

**Residential Services for Children in the
Comprehensive Services Act**

**Utilization, Length of Stay and Expenditures
Statewide and by Locality**

Program Year 2009

Report by:

**Virginia Office of Comprehensive Services for At-Risk Youth & Families
December 15, 2009**

Residential Care in CSA
For Program Year Ending June 30, 2009
December 15, 2009

Mandate and Scope of Report

The 2009 Appropriations Act (*Item 283, B 2.d*) requires the Office of Comprehensive Services for At Risk Youth and Families (*OCS*) to report to the Governor and Chairs of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees on utilization rates and average lengths of stays in residential care statewide and by locality. Each locality is required to submit to OCS “information on utilization of residential facilities for treatment of children and length of stay in such facilities.”

Historically, this report defined residential care as group homes, residential treatment facilities, and psychiatric hospitals. Beginning in 2009, the Commonwealth enacted the Annie E. Casey Strategic consulting Group policy advice to strengthen CSA financial incentives to reduce reliance on residential care (see section *FY09 Major Initiative to Manage the Use of Residential Care*; page 3). In short, the policy modification reduced the local match on community care and increased the local match on the use of congregate (residential) care. Refer to the “*Status on the Implementation of the Comprehensive Services Act Match Rate Incentive for Residential Care*”, November 2009, for additional information regarding initial results from this major policy initiative.

To more closely monitor expenditure trends, the State Executive Council, at the June 12, 2008 meeting, developed final CSA match rate and service categories along with service definition. Beginning in 2009, the service categories comprising residential care include group homes, residential treatment facilities along with temporary care facilities, and congregate care education cost for both non-Medicaid and Medicaid funded cases. Previously, the temporary care facility and residential education categories were included in the group home, residential or psychiatric hospital for cost and census information. Beginning in PY09, psychiatric hospital cases were no longer included as part of the residential category.

The attached schedule (Schedule 1) provides utilization (# of Children in Residential Care), length of stay (Average # Residential Days/Child), and expenditure data on residential placements statewide and by locality for program years 2005 through 2009. Program Year (*PY*) is defined as all children’s services that were provided using CSA funds from July 1 through June 30 of each year.

CSA Statutory Framework

The purpose of the Comprehensive Services Act (*CSA*) is to create a collaborative system of services and funding for troubled youth and their families that is child-centered, family-focused and community-based. A fundamental purpose of CSA is to preserve and

strengthen families through providing appropriate services for children and their families in the least restrictive setting (§ 2.2-5200).

Children who are eligible for CSA services and funds have emotional and/or behavior problems that are significantly disabling in several community settings (*e.g., home, school or with peers*). They require services that are beyond the normal services or routine collaboration across agencies. They require coordinated interventions by at least two agencies (§2.2-5212). State and local governments are mandated by federal and state law to provide services to children who receive foster care services and specific special education services (§2.2-5211.C).

The CSA statute places the primary responsibility, authority and accountability for this federally and state mandated program to community teams. In each community, teams of professionals and family members collaboratively work to improve outcomes for children and families and to control the rate of growth in CSA expenditures. They decide how to provide services across sectors, enabling children to remain in their homes, schools and communities whenever appropriate while protecting the welfare of children and the safety of the public. They pool resources across sectors, including family, private insurance, Medicaid, federal Title IV-E, CSA state pool of funds, private and community resources.

Family Assessment and Planning Teams (*FAPTs*) assess the strengths and needs of children and their families, develop individual family services plans (*IFSPs*), refer children and families to services, and designate case managers to monitor children's progress. The teams are responsible for engaging families in participating in all aspects of assessment, planning and implementation of services (§2.2-5208). The teams are comprised of a parent and representatives from the local child serving agencies (*community services boards, courts service units, social services, and public schools*). They may include a local health department and private provider (§2.2-5207). Communities include other representatives they deem appropriate for their community or for individual children and families served.

The FAPTs work in accordance with policies established by the CSA Community Policy and Management Teams (*CPMTs*). CPMTs have the statutory authority and accountability for managing collaborative efforts and implementing interagency policies that govern CSA in the community. They coordinate community wide planning, develop needed services, maximize and pool resources across sectors, and manage local CSA funds (§2.2-5206). The CPMTs are comprised of a parent, local government official, agency heads from the local child serving agencies (*community services boards, courts service units, health, social services, and public schools*) and a private provider representative (§2.2-5205). Communities include other representatives they deem appropriate.

CSA Coordinators are hired by many, but not all communities to manage local CSA implementation. Each community has a fiscal agent to manage CSA funds.

While local teams make service and funding decisions, the Commonwealth provides the majority of CSA funds to support local decisions.

At the state level, the State Executive Council (SEC) serves as the supervisory council that provides leadership for CSA (§2.2-2648). It oversees the development and implementation of state interagency program and fiscal policies. The SEC is chaired by the Secretary of Health and Human Resources or a designated deputy. It is comprised of two General Assembly members, state government agency heads (*from the five child serving agencies, the Virginia Department of Medical Assistance Services, and the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court*), two local government officials, the chair of the State and Local Advisory Team (SLAT), and representatives from parents and a private provider association. The Office of Comprehensive Services for At Risk Youth and Families (OCS) serves as the administrative entity of the SEC and ensures that its decisions are implemented. SLAT advises the SEC and OCS by managing cooperative efforts at the state level and providing support to community efforts.

