



46TH DISTRICT  
STATE CAPITOL  
P.O. BOX 30014  
LANSING, MI 48909-7514  
PHONE (517) 373-1798  
FAX (517) 373-8574  
E-MAIL: [johnreilly@house.mi.gov](mailto:johnreilly@house.mi.gov)  
WEB: [www.RepReilly.com](http://www.RepReilly.com)

MICHIGAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

**JOHN REILLY**  
STATE REPRESENTATIVE

**COMMITTEES:**  
OVERSIGHT, VICE CHAIR  
COMMERCE AND TOURISM  
EDUCATION  
NATURAL RESOURCES AND  
OUTDOOR RECREATION

April 25, 2019

Members of the House Ways and Means Committee,

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of my legislation, House Bill 4095, which would amend the Zoning Enabling Act to allow for more children to be accommodated in a foster care home located on a property of 20 acres or more. The current limit of six children would be raised to ten, and only in that circumstance.

I'll elaborate on the terms of the bill and the need for it, then address some possible objections and technical details.

Michigan faces a crisis in child foster care. There are simply not enough loving families to take them in.

In fact, just last week, there was a great piece by our local Lansing news network on this very issue, that speaks to the child foster care crisis. Can we play the clip? [clip plays]

As a society, and as a legislature, there is no greater challenge before us than what we can do to help our constituents, our fellow citizens, that face terrible adversity in their lives.

Some of those people bear some responsibility for their problems. Convicted criminals, for example.

Some of those people suffer for some combination of terrible circumstances. Yesterday, I spoke with a constituent that my staff has been working to help. Her nephew is in adult foster care. He has serious psychological issues, and addiction issues. He has no parents, and his father died in his arms when he was a teenager. His court-appointed guardian allegedly neglects him. Hospitals allegedly neglected him. He has no money and no family with the financial resources needed to support him.

Our hearts go out to people in circumstances like this. We wrestle with a moral dilemma: is it right to force fellow citizens – many of whom have any number of their own trials and tribulations – to pay for his support? What has become of the traditional support network for the community – the church – and what is, or has been, the government's role in diminishing it over the years?

Whatever the answer, the bottom line is, we strive to help people. And as we contemplate what we *can* do, what we *should* do, and *for whom at what cost...*

I would be hard pressed to find a group of suffering people so innocent as young children, and present something we can do for them at no cost at all.

Under the current zoning law, a child care home can be considered a residential use of property if it has no more than six children in the home.

And why six children? Well, because six children is a reasonable number of children in a single-family home. A family with six children is a somewhat large family, but well within our social norms, and unquestionably a reasonable quantity for two parents to raise in a middle-class home.

And that's what the law was intended for: having foster children in a home environment. A real home, not an institution. A place that looks like home, feels like home, and provides the loving embrace of a home.

Nobody, in an ordinary, suburban environment, would think twice about a family with six children. And the law, currently, doesn't delineate between an urban home, a suburban home, or a home on a farm.

But... on a large home on a large property – say, 20 acres or more, a substantial plot of land – ten children is not unreasonable.

In my district, the House of Providence is building what any reasonable person would describe as a paradise for foster children. An affluent, rural environment where the children are at vastly lower risk of exposure to negative influences.

This is an organization with a proven record of wonderful success helping those children with the greatest needs. And out of their genuine love for these children, they want to help as many of them as they can.

And if they could help ten children instead of six, they would bring that much more relief to this suffering world.

My bill limits the increase, from six to ten, to only homes on large properties so we avoid getting into issues that might be found with a home in a more crowded environment. Because maybe that could be an issue in those places – although I don't concede that it necessarily would.

But surely, we can help bring more children into a loving environment – and I hope the House of Providence does pave the way for a successful model – by allowing more children to benefit from the quality of care that comes with the wonderful environment they intend to provide and indeed have always provided.

If this legislation looks and sounds familiar, it is.

It passed both chambers last year with overwhelming bipartisan support, 96 to 13 in the House and 37 to 1 in the Senate.

