Funding sources for migrant child care programs and their various components, such as services, personnel, food, equipment, and some Federal child care legislation bills, are given in this publication. The programs are grouped into the various agencies and departments of the Federal government which help fund them (i.e., the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Department of Labor; the Office of Economic Opportunity; the Department of Agriculture; the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and Vista). A brief description of each program is included. The Title IV-A of the Social Security Act is discussed; in this program, the Federal government pays 75% of the costs and the States pay 25% of the costs. Examples of how Washington, Minnesota, California, Arizona, Oregon, Texas, and Iowa have obtained Title IV-A money are given. A list of follow-up contacts and samples of contracts are appended. (NQ)
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Migrant children are on the bottom rung of the poverty ladder. Their parents, 1.4 million Chicano, Black, Indian, Puerto Rican and white men and women who make their living in seasonal farm work, earn a median income of $2,000.

Migrants move through three broad and intermingling "streams" from Florida, Texas and California. Approximately 65% of migrants are Chicano.

The poverty of migrant families forces them to use the labor of their children to increase the family income. In Oregon, it is estimated that 75% of the seasonal force of laborers are children.

Where child care arrangements are either not available or accessible, children are brought to the parents' place of work or remain in cars beside the fields.
“Children live and work under the same conditions as adults in the field of farm labor,” according to a 1971 Special Report on Child Labor in Agriculture by the American Friends Service Committee. “But the conditions are not the same. These are children—human beings who are still developing physically, emotionally, intellectually. The child, in many ways, sacrifices his future to a much greater degree and can, perhaps, never be fully compensated.”

Stooping and crawling in intense heat for eight to ten hours a day together with the unsanitary and unsafe conditions of both fields and housing.
as well as lack of proper diet and medical care, invariably bring about health problems, says the American Friends' Report.

The infant mortality rate of the migrant child is 2½ times the national average. Adults live 20 years less than the rest of the population, a statistic due mainly to the large number of infant deaths. According to a 1969 study by the Washington State Council of Churches, a child born to a migrant Mexican-American family in that state has a life expectancy of about 38 years; a third of the children die at birth.

The migrant child suffers from rickets, scurvy, pinworms, anemia, acute febrile tonsillitis and sometimes kwashiorkor, a severe protein deficiency usually only found in the most underdeveloped countries of the world.

A California medical study reported a high incidence of death from diarrhea and dehydration among migrant babies, because when the child takes to the fields with his mother his bottle sours from the hot sun.
The only reported polio epidemic in the country in the 1970's was among South Texas migrants, where three children died.

Ten percent of migrant children have never had milk, 19% have never had citrus fruit, 35% have never had vegetables and 14% have never had meat. Fifty-nine percent of migrant children under 3 years of age have had no immunizations.

The average per capita health care expenditure in 1967 for one million migrants was $7.20 compared with an average of $200 for the total population, according to the United States Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

In addition to receiving the lowest wages and lacking health care, migrants live in the poorest of housing. Migrant camps consist of rows of one-room shacks, very often with no indoor plumbing. A single pump or faucet may supply water for the entire camp. Sometimes there is no electricity.

Support services available to most Americans and which might help alleviate the migrant's poor living conditions are not available to him. The migrant worker received no unemployment compensation, retirement benefits, Medicaid or Medicare, food stamps, social security or sick leave. He is not protected by minimum wage laws or union activities. He is generally not a welfare recipient.

This booklet focuses on the youngest child, the child under six, who although he is still a child works in the field with the rest of the family, is nevertheless subject to the same conditions. It is the migrant preschooler who is reported to have suffocated when locked in an abandoned car by a field where his parents are working or to have been...
accidentally tilled into the soil by farm machinery.

Although there is no panacea for these problems, one possible method of cutting down on the health, educational, and nutritional problems of the migrant child is through the provision of child development programs in the preschool years. Attempts at this in the past have not been satisfactory. The National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity reported to the President in 1970 that fewer than 2% of migrant children needing care were receiving it... specifically, 13,000 out of over 700,000 children were covered by federal funding.

The reasons for this are not simple. A mobile migrant population is much harder to serve than a stable population. Mobility presents problems of organization, funding and leadership. In the past, relatively few people have been willing to go to bat for a group of people moving from state to state and who have very little influence or impact on local or federal government.

Then too, child care funding has been seriously lacking, not only for migrants but for the general population. Total federal spending in 1971 was approximately $½ billion to cover an estimated 5 million preschoolers needing care.

At the same time, however, there is some evidence that existing funding for migrant children's programs is not being used to its fullest extent—mostly due to a lack of awareness of its existence and how to use it. The purpose of this booklet, therefore, is to describe these funding sources in the hope of maximizing their use. The programs are grouped into the various agencies and departments of the federal government and include potential funding sources for several components of child care programs, such as services, staffing, food and equipment.

In addition to a brief description of the programs, there are lists of follow-up contacts in the appendix.
OPEN-ENDED POTENTIAL
The greatest potential source of money for child care is Title IV-A of the Social Security Act. A section of the 1967 Social Security Amendments (Aid to Families with Dependent Children—AFDC), IV-A authorizes the federal government to meet state expenditures on a 3 to 1 matching basis for costs of child welfare services, including day care. The money is open-ended, meaning that the federal government will meet its 75% share of the costs no matter how much it is.

Day care programs funded under IV-A are administered by a state agency, usually the state welfare department, with ultimate authority resting in the Social and Rehabilitation Service (SRS) of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

UNEASINESS OVER IV-A

This source of funding has never been used to its fullest extent. This is partly because states fear that the money will not remain open-ended, leaving them with full responsibility for the program. This apprehension is not justified, however, because it is possible, as most states have done, to word IV-A contracts so that there is no tax liability to the state. Contracts have been made contingent on the "continuing availability of federal funds," which, if cut off, makes them null and void.

The fact that Title IV-A may not remain open-ended is not inconceivable, however. In 1970, a separate social services amendment was tacked on to the Family Assistance Plan that would have closed the open-ended authorization for social service expenditures by the federal government. The amendment, although keeping the 3 to 1 formula, would have required Congress to appropriate a fixed sum of money each year and allocated funds to each state up to the point where the allocation would have met the 1971 federal expenditure. In its final form, however, the amendment exempted from its provisions child care and birth control.

Whether or not an individual or group is qualified to receive services funded by IV-A is determined by the State Welfare Plan. Welfare departments are allowed, if they choose, to provide day care for "potential" welfare recipients as well as present recipients under present federal regulations. Migrants qualify as potential recipients. But since many states do not choose to include the potential category, herein lies one of the major stumbling blocks to migrants receiving IV-A money.