FY09 Major Initiative to manage the use of residential care

The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) identified that community based service gaps are the primary obstacle to serve children in the most appropriate, least restrictive setting. In 2007/08, the Casey Strategic Consulting Group provided policy advice to strengthen CSA financial incentives to reduce reliance on residential care, serve children in their homes and invest funds for the development of community based services. Though modified during the 2008 General Assembly session, in short, the policy advice consisted of phasing in a system of financial incentives over the biennium that is consistent with the statutory purposes of the CSA:

- preserve and strengthen families;
- design and provide services that are responsive to the unique and diverse strengths and needs of troubled youth and families and;
- provide appropriate services in the least restrictive environment, while protecting the welfare of children and maintaining the safety of the public.

The following are excerpts from the CSA 2008 Appropriations Act, Chapter 879, mandating the establishment of an incentive match rate system for CSA pool fund expenditures:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of C 2 of this Item, beginning July 1, 2008, the Secretary of Health and Human Resources shall oversee the implementation of a system of financial incentives that is consistent with the statutory purposes of the Comprehensive Services Act. The financial incentive system shall use the methodology in place on July 1, 2007, for calculating the base rate for each locality. The Secretary shall establish a work group to implement the changes in state and local match rates for the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) program. The work group shall include representatives from the Virginia Association of Counties, the Virginia Municipal League, the Virginia League of Social Services Executives, the Virginia Association of Community Service Boards, the Virginia Coalition of Private Providers, the Virginia Association of School Superintendents, the Department of Education, the Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court. The

work group shall examine the impact of the match rate changes on local and state administration of the program, reporting requirements, service development and delivery, quality assurance, utilization management, and care coordination to ensure that children continue to receive appropriate and cost-effective services.

Community Based Services. Beginning July 1, 2008, the local match rate for community based services for each locality shall be reduced by 50 percent.

Localities shall review their caseloads for those individuals who can be served appropriately by community-based services and transition those cases to the community for services. Beginning January 1, 2009, the local match rate for residential services for each locality shall be increased by 15 percent above the fiscal year 2007 base rate after a locality has incurred a total of \$100,000 in residential care expenditures for the period of January 1, 2009, through June 30, 2009. Beginning July 1, 2009, the local match rate for residential services for each locality shall be 25 percent above the fiscal year 2007 base rate after a locality has incurred a total of \$200,000 in residential care expenditures”

Summary Statewide Information on Residential Care

Children served in residential care. There were 3,697 children placed in residential care at some point during PY09. Thus, 20.9% of all CSA children (17,664), or approximately one out of every five CSA children, received residential services. This percentage declined slightly from PY08 when 23.7% of all children served in CSA (18,195 total children served) were placed in residential (4,313 unduplicated residential placements) at some point during the program year.

There were 616 fewer children placed in residential care in PY09 than in PY08, representing a 14.3% decline. This favorably compares to PY08 results, where 12 more children were placed in resident care than in PY08, representing less than a 1.0% increase.

While the children in residential care varied in PY09, near teenage males were the typical recipients. Demographics describing these youth included:

- On average, they were 12 years and 10 month old.
- 61% were male; 39% were female.
- 55% were Caucasian; 39% African American; 1% Asian; 5% undetermined.

Almost two-thirds of the children were originally referred to CSA by local departments of social services (59%). One-quarter of the children were referred by the schools (25%) and the juvenile justice system referred 7%. Fewer referrals came from community service boards (6%) and families (1%). Two percent were referred by the Fairfax Interagency Team which is the only locality that captures data this way.

Children are placed in different types of residential care:

- Residential Treatment Facilities: These programs included secure residential treatment facilities and campus style residential programs. An unduplicated count of 1,901 children were placed in these facilities in PY09 representing a 36.8% (1,105 placements) decline from PY08. An unduplicated count of 3,006 children was placed in these facilities in PY08. Note however that PY09 amounts were favorably impacted due to a change in statistics gathering in the CSA data set. Effective with PY09 reporting, educational residential services were reported separately whereas prior to PY09 the reporting of these cases was included in the residential reporting. For example, in PY08 there were 631 children placed for IEP residential services. In PY08 these children were reported in the residential facility category. However, in PY09 IEP residential placements were reported in the congregate care education category, thus contributing to the case count decline.
 - In FY09 there were a total of 1,980 congregate care educational placements for either non-Medicaid or Medicaid educational purposes.
- Group Homes: An unduplicated count of 1,532 children was served in group homes in PY09 representing a 20.9% decrease from PY08. The unduplicated count in PY08 was 1,938 children.
- Psychiatric Hospitals: An unduplicated count of 58 children was placed in PY09 representing a 44.2% decline from PY08. There was an unduplicated count of 104 children placed in PY08.
- Temporary Care Facilities: In previous years, statistical information on temporary care facilities was reported as congregate residential care. In PY09 local government reported serving 137 children in this category. This total will serve as the baseline for future analysis.
- Congregate Educational Services: This service type is a combination of children receiving congregate care educational services as directed by their Individual Education Plan (IEP), children receiving education services while in a residential care or group home facility but placed for purposes other than an IEP, or the education services for a Medicaid child whose other residential services are paid by the Department of Medicaid Assistance services. In previous years, education services for residential or group home children would have been reported as a component of the total cost (and census) of the residential or group home placement. In the case of a DMAS funded residential placement, the education cost could have either been part of residential cost or could have been reported as private day residential. As with Temporary Care facilities, PY09 was the initial year congregate care education costs were reported separately and PY09 will serve as the baseline for future analysis.

