

# A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO THE ICPC<sup>1</sup> IN GEORGIA

*PREPARED FOR THE  
GEORGIA JUVENILE COURT JUDGES (ICJE)  
FALL, 2004 SEMINAR*

BY:

RANDALL M. KESSLER<sup>2</sup>

**KESSLER | SCHWARZ, P.C.**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

CENTENNIAL TOWER  
101 MARIETTA STREET, SUITE 3500  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303  
404.688.8810  
[WWW.KESSLERSCHWARZ.COM](http://WWW.KESSLERSCHWARZ.COM)

---

<sup>1</sup>*Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children*

<sup>2</sup>*The presenter, Randall M. Kessler is the founder of Kessler & Schwarz, P.C., a domestic relations law firm in Atlanta, Georgia. Mr. Kessler is the National Chairperson for the Family Courts Committee of the Family Law Section of the American Bar Association and is the former chair of the Family Law Section of the Atlanta Bar Association. Joseph Sullivan, a summer associate at Kessler & Schwarz, P.C., researched and composed the original materials. Karlise Grier, founding partner of the Law Offices of Karlise Grier in Atlanta, Georgia, assisted in the research and composition of these materials.*

**A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO THE INTERSTATE COMPACT on the PLACEMENT of CHILDREN (ICPC) IN GEORGIA**

The Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC or “the Compact”), enacted in 1960 and embodied in the State of Georgia at O.C.G.A. §§ 39-4-1 through 39-4-10, was designed to ensure protection and services to children<sup>3</sup> who are placed across state lines for foster care or adoption. The purpose of the Compact is to protect the jurisdictional, administrative, and human rights obligations of all parties involved in an interstate placement.<sup>4</sup> By enacting the Compact, the 50 states of the U.S. recognized that children placed outside state borders need the same protections and services that would be provided if they remained in state. In addition, the Compact sought to ensure children a return to their original jurisdictions should placements prove not to be in their best interests or should the need for out-of-state services cease. The Compact is under the umbrella of the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA). The ICPC Secretariat, through APHSA, has issued 10 regulations and forms (discussed later) to

---

<sup>3</sup>According to the ICPC, a “child” is defined as “a person, who by reason of minority, is legally subject to parental guardianship or similar control.” *Guide to the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children*; (visited 10/4/04); [http://icpc.aphsa.org/documents/Guidebook\\_2002.pdf](http://icpc.aphsa.org/documents/Guidebook_2002.pdf).

<sup>4</sup>O.C.G.A. § 34-4-4, Art. I, describes the purpose of the Compact as ensuring that “(a) each child requiring placement shall receive the maximum opportunity to be placed in a suitable environment and with persons or institutions having appropriate qualifications and facilities to provide a necessary and desirable degree and type of care; (b) the appropriate authorities in a state where a child is to be placed may have full opportunity to ascertain the circumstances of the proposed placement, thereby promoting full compliance with applicable requirements for the protection of the child; (c) the proper authorities of the state from which the placement is made may obtain the most complete information on the basis of which to evaluate a projected placement before it is made; (d) appropriate jurisdictional arrangements for the care of children will be promoted.”

implement the law.<sup>5</sup>

### **I. A BRIEF HISTORY**

The need for a compact to regulate the interstate movement of children was recognized in the 1950s. At that time, a group of east coast social service administrators joined informally to study the problems of children moved out of state for foster care or adoption. Among the problems they identified was the failure of importation and exportation statutes enacted by individual states to provide protection for children. The administrators recognized that a state's jurisdiction ends at its borders and that a state can only compel an out-of-state agency or individual to discharge its obligations toward a child through a compact. The administrators were also concerned that a state to which a child was sent did not have to provide supportive services even though it might agree to do so on a courtesy basis. In response to these and other problems, the Compact was drafted, and in 1960 New York was the first state to enact it.<sup>6</sup>

### **II. WHAT THE COMPACT DOES**

The Compact contains 10 articles, enumerated in the State of Georgia at O.C.G.A. § 39-4-4. These articles define the types of placements and persons subject to the law, the procedures to be followed in making an interstate placement, and the specific protections, services, and requirements brought by the enactment of the law.