With an annual income of $2,000, migrants qualify to go on welfare, but most choose not to. Called "honorables" by some, most migrants are too proud to apply for welfare. As a result, they receive no public assistance for which they economically qualify, and, in addition they receive no support services, such as child care, which are tangential to the welfare system. It would also be accurate to say that if migrants were to accept welfare, they would be able to settle out of the stream and live an apparently preferable existence.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE?

Each state is required to submit a state plan outlining who is to receive services which, as mentioned, can include past and potential AFDC recipients as well as those presently on assistance. A "past recipient" is defined as a parent who has within a certain number of years been on welfare; a potential recipient is a parent likely to go on assistance if a child welfare service, such as day care, is not available.

"Potential" recipients can also include the medically needy and those living in disadvantaged neighborhoods, regardless of the resident's income. In the latter case, entire neighborhoods with large numbers of AFDC recipients can be eligible for child care. Any geographic area meeting state or federal criteria of poverty, such as a Model Cities program, would be appropriate. It has been difficult, however, to define a geographic area relative to migrants, since they characteristically do not live in any central location.

In a few states, potential recipients can now include migrants as an occupational grouping. In Washington state, for example, migrants are defined state-wide as an occupational group according to the Office of Economic Opportunity definition of migrants, which includes those who are currently migrants. Minnesota uses the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I definition for eligibility, which includes anyone who has been a migrant in the last five years.

DIFFICULTY WITH MATCHING SHARE

Raising the matching 25% share has been another frustration. Normally living in rural areas, migrant groups find it harder to ferret out what are usually urban sources of private money such as the United Fund, Model Cities Supplemental funds, and money from religious and civic groups, business or labor.

In addition, migrants seldom benefit from state appropriations which can be used as the matching money. Since they are transitory, as well as voteless, migrants are very often ignored by states and local politicians.
who do not look on them as "their people." Moving from state to state and often with no stationary representative organization, migrants are "no one's constituents."

This difficulty in raising the matching share has lead many experts in the field of migrant child care to conclude that either IV-A money should be 100% for migrants, or that other federal money (such as OEO's III-B) should be eligible for use as the matching 25% in the same way Model Cities money can be used. (Model Cities Supplemental Funding is the only example of federal money that can be matched with federal money.)

The following are some examples of how several states and migrant groups have managed to get IV-A money. Each serves as a model of a different approach to the raising of the matching share, including use of state education money, Model Cities Supplemental Funds, and use of liberal in-kind contributions.

**WASHINGTON:**
State Education Money

Under the umbrella organization, Northwest Rural Opportunity (an OEO III-B grantee), Washington State obtained a grant from the State Education Agency which has been matched 3 to 1 by the State Welfare Department. The funding level for the operation of the NRO combination preschool education and day care programs was over $500,000 in 1971. In addition, NRO has obtained a small amount of money from growers which has been matched by Title IV-A.

NRO, the first non-public agency to get education money in Washington, runs nine centers serving 1,800 children throughout the growing season. The total capacity of the centers is 596 at any one time, but because of an unusually long growing season (March through October), they operate as a flow-through service. Centers stay open year round to accommodate migrants leaving the stream.

Washington's use of education funds serves as an important model. The same technique could be applied in many other states providing the political climate is right. The important thing to remember is that the source of funds must be state or local tax dollars. Title I of the ESEA or other federal education funds would not qualify.

**MINNESOTA:**
Use of Public School Space

Minnesota has been able to raise most of its 25% matching local share on the basis of "in-kind" rather than cash matching. "In-kind" donation is audited value of space and other contributions by public agencies, allowable under Title IV as a legitimate part of the local share. The key to qualifying an in-kind contribution is that it must originate from something that is tax supported.

Since Minnesota's growing season is during the summer, migrant centers use school building space—the in-kind contribution that constitutes the majority of its matching share.

Use of in-kind contributions has been feasible in Minnesota because the state education system has an established, highly accessible uniform cost accounting system which makes it easy to pull out the figures for value per square foot (multiplied times the number of square feet used by migrant centers). The lack of this kind of well organized, highly auditable system in many other states has frustrated the use of in-kind contributions.

Less significant in-kind donations in Minnesota have come from contributions of equipment and the services of public health nurses. Altogether there are 16 migrant child care centers in Minnesota, funded in 1971 by approximately $100,000 in IV-A money, in addition to some ESEA Title I money for the older children and Head Start money for the 4-6 year olds. The three-pronged program is coordinated through the state offices of Education, Equal Opportunity, and Public Welfare.

**CALIFORNIA:**
Self-help Program

Rent collected from migrant camps constitutes the major portion of the local share in California. In 1971, 26 state-built Flash Peak Labor Camps, built in 1965 with OEO III-B money, brought in $251,500 which was combined with $97,500 appropriated from the state general fund for a total of $349,000 of IV-A matching money. When combined with the Federal share, California had a total of $1,470,000 IV-A money, complemented with $250,000 in ESEA Title I money.

Pledged for use by migrants, rent collected from the camps is remitted to the State Department of Human Resources Development where it is allocated to social welfare. Funded are 25 centers for a season of 6 to...
ARIZONA
Recycled Money

Phoenix, Arizona, is unique in its use of all private cash donations for matching with Title IV-A. Arizona's case history will benefit migrant programs unable to get a state to appropriate matching money.

After OEO was forced to close several of its child care centers, Arizona citizens formed a task force to raise money to reopen them. Twelve thousand dollars was raised through a newspaper campaign exposing the plight of the migrant children. Since the state did not feel that money available from a "one time only" appeal immediately after the closing of the centers was an adequate basis for funding a program, the "Save a Child League" was formed as an on-going fund-raising organization. As the only state-wide money-raising effort for migrant child care, the League employs a professional fundraiser, organizes charity benefits and solicits from groups and individuals.

In addition to organizing the "Save a Child League," task force developed three coordinating councils to act as umbrella organizations to administer and monitor the programs. Each Council has a policy board consisting of 1/3 parents, 1/3 board and community representation, and 1/3 professionals.

Federal law prohibits an operating agency from supplying funds which it then receives back for its own operation. However, if the funds come from a separate agency, a "third party," an operating organization can contribute these funds to the Department of Welfare to generate matching funds.

The League, as the third party in this case, raises the private monies and contributes the money to the Welfare Department for matching. The matched money then goes to the umbrella organizations (Coordinating Councils), which in turn allocate funds to specific programs.

The Coordinating Councils, fostered by the Community Council (a planning body supported by the United Fund), are supported with IV-A money taken "off the top" of the matched funds with the rest used to purchase care.

The annual budget administered by the Phoenix Council in 1970 amounted to $431,980, of which $107,995 was local funds and $323,985 was potential Title IV-A generated funds. Although a small portion of this was raised by the League, the majority came from "recycled money." Instead of continuing to contribute money directly to day care programs, the Phoenix United Fund gave it to the State Welfare Department to be matched with IV-A funds. When matched, it was returned more than doubled to the Council for distribution to the centers. This recycling of funds would, of course, only work in a metropolitan area where there is a large United Fund.