It is important to note that the same child could have been placed in a residential treatment facility, a group home, psychiatric hospital, or temporary facility during the year and were counted in each category. Most all children received some form of CSA funded education services, so that case count is duplicative with the other congregate care categories. However, the numbers of children within each type of residential care were unduplicated if they were placed more than once during the same year.

Length of Stay Varies by Placement

The length of stay in the different types of residential care varied. This calculation was derived by the total number of days children received these services during the year divided by the total number of children served.

- During PY09, children in residential treatment facilities were in care on average 282 days, an average of 9.27months. This represents an increase in the PY 08 length of stay where children in residential treatment facilities stayed on average 7.53 months (229 days).
- In PY09 there was an overall reduction in the use of residential care. Total use of all residential care declined from 4,313 unduplicated cases in F08 to 3,697 cases in PY09, representing 616 cases or an annual decrease of 14.3%.
- In PY09, a new child assessment instrument, the Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths Assessment (CANS) was implemented. Once fully implemented statewide, further analysis of children in residential facilities, including their needs and characteristics will be available.
- Below is further information on the CSA census in PY09:

The PY09 unduplicated census reported by local governments is 17,664; the PY08 unduplicated census was 18,195. As with service categories, the CSA mandate categories were also modified in PY09 to accommodate management reporting needs. Below provides a comparison between PY09 and PY08 census by primary expenditure mandate category, isolating the categories comprise the 531 census decline:

CSA Unduplicated Census Comparison

Mandate Category	PY2008	PY2009	Change
Foster Care Services	9,512	8,523	-989
Foster Care Prevention Services	3,186	3,225	39
Foster Care Parental Agreements/ non-Custodial Agreements	364	541	177
SPED Services	2,663	2,738	75
Services in the Public School	1,353	1,358	5
Non Mandated	1,117	1,279	162
Total	18,195	17,664	-531

The entire census decline in PY09 was realized from a decline in foster care services. In FY09, these categories include (1) Abuse and Neglect – local DSS custody; (2) Child in Need of Services – Custody; (3) Court Ordered for Truancy; and (4) Court Ordered for Delinquent Behaviors. The CSA decline in foster care services coincides with the Department of Social Services OASIS census reports (FC Demographic Reports). Their

reports indicate an overall foster care census decline from 7,764 children in service in July 2008 to 6,924 in July 2009.

Expenditures. State and local governments spent \$120.8 million (gross) in CSA expenditures on residential care during PY08, representing 39.7% of all CSA state pool data set gross expenditures (\$376.4 million).

The percentage of total residential cost to total annual gross pool fund cost continued to decline for the fifth consecutive year:

	Residential Cost	Total Gross Cost	%
2009	\$120.8M	\$376.4M	32.1%
2008	\$155.2M	\$388.7M	39.9%
2007	\$149.7M	\$352.8M	42.4%
2006	\$138.1M	\$307.2M	44.9%
2005	\$132.9M	\$283.6M	46.9%

Note: At the June 2008 SEC meeting, psychiatric hospital placements were not included as part of residential care for incentive match rate purposes. Psychiatric hospital census and expenditure information is not included in the statewide summary (Schedule 1).

Below are the categories comprising the \$120.8M in PY09 residential expenditures and their respective gross cost:

* Residential Treatment Facilities	\$40.9M
* Group Homes	\$34.9M
* Temporary Care Facilities	\$ 0.9M
* Residential Educational Cost (Non-Medicaid and Medicaid)	<u>\$ 44.1M</u>
Total Residential	<u>\$120.8M</u>

Beginning in PY09, categories for collecting residential expenditures from the CSA Data Set was expanded to capture more discrete expenditure information. For example, historically all residential educational cost was included with the residential, group home or psychiatric hospital expenditure categories. Beginning in PY09, education cost associated with residential placements was reported separately. Furthermore, historical data included temporary care facilities with the residential cost; in PY09 temporary care facilities are reported separately. Since PY09 categorical costs are reported different in PY09, comparison to historical trends is not available. Additional analysis of residential cost will occur in PY10 when there will be two years of consistent reporting.

In addition to CSA funds, communities used Medicaid funds to pay residential services for CSA children to maximize other funding sources. Medicaid expenditures totaled \$94.6 million from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009 (*based on service billings received and paid through September 2009*). This total represents a decline of \$6.8M, or 6.7% from the FY08 total of \$101.4M. Medicaid expenditures included:

- Residential treatment facilities (*not including campus style settings*). A total of \$75.9M million was spent in PY08. This represents a 9.8% decrease, or \$8.9 million, over the FY08 year total of \$84.1M million.
- Group homes. A total of \$18.7M million was spent in PY09. This represents an 8.1% increase, or \$1.4 million, over the prior year amount of \$17.3M million.

Report Methodology

This report used information from the CSA Data Set system as of December 15, 2009. The CSA Data Set contains demographic, service, and expenditure information on all children funded through the CSA state pool of funds. This information is reported three times annually by 131 localities. Information from the 4th quarter data set report, which is cumulative for the program year, was used in determining the results in this report.

Program year (*PYxx*) is defined as all children's services that were provided using CSA funds from July 1 through June 30 of each year.

Length of stay information is derived from:

- Average number of days during the year. This calculation was derived by isolating all children who resided in a residential care setting at some point in PY09 obtained from the 4th quarter CSA Data Set master file. For these children, length of stay was calculated by the total numbers of days in residential care during the year divided by the total number of children in residential care. This calculation allows comparisons of length of stay across years. Schedules 1 used this calculation.