The Compact applies to four types of situations in which children may be sent to other states: (1) placement preliminary to an adoption; (2) placements into foster care, including foster

---

<sup>5</sup>*Guide to the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children*; (visited 7/14/04); [http://icpc.aphsa.org/documents/Guidebook\\_2002.pdf](http://icpc.aphsa.org/documents/Guidebook_2002.pdf).

<sup>6</sup>See *Supra* n. 5.

homes, group homes, residential treatment facilities and institutions; (3) placements with parents and relatives when a parent or relative is not making the placement; and (4) placements of adjudicated delinquents in institutions in other states. The Compact mandates that “sending agencies” must use the Compact when they “send, bring, or cause a child to be brought or sent” to another party state. O.C.G.A. § 39-4-4, Art. III(a). The Compact defines a “sending agency” as “a party state, or officer, or employee thereof; a subdivision of a party state, or officer thereof; a court of a party state; a person, corporation, association, charitable agency or other entity which sends, brings or causes to be sent or brought any child to another party state.” O.C.G.A. § 39-4-4, Art. II(b).

However, not all placements of children are subject to the provisions in the Compact. In addition, not all persons who place children are subject to the Compact. The Compact does not include placements made in medical and mental health facilities or in boarding schools. The Compact also does not include placements made in “any institution primarily educational in character.” O.C.G.A. § 39-4-4, Art. II(d). The placement of a child into a receiving state made by a parent, stepparent, grandparent, adult brother or sister, adult uncle or aunt, or the child’s guardian is not covered by the Compact if that person leaves the child with any such relative or non-agency guardian in the receiving state.<sup>7</sup> Consequently, Art. VIII(a) of the Compact excludes from coverage placements made from certain individuals to certain enumerated individuals. The wording of the provision, however, is specific in that exclusion from the Compact only occurs when both the placer and the placement recipient belong to the enumerated classes of individuals. For instance, a placement made by a parent to an “adult uncle or aunt” of the child or from one of

---

<sup>7</sup>O.C.G.A. § 39-4-4, Art. VIII(a).

the other enumerated individuals to a parent is exempt from the compact.

The Compact seeks to manage out of state placements in order to provide numerous safeguards to the children of the U.S., as well as to protect any state agency or party involved in the transfer. The Compact provides the sending agency the opportunity to obtain home studies and an evaluation of the proposed placement. The prospective receiving state can ensure that the placement is not “contrary to the interests of the child” and that its applicable law and policies have been followed before it approves the placement. In addition, the Compact guarantees the child legal and financial protection by fixing these responsibilities with the sending agency or individual. Finally, the Compact provides any sending agency the opportunity to obtain supervision and regular reports on the child’s adjustment and progress in the placement. These types of safeguards are routinely available when the child, person, or responsible agency and the placement are all in a single state or jurisdiction. However, when the placement involves two states or jurisdictions, these types of safeguards are only available through the Compact.<sup>8</sup>

### **III. PROCEDURES FOR MAKING COMPACT PLACEMENTS**

When the State of Georgia enacted the Compact, it became law, just as any other legislation passed by the State Legislature. Under the terms of the law, the States agree to follow uniform procedures when they make or accept interstate placements of children. Since the Compact is also a contract among the States, as well as a statute in each of them, it must be interpreted and implemented uniformly by all of the States.<sup>9</sup>

Georgia has appointed James Graves and John Hutto as Compact Administrators who are

---

<sup>8</sup>See Supra n. 5.