The administrative budget for the Coordinating Council was $26,187, which paid for an executive director, secretary-bookkeeper, and related office costs, as well as occasional training workshops handled for participating agencies.

OREGON:
Getting it Together

A unique state-wide Coalition spearheads the search for funds for migrant and Indian children in Oregon. Formed in 1971, the Coalition board consists of one parent and one community representative from various sections of the state. In addition, there are four positions for medical and educational professionals and representatives of state agencies concerned with migrant children.

Following the Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) plan, the Coalition has applied for recognition as a 4-C agency. Community Coordinated Child Care is a federal government-developed comprehensive, coordinated approach for communities to apply to providing day care and preschool services. Organizing around the 4-C plan opens the way for use of Title IV-A funds for planning and coordination.

The Coalition has been called a "centralized local 4-C." It acts as an administrative umbrella over a number of child care facilities and at the same time represents several areas of the state. A representative of the Coalition sits on the state 4-C board.

In some cases, Coalition jurisdiction overlaps local 4-C jurisdiction. Where this happens, a facility may choose between the two. Sometimes the project may choose both and receive year round service to local children through the 4-C and seasonal services for migrants from the Coalition. Or, the Coalition may simply give technical assistance.

Coalition services include:
- Technical assistance in forming community-based organizational sponsors for child care services.
- Aid in raising cash and in-kind contributions for matching with Title IV-A money. The Coalition has published an idea booklet with examples of contribution sources from each of its facilities.
• Assistance to a facility in meeting Federal Interagency guidelines and state licensing requirements.
• Assistance in applying for U.S. Department of Agriculture Food reimbursement.
• A contract for purchase of child care services and assistance with a standard accounting, record keeping system.
• Training conferences and curriculum resource materials of a "cross cultural" program for migrant and Indian children.

Although the Coalition has a grant from the Indian and Migrant Desk of Head Start, most of its funding comes from community sources matched with Title IV-A money.

In addition to the $6.00 per child per day allowed in Oregon for IV-A supported programs, the Coalition allows each community to spend an additional $1.50 in Headstart Indian and Migrant Division funds. This is used to pay for start-up costs such as remodeling and equipment, for parent involvement programs, and for medical or dental treatment. (Title IV-A money cannot be used for equipment or building costs, except in the "consumable supply or repair" category, and although IV-A can be used for medical examination, it cannot be used for treatment.)

The IMPD money enables the facilities to upgrade services to meet Head Start standards by including such programs as career development for staff and parent involvement.

Oregon has followed Arizona's example in forming a separate corporation for receiving money. Called Friend, the corporation receives donations and operates as a "friend" of the Coalition in providing cash for use in matching with Title IV-A money.

This is how it works. Local contributors make cash donations to Friend requesting that it be held until a local facility needs matching money. The Coalition applies to the corporation. In some cases the contributions are earmarked for a particular area; in other cases Friend can, with contributor permission, borrow or transfer funds from one area to another.

The Oregon Coalition is the only centralized 4-C-like agency specializing in the needs of migrant children, as well as the only one serving non-reservation Indians.

EDINBURG, TEXAS:

Model Cities Bilingual Child Development

In few instances have migrants been able to benefit from the use of Model Cities Supplementary funds. Edinburg, Texas, with its winter based bilingual program has that distinction. (The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 allows Housing and Urban Development supplemental funds to "be used and credited as part or all of the required non-federal contribution . . . under a federal grant-in-aid program." Supplemental money can be used instead of state funds to earn federal IV-A dollars.)

In 1971, Edinburg received $5,000 in Model Cities money to be matched with $16,667 IV-A federal share, supplemented by a $20,000 Child Welfare Research and Demonstration (OCD) grant. This funded one child care program in the Model Cities area for 100 children, 20 to 30 percent of whom are estimated to be migrants.

IOWA:

State Money

A state appropriation for day care for non-residents is used as Iowa's local matching share, bringing in a total of about $30,000 in IV-A money in 1971 with a state appropriation of $7,500.

With this money, the umbrella organization, Migrant Action Program (MAP) operates 5 centers, serving 35 to 45 migrant children, ages 13 months to 3 years. MAP received a waiver from the State Department of Social Services to include much younger children in its program.

IV-A LIMITATIONS

One restriction on the use of IV-A monies is that donated funds may not revert back to the donor, although a United fund donation, for example, may be used to purchase services from a United Fund member agency which is considered a separate entity.

For a state to receive IV-A funds, it must submit to Social and Rehabilitation Services a State Plan for administration of AFDC. The State Welfare Department receives payments on a reimbursement basis from the SRS Public Assistance unit in Washington.

"STATEWIDENESS"

Social Security laws call for AFDC to be applied uniformly to every state "political subdivision." In other words, this principle of statewideness requires a state to offer any service available to past, present, or potential AFDC recipients to all individuals in the state who meet the criteria. This principle caused great confusion until 1970 when SRS amended its statewideness require-
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ment to say that a state need only "evidence a genuine commitment to provide services on a state-wide basis within a reasonable time." This meant that states did not have to initiate services in all areas at exactly the same time.

WHAT'S NEXT?
After a group has decided to apply for funds, it should contact the State Welfare Department for information on how to proceed. If the group is not happy with the cooperation it is getting, it should contact its regional SRS office. All through preliminary discussions, both parties should understand their rights and responsibilities. Accepting federal money means accepting some federal control. Finally, legal assistance will help negotiate a fair and reasonable contract. (See samples of contracts in appendix.)

For more information contact State Welfare Departments, or regional SRS offices. (See list in appendix.)
Head Start

Head Start was designed as a massive social experiment to break the poverty cycle through a comprehensive, national child development program. The purpose of the program is to meet the emotional, medical, nutritional, and societal needs of the low-income preschool child.

Total estimated funding was $360 million in 1971 serving 471,600 children, of which 3,500 are migrant children. This means that less than 1% of the Head Start budget goes to migrant children.

When Head Start was moved from OEO to HEW in 1969, a separate "region" was established for migrant and Indian programs. Head Start’s Migrant and Indian Division has been appropriated and allocated $12.5 million in 1972, of which $3.4 million was for migrant programs alone.

It should be noted that overall Head Start funding has not substantially increased since 1966, partially because the program has been the center of a sometimes heated controversy. One potent barb came from the Westinghouse Report in the late 60’s which concluded that gains made by Head Start children were wiped out in grade school. Although the study was later proved inaccurate, harm had been done. Finally, it should be easy to understand that since there is little likelihood that Head Start’s funding will be increased in the near future, there is stiff competition for available money.