When reviewing these reports, it is also important to note that when the data set was initiated in July 2003, local governments were required to populate information based on placement as of July 1, 2003. Local governments were not required to provide historical placements prior to July 1, 2003. As such, placement information for individual children may not include the pre-July 2003 residential service.

Finally, there are two cautions to consider when reviewing the locality data in the attached schedules. First, localities should carefully review and determine the accuracy of the data they reported to OCS. This data is increasingly being used by state and local decision makers. Second, a community may have a significantly higher percentage of children or expenditures than other communities. The reason for this could be that the CSA caseload for the community is small. Thus, one or two children in residential care comprise a larger percentage of the total caseload than communities with more children.

CSA Residential Report
 (Group Homes, Residential Treatment Facilities, Temporary Care Facilities and Residential Educational Cost)
 FY05-FY09 Summary

FIPS	Locality	# Children In Residential Care					Average # Residential Days/Child									Total CSA Expenditures on Residential												
		FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	% Change					% Change				FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	% Change							
							FY05 to	FY06 to	FY07 to	FY08 to	FY09 to	FY05 to	FY06 to	FY07 to	FY08 to	FY09 to						FY05 to	FY06 to	FY07 to	FY08 to	FY09 to		
							FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09		FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09							FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09			
1	Accomack	30	32	24	18	13	6.7%	-25.0%	-25.0%	-27.8%	243	253	170	225	250	4.1%	-32.8%	32.4%	11.3%	1,208,549	1,340,700	823,089	622,520	380,320	10.9%	-38.6%	-24.4%	-38.9%
3	Albemarle	70	88	81	76	54	25.7%	-8.0%	-6.2%	-28.9%	261	236	268	359	518	-9.6%	13.6%	34.0%	44.3%	3,124,395	3,081,665	2,676,634	3,096,883	2,771,349	-1.4%	-13.1%	15.7%	-10.5%
5	Alleghania	12	19	23	16	16	58.3%	21.1%	-30.4%	0.0%	333	284	241	199	416	-14.7%	-15.1%	-17.4%	109.0%	439,881	529,816	560,689	306,105	219,858	20.4%	5.8%	45.4%	-28.2%
7	Amelia	2	1	3	3	2	-50.0%	200.0%	0.0%	-33.3%	365	365	203	462	365	0.0%	-44.4%	127.6%	-21.0%	36,383	640	57,882	90,655	64,747	-98.2%	8944.1%	56.6%	-28.6%
9	Amherst	15	15	19	20	23	0.0%	26.7%	5.3%	15.0%	214	278	250	286	247	29.9%	-10.1%	14.4%	-13.6%	202,025	415,251	510,819	580,311	639,760	105.5%	23.0%	13.6%	10.2%
11	Appomattox	6	5	8	8	13	-16.7%	60.0%	0.0%	62.5%	151	164	205	228	233	8.6%	25.0%	11.2%	2.0%	66,111	88,882	124,330	218,336	291,574	34.4%	39.9%	75.6%	33.5%
13	Arlington	80	102	99	94	72	27.5%	-2.9%	-5.1%	-23.4%	228	209	276	289	236	-8.3%	32.1%	4.7%	-18.5%	3,856,463	5,130,989	4,869,160	5,553,550	3,511,643	33.0%	-5.1%	14.1%	-36.8%
15	Augusta	50	52	49	49	42	4.0%	-5.8%	0.0%	-14.3%	190	208	240	237	238	9.5%	15.4%	-1.3%	0.6%	1,157,734	1,373,278	1,428,147	2,125,633	1,246,957	18.6%	4.0%	48.8%	-41.3%