<sup>9</sup>Id.

to oversee or perform the day-to-day tasks associated with the administration of the Compact. The Georgia Administrators may be reached at (404) 657-3564 and at: The Division of Family and Child Services, Georgia Department of Human Resources, Atlanta, Georgia, 30303-3180. (See Attachment C for all ICPC Contact Personnel). In every state, the Compact office and personnel are located in an office that is part of the department of public welfare or the state's equivalent agency. In Georgia, the appropriate location is the Department of Human Resources. The Compact Administrator is designated to serve as the central clearing point for all referrals for interstate placements. The Administrator and his/her deputies are authorized to conduct the necessary investigation of the proposed placement and to determine whether or not the placement is contrary to the child's interests. After the placement is approved and the child is moved into the state, the Compact Administrator is responsible for overseeing the placement as long as it continues.

Recognizing when a placement is covered by the Compact can be a tricky endeavor. However, there are some general circumstances where the Compact will apply to a placement: (1) if the placer is not related to the child (or is not the child's non-agency guardian) or, if the placer is related, and is sending the child to live with someone other than a close relative or non-agency guardian named in Article VIII(a) of the Compact<sup>10</sup>; *and* (2) if the placer is sending, bringing or *causing* the child to be brought or sent into a party state, whether or not the placer has custody of the child, and without regard to the present location of the child ; *and* (3) if the placer is placing the child with someone or some agency *other than* a medical facility or boarding

---

<sup>10</sup>“A parent, step-parent, grandparent, adult brother or sister, adult uncle or aunt, or guardian.” O.C.G.A. § 34-4-4, Art. VIII(a).

school; it is likely that the placement will be regulated by the guidelines in the Compact.<sup>11</sup>

When an interstate placement is being considered, the Compact requires that the prospective sending agency submit a written notice of the proposed placement to the Compact Administrator in the receiving state. All party states further require that this same notice be first submitted to the sending state Compact Administrator, who then forwards it to the prospective receiving state. This written notice is made on form ICPC-100A, (see Attachment A), which is available from all party states. A social history of the child and case plan must also be prepared, and both the completed ICPC-100A and the child's social history are forwarded to the prospective receiving state's Compact Administrator by the sending state Compact Administrator.<sup>12</sup>

Upon receiving notice of the proposed placement, the receiving state Compact Administrator will forward the documents to an appropriate party in the receiving state for further action. The "appropriate party" will usually be a local public or private child welfare agency or the residential facility which is being asked to place the child. The "action" needed on any particular request will vary depending upon the nature of the proposed placement, and may include a study of a prospective adoptive or foster family, a relative home, or a review by the facility to determine whether or not its program will meet the child's needs. After the local agency has completed the necessary work, it prepares a report which includes a recommendation on whether or not the placement should be made. This information is returned to the Compact Administrator in the receiving state for review. If the local agency's recommendation is favorable

---

<sup>11</sup>*See supra* n. 5.

<sup>12</sup>*Id.*

and the Compact Administrator determines that all requirements of the receiving state's laws have been met, the placement will be approved. If, however, the local agency recommends against the placement or the Compact Administrator determines that the placement cannot lawfully be completed, the placement will be denied unless the problems can be remedied. In either case, the Compact Administrator notifies the sending state's Compact office and forwards copies of its detailed report to the sending agency.<sup>13</sup>

Six weeks, or around 30 working days, is the recommended processing time from the date the receiving state Compact office receives the notice of the placement until the date that the placement is approved or denied. Usually referrals take longer to process because of other work demands placed upon the local agency in the receiving state or upon the Compact office. Whenever emergencies arise, the Compact Administrators will give consideration to requests and will respond by the fastest means of communication. Experience, especially in recent years, has shown that delays in the completion of home studies by the receiving states' local agencies are a significant problem. Sometimes the receiving state does not complete the home studies for many months. As a result, Regulation VII, Priority Placement, (discussed later) was enacted in 1996 with the aim of achieving parity of treatment for interstate and intrastate cases. Regulation VII is also intended to assure priority handling for hardship cases and for cases which have already suffered delay.<sup>14</sup>

When the request to place a child has been approved by the receiving state, the sending agency and receiving parties work together to arrange the details of the actual placement. Final

---

<sup>13</sup>See supra n. 5.