With 69 centers in 17 states, migrant programs differ from other Head Start programs in several ways: they are bilingual and bicultural; they are open longer hours to accommodate the adult farmworkers’ workday (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. generally); and participating children can be infants (normally Head Start begins at 4 years).

Areas with Migrant and Indian Head Start centers include: New York, Florida, California, Utah, Illinois, New Jersey, the Texas panhandle, Arizona, Kansas, Oregon, Colorado, Washington, Idaho, North Dakota, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Michigan. One program, commanding a large proportion of the funding is mobile, moving with the migrant from his home base state through the stream.

Head Start programs also include 29 parent and child centers, of which two serve migrant families.

To find out more about the Head Start Indian and Migrant program, contact your local Community Action Agency or Project Head Start, Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20201. Where there is no CAP, contact the Board of Education, Welfare Department or Mayor’s office. Information also available through the state and regional HEW offices. (See list in Appendix.)

Title I ESEA

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, designed to help educationally deprived children, was amended in 1966 to include the children of migratory agricultural workers. Today more than 235,000 migrant children in 46 states receive educational and special supplementary services under Title I.

The purpose of the program is to “identify and meet the specific educational needs of migrant children through remedial instruction; health, nutritional, and psychological services; cultural development, and pre-vocational training and counseling.” Special attention in instructional programs is given to development of the language arts, including reading, speaking, and writing in both English and Spanish.

Authority to approve state programs rests with the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The State Education Agency (SEA) is directly responsible for the administration and operation of the State’s Title I migrant program. However, if the State Education Officer and the State Attorney General are unable, or unwilling, to find migrant children and approve projects on their behalf—or if it can be established that another group can better perform these services—a private, nonprofit group such as a CAP may become the administrator. Any state where migrant workers live for any portion of the year receives an allocation of Title I migrant funds.

The State Education Agency may contract with a private agency to provide services for the migrant children under the state’s jurisdiction provided that it: does not operate a private school; is actively supervised by the SEA of local education through which the program is operated; and agrees that the ultimate responsibility for its activities lies with the SEA.

Eligibility for Title I funds includes children who are presently in the stream, as well as any migrant children for 5 years after the family has settled in one place out of the stream.
Title I migrant funds may be used to provide the following services for migrant children:

- Improving the educational program offered to migrant children through bilingual instruction, remedial courses, and individualized instruction;
- Hiring additional teachers, aides, counselors, and social workers;
- Providing recreational, cultural, and library services to the children;
- Purchasing additional educational materials, including mobile classrooms to follow the children from camp to camp, bilingual course materials, art supplies, and industrial arts and prevocational equipment.

Eligibility of Preschoolers Defined

In most cases, ESEA Title I money is used for children 5 to 17 years old. There have been, however, several instances where Title I money has been used for preschool programs with a strong educational component and where it has been necessary to include younger siblings in order to get school-aged children to participate.

In answer to requests for clarification of the age limit for use of Title I funds, the Office of Education legal counsel states that “Title I funds are authorized for all children to free public education which is provided as elementary and secondary education and may, if so determined by the State, include education below grade 1. In this context, Title I Migrant funds can be used to meet the needs of preschool children.”

Many states have expressed concern that the lack of day care for very young children, in some cases due to the phasing out of existing centers, has been contributing to high rates of absenteeism among older migrant children, who must stay home to babysit and who are, or should be, participating in the Title I programs.

In response to this, the legal counsel has noted that “if a preschool program is provided for migrant children, then day care for children who are too young to actually participate in such a program may be included provided that the application and project summaries show:

- Documented evidence that the proposed day care program is necessary to release older children to attend classes. but not to work.
- Documented evidence of the state’s effort to seek other sources of funding in line with Section 116.2-(a) of the Title I Regulations, e.g., state welfare, church groups and private organizations. There should not be any attempt to supplant any effort already in existence, but rather to secure maximum assistance from other sources.
- Documented evidence that the older children (preschool and above) will actually participate in the Title I migrant program.”

Funding

The maximum amount of funding available to eligible state education agencies is determined by the Commissioner of Education by estimating the number of migrant children in each state from Labor Department statistics.

Funds are distributed on the basis of a formula under which a state receives a maximum grant. (No matching is required.) The grant is computed by the sum of the estimated number of migrant children aged 5 to 17 residing full or part time in the state, multiplied by the national or state average per pupil expenditure, whichever is higher.

The state educational agency, in addition, receives federal funds for the administration of the program. For this purpose the state educational agency may claim up to $150,000, or 1% of the amount allocated under this title, whichever is higher.

Applications must be received in the Office of Education by June 15 if they are to be approved before the end of the fiscal year.

Interstate cooperation is encouraged to ensure some degree of educational continuity for the mobile migrant children.

More information about the Title I migrant program can be obtained by contacting the Title I migrant coordinator in the State Department of Education in any state capital, or the Migrant Programs Branch, Division of Compensatory Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

Work-Study Programs

There is some potential for obtaining staff for day care centers through the work-study programs. Administered by the Office of Education and as authorized by Title IV, Part C of the Higher Education Act of 1965, these programs help needy students, particularly those from low income families, to obtain a higher education by providing part-time jobs in “useful projects sponsored by the institutions of higher education in which they are enrolled.” Many students have chosen to work up to 15 hours a week as aides in day care centers. It is not necessary for the work to relate to the student’s field of study.

The Office of Education provides 80% of costs of the student’s salary...
for part-time off-campus employment during the school year, as well as for full time temporary summer employment. The remaining 20% normally comes from the institution or organization employing the student. It may be possible, however, to negotiate with the university if the employing organization (such as a migrant day care center) is in financial straits.

Because of transportation problems, utilizing students may present a problem in rural areas during the school year. Summer employment, during many growing seasons, may not create as great a stumbling block.

Budgeted for $160 million for 1971, the work-study programs involve 2,500 public and private colleges and vocational schools. Contact the Student Financial Aid Office of any college near you to see if they are participating in the program. Or, contact the HEW Regional Office. (See list in Appendix.)

Office of Surplus Property Utilization
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration

Surplus Property Utilization

Agencies and departments of the federal government may from time to time find that they own more real or personal property than they require. Because of this, Congress enacted legislation regulating the disposal of surplus property. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to allocate federal surplus personal property for transfer to State Agencies for Surplus Property, which in turn distribute it to eligible health and educational applicants.

Each State Agency distributes personal property for health, educational or civil defense purposes. Child care centers can qualify if they include an educational component, that is, if they have qualified teachers. HEW tries to be liberal in determining who is eligible.

Surplus supplies may include furniture, office equipment, paper supplies, or even "carryalls" (8-10 passenger vehicles resembling Volkswagen buses).