Regrettably, the legislation was vetoed by Governor Snyder. Since I continue to pursue this legislation, I think it is not only proper, but my obligation to address the former governor's points in his veto letter.

The letter reads, in relevant part:

"As the number of foster youths have increased across the state, expanding the capacity for Child Caring Institution facilities that can place foster youths is critical."

This is correct.

"However," it goes on to say, "the critical needs of fostered youth must be balanced with the ability to effectively provide them with the precious care that they deserve."

This is a confusing statement, because these are not in conflict, and so there is no "balancing" needed. Effectively providing children with the "precious care" that they deserve is the critical need of fostered youth.

Allowing more children into a spacious, loving home located in a peaceful, rural community, as most places located on 20+ acres of property are, is better care than they would otherwise receive in the overcrowded juvenile facilities where they are currently relegated. It is the very definition of what Governor Snyder termed "precious care."

So it is puzzling as the letter goes on to say: "While seemingly well intended"—and I certainly hope the former governor didn't doubt the sincerity of my intentions—"increasing the capacity and concentration of fostered youths could negatively impact the goals of providing foster youth care," he wrote.

He offered no specifics as to *how* increasing the capacity and concentration of children would have a negative impact. And as to the question of "concentration," remember we are talking about four additional children *on a 20-acre property*. There are no spatial limitations on the quantity of foster homes in a dense urban environment where you could have a dozen foster care facilities on less than 20 acres.

Density is not the issue here. The very intent of this legislation is to offer more needy children the most spacious accommodations they could have.

Of Michigan's 104 child foster care facilities, half have more than 20 beds. And half of the beds are located in facilities with 70 beds or more – some with over 200 beds.

We are trying to create more residential home environments for the children, so they *aren't* put in a crowded facility. That is the goal.

Finally, I would note that Governor Snyder's own Department of Health and Human Services supported the bill, and in the Local Government Committee this year, a representative of DHHS plainly testified: "We need beds. Our children need beds. We're grateful for any effort to give more children beds."

With all due respect to our former governor, his objections are remarkably vague.

*And these children still need beds.*

He delivered this message three days after Christmas.

His letter closed by saying that the then-governor does “not believe that this legislation was as [sic] thoroughly evaluated before final passage.” (I think he meant “was not thoroughly evaluated.”)

The legislation had indeed been evaluated by two committees, one in each chamber, and voted on by each member on the House and Senate Floor. I believe our evaluation was thorough, and I thank you all for having supported the bill at that time.

If my bill reaches the governor’s desk, it will have been vetted by three additional committees, and passed both chambers twice. There would certainly be no remaining doubt that it had been vetted.

And let’s vet it; others have raised additional objections, so let’s work through them.

In a July 20, 2016 story in the *Oxford Leader*, in a story titled “Horse Country Folks Oppose Plans to House Foster Youth,” opponents alleged that, quote:

“The Providence compound [their term] will ultimately lead to a very high perimeter fence to retain occupants 24-7. So, Oxford Township and neighboring Metamora Township will have a juvenile prison, which will decrease our land values.”

Continuing to quote the article, “When asked if House of Providence is planning to fence the property, Jason Dunn [of the House of Providence] told this reporter, “No. You know how much money it would cost to fence that property off?

“You don’t buy property to create a bucolic setting (and) then remove the bucolic setting by making it like a prison,” he continued. “That’s not the goal.

“When we say that we’re going to keep (the property) as beautiful as it is, that’s really what we’re going to do,” Dunn added.

The Dunns are building a home, a haven for these children. And they’re being accused of building a prison. It’s incredible.

The article went on to quote another resident expressing her concern about the imagined increase in traffic on gravel roads in the area. Quote:

“I rent a field across the street and my dog and I hop on the tractor and run over there every day, and very rarely do I even (encounter) one car as I’m going back and forth across the road,” she said. “With a development like (House of Providence), the traffic increase would be huge.”

