



118th MAINE LEGISLATURE

FIRST REGULAR SESSION-1997

Legislative Document

No. 1163

H.P. 858

House of Representatives, February 20, 1997

An Act to Amend Child Protective Laws.

Reference to the Committee on Judiciary suggested and ordered printed.

OSEPH W. MAYO, Clerk

Presented by Representative MARVIN of Cape Elizabeth. Cosponsored by Senator MITCHELL of Penobscot and Representatives: BRAGDON of Bangor, BROOKS of Winterport, LOVETT of Scarborough, QUINT of Portland, SNOWE-MELLO of Poland, Senator: PARADIS of Aroostook.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Maine as follows: 2 Sec. 1. 22 MRSA §4002, sub-§1-A, ¶¶A and B, as amended by PL 4 1995, c. 481, §1, are further amended to read: A. Failure, for a period of at least 6 3 months and with no б reasonable excuse, to communicate meaningfully with the 8 child; 10 B. Failure, for a period of at least 6 3 months and with no reasonable excuse, to maintain regular visitation with the child; 12 Sec. 2. 22 MRSA §4003, sub-§2, as enacted by PL 1979, c. 733, 14\$18, is amended to read: 16 Removal from parental custody. Provide that children 2. 18 will be taken from the custody of their parents enly--where failure-to-do-so-would jeopardize their health or welfare when it is in the best interest of the children because they are in 20 circumstances that present a substantial risk of abuse or neglect; 22 Sec. 3. 22 MRSA §4035, sub-§4, as amended by PL 1995, c. 481, 24 $\S2$, is further amended to read: Final protection order. The court shall issue a final 26 4. protection order within 18 12 months of the filing of the child protection petition unless good cause is shown why the order 28 should not be issued within that time period. 30 Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, if the court makes a finding pursuant to section 4055, subsection 1-A, 32 then the court shall issue a final protection order within 12 9 34 months of the filing of the child protection petition unless good cause is shown why the order should not be issued within that time period. Good cause does not include a scheduling problem. 36 Sec. 4. 22 MRSA §4036, sub-§2, as enacted by PL 1979, c. 733, 38 §18, is repealed and the following enacted in its place: 40 2. Principles. In determining the disposition, the court 42 shall apply the following principles in this priority: 44 A. Further the best interest of the child; 46 B. Protect the child from jeopardy to health or welfare; 48 C. Give custody to a parent if appropriate conditions can be applied;

2 D. Terminate department custody at the earliest possible time; and 4 E. Give custody to a parent if appropriate conditions can be applied. 6 Sec. 5. 22 MRSA §4038, sub-§1, as amended by PL 1987, c. 269, 8 §1, is further amended to read: 10 1. Mandated review. If a court has made a final protection 12 order, it shall review the case at least once within 18 12 months of the final protection order and at least every 2 years thereafter, unless the child has been emancipated or adopted. 14 Sec. 6. 22 MRSA §4038, sub-§7, ¶A, as amended by PL 1991, c. 16 176, $\S3$, is further amended to read: 18 The court shall review the final protection order and 20 make a determination within 18 12 months of its initial order either to: 22 (1)Return the child to the parent; 24 (2)Continue reunification efforts for a specific 26 limited time not to exceed 6 months and to judicially review the matter within the time specified; or 28 Enter an order under section 4036, subsection 1, (3) 30 paragraph G-1. The court may not order reunification efforts to continue 32 under subparagraph (2) more than once unless all parties agree to the order to continue reunification and unless the 34 court determines reunification efforts to be in the best 36 interest of the child. Sec. 7. 22 MRSA §4038, sub-§7, ¶C, as enacted by PL 1991, c. 38 176, §3, is amended to read: 40 When 2 placements with the same parent have failed and C. the child is returned to the custody of the department, the 42 court shall enter an order under section 4036, subsection 1, 44 paragraph G-1 unless theparent demonstrates that reunification should be continued and the court determines reunification efforts to be in the best interest of the 46 child. 48 Sec. 8. 22 MRSA §4055, sub-§1-A, ¶¶C and E, as enacted by PL 50 1995, c. 481, $\S4$, are amended to read:

Page 2-LR1116(1)

C. The child has been placed in the legal custody or care of