For more information contact the Regional Office of Surplus Property Utilization. (See list in Appendix.)

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Public Service Careers

The Public Service Careers program, under the Department of Labor, has a 1972 funding level of $62.2 million for training programs operated through public agencies.

The purpose of the Public Service Careers program is to help para-professionals break into public agency employment through restructuring some career positions. The idea is to get trainees into civil service or into a job (with a future career step) with a public school system or other public program. Migrant programs could use this source of funding for training money to develop careers for migrants in the day care field.

In 1970, Head Start negotiated a $3 million grant to be used for training of personnel, of which $500,000 went to the Migrant and Indian Desk. Most of the funds went to Indian grantees, since they more easily fulfill the requirement of being a "public agency." (Tribal councils are considered public agencies.)

National Rural Organization (NRO) in Washington state has been one migrant grantee to benefit from this. NRO circumvented the "hired by a public agency" requirement by delegating their Head Start program to a cooperative school district.

For more information contact: Regional Manpower Administration (See list in appendix) or the Washington, D.C. Office: D.C. Manpower Administrator, 14th & E St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004 (202-629-3663).

"Last Yellow Bus"

The purpose of this program, established in 1971 under the Labor Department's Rural Manpower Service, is to enable migrants to settle out. Specifically, it proposes in 1972 to help 5,800 migrant workers to develop marketable job skills that will equip them for stable, year-round employment. To do this, migrants will need a full range of services, including day care.

With a funding level of $20.2 million in 1972, the program will consist of (1) comprehensive training and job development programs in the home base areas and (2) in-stream settle-out programs to help families settle in communities along the migrant stream. Six in-stream projects have already been funded for $2 million. The rest of the funding will go into the home base migrant projects in Texas, California and Florida.
Although local job development is emphasized, the economic condition in some migrant home-base areas will probably require worker relocation assistance. For this purpose, a Migrant Manpower Unit has been established at the National Office level to provide coordination with existing groups (NAB, trade associations, manufacturers) as well as to give direction and impetus to state and regional office efforts.

For more information contact your Regional Manpower Administrator. (See list in Appendix.)

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Title III-B

Faced with a reduced budget, the Office of Economic Opportunity’s Migrant Division announced in 1967 that it would phase out its support of children’s programs. Under Title III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act, grants are administered for special migrant programs, including child care.

From a budget of approximately $10 million in 1965, OEO III-B funding for child care is now $2 million, a level which is not expected to change in the coming years.

The intention of the reduction and associated policy change is to free funds for more education and job development programs for adult migrants on the theory that this approach more directly lifts migrants out of poverty.

By including III-B in the EOA of 1964, Congress recognized that seasonal farmworkers needed special programs if they were to benefit from the anti-poverty effort. Congress saw this as a way of offsetting the consequences of job displacement due to increased mechanization of agricultural work. In addition, migrants were very unlikely to participate in existing local anti-poverty programs.

The only anti-poverty program concerned with an occupational group rather than an age group or geographic community, III-B addresses both the immediate needs and problems of massive job displacement among the work force due to mechanization.

Operating with $35 million for overall III-B programs in 1972, OEO may make grants to private nonprofit organizations, state or public agencies and educational institutions to carry out programs for farmworkers.

In addition to child care, these programs include education, sanitation and housing. Up to 100% of the cost of a day care project may be supplied, with funding provided for remodeling but not for new construction.

The overall objective is “to assist migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a productive and self-sufficient life.”

Another objective of the OEO-funded migrant program is to broaden the use of resources available through attracting new, non-OEO resources to serve farmworkers. This policy has lead many to suggest that III-B funds might be used for matching with IV-A money, as is the case for Model Cities.

Prior to the passage of III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act, it was often noted that more funds were allocated for migratory birds than for migratory workers. III-B was the first piece of legislation, other than the Migrant Health Act, designed especially for migrants.

For more information contact: Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity, Atten: Migrant Branch, Washington, D.C. 20506.

Community Action Program — Emergency Food and Medical Services

Authorized by Title II, section 22A (6) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, this program provides temporary grants for foodstuffs and medical services to counteract starvation and malnutrition among the poor.

Total appropriation for the program in 1971 was $33 million, of which $2.5 million went to the Migrant Division. These funds are divided among four prime grantees who decide how to allocate the money. Therefore, if the priority is for feeding children in a day care center, the prime grantee has the flexibility to do that.

Funds can be used either for the grantee to provide food directly or to act as an advocate to see that the poor receive the food provided by other programs. The purpose of the program is to make food delivery systems more responsive to the poor.

For more information on this program contact the prime grantee for your area:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Special Food Service Program for Children

Funds for free or reduced price meals for needy children including those in child care centers are available under Section 13 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended in 1968. Called the Special Food Service Program for Children, or Vanik Bill, participation is limited to "all public and nonprofit service institutions such as day care centers, settlement houses, or recreation centers that provide child care (where children are not maintained in residence), for children from areas in which poor economic conditions exist, or areas in which there are high concentrations of working mothers."

Although Head Start programs fit the definition of an eligible facility, they receive their money for food programs as part of their regular Head Start budget. Head Start programs which received Vanik Bill money before November 1, 1969, however, may still continue to receive Vanik funding.

Public or private institutions can develop a special summer program providing a food service similar to the National School Lunch for these children.

Institutions may not participate in this program and the Special Milk Program at the same time. And perhaps it makes no sense to, since this program includes milk.

In most states the program is administered by the state educational agency and where it is not, by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Federal appropriation for 1972 for this program is $49 million, a figure which should not be too heavily relied upon since it fluctuates. Federal funds are apportioned among the states in an amount in ratio of children ages 3-17 in that state to the total number of children of those ages in all the states. Funds may also be used to meet up to 75% of the cost of purchase or rental of equipment needed to provide food service. This program pays up to 95¢ a day per child, plus commodities.

COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION

Participants in the Special Food Service Program for Children may also receive certain types of commodities donated under the Commodity Distribution Program. To receive food surplus, however, the institution does not have to participate in any other federal food program. Commodity Distribution is a permanent appropriation, requiring no Congressional action from year to year.

For more information on this program and the Special Food Program, contact the Director, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture:

- S.E. Region, 1795 Peachtree Street, N.E., #302, Atlanta, Georgia 30309 (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and the Virgin Islands).
- Midwest Region, 536 South Clark Street, Chicago, Illinois 60605 (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin).
- Southwest Region, 500 South Ervay Street, Dallas, Texas 75201 (Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas).