17	Bath	4	5	3	2	2	25.0%	-40.0%	-33.3%	0.0%	278	242	294	366	117	-12.9%	21.5%	24.5%	-68.0%	22,588	79,661	39,073	15,123	4,280	252.7%	-51.0%	-61.3%	-71.7%
19	Bedford County	59	51	42	39	23	-13.6%	-17.6%	-7.1%	-41.0%	190	197	196	213	310	3.7%	-0.5%	8.7%	45.4%	1,767,850	1,416,618	1,303,873	1,035,939	289,271	-19.9%	-8.0%	-20.5%	-72.1%
21	Bland	6	2	1	0	0	-66.7%	-50.0%	-100.0%	0.0%	110	316	279	0	0	187.3%	-11.7%	-100.0%	0.0%	25,717	37,921	16,179	0	0	47.5%	-57.3%	-100.0%	0.0%
23	Botetourt	10	19	16	14	14	90.0%	-15.8%	-12.5%	0.0%	195	186	188	268	359	-4.6%	1.1%	42.6%	33.8%	391,434	690,274	503,857	693,872	425,300	76.3%	-27.0%	37.7%	-38.7%
25	Brunswick	5	6	11	13	7	20.0%	83.3%	18.2%	-46.2%	74	272	262	261	405	267.6%	-3.7%	-0.4%	55.1%	76,730	156,292	486,368	538,020	422,485	103.7%	211.2%	10.6%	-21.4%
27	Buchanan	30	32	28	25	35	6.7%	-12.5%	-10.7%	40.0%	228	175	176	241	348	-23.2%	0.6%	36.9%	44.6%	557,165	366,101	384,531	505,565	603,636	-34.3%	5.0%	31.5%	19.5%
29	Buckingham	11	7	7	10	12	-36.4%	0.0%	42.9%	20.0%	272	178	224	278	371	-34.6%	25.8%	24.1%	33.5%	246,286	169,031	199,565	170,332	350,091	-31.4%	18.1%	-14.8%	105.9%
31	Campbell	22	32	39	32	32	45.5%	21.9%	-17.9%	0.0%	238	204	204	282	372	-14.3%	0.0%	38.2%	31.7%	706,522	972,975	1,299,221	1,553,437	1,039,356	37.7%	33.5%	19.6%	-33.1%
33	Caroline	7	3	7	10	9	-57.1%	133.3%	42.9%	-10.0%	212	190	179	223	167	-10.4%	-5.8%	24.6%	-25.0%	86,679	212,320	309,599	253,972	290,809	144.9%	45.8%	-18.0%	14.5%
35	Carroll	13	14	14	17	25	7.7%	0.0%	21.4%	47.1%	183	143	286	221	376	-21.9%	100.0%	-22.7%	70.2%	341,821	501,137	716,102	344,809	553,899	46.6%	42.9%	-51.8%	60.6%
36	Charles City	1	1	4	6	6	0.0%	300.0%	50.0%	0.0%	1	365	134	257	303	36400.0%	-63.3%	91.8%	18.0%	4,069	141,435	118,323	233,325	163,067	3375.9%	-16.3%	97.2%	-30.1%
37	Charlottesville	3	5	9	13	11	66.7%	80.0%	44.4%	-15.4%	148	161	214	264	333	8.8%	32.9%	23.4%	26.0%	29,761	49,743	348,104	510,609	416,004	67.1%	599.8%	46.7%	-18.5%
41	Chesterfield	97	100	99	115	76	3.1%	-1.0%	16.2%	-33.9%	231	140	186	150	85	-39.4%	32.9%	-19.4%	-43.5%	3,465,002	2,873,943	3,856,456	3,582,539	1,465,586	-17.1%	34.2%	-7.1%	-59.1%
43	Clarke	8	7	8	5	6	-12.5%	14.3%	-37.5%	20.0%	225	177	293	280	285	-21.3%	65.5%	-4.4%	1.6%	481,798	434,863	670,366	318,895	431,872	-9.7%	54.2%	-52.4%	35.4%
45	Craig	2	3	14	14	9	50.0%	366.7%	0.0%	-35.7%	286	300	206	327	313	4.9%	-31.3%	58.7%	-4.2%	6,084	203,002	296,021	366,587	139,199	3236.7%	45.8%	23.8%	-62.0%
47	Culpeper	25	29	29	35	34	16.0%	0.0%	20.7%	0.0%	232	274	236	256	256	18.1%	-13.9%	8.5%	-0.1%	771,713	1,089,504	966,667	1,506,301	1,277,700	41.2%	-11.3%	55.8%	-15.2%
49	Cumberland	10	13	15	16	3	30.0%	15.4%	6.7%	-81.3%	168	204	239	185	256	21.4%	17.2%	-22.6%	38.4%	298,417	474,642	322,721	303,416	70,911	59.1%	-32.0%	-6.0%	-76.6%
51	Dickenson	16	19	30	27	18	18.8%	57.9%	-10.0%	-33.3%	166	177	151	200	242	6.6%	-14.7%	32.5%	21.1%	324,010	497,803	596,570	660,710	343,284	53.6%	19.8%	10.8%	-48.0%
53	Dinwiddie	9	9	10	12	14	0.0%	11.1%	20.0%	16.7%	152	206	147	232	184	35.5%	-28.6%	57.8%	-20.5%	129,969	126,775	123,882	258,762	227,460	-2.5%	-2.3%	108.9%	-12.1%