<sup>14</sup>Id.



agreements (usually discussed at the time of referral) are entered into regarding payment for the child's care, the type of monitoring of the placement, and the frequency of supervisory reports to be provided to the sending agency. After all plans and agreements have been completed, the child is moved to the receiving state. The sending agency notifies the receiving state of the placement by using form ICPC-100B, "Interstate Compact Report: Child Placement Status" (see Attachment B).

While the child remains in the out-of-state placement, the sending agency retains legal and financial responsibility for the child.<sup>15</sup> This means that the sending agency has both the authority and the responsibility to determine all matters in relation to the "custody, supervision, care, treatment, and disposition of the child," just as the sending agency would have "if the child had remained in the sending agency state."<sup>16</sup> The sending agency's responsibilities for the child continue until it legally terminates the interstate placement. It may terminate the placement by returning the child to the home state, or the placement may be terminated with the child left in the receiving state when the child is legally adopted, becomes self supporting or reaches majority, or for other reasons with the prior concurrence of the receiving state.<sup>17</sup> The sending agency must notify the receiving state Compact Administrator of any change in the child's status, again using form ICPC-100B. Changes of status may include a termination of the interstate placement or such things as a new placement of the child in the receiving state or a transfer of

---

<sup>15</sup>See O.C.G.A. § 39-4-4, Art. V(a).

<sup>16</sup>*Id.*

<sup>17</sup>See O.C.G.A. § 39-4-4, Art. V(a).

legal custody.<sup>18</sup>

For an example, The South Carolina Department of Social Services (SCDSS) obtained legal and physical custody of child, K.W., in October of 1997 after K.W.'s intoxicated mother left him with a stranger. The mother was living in South Carolina at the time and was separated from her husband, who lived in Georgia. Following a hearing, the family court of the Fifteenth Judicial Circuit of South Carolina concluded that K.W. was to remain in SCDSS custody based on evidence that his parents had sexually molested him. The Court eventually placed K.W. with his paternal uncle and aunt in Georgia pursuant to the ICPC, and filed a petition to terminate the parents' parental rights. The parents of K.W. then moved to dismiss or stay the termination action in South Carolina, arguing that Georgia was the proper jurisdiction for the action. The court decided that:

“when an agency from another state places a child in Georgia pursuant to the ICPC . . . the agency that sent the child to Georgia shall retain jurisdiction over the child sufficient to determine all matters in relation to the custody, supervision, care, treatment and disposition of the child which it would have had if the child had remained in the sending agency's state, until the child is adopted, reaches majority, becomes self supporting or is discharged with the concurrence of the appropriate authority in the receiving state.”

The court concluded that since none of the above factors had yet to occur, South Carolina was still the legal guardian of K.W. and therefore retained proper jurisdiction.<sup>19</sup>

#### **IV. IMPORTANT AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE III-INSTITUTED 2001-2002**

---

<sup>18</sup>See Supra n. 5.

<sup>19</sup>In the Interest of K.W., 261 Ga. App. 654, (2003).

The Compact was revised in 2001-2002 by the Secretariat to the Association of Administrators of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children. The revisions concerned key provisions of the Compact, namely, who the compact would (or would not) apply to<sup>20</sup> and, as discussed previously, the institution of the Priority Placement provisions of Regulation VII. Revisions in Article III made it clear that the compact would not apply whenever a court transferred a child to a non-custodial parent with respect to whom the court: (1) did not have evidence before it that such parent was unfit; (2) did not seek such evidence; and (3) did not retain jurisdiction over the child after the court transferred the child.<sup>21</sup>

Further regulations were enacted to institute the Priority Placement provisions of Regulation VII.<sup>22</sup> The intention of Regulation VII was to address the concerns of both state agencies and the general public that the ICPC was too inefficient and had a lack of accountability in its structure. The priority placement provision in Regulation VII had 4 main goals: (1) achieve parity of treatment for interstate cases; (2) assure priority handling for hardship cases and case which had already suffered delay; (3) establish procedures for out-of-state priority placement of children; and (4) set time frames for priority placement to occur within 28 business days.<sup>23</sup>

The reason for the revisions in Regulation VII was that courts and state agencies could no

---

<sup>20</sup>See O.C.G.A. § 39-4-4, Art. III(b).