OR

Contact your State School Lunch Program Director, Department of Education, in your state capital.
Special Milk Program

Destined to die every year, but always saved by the dairy industry, the Special Milk Program offers schools and child care institutions (non-profit nursery schools, child care centers, settlement houses, summer camps), part of the cost for each half-pint of milk they serve. Maximum reimbursement per half-pint are:

- 4¢ to those that participate in the National School Lunch Program;
- 3¢ where milk is sold as a separately priced item;
- 2¢ where children do not purchase milk separately.

This program cannot be used in conjunction with the Special Food Service Program.

For more information contact HUD regional offices.

(List in appendix.)

FEDERAL CHILD CARE LEGISLATION

The early 70's will probably be remembered as the beginning of a renaissance of public interest in child care. Reflecting this, several pieces of legislation were introduced into Congress in 1972.

Although not intended in any way to represent the current "state of the art," the following descriptions of pending legislation in the 92nd Congress are meant to be educational, offering help in understanding some of the thinking on the federal level regarding child care legislation. The descriptions focus on such important issues as delivery systems and funding levels, as well as on how low-income groups and especially migrants are provided for.

For up-to-date information on federal legislation contact the Congressman or Senator in your state or write them at the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515, or at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510. You may call the Capitol Hill number, which is 202/225-3121, and ask for your Representative’s or Senator’s office. It is best to speak to his legislative assistant for information on current bills.

Nelson-Mondale Bill, S.3193

Sponsored by Senators Gaylord Nelson (D-Wisc.) and Walter Mondale (D-Minn.), the "Child Care Centers and Services Act" was introduced as an amendment to the Equal
Opportunity Act and is a modified version of a bill vetoed in 1971 by
President Nixon. S.3193 is an attempt to meet some of the presidential ob-
jections to the old Mondale bill such as size of prime sponsor and funding
level.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to
direct programs supporting full time, part time, family, day, night and
program groups for children 14 years old and under.

The "prime sponsor" (principal grantees) would be any state or munici-
pality with a population of 25,000, non-profit organization, or Indian res-
ervation. Each prime sponsor would establish a Child Care Council to run
the programs. The councils would be made up 50% of parents and 50%
of those appointed by the mayor or chief executive officer of the prime
sponsorship area. Of the total, however, ½ must be parents of disad-
vantaged children, defined as those families with incomes $6,900 and
under.

In areas with populations below 25,000 or where a locality does not
apply or qualify for prime sponsorship, states would serve as prime
sponsors and establish Child Care Councils. States would then be re-
quired to subdivide areas they serve into program areas, not to exceed
50,000 in population, and establish for each a Local Policy Council
(LPC) to approve project applications and develop and approve the part
of the state plan which concerns them. Parents would make up 50% of the
LPC's. Project Policy Committees (PPC's) composed of parents and
those approved by parents, would administer each project.

Proposed funding for S.3193 is $100 million in start-up costs for
1973 and $1.5 billion for 1974, after $500 million is set aside for Head
Start. Priority would be given to children from families with an annual in-
come below the lower living standard budget determined by the Bureau of
Labor Statistics—currently $6,900 for an urban family of four—by reserving
65 percent of funds for such children. The bill provides free services to
children from families with incomes up to $4,320 and a fee limitation of
$316 on an urban family of four earning $6,900. Above the BLS level, fees
would be set by the Secretary.

Priority for full day services would be given to children whose parents
are already working or in training, or to such children as the handicapped
who may have special needs for full day services. For children whose
mothers (low income or non-low income) are in the home, eligibility is
limited to part-day services.

PROVISIONS FOR MIGRANTS

S.3193 would allow Indian and migrant groups to administer their own
funds, in addition to providing 100% federal funding for them. (Federal
funds would pay 90% of costs of other programs.) Funds are provided
for year-round programs for migrant children and for programs on Indian
reservations. Each local program, in addition, must provide equitably for
the needs of all minority groups, Indian and migrant children in the area
served. with particular emphasis on the needs of children from bilingual
families for the development of skills in English and the other language
spoken in the home.

Approximately 4.4% of the funds of this bill would be set aside for
Indian and migrant children. This is determined on the basis of the pro-
portion of Indian and migrant chil-
dren to the number of economically disadvantaged children (BLS level),
based on fur available after the
$500 million . . . set aside for Head
Start.

The Nelson-Mondale bill also pro-
vides possibly up to another 5% of
funds for disadvantaged, minority, or
bilingual children by making special
model programs for these groups
one focus of the Secretary's reserved
discretionary funds.

The House of Representatives' ver-
sion of S.3193 is H.R.13602.

Javits-Taft Bill,
S.3228

As the Republican alternative to
the Nelson-Mondale bill, the "Com-
prehensive Headstart, Child Develop-
ment and Family Services Act of
1972," also amending the Economic
Opportunity Act, is the same as
S.3193 with the following differences:

- Population size for prime sponsor
  would be 50,000 (making this bill a
  state plan).
- Funding for 1974 is $1.2 billion
  and for 1975, $1.6 billion.
- Set-aside for Head Start would be
  $500 million.
- State and local Child Development
  and Family Services Councils (same
  as Child Care Councils and Local
  Policy Councils in Nelson-Mondale
  bill) are given an advisory role.

S.3228 provides about the same
for migrants as the Nelson-Mondale
bill except that the set-aside would be
slightly less than 4.4%, since this is
based on funds available after $500
million (versus $500 million) is taken out for Head Start. Also, the bill provides up to 10% of funds for special model programs.

**Dellenback Bill, H.R.13649**

Introduced into the 2nd session of the 92nd Congress, The "Child Development Act" (H.R.13649) would provide for the consolidation and coordination of all federal child care and child development programs under a single federal agency, designated by the President. Providing "such sums as may be necessary," the bill would allow a state, through its governor, to apply for assistance from the federal child development agency for assistance in developing plans for carrying out and coordinating its child care programs.

The bill would authorize the designated agency to coordinate child care and child development and to make a special study of proposed future national goals in child development, in light of existing knowledge in the field coupled with the existing small number of trained child care personnel. The report would be submitted to the President and to the Congress by July 1, 1974.

H.R.13649 would amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide funds for the training of professional and paraprofessional child care personnel.

This bill could be considered a "holding pattern" response to the President's veto message regarding the old Mondale bill. The President stated at that time that he felt that it would be foolish to pour large amounts of money into day care when so little is known about early child development, and there are so few trained personnel to carry out the provisions of the bill.

**Long Bill, S.2003**

Taking a completely new legislative tack, S.2003 would set up an independent Federal Child Care Corporation (FCCC) to be run by a three-member Board of Directors appointed for a 3-year term by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The chairman would be appointed by the President and not more than two of the board members would be of the same political party.

Senator Russell Long's bill would establish a National Advisory Council on Child Care, made up of the Secretaries of HEW, Labor, and HUD, and 12 non-civil service individuals appointed by the Board.