57	Essex	10	11	8	7	6	10.0%	-27.3%	-12.5%	-14.3%	258	301	365	554	500	16.7%	21.3%	51.8%	-9.7%	426,701	523,181	312,473	257,989	154,427	22.6%	-40.3%	-17.4%	-40.1%
61	Fauquier	27	27	32	36	23	0.0%	18.5%	12.5%	-36.1%	175	228	201	168	353	30.3%	-11.8%	-16.4%	109.8%	736,469	1,038,024	978,121	1,120,298	1,050,380	40.9%	-5.8%	14.5%	-6.2%
63	Floyd	11	7	10	9	7	-36.4%	42.9%	-10.0%	-22.2%	202	246	229	209	592	21.8%	-6.9%	-8.7%	183.3%	554,525	342,799	407,891	332,095	314,169	-38.2%	19.0%	-18.6%	-5.4%
65	Fluvanna	29	33	25	18	21	13.8%	-24.2%	-28.0%	16.7%	231	224	246	322	370	-3.0%	9.8%	30.9%	14.8%	970,863	948,517	969,277	821,887	681,047	-2.3%	2.2%	-15.2%	-17.1%
67	Franklin County	44	37	60	54	44	-15.9%	62.2%	-10.0%	-18.5%	176	203	157	240	384	15.3%	-22.7%	52.9%	60.1%	1,266,259	1,090,901	1,409,540	1,122,643	1,082,731	-13.8%	29.2%	-20.4%	-3.6%
69	Frederick	20	24	29	14	14	20.0%	20.8%	-51.7%	0.0%	223	176	225	274	267	-21.1%	27.8%	21.8%	-2.6%	1,267,943	1,155,498	1,577,795	1,098,290	642,066	-8.9%	36.5%	-30.4%	-41.5%
71	Giles	11	14	12	12	4	27.3%	-14.3%	0.0%	-66.7%	255	191	231	183	462	-25.1%	20.9%	-20.8%	152.6%	209,611	356,073	185,177	287,698	79,511	69.9%	-48.0%	55.4%	-72.4%
73	Glooucester	11	15	8	5	7	36.4%	-46.7%	-37.5%	40.0%	238	165	262	265	206	-30.7%	58.8%	1.1%	-22.2%	419,371	341,641	301,090	225,316	178,485	-18.5%	-11.9%	-25.2%	-20.8%
75	Goocland	9	8	9	7	7	-11.1%	12.5%	-22.2%	0.0%	245	161	233	242	135	-34.3%	44.7%	3.9%	-44.3%	275,047	247,259	284,109	190,040	187,105	-10.1%	14.9%	-33.1%	-1.5%
77	Grayson	10	8	10	9	12	-20.0%	25.0%	-10.0%	33.3%	151	184	197	197	210	21.9%	7.1%	0.0%	6.5%	200,146	206,581	144,201	154,563	347,558	3.2%	-30.2%	7.2%	124.9%
79	Greene	26	25	19	22	18	-3.8%	-24.0%	15.8%	-18.2%	208	212	205	175	439	1.9%	-3.3%	-14.6%	150.8%	791,218	964,085	1,041,137	1,066,378	1,122,508	21.8%	8.0%	2.4%	5.3%
83	Halifax	23	25	31	38	31	8.7%	24.0%	22.6%	-18.4%	153	229	333	317	325	49.7%	45.4%	-4.8%	2.4%	458,768	887,218	1,293,671	1,689,080	1,352,251	93.4%	45.8%	30.6%	-19.9%
85	Hanover	32	25	32	32	36	-21.9%	28.0%	0.0%	12.5%	278	285	258	271	181	2.5%	-9.5%	5.0%	-33.1%	1,575,236	1,072,172	1,919,529	1,893,772	2,270,459	-31.9%	79.0%	-1.3%	19.9%
87	Henrico	95	143	158	88	73	50.5%	10.5%	-44.3%	-17.0%	239	211	213	253	340	-11.7%	0.9%	18.8%	34.3%	2,807,469	3,234,150	3,366,325	3,210,687	2,520,340	15.2%	4.1%	-4.6%	-21.5%
89	Henry	10	10	8	7	7	0.0%	-20.0%	-12.5%	0.0%	186	105	118	190	267	-43.5%	12.4%	61.0%	40.4%	260,792	132,010	77,885	248,872	242,289	-49.4%	-41.0%	219.5%	-2.6%
91	Highland	1	0	0	0	0	-100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	226	0	0	0	0	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%	0.0%	1,502	0	0	0	0	-100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
93	Isle of Wight	7	13	8	7	9	85.7%	-38.5%	-12.5%	28.6%	91	145	135	189	107	59.3%	-6.9%	40.0%	-43.3%	48,512	159,620	185,156	223,054	95,882	229.0%	16.0%	20.5%	-57.0%
95	James City	4	3	9	6	4	-25.0%	200.0%	-33.3%	-33.3%	180	138	102	323	301	-23.3%	-26.1%	216.7%	-6.9%	72,914	19,073	28,817	81,050	59,935	-			