<sup>21</sup>*Id.*

<sup>22</sup>Regulation VII does not apply to cases where the sending state makes a request for the placement of child in a licensed or approved foster family care or adoption situation, or where the child is already in the receiving state in violation of the ICPC.

<sup>23</sup> Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children, Regulation VII states that a court may utilize Regulation VII when the “court, upon request, or on its own motion, or when court approval is required, determines a proposed priority placement is necessary.”

longer be expected to complete a relative home study in 20 working days because the federal regulations to implement the Adoption and Safe Families Act require state license of all non-parental homes. The home study, which is conducted in the home state of the prospective adoptive or foster family, generally includes the following information: parent's health status/history and medical reports; parent's social history and family background; parenting style and approaches to discipline; parent's employment and finances; personal interviews; physical environment of the home; all required documentation on the prospective family; criminal and child abuse background checks; references; foster or adoptive parent training; case summary and worker's recommendation.<sup>24</sup>

Consequently, no difference was found between the relative home study and the foster home study. As such, the frequency in the delays involved in licensing by training requirements, safety inspections and fingerprinting were becoming vastly overwhelming. To comply with the provisions of Regulation VII, the court must send its order to the sending agency within 2 business days. The order must include the name, address, telephone number, and, if available, the fax number of the judge and court. The court must then have the sending agency transmit within 3 business days the signed court order, a completed form 100A and any supporting documentation to the sending state compact administrator.

Within 2 business days after receipt of the ICPC priority placement request, the sending state compact administrator must transmit the priority request and the accompanying documentation to the receiving state administrator together with a notice that the request for

---

<sup>24</sup>*Understanding Delays in the Interstate Home Study Process*; (visited 10/4/04); <http://aaicama.aphsa.org/home%20study%20report.pdf>.

placement is entitled to priority placement. The court order, 100A, and supporting documentation must be transferred to the receiving state compact administrator as soon as practicable but not later than 20 business days from the date the overnight mailing was received. If the receiving state compact administrator fails to complete these actions within the time period allowed, the receiving state will not be in compliance. If the receiving state is not in compliance, the court which made the priority order may inform an appropriate court in the receiving state, providing documentation and requesting assistance in the matter.

## **V. CONFLICTS**

Conflicts may occur between the ICPC, the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act (UCCJA)<sup>25</sup>, (which no longer exists in Georgia since Georgia passed the Uniform Child Custody and Enforcement Act effective July 1, 2001), and the Parental Kidnaping Prevention Act (PKPA). When a conflict occurs, courts must reconcile the statutes to determine the proper jurisdiction of a case before making a decision on the merits. For instance, when a conflict occurs in a foster placement, courts are more likely to defer to the jurisdiction of the sending state. States base this deference on the mandates of Article V of the ICPC, the “best interest” standard

---

<sup>25</sup>See In Re Marriage of Slate, 536 N.E.2d 894 (Ill. Ct. App., 1989) (conflict occurred in foster placement where 3 children adjudicated dependent in WA as a result of mother’s mental condition & father’s absence were placed in foster care in WA. WA continued to supervise the placement and provided foster care payments and medical expenses. Children were later placed under ICPC to IL with relative caretaker and after 4 years, mother in IL filed for dissolution of marriage and for custody. IL court refused to hear custody petition and held that WA had retained jurisdiction); *see also* Stancil v. Brock, 108 N.C. App. 745 (N.C. App. 1999) (KY residents placed child with residents of NC for adoption through ICPC. Adoptive parents sought custody in NC when they learned natural parents wanted to revoke adoption consent. Natural parents filed a petition to revoke consent and dismiss adoptive parents custody petition. Court decided that KY had proper jurisdiction).