Another person, whose name I won’t repeat on record, although it is provided in the story, is then quoted telling the board she has a friend who lives in a condo in Troy and this person has lived near both Chinese students and “inner city kids.”

She said –I'm quoting the article – “the inner city kids escaped from their homes through the windows” and “rampaged through the neighborhood, stabbing car tires, breaking windows, dumping over garbage, splashing paint around on different houses.

“They did a lot of damage and they were uncontrollable and could not be educated,” [she] continued. “And they're still there, rampaging around and not doing the community any good.

“I don't have any hopes that the children that come from the inner city out here would be any better behaved,” she added.

End quote.

These children aren't hoodlums.

These children are not hooligans.

And the notion that we can't allow ten children, as opposed to six, to be taken out of a miserable environment and brought into a healthful, loving environment without endangering the community is at best, the product of paranoia.

The House of Providence has been blessed by an outpouring of community support. People have volunteered to pave their driveway and frame the building.

I pray that those who fear this wonderful charity look within themselves, re-examine their fears, and think about how their own souls might benefit from embracing these children.

When I met with these unwelcoming neighbors, their fears were less bluntly expressed. They did restate their concerns that their dogs and horses might not be able to run free across the street and into the vacant lot. But no property owner is entitled to this incidental luxury. Property rights do not extend over your neighbors. You can't prevent people from developing because you don't want any more traffic on your road. You aren't entitled to be surrounded by vacant lots, so your dogs and horses can run loose.

When this same opposition came before the Local Government Committee, they voiced more nuanced concerns. But even then, it was obvious to all members that this was a Not-In-My-Backyard, There-Goes-The-Neighborhood issue.

They raised the issue that the House of Providence property was once a hunt club and there were issues with lead in the soil. Those issues were resolved with the DEQ, but even if they weren't, they're immaterial to the policy question before us. That's between House of Providence and the DEQ.

They did raise some issues, which are now echoed by the Townships Association in their opposition to the bill, that this legislation erodes local control over zoning.

No it doesn't. Read the bill. It does nothing more than change a number from 6 to 10, in limited circumstances.

The essential relationship between state and local government is totally unchanged. The bill changes a fixed quantity. That's all. It does nothing to alter the state Zoning Enabling Act in any other way, but to change a figure from 6 children to 10, in limited circumstances.

Opponents have said this issue could be resolved locally, and state intervention is unnecessary. This is incorrect, and needs explanation.

They have claimed that House of Providence, and presumably others elsewhere, could simply obtain a variance. They cannot.

Here's why: It's because of the *state* Zoning Enabling Act that child foster care homes are considered a residential usage of property. A *local* government cannot offer a variance to a *state* law. They cannot say, "the state says that with up to 6 kids a foster care home can be considered a residential usage, but we can make it 10."

Local governments can typically offer *dimension* variances, where they would allow something larger than typically allowed. But that would run afoul of *state* law which only allows a home of up to 6 to be considered a *residential* use of the property.

They could only allow a *usage* variance, which Oxford Township, and many townships, simply do not allow at all. And that makes sense. Nobody would want their township to be able to allow someone to, for example, put a marijuana dispensary in the middle of their subdivision. They don't want any potentially well-connected actors to be able to go around their zoning law.

That *would* cause a drop in property value, all across the township, because property owners would lose the certainty that some kind of commercial property couldn't build in a residential area.

So the only conceivable way, locally, a township like Oxford could allow for House of Providence to house these children would be to amend their entire zoning ordinance – exposing their entire population to all kinds of unintended consequences.

Nobody wants this. It's in state law, where the residential usage for up to 6 children is defined, where we can change that number to 10, without asking every township in Michigan to tamper with their zoning ordinances.

And let me be clear: under my bill, the change from 6 to 10 applies only to child foster care. Not adult foster care. That's another issue opponents have attempted to bring in to confuse people. The bill is very clear. The change from 6 to 10 applies only to child foster care.