CSA Residential Report
 (Group Homes, Residential Treatment Facilities, Temporary Care Facilities and Residential Educational Cost)
 FY05-FY09 Summary

FIPS	Locality	# Children In Residential Care					Average # Residential Days/Child								Total CSA Expenditures on Residential															
		FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	% Change		FY05 to	FY07 to	FY08 to	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	% Change		FY05 to	FY06 to	FY07 to	FY08 to								
							FY05 to	FY06 to	FY07 to	FY08 to	FY05 to	FY06 to	FY07 to	FY08 to	FY09 to	FY05 to	FY06 to	FY07 to	FY08 to	FY09 to	FY05 to	FY06 to	FY07 to	FY08 to						
							FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09								
141	Patrick	8	9	4	4	3	12.5%	-55.6%	0.0%	-25.0%	211	255	379	268	504	20.9%	48.6%	-29.3%	88.1%	114,984	199,643	118,942	120,466	73,161	73.6%	-40.4%	1.3%	-39.3%		
143	Pittsylvania	29	41	26	33	39	41.4%	-36.6%	26.9%	18.2%	257	269	315	296	229	4.7%	17.1%	-6.0%	-22.7%	1,079,938	1,321,701	653,293	931,803	910,213	22.4%	-50.6%	42.6%	-2.3%		
145	Powhatan	9	9	10	12	12	0.0%	11.1%	20.0%	0.0%	257	248	241	270	250	-3.5%	-2.8%	12.0%	-7.5%	562,966	475,043	460,730	595,376	360,681	-15.6%	-3.0%	29.2%	-39.4%		
147	Prince Edward	17	15	16	16	20	-11.8%	6.7%	0.0%	25.0%	260	279	221	208	203	7.3%	-20.8%	-5.9%	-2.3%	753,911	681,949	349,496	380,444	364,375	-9.5%	-48.8%	8.9%	-4.2%		
149	Prince George	4	5	2	4	5	25.0%	-60.0%	100.0%	25.0%	252	148	366	179	253	-41.3%	147.3%	-51.1%	41.2%	88,661	52,458	26,896	100,534	182,705	-40.8%	-48.7%	273.8%	81.7%		
153	Prince William	145	114	132	140	142	-21.4%	15.8%	6.1%	1.4%	212	167	159	175	146	-21.2%	-4.8%	10.1%	-16.7%	4,016,337	2,799,927	3,886,192	4,444,700	3,246,013	-30.3%	38.8%	14.4%	-27.0%		
155	Pulaski	48	54	52	46	64	12.5%	-3.7%	-11.5%	39.1%	206	191	223	225	404	-7.3%	16.8%	0.9%	79.4%	1,210,727	1,302,966	1,473,575	1,410,860	1,383,886	7.6%	13.1%	-4.3%	-1.9%		
157	Rappahannock	4	4	4	8	7	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	-12.5%	281	371	261	337	493	32.0%	-29.6%	29.1%	46.3%	113,455	143,696	318,164	558,355	282,264	26.7%	121.4%	75.5%	-49.4%		
159	Richmond County	4	8	9	8	7	100.0%	12.5%	-11.1%	-12.5%	274	206	231	271	311	-24.8%	12.1%	17.3%	14.8%	102,894	184,179	269,541	325,851	100,798	79.0%	46.3%	20.9%	-69.1%		
161	Roanoke County	57	71	77	47	33	24.6%	8.5%	-39.0%	-29.8%	237	205	200	260	273	-13.5%	-2.4%	30.0%	5.1%	2,775,971	2,602,649	3,189,215	2,075,079	1,077,229	-6.2%	22.5%	-34.9%	-48.1%		
163	Rockbridge	23	38	33	41	37	65.2%	-13.2%	24.2%	-9.8%	215	171	248	240	365	-20.5%	45.0%	-3.2%	51.9%	824,332	1,040,055	1,217,317	1,727,421	995,377	26.2%	17.0%	41.9%	-42.4%		
165	Rockingham	56	63	58	54	43	12.5%	-7.9%	-6.9%	-20.4%	246	369	362	356	443	50.0%	-1.9%	-1.7%	24.3%	2,389,092	2,975,760	2,716,472	2,249,736	1,467,093	24.6%	-8.7%	-17.2%	-34.8%		
167	Russell	27	22	19	21	18	-18.5%	-13.6%	10.5%	-14.3%	168	141	203	139	239	-16.1%	44.0%	-31.5%	71.6%	400,828	389,824	449,293	356,318	430,045	-2.7%	15.3%	-20.7%	20.7%		
169	Scott	21	17	22	18	8	-19.0%	29.4%	-18.2%	-55.6%	127	229	190	224	307	80.3%	-17.0%	17.9%	36.9%	150,001	170,119	236,778	339,217	102,613	13.4%	39.2%	43.3%	-69.8%		
171	Shenandoah	29	36	37	23	25	24.1%	2.8%	-37.8%	8.7%	203	225	237	218	359	10.8%	5.3%	-8.0%	64.7%	765,336	1,228,830	1,105,069	780,130	843,233	60.6%	-10.1%	-29.4%	8.1%		
173	Smyth	27	29	29	30	16	7.4%	0.0%	3.4%	-46.7%	215	151	200	162	125	-29.8%	32.5%	-19.0%	-23.1%	474,678	375,553	526,023	501,732	274,774	-20.9%	40.1%	-4.6%	-45.2%		
175	Southampton	0	1	1	4	6	#DIV/0!	0.0%	300.0%	50.0%	0	198	168	95	212	#DIV/0!	-15.2%	-43.5%	123.3%	0	18,125	16,218	41,230	114,728	#DIV/0!	-10.5%	154.2%	178.3%		
177	Spotsylvania	52	58	70	84	65	11.5%	20.7%	20.0%	-22.6%	187	200	213	230	273	7.0%	6.5%	8.0%	18.8%	2,237,342	2,326,461	3,826,867	3,840,839	2,733,750	4.0%	64.5%	0.4%	-28.8%		
179	Stafford	44	43	55	43	35	-2.3%	27.9%	-21.8%	-18.6%	250	263	196	218	319	5.2%	-25.5%	11.2%	46.2%	2,056,531	2,369,708	2,064,780	1,850,827	1,294,061	15.2%	-12.9%	-10.4%	-30.1%		
181	Surry	0	1	0	0	2	#DIV/0!	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	99	0	0	176	#DIV/0!	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	6,609	0	0	0	7912	#DIV/0!	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	