of the child, and the UCCJA.<sup>26</sup> Because the sending state often has fewer connections with the child in an independent adoption, as opposed to a foster placement, courts often allow the receiving state to assume jurisdiction under the UCCJA. “If applying the UCCJA/UCCJEA and the PKPA determines that the court has jurisdiction, then the court proceeds to consider the matter of the child’s custody. If applying the UCCJA/UCCJEA and the PKPA determines that another court has jurisdiction, then the matter must be transferred to the other court. Only after jurisdiction is established does the court proceed to the stages in the case in which the ICPC may apply.”<sup>27</sup> However, such conflicts should be rare since the UCCJEA, as passed in Georgia, does not cover adoptions. Thus, only when a rare custody issue or claim is present might there be such a conflict.

Along with the possible pitfalls of choosing what statute should be applied, courts may face the dilemma of deciding between what constitutes a mere visit from an actual placement. Although this may be tough to distinguish, courts should examine the purpose, duration and the intention involved with the stay of the child. For instance, if the proposed stay is more than 30 days, there is no terminal date which can be established by the stay, or if the duration is not clear from the circumstances of the case, it is very probable that a placement, rather than a visit, has occurred. In addition, if the purpose of the stay was made with the hope or the intention to place

---

<sup>26</sup>Id.

<sup>27</sup>*The Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children: A Manual and Instructional Guide for Juvenile and Family Court Judges*; (visited 10/4/04); [http://www.pppncjfcj.org/pdf\\_ICPC/chap1.pdf](http://www.pppncjfcj.org/pdf_ICPC/chap1.pdf).

the child, it is likely that a placement has been made as well.<sup>28</sup>

## **VI. PENALTIES FOR ILLEGAL PLACEMENTS**

Interstate placements made in violation of the law constitute a violation of the “laws respecting the placement of children of both the state in which the sending agency is located or, from which it sends or brings the child and of the receiving state.”<sup>29</sup> Violators are subject to punishment or penalties in both jurisdictions in accordance with their laws. In addition to liability for penalties, the violation will also constitute full and sufficient grounds for the suspension or revocation of any license, permit, or other legal authorization held by the sending agency which empowers or allows it to place or care for children. In considering a violation of the ICPC, courts ask first and most obviously, was the compact violated? Then courts will need to determine who or what entity violated the compact. Finally courts should decide what remedy should be imposed as a result of the violation. Although empowered with the authority, courts have been reluctant to impose certain penalties. For instance, courts usually decline to order sanctions against individual violators, or to dismiss previous placement orders. In addition, courts will rarely dismiss an adoption petition, choosing instead to defer to the “best interests” standard to decide a child’s ultimate location.

Although imposition of penalties have been rare, since 1980 there have been several cases in which a child placed illegally was ordered to be returned to the sending state or a dismissal of adoption was ordered. Though rare, some of the factors in determining whether to dismiss are:

---

<sup>28</sup>In Re Emmanuel R., 114 Cal. Rptr.2d 320, (2001); *see also* Regulation IX, *Guide to the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children*; (visited 7/14/04); [http://icpc.aphsa.org/documents/Guidebook\\_2002.pdf](http://icpc.aphsa.org/documents/Guidebook_2002.pdf).

<sup>29</sup>*See* O.C.G.A. § 39-4-4, Art. IV.

whether the ICPC violation was knowingly committed; whether the violation impaired the rights of the natural parents; whether the violation was more than a technicality; whether the violation impeded the state's jurisdiction to determine the "best interests" of the child; and, whether the violation circumvented the sending state's law in order to effectuate the adoption; whether the violation was made to enhance the bond between the adoptive parents and the child or to dictate the adoption in the receiving state's courts. Last, but certainly not least to consider in the court's examination, what were the best interests of the child?<sup>30</sup>

## **VII. CONCLUSION**

The ICPC is an important addition to the goal of protecting and providing services to children who are placed across state lines for foster care or adoption. The mission of the Compact is clear: establish orderly procedures for the interstate placement of children and fix responsibility for those who are involved in placing those children in order to ensure that the best interests of the children are met. The Compact was designed to eliminate much of the confusion and the many potential conflicts which can arise in the interstate placement of children. Although the provisions of the Guide have been cited as being outdated and poorly drafted, as the law develops the ICPC will become easier to apply and predict. We hope this paper is of use as you encounter the ICPC and the various interstate issues which arise in child placement cases.