S.2003 would provide money for facilities (construction and staffing) for use by anyone who can pay for them. Low income parents would be paid for by whatever present funding is available, i.e., Title IV-A and B of the Social Security Act, etc. The bill, however, would authorize an appropriation "from sums available" for partially subsidizing child care on a percentage basis according to income where services are necessary for an adult member of a low income family to engage in employment.

The Corporation would help private or public groups to start new day care centers by lending them money. The Corporation would operate on a $500 million loan from the U.S. Treasury which would be paid back with interest in 50 years. This money would go into a revolving fund along with collected child care fees to provide further capital for expanding services. The Corporation would also be authorized to issue and sell bonds.

The bill also provides equal priority of services to welfare recipients and working mothers. It also increases Title IV-A funding to 100% for child care provided through the Corporation, thus potentially solving one serious problem of migrants—that of raising the matching local 25% share.
CONTRACTS (SAMPLES)

1. Contract between unrelated 3rd party funding source (such as Oregon's Friend Corporation) and a State Welfare Agency.
2. Contract between State Welfare Agency and an administrative umbrella organization (Oregon Coalition or a 4-C).
3. Contract between administrative umbrella organization and a child care project.

Sample #1: Trust Agreement

THIS AGREEMENT, dated the 19th day of ................................., 19.............. between ...................................................... hereinafter referred to as "FUND" and the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare, hereinafter referred to as "STATE." 

RECITALS:
I. One of the objectives of the FUND is to improve the welfare of children in the community it serves. The welfare of said children will be improved if Day Care Services are provided to children in the community whose families cannot afford to pay for same.

II. Attached hereto and hereinafter referred to as Exhibit A, are certain Regulations promulgated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and set forth in the Federal Register, Volume 34, No. 10, dated January 28, 1969, Part II, being further described as Part 220, Chapter II, Title 45. These Regulations relate, among other things to Day Care Services.

III. Hereinafter referred to as Exhibit B, are Title IV, A and B of the Social Security Act.

IV. Attached hereto, and hereinafter referred to as Exhibit C, are Sections 6.1 through 6.3 inclusive of the State Plan.

V. Under Exhibit B, STATE has it within its power to provide Day Care Services to children from eligible families, with part of the cost of such services funded by the Federal Government on a matching basis, provided the STATE has funds available for this purpose. (Exhibits A and B).

VI. STATE, in order to make available to it the Federal matching funds, on the 17th day of December, 1969, adopted amendments to its STATE PLAN. (Exhibit C). Such Amendments qualify STATE to receive the Federal matching funds.

VII. STATE does not have sufficient funds to provide Day Care Services to all eligible children who could qualify for such services under the provisions of Exhibits A, B and C.

VIII. Under the provisions of Exhibits A, B and C, third parties may lawfully contribute funds to STATE for Day Care Services, which STATE may then use to generate the matching Federal Funds for such services. I.e., such funds contributed by third parties may lawfully be used by STATE as its share of the cost of Day Care Services for purposes of qualifying STATE for the matching Federal funds in question. Such funds are hereinafter referred to as the "STATE share".

IX. FUND desires to contribute to State, funds to be used as the State share to generate the matching Federal funds.

AGREEMENT:
I. FUND does by these present, make, confirm, and give to STATE a gift of the sum of $.............................. each month for the term of this Agreement subject however to the following terms and conditions, all of which are agreed to by STATE:

(A) The funds being donated to STATE are for Day Care Services and shall be considered, and are "donated private funds" for Day Care Services which shall be the STATE share for the purpose of claiming Federal reimbursement, within the meaning of Section 220.64 (b) (1) of Exhibit A.

(B) The funds hereby donated by FUND to STATE, shall be transferred to STATE and shall be under STATE'S exclusive control, within the meaning of 220.64 b (1) (i) of Exhibit A. The said funds shall be deposited in a special account separate and apart from the STATE'S appropriated funds. In no event shall the funds deposited be placed in or with the General Fund of the STATE.

(C) The use of funds being donated by FUND to STATE are donated on a completely unrestricted basis, excepting only:

(1) That they shall be used solely to provide Day Care Services, in Day Care Centers, for eligible children who qualify under the provisions of Exhibits A, B and C; and

(2) The FUND shall not be, and is not the sponsor or operator of the Day Care Services being funded within the meaning of Section 220.64 (b) (1) (ii) of Exhibit A; and

(3) That such money shall be used only as the STATE share for generating the matching Federal funds; and

(4) That such money will be used by the STATE for Day Care Services in the geographic area of ................................. Arizona; and

(D) The money being contributed by FUND to STATE is not, and shall not be earmarked for a particular individual or for members of a particular organization within the meaning of Section 220.64 (2) (I) of Exhibit A.

II. If for any reason STATE does not, or cannot use the funds being donated herein as the State share in claiming Federal reimbursement for the provision of Day Care Services under the terms of Exhibits A, B and C, then all any of such funds not utilized in this fashion shall be forthwith returned to FUND, and this Agreement shall be null and void.

III. The term of this Agreement shall be for the period of ................................. through ...........................................................

(A) Any funds granted to the STATE by the FUND which do not generate Federal matching funds and are not expended by the STATE for Day Care Services, shall be returned by the STATE to the FUND upon demand.

IV. STATE will, on a quarterly basis, render to FUND a statement of accounting of money received from FUND and of expenditures incurred or committed.

V. To the extent feasible and lawful, FUND and STATE shall cooperate to the end that Day Care Services in Day Care Centers shall be provided to children from eligible families.

VI. This Agreement shall take effect on the 19th day of ................................., provided that on or before the 19th day of ................................., FUND shall have delivered to STATE its check for the sum of
after, shall deliver a like sum to the
STATE during the term of this Agree-
ment. In the event the FUND is unable,
for any reason, to deliver the aforesaid
sum on the dates specified, this Agree-
ment shall be null and void.

VII. Either party may terminate this
Agreement by giving to the other party
thirty days written notice.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties
hereunto signed their names this

ARIZONA STATE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

by

Commissioner

Sample #2:
Agreement

THIS AGREEMENT made this

by and between the Arizona State De-
partment of Public Welfare, and

hereinafter referred to as "Council."

For good and valuable consideration
herewith acknowledged, the Arizona
State Department of Public Welfare con-
tracts with "Council" to provide day care
services for children, at various day care
centers, hereinafter referred to as Facilities,
under the following terms and
conditions:

1. The families of all children must
meet the eligibility criteria of the Arizona
State Department of Public Welfare as set
forth in its State Plan for Day Care
Services and any amendments or addi-
tions thereto, a copy of which is attached
hereeto as Exhibit "A."

