatment Centers.

Reality House is interested in contracting directly with the Division of Family Services for Title XX funds. To do this, it needs to come up with its share of the 25% match. As things stand, there are no indications that Reality House can come up with this match money.
The city of Columbia is also interested in becoming a prime contractor for Title XX funds. It wants to spend a portion of its revenue sharing money on human and social services. Accordingly the city, in conjunction with the county, instituted a community services council which undertakes the needs assessment of the community and makes recommendations to the city council to purchase the highest priority services. At this point, residential treatment centers are not popular with the city council and community services council. Hence, there is little chance of getting the needed support from the city council.

At the state level, the Missouri State Board of Probation and Parole is trying to become a prime contractor for Title XX money on behalf of all halfway houses. At this point the board visualizes two possibilities by which Title XX funds can flow into halfway houses. One possibility is that halfway houses negotiate their own Title XX proposals and process them through the Board of Probation and Parole. In such an event halfway houses need to come up with their own match money--the Board of Probation and Parole will merely act as a clearing house for halfway houses.

In the second case, the Board of Probation and Parole would secure Title XX funds by showing the 25% match money from its own resources. Since the Board of Probation and Parole, in turn, would directly contract with the halfway houses that are serving their clients, the need for the halfway houses to produce the match would be eliminated.

The Missouri Association of Community Residential Treatment Centers is also trying to establish a Title XX contract with the
Division of Family Services to administer Title XX funds for adult private community residential treatment programs. The MACRTC claims that it is a viable association with a membership of 27 known private community residential treatment programs providing a wide range of treatment delivery services with a total capacity of 1600 beds.

The Association suggests that the "line item budget appropriations to finance per diem costs for clients sent to private community based treatment programs by the Division of Probation and Parole, the Division of Corrections and the Mental Health hospitals could be used as Title XX match money and produce for Missouri four times the amount of dollars used to treat the individuals in community-based treatment programs.

MACRTC also urges the Division of Family Services to raise the 80 per cent median income eligibility level for Title XX recipients to the allowed maximum of 115 per cent and to develop the necessary sliding fee scale.

For the large number of adult offenders and drug and alcoholic abusers being served by community-based residential and non-residential treatment programs throughout the state, a full time good paying job is an extremely important and in most cases an essential part of their successful rehabilitation.

Under the present maximum 80 per cent median income eligibility level of Missouri's Title XX program, once an individual obtains a job paying a yearly income of $5,541 or $2.66 per hour he is no longer eligible for Title XX services. This places extreme limitations on the individual recipient. It also places an unnecessary
burden on the staff of the agencies providing the services who may be relying heavily on Title XX funds for support. They would be forced to make a decision on a client's release based not only on his readiness for release but also on his income eligibility status with regard to Title XX.

At the time of closing the fieldwork for the present project, everything relating to Title XX money is hanging in the air. A great deal of lobbying is going on with the Division of Family Services for this money and no one knows which way it will go.