And let me also be clear: This bill has no bearing whatsoever on the licensing of child care facilities.

There is a great deal of licensing rules that apply to all foster care facilities, for children and for adults. This legislation has nothing to do with any of it. My bill has absolutely nothing to do with licensing rules. All licensing rules are in place at all times. My bill

concerns zoning law, and nothing else. By allowing 10 kids on a 20-acre property to be considered a residential usage, as is the case for all child foster care homes with up to 6 kids in all places.

This is a simple issue, despite attempts by some – let’s call them stakeholders – to mystify it, to make the issue appear more complex than it actually is.

These “stakeholders” have spread rumors and misinformation to not only townships in my district, but neighboring districts, to districts of members that cosponsored the bill.

At the end of the day, all of their arguments, insinuations, and doomsaying fail because the language of the bill is so simple – changing a number, from six, to ten, within a specific circumstance – that they simply cannot find any language in its text to justify their arguments.

I’m amazed we have had to discuss something so simple in such depth, but that is a testament to the power of a small but bitter opposition to make trouble.

And with that I will close on this point, regarding the issue of local control:

I don’t think all Michigan townships speak with one voice on this issue. And Oxford Township has not spoken out in support of my bill.

But I think that, in light of the pressure, the browbeating, the bullying that township officials have endured from a remarkably well-organized not-in-my-backyard effort, they might say, if only off the record, that they wish no township should have to endure what they have been through.

They have been threatened with lawsuits. They have been politically browbeaten. House of Providence has weathered complaints to Child Protective Services and the Department of Environmental Quality. They have persevered through every attack.

And contrary to the assertion of some opposing organizations, the House of Providence came to us having fully exhausted every local remedy available. They came to us with nothing else they could do.

The Oxford Township attorney in a written opinion has told the township board it is his opinion that Oxford Township does not have legal authority to grant a variance. Therefore, the only way the House of Providence can house 10 children rather than six children in the home of over 7,000 square feet that has been built on a parcel of over 20 acres is to secure passage of House Bill 4095.

We can—through a remarkably simple change in statute—empower the House of Providence, and hopefully other loving charities, create a wonderful environment for our neediest innocent children.

I implore you to support this bill and move it forward.

References:

Video link/credit: <https://www.wlns.com/news/michigan/michigan-s-growing-foster-care-crisis/1932762420>

Governor Snyder veto letter:

[https://content.govdelivery.com/attachments/MIGOV/2018/12/28/file\\_attachments/1130278/Veto%20Letter%206499.pdf](https://content.govdelivery.com/attachments/MIGOV/2018/12/28/file_attachments/1130278/Veto%20Letter%206499.pdf) Short link: <https://bit.ly/2W4RCRF>

Oxford Leader story (behind paywall): <https://oxfordleader.com/horse-country-folks-oppose-plans-to-house-foster-youth/>



**Michigan Department of Health and Human Services**  
**Residential Foster Care Contracts by County**  
 Revision date: 12/14/2018

County Name	Program/Facility Name	Facility City, State, Zip	Counties Served	Gender	Licensed Beds
CALHOUN	Professional Group Home Starr Commonwealth - Albion Prep	Albion, MI 49224	Statewide	Male	6
CALHOUN	Residential (Starr Commonwealth)	Albion, MI 49224	Statewide	Female	240
EATON	House One (Sunny Crest Youth Ranch)	Sunfield, MI 48890	Statewide	Male	30
GENESEE	Mott Children's Residence (Whaley Children's Center)	Flint, MI 48503	Statewide	Both	6
GENESEE	Zonta House (Whaley Children's Center)	Flint, MI 48504	Statewide	Both	6
GENESEE	Optimist House (Whaley Children's Center)	Flint, MI 48502	Statewide	Both	6
GENESEE	Rotary House (Whaley Children's Center)	Flint, MI 48503	Statewide	Both	6
INGHAM	Angel House (Child & Family Charities)	Mason, MI 48854	Statewide	Female	15
INGHAM	Determinate Length of Stay (St. Vincent Catholic Charities)	Lansing, MI 48917	Statewide	Both	24
INGHAM	St. Vincent Home (St. Vincent Catholic Charities)	Lansing, MI 48917	Statewide	Both	10
INGHAM	Short Term Assessment (St. Vincent Catholic Services)	Lansing, MI 48917	Statewide	Both	6
INGHAM	Ingham County (Highfields)	Onondaga, MI 49264	Statewide	Male	48
ISABELLA	New Hope	MI, Pleasant, MI 48804	Statewide	Female	15