2. Exhibit "B" attached hereto lists
with respect to each facility which will
receive funds under this Agreement:
(a) Name and address
(b) Criterion on which it bases its
qualification under the State Plan
(c) Description of the geographical
area in which eligible families must
reside

Council will promptly notify the Arizona
State Department of Public Welfare of
new facilities or of facilities to be elimi-
nated from funding under this Agreement.

3. All facilities shall be licensed by
the Arizona State Department of Health.
Facilities shall meet and maintain their
operations in accordance with any regu-
lations promulgated by the Arizona State
Department of Public Welfare. Facilities
shall meet and maintain their operations
in accordance with the Federal Inter-
agency Day Care Requirements as
approved by the U.S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare, dated
September 23, 1968, and any amend-
ments or additions thereto.

4. Council shall submit records and
reports as requested by the Arizona State
Department of Public Welfare. The said records shall be open
for inspection by representatives of either
or both of the U.S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare and the Arizona
State Department of Public Welfare.

5. The term of this Agreement shall be
for the period of

through


6. Facilities shall provide child
care days per month for the term of this
Agreement. The total of child care days is
determined by multiplying the number of
children that will be in attendance at
facilities per day by the number of days
facilities are open for the month.

7. The Arizona State Department of
Public Welfare will pay to Council the
sum of $.................. per month to pro-
vide child care services at facilities, which
shall be derived from private donated
funds and Federal matching funds upon
meeting all of the following terms and
conditions:

(a) Adequate donated funds and/or
in kind public contributions must be
actually received by the Arizona State
Department of Public Welfare to gener-
ate Federal matching funds to pay in
full the amount.

(b) Council shall on or after the last
day of each month submit through the
principal officer of the Arizona State
Department of Public Welfare a claim
voucher prepared in triplicate to the
State Department of Finance describing
the services requested and requesting pay-
ment for the preceding monthly period.
The Arizona State Department of Public
Welfare shall assist Council in the prepa-
ration of such voucher and the same shall
be prepared in accordance with the re-
quirements of said State Department of
Finance. The Arizona State Department
of Public Welfare shall furnish the neces-
sary claim voucher forms on request of
Council.

8. In the event adequate donated
funds, in kind public contributions, and/or
Federal matching funds are not actually
received by the Arizona State Department
of Public Welfare in any given month, this
Agreement shall be null and void. In no
event will state appropriated funds ever be
used for payment of day care services
provided herein.

9. In no event will any funds paid to
Council be used for any religious activity
or for any administrative or capital ex-
penses to provide day care services for
children at one or more day care

centers, hereinafter referred to as Facilities,
under the following terms and
conditions:

(a) Adequate donated funds and/or
in kind public contributions must be
actually received by the Arizona State
Department of Public Welfare to gener-
ate Federal matching funds to pay in
full the amount.

(b) Council shall on or after the last
day of each month submit through the
principal officer of the Arizona State
Department of Public Welfare a claim
voucher prepared in triplicate to the
State Department of Finance describing
the services requested and requesting pay-
ment for the preceding monthly period.
The Arizona State Department of Public
Welfare shall assist Council in the prepa-
ration of such voucher and the same shall
be prepared in accordance with the re-
quirements of said State Department of
Finance. The Arizona State Department
of Public Welfare shall furnish the neces-
sary claim voucher forms on request of
Council.
1. The Families of all children served under this agreement must meet the eligibility criteria of the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare as set forth in its State Plan for Day Care Services and any amendments or additions thereto, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

2. Exhibit "B" attached hereto lists with respect to each facility which will receive funds under this Agreement:
   (a) Name and address.
   (b) Criterion on which it bases its qualification under the State Plan.
   (c) Description of the geographical area in which eligible families must reside.

   Council will promptly notify the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare of new facilities or of facilities to be eliminated from funding under this Agreement.

3. All facilities shall be licensed by the Arizona State Department of Health. Facilities shall meet and maintain their operations in accordance with any regulations promulgated by the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare. Facilities shall meet and maintain their operations in accordance with the Federal Inter-agency Day Care Requirements as approved by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated September 23, 1965, and any amendments or additions thereto.

4. Corporation shall submit records and reports as requested by Community Council. Facility shall maintain such records as required by the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare or as required by the Community Council. The said records shall be open for inspection by representatives of any or all of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare, and the Community Council.

5. The term of this Agreement shall be for the period of .

6. Facilities shall provide .

7. Community Council will pay to Corporation the sum of $ . per month to provide child care services at facilities, which shall be derived from private funds, in-kind public contributions, and/or Federal matching funds upon meeting all of the following terms and conditions:
   (a) Adequate donated funds and/or in kind public contributions must be actually received by the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare to generate Federal matching funds to pay in full the above stated sum.
   (b) Corporation shall furnish the necessary claim voucher forms on request of Corporation.

8. In the event adequate donated funds, in-kind public contributions, and/or Federal matching funds are not actually received by the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare in any given month, and therefore no funds are received by Community Council in any given month, this Agreement shall be null and void.

9. In no event will any funds paid to Corporation be used for any religious activity or for any administrative or capital expenditure for any religious organization.

10. Corporation and all facilities shall comply with the following regulation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Sec. 601: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

11. Either party herein may terminate this Agreement without cause upon thirty (30) days written notice to the other party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have hereunto signed their names this .

COMMUNITY COUNCIL

by .

Executive Director

by .
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Mr. Ray Myrick
Associate Regional Commissioner
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DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
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Model Cities
Department of HUD
Federal Office Building—Room 11-a-23
819 Taylor Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
817-334-3301

REGION 7
Model Cities
Department of HUD
Federal Office Building—Room 300
911 Walnut Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
816-374-2325

REGION 8
Mr. Roger Olsen
Model Cities
Department of HUD
Samsonite Building
1050 South Broadway
Denver, Colorado 80209
303-297-3338

REGION 9
Mr. Keith Axtell
Model Cities
Department of HUD
Federal Office Building
1321 Second Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101
206-593-4978

STATE AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR TITLE IV-A

REGION 1
CONNECTICUT
Mr. John F. Harter
Commissioner
State Welfare Department
1000 Asylum Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06105

MAINE
Dr. Dean Fisher
Commissioner
Department of Health and Welfare
State House
Augusta, Maine 04330

MASSACHUSETTS
Mr. Steven A. Minter
Commissioner
Department of Public Welfare
600 Washington Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02111

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Mr. Edward Sanel, Sr.
Acting Commissioner
Department of Health and Welfare
State House Annex
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

RHODE ISLAND
Mr. John J. Affleck
Commissioner
Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services
1 Washington Avenue
Providence, Rhode Island 02905

REGION 2
NEW YORK
Mr. George K. Wyman
Commissioner
Department of Social Welfare
1450 Western Avenue
Albany, New York 12203
518-457-7354

NEW JERSEY
Mr. Lloyd McCorkle
Commissioner