---

<sup>30</sup>See In Re Adoption/Guardianship No. 3598 in the Circuit Court for Hartford County, 109 Md. App. 475, (1996).



**ATTACHMENT A**

**ICPC 100A**

REV. 8/2001

INTERSTATE COMPACT ON THE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN REQUEST

TO: \_\_\_\_\_ FROM: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION I-IDENTIFYING DATA**

Notice is given of intent to place-Name of Child: \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity: \_\_\_\_\_

Social Security Number: \_\_\_\_\_ ICWA Eligible? Yes/No \_\_\_\_\_ Race: \_\_\_\_\_

Sex: \_\_\_\_\_ D.O.B.: \_\_\_\_\_ Title IV-E Determination: \_\_\_\_\_  
Yes No Pending

Name of Mother: \_\_\_\_\_ Name of Father: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Agency or Person Responsible for Planning for Child: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Agency or Person Financially Responsible for Child: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION II-PLACEMENT INFORMATION**

Name of Person(s) or Facility Child is to be placed with: \_\_\_\_\_ Soc. Sec.# (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Care Requested: \_\_\_\_\_  Parent

Foster Family Home  Residential Treatment Center  Relative (Not Parent)

Group Home Care  Institutional Care-Art. VI,  Other

Child Caring Institution  Adjudicated Delinquent

Current Legal Status of Child: \_\_\_\_\_  Protective Supervision

Sending Agency Custody/Guardianship  Parental Rights Terminated-Right to Place for

Parent Relative Custody/Guardianship Adoption

Court Jurisdiction Only  Unaccompanied Refugee Minor  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION III-SERVICES REQUESTED**

Initial Report Requested (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisory Services Requested: \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisory Reports Requested: \_\_\_\_\_

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parent Home Study   | <input type="checkbox"/> Request Receiving State to Arrange Supervision | <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Relative Home Study | <input type="checkbox"/> Another Agency Agreed to Supervise             | <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-Annually |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adoptive Home Study | <input type="checkbox"/> Sending Agency to Supervise                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Upon Request  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foster Home Study   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other:        |

Name and Address of Supervising Agency in State:

- Enclosed:       Child's Social History       Court Order       Financial/Medical Plan  
 Home Study of Placement Resource       ICWA Enclosure       IV-E Eligibility Documentation       Other

Signature of Sending Agency or Person: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Sending State Compact Administrator, Deputy, or Alternate: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION IV-ACTION BY RECEIVING STATE PURSUANT TO ARTICLE III(d) of ICPC**

- Placement may be made       Placement shall not be made

REMARKS:

Signature of Receiving State Compact Administrator, Deputy or Alternate: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENT B**

**ICPC 100B**

REV. 8/2001

INTERSTATE COMPACT ON THE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN  
REPORT ON CHILD'S PLACEMENT STATUS

**Section I-Identifying Information**

Child's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Birthdate: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mother's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Father's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Section II-Placement Status**

- Initial Placement of Child in Receiving State      Date Child Placed in Receiving State:

Name of Resource:

Address:

Type of Care:

- Placement Change      Effective Date of Change

Name of Resource

Address:

Type of Care:

**Section III-Compact Placement Termination**

- Adoption Finalized       In Sending State       In Receiving State       Court Order Attached

- Child Reached Majority/Legally Emancipated

- Legal Custody Returned to Parent(s)       Court Order Attached

- Legal Custody Given to Relative       Court Order Attached

Name:

Relationship:

- Treatment Completed

- Sending State's Jurisdiction Terminated with the Concurrence of the Receiving State

- Unilateral Termination

- Child Returned to Sending State

- Child Has Moved to Another State

- Proposed Placement Request Withdrawn

Name of Placement Resource:

- Approved Resource Will Not Be Used for Placement

Name of Approved Placement:

Other (Specify):

Date of Termination:

---

**Section IV-Signatures**

Person/Agency Supplying Information

Date:

---

Compact Administrator, Deputy or Alternate:

Date:

---

**ATTACHMENT C**

<b><u>STATE</u></b>	<b><u>CONTACT</u></b>	<b><u>CONTACT #</u></b>
Alabama	Anne Holliday	Not Furnished
Alaska	Marcia Pickering	(907) 465-2105
Arizona	Ruby Pittman	(602) 235-9134 Ext. 7102
Arkansas	Marty Nodurfth	(501) 682-8556
California	Jackie Rodriguez	(916) 322-5391
Colorado	Chantal Smith	(303) 866-2998
Connecticut	Sandra Matlack	(860) 550-6392
Delaware	Rose Marie Holmquist	(302) 633-2698
District of Columbia	Sharlynn Bobo	(202) 442-6100
Florida	Samuel G. Ashdown, Jr.	(850) 487-2760
Georgia	James Graves John Hutto (Public Agency Adoptions)	(404) 657-3567 (404) 657-3564
Hawaii	Cynthia Goss	(808) 586-5699
Idaho	Carolyn K. Ayres Barbara Jarrett (Adoptions)	(208) 334-5700 (208) 334-5652
Illinois	Ron Davidson	(217) 557-5384
Indiana	Nancy Ingle	(317) 232-4769
Iowa	Sarah Stark	(515) 281-5730

Kansas	Angie Casey	(785) 296-0918
Kentucky	Mike Overstreet	(502) 564-5813
Louisiana	Leola McClinton	(225) 342-4034
Maine	Charles Gagnon	(207) 287-5060
Maryland	Stephanie Pettaway	(410) 767-7506
Massachusetts	Paula Sweeney	(617) 748-2375
Michigan	Dale Murray	(517) 373-6918
Minnesota	Kelly Simmons _____	(651) 296-2725
Mississippi	Patricia Hickman	(601) 359-4986
Missouri	Mary Kay Kliethermes	(573) 751-2981
Montana	Kandice Morse	(406) 444-5917
Nebraska	Suzanne Schied	(402) 471-9245
Nevada	Connie Martin	(775) 684-4418
New Hampshire	Linda Bombaci	(603) 271-4708
New Jersey	Benita Rommel	(609) 292-3188
New Mexico	Peg A. Tasset _____	(505) 827-8457
New York	James M. Keeler, Jr.	(518) 473-1591
North Carolina	Osborne Shamberger	(919) 733-9465
North Dakota	Deb Petry (Foster Care)	(701) 328-3581
	Delores Friedt (Adoption)	(701) 328-4152
Ohio	Heidi Stone	(614) 466-9274
Oklahoma	Margaret Linneman	(405) 522-1599
Oregon	Victor Congleton	(503) 945-6685
Pennsylvania	Larry Yarberough	(717) 772-5505
Rhode Island	Everett Thornton	(401) 254-7077
South Carolina	Mary Williams	(803) 898-7318
South Dakota	Duane E. Jenner	(605) 773-3227
	DiAnn Kleinsasser (Adoptions)	
Tennessee	Cheri Stewart	(615) 532-5618
Texas	Carolyn Thompson	(512) 834-4474
Utah	Mike Chapman	(801) 538-4364
Vermont	Margo Bryce	(802) 241-2141
U.S. Virgin Islands	Cheryl S. Hyndman	(340) 774-0930
Virginia	RoseMarie Keith	(804) 692-1274/1279

Washington	Janette Benham (Adoptions) Tina Neswick (Foster Care)	(360) 902-7987 (360) 902-7984
West Virginia	Nancy Chalhoub	(304) 558-1260
Wisconsin	Connie Klick Lynn Lehr Kathy Gerber	(608) 266-1489 (608) 266-8501 (608) 267-2075
Wyoming	Maureen Clifton	(307) 777-3570