KALAMAZOO	Boys to Men Group Home	Kalamazoo, MI 49008	Statewide	Male	6
	Let's Talk About It Girls				
KALAMAZOO	Home (ACTS II Ministry for Teens)	Kalamazoo, MI 49007	Statewide	Female	6
	Let's Talk About It Home for Young Men (ACTS II Ministry for Teens)				
KALAMAZOO		Kalamazoo, MI 49006	Statewide	Male	6
KALAMAZOO	Kalamazoo County (FAFF Place)	Kalamazoo, MI 49001	11, 13, 39, 54	Male	6
	Great Lakes Center for Autism (Residential Opportunities)				
KALAMAZOO		Portage, MI 49002 Kalamazoo, MI 49008	Statewide	Both	12
KALAMAZOO	Lakeside for Children		Statewide	Male	124
KENT	DART (Hope Network Behavioral Health Services)	Kentwood, MI 49512	Statewide	Both	20
	Cedar Lodge (Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services)				
KENT		Grand Rapids, MI 49548	Statewide	Both	40
	Maple Lodge Group Home (Pine Rest christian Mental Health Services)				
KENT		Grand Rapids, MI 49548	Lower Peninsula	Both	8
	Vander Ark (Wedgwood Christian Services)				
KENT		Grand Rapids, MI 49512	Statewide	Both	24
	Cook-Claus Home (Wedgwood Christian Services)				
KENT		Grand Rapids, MI 49512	Statewide	Female	14
	Antonini (Wedgwood Christian Services)				
KENT		Grand Rapids, MI 49512	Statewide	Female	58
	Devos (Wedgwood Christian Services)				
KENT		Grand Rapids, MI 49512	Statewide	Male	58
	Summit (Wedgwood Christian Services)				
KENT		Grand Rapids, MI 49512	Statewide	Both	58
	Kentwood Campus (Wedgwood Christian Services)				
KENT		Grand Rapids, MI 49512	Statewide	Male	38

KENT	St. John's Home (D.A. Blodgett)	Grand Rapids, MI 49505	Statewide	Both	66
KENT	Kids First (D.A. Blodgett for Children)	Grand Rapids, MI 49505	Statewide	Both	24
KENT	Ridgeview (Bethany Christian Services)	Grand Rapids, MI 49501	Statewide	Male	41
LUCE	Lakes Area (Teaching Family Homes of Upper Michigan)	Newberry, MI 49868	Statewide	Male	8
MACOMB	Martin Luther King House (Holy Cross)	Mt. Clemens, MI 48036	Statewide	Male	15
MARQUETTE	Regional Treatment Center (Teaching Family Homes of Upper Michigan)	Marquette, MI 49855	Statewide	Both	8
MARQUETTE	Cedar Creek (Teaching Family Homes of Upper MI)	Marquette, MI 49855	UP	Both	8
MARQUETTE	Indian River (Teaching Family Homes of Upper MI)	Marquette, MI 49855	UP	Both	8
MARQUETTE	South Bluff Teaching Family Home (Teaching Family Homes of Upper MI)	Marquette, MI 49855	Statewide	Both	8
MARQUETTE	Marquette County (Great Lakes Recovery)	Nagaunee, MI 49866	Statewide	Female	20
MARQUETTE	Marquette County (Great Lakes Recovery)	Nagaunee, MI 49866	Statewide	Male	20
OAKLAND	New Directions - Farmington Hills (Wellspring Lutheran Services)	Farmington Hills, MI 48336	Macomb, Oakland, Wayne	Both	48
OAKLAND	Delaware Home (CFO Management LLC)	Southfield, MI 48033	Statewide	Male	6
OAKLAND	Boy's Center (Crossroads for Youth)	Oxford, MI 48371	Statewide	Male	100
OAKLAND	Girl's Center Crossroads for Youth)	Oxford, MI 48371	Statewide	Female	100
OAKLAND	Impulse Disorder Program (Universal Health Services)	Auburn Hills, MI 48326	Statewide	Male	30
OAKLAND	Westview Home (Victory Management Family Homes)	Femdale, MI 48220	Statewide	Male	5