183	Sussex	4	0	2	1	3	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	-50.0%	200.0%	208	0	40	359	213	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	797.5%	-40.8%	23,380	0	6,652	42,701	73,268	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	541.9%	71.6%	
185	Tazewell	35	28	42	43	25	-20.0%	50.0%	2.4%	-41.9%	201	429	178	225	517	113.4%	-58.5%	26.4%	129.6%	692,046	1,503,382	1,026,802	1,116,963	575,260	117.2%	-31.7%	8.8%	-48.5%		
187	Warren	32	38	41	45	34	18.8%	7.9%	8.8%	-24.4%	229	218	212	219	246	-4.8%	-2.8%	3.3%	12.3%	1,411,053	1,441,811	1,429,248	1,228,548	954,502	2.2%	-0.9%	-14.0%	-22.3%		
191	Washington	12	14	12	13	12	16.7%	-14.3%	9.3%	-7.7%	246	249	266	286	371	1.2%	6.8%	7.5%	29.6%	294,452	329,194	262,965	486,333	203,799	11.8%	-20.1%	84.9%	-58.1%		
193	Westmoreland	6	4	5	7	5	-33.3%	25.0%	40.0%	-28.6%	220	280	310	308	505	27.3%	10.7%	-0.6%	63.9%	308,011	104,026	183,224	375,468	292,872	-66.2%	76.1%	104.9%	-22.0%		
195	Wise	11	11	3	15	20	0.0%	-72.7%	400.0%	33.3%	155	222	324	225	356	43.2%	45.9%	-30.6%	58.2%	82,715	37,314	46,070	189,018	507,533	-54.9%	23.5%	310.3%	168.5%		
197	Wythe	15	21	32	29	27	40.0%	52.4%	-9.4%	-6.9%	183	225	184	255	410	23.0%	-18.2%	38.6%	60.8%	414,172	472,416	861,724	911,305	629,822	14.1%	82.4%	5.8%	-30.9%		
199	York	7	9	8	9	12	28.6%	-11.1%	12.5%	33.3%	337	226	290	304	393	-32.9%	28.3%	4.8%	29.4%	517,193	261,686	247,346	340,817	368,263	-49.4%	-5.5%	37.8%	8.1%		
510	Alexandria	67	60	65	70	54	-10.4%	8.3%	7.7%	-22.9%	214	217	215	216	274	1.4%	-0.9%	0.5%	26.9%	2,591,110	2,512,457	2,835,811	3,146,538	2,187,808	-3.0%	12.9%	11.0%	-30.5%		
515	Berford City	13	15	10	7	8	15.4%	-33.3%	-30.0%	14.3%	197	218	201	252	341	10.7%	-7.8%	25.4%	35.3%	236,808	306,246	212,669	236,131	210,016	29.3%	-30.7%	11.2%	-11.1%		
520	Bristol	25	21	23	26	21	-16.0%	9.5%	13.0%	-19.2%	261	276	280	346	330	5.7%	1.4%	23.6%	-4.7%	459,260	611,389	469,183	605,069	481,576	33.1%	-23.3%	29.0%	-20.4%		
530	Buena Vista	5	10	14	15	19	100.0%	40.0%	7.1%	26.7%	141	247	144	143	373	75.2%	-41.7%	-0.7%	160.9%	83,189	311,966	412,984	392,399	502,077	275.0%	32.4%	-4.9%	27.8%		
540	Charlottesville	112	114	116	128	108	1.8%	1.8%	10.3%	-15.6%	202	205	224	213	299	1.5%	9.3%	-4.9%	40.2%	3,346,953	3,337,581	4,374,385	5,183,713	4,552,545	-0.3%	31.1%	18.5%	-12.2%		
550	Chesapeake	58	52	43	47	42	-10.3%	-17.3%	9.3%	-10.6%	256	159	193	165	254	-37.9%	21.4%	-14.5%	54.0%	1,849,303	1,479,324	1,469,454	939,546	996,706	-20.0%	-0.7%	-36.1%	6.1%		
570	Colonial Heights	7	14	16	5	0	100.0%	14.3%	-68.8%	-100.0%	120	82	110	96	#DIV/0!	-31.7%	34.1%	-12.7%	#DIV/0!	61,390	122,218	191,274	101,607	0	99.1%	56.5%	-46.9%	-100.0%		
580	Covington	18	17	15	14	9	-5.6%	-11.8%	-6.7%	-35.7%	404	365	309	156	417	-9.7%	-15.3%	-49.5%	167.1%	583,152	449,951	435,655	297,672	211,812	-22.8%	-3.2%	-31.7%	-28.8%		
590	Danville	33	40	40	45	37	21.2%	0.0%	12.5%	-17.8%	224	234	263	290	334	4.5%	12.4%	10.3%	15.2%	695,677	929,681	1,102,154	1,247,886	1,012,275	33.6%	18.6%	13.2%	-18.9%		
620	Franklin City	3	5	8	5	4	66.7%	60.0%	-37.5%	-20.0%	234	252	174	108	226	7.7%	-31.0%	-37.9%	109.5%	77,646	182,054	138,852	42,103	61,600	134.5%	-23.7%	-69.7%	46.3%		
630	Fredericksburg	15	22	25	16	20	46.7%	13.6%	-36.0%	25.0%	245	214	199	213	261	-12.7%	-7.0%	7.0%	22.7%	622,159	782,255	781,565	612,217	628,764	25.7%	-0.1%	-21.7%	2.7%		
640	Galax	2	5	2	2	4	150.0%	-60.0%	0.0%	100.0%	256	128	259	366	284	-50.0%	102.3%	41.3%	-22.5%	76,997	123,990	50,149	61,210	55,157	61.0%	-59.6%	22.1%	-9.9%		
650	Hampton	36	39	36	15	2	8.3%	-7.7%	-58.3%	-86.7%	129	139	155	107	58	7.8%	11.5%	-31.0%	-45.8%	477,357	745,312	823,929	210,465	44,811	56.1%	10.5%	-74.5%	-78.7%		
660	Harrisonburg	43	45	55	55	38	4.7%	22.2%	0.0%	-30.9%	249	359	384	390	457	44.2%	7.0%	1.6%	17.3%	1,429,862	1,578,939	2,437,061	3,054,958	1,344,402	10.4%	54.3%	25.4%	-56.0%		
670	Hopewell	21	17	19	15	23	-19.0%	11.8%	-21.1%	53.3%	249	284	282	254	232	14.1%	-0.7%	-9.9%	-8.7%	820,500	1,129,247	1,031,564	762,588	782,294	37.6%	-8.7%	-26.1%	2.6%		
678	Lexington	4	4	2	2	3	0.0%	-50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	280	241	211	229	441	-13.9%	-12.4%	8.5%	92.6%	272,962	246,195	203,020	189,651	85,443	-9.8%	-17.5%	-6.6%	-54.9%		
680	Lynchburg	29	52	78	143	93	79.3%	50.0%	80.8%</																					