OAKLAND	CAO Home	Southfield, MI 48033-3924	Statewide	Male	6
OAKLAND	Mandy's Place (Childrens Village)	Pontiac, MI 48341	Statewide	Both	44
OSCEOLA	Leppien House (Eagle Village)	Hersey, MI 49639	Statewide	Both	15
OSCEOLA	Putnam (Eagle Village)	Hersey, MI 49639	Statewide	Male	12
OSCEOLA	Ashmum (Eagle Village)	Hersey, MI 49639	Statewide	Both	12
OSCEOLA	Ashmum (Eagle Village)	Hersey, MI 49639	Statewide	Female	12
OSCEOLA	Connections @ Hanley (Eagle Village)	Hersey, MI 49639	Statewide	Both	12
OSCEOLA	Eagle Village Assessment Center	Hersey, MI 49639	Statewide	Both	24
OSCEOLA	Barton, Wilcox, Pugsley (Pineview Homes)	Ewart, MI 49631	Statewide	Male	37
OSCEOLA	Osceola County - Residential (Muskegon River Youth Home)	Ewart, MI 49631	Statewide	Male	12
OSCEOLA	Osceola County - Residential (Muskegon River Youth Home)	Ewart, MI 49631	Statewide	Female	12
OSCEOLA	Osceola County - Specialized (Muskegon River Youth Home)	Ewart, MI 49631	Statewide	Female	40
OSCEOLA	Osceola County - Specialized (Muskegon River Youth Home)	Ewart, MI 49631	Statewide	Male	40
OSCEOLA	S.T.U. (Muskegon River Youth Home)	Ewart, MI 49631	Statewide	Male	15
OSTEGO	North Point Home	Gaylord, MI 49735-1501	Statewide	Male	6
SAGINAW	St. Vincent - Corcoran (Hope) (Holy Cross Services)	Saginaw, MI 48603	Statewide	Female	64
SAGINAW	St. Vincent - John/James (Holy Cross Services)	Saginaw, MI 48603	Statewide	Male	64
SAGINAW	St. Vincent - Matthew (Holy Cross Services)	Saginaw, MI 48603	Lower Peninsula	Male	14

SAGINAW	Assessment Center at St. Vincent's (Holy Cross)	Saginaw, MI 48609	Statewide	Both	64
SAGINAW	Secure Treatment (Wolverine Human Services)	Saginaw, MI 48601	Statewide	Female	100
SAGINAW	Secure Treatment (Wolverine Human Services)	Saginaw, MI 48601	Statewide	Male	100
TUSCOLA	Gazan (Wolverine Human Services)	Vassar, MI 48768	Statewide	Male	114
TUSCOLA	Wolverine Foundations Program	Vassar, MI 48768	Statewide	Male	90
TUSCOLA	Clarence Fisher (Wolverine Human Services)	Vassar, MI 48768	Statewide	Male	90
TUSCOLA	Wolverine Growth & Recovery (Wolverine Human Services)	Vassar, MI 48768	Statewide	Male	114
TUSCOLA	Vassar House - Journeys/Passages (Wolverine Human Services)	Vassar, MI 48768	Statewide	Female	70
TUSCOLA	Behavior Stabilization, Wcare-Boys (Wolverine Human Services)	Vassar, MI 48768	Statewide	Male	114
TUSCOLA	Behavior Stabilization, Wcare-Girls (Wolverine Human Services)	Vassar, MI 48768	Statewide	Female	70
TUSCOLA	Betsy's Place	Kingston, MI 48417	Statewide	Male	12
TUSCOLA	Betsy's Place LLC	Caro, MI 48723	Statewide	Male	12
TUSCOLA	Jamie's House (Lighthouse, Inc.)	Caro, MI 48723	Statewide	Both	18
WASHTENAW	Washtenaw County (St. Louis Center)	Chelsea, MI 48118	Statewide	Both	40
WAYNE	Wayne County (Christ Child House)	Detroit, MI 48228	Statewide	Male	31
WAYNE	Apex-Mayfield (Detroit Behavioral Institute)	Detroit, MI 48205	Statewide	Both	36

WAYNE	Detroit Capstone-Horizon (Detroit Behavioral Institute)	Detroit, MI 48201	Statewide	Female	74
WAYNE	Detroit Capstone-Horizon (Detroit Behavioral Institute)	Detroit, MI 48201	Statewide	Male	74
WAYNE	Girlstown	Belleville, MI 48112	Statewide	Female	14
WAYNE	Thea Bowman House (Holy Cross Services)	Detroit, MI 48205	Statewide	Female	12
WAYNE	House of Providence	Detroit, MI 48207	Statewide	Female	15
WAYNE	Paul Martin Home for Boys (Louisiana Homes, Inc)	Detroit, MI 48206	Statewide	Male	20
WAYNE	Hanley House (Louisiana Homes, Inc)	Harttramck, MI 48212	Statewide	Male	10
WAYNE	Transitional Treatment (Methodist Children's Home)	Detroit, MI 48240	Statewide	Male	60
WAYNE	Ruth's House (Ruth Ellis Transitional Living Unit)	Detroit, MI 48202	Statewide	Both	5
WAYNE	Ruth Ellis Center, Inc II	Detroit, MI 48202- 2225	Statewide	Both	4
WAYNE	Sumpler House (Spectrum Child & Family Services)	Belleville, MI 48111	Statewide	Female	12
WAYNE	Beverly House (Spectrum Child & Family Services)	Romulus, MI 48174	50, 63, 81, 82	Female	6
WAYNE	Elizabeth Davenport Straler (Spectrum Child & Family Services)	Detroit, MI 48207	Statewide	Female	12
WAYNE	Galumet Center (Spectrum Juvenile Justice Services)	Highland Park, MI 48203	Statewide	Male	88
WAYNE	Lincoln Center (Spectrum Juvenile Justice Services)	Highland Park, MI 48203	Statewide	Male	90
WAYNE	Bridges Program (Vista Maria School for Girls)	Dearborn Heights, MI 48127	Statewide	Female	36
WAYNE	Donna Maria/Lourdes - (Vista Maria School for Girls)	Dearborn Heights, MI 48127	Statewide	Female	85
WAYNE	Rose Hall (Vista Maria School for Girls)	Dearborn Heights, MI 48127	Statewide	Female	29

WAYNE	Beala Hall (Vista Maria School for Girls)	Dearborn Heights, MI 48127	Statewide	Female	28
WAYNE	DeRoy-Wings (Vista Maria Home for Girls)	Dearborn Heights, MI 48127	Statewide	Female	36
WAYNE	Delores/Lourdes Hall (Vista Maria School for Girls)	Dearborn Heights, MI 48127	Statewide	Female	87
WAYNE	Victor's Center (Wolverine Human Services)	Detroit, MI 48215	Statewide	Male	44
WAYNE	St. Jude's Home for Boys (Wolverine Human Services)	Detroit, MI 48215	Statewide	Male	20
WAYNE	Wolverine Center (Wolverine Human Services)	Detroit, MI 48215	Statewide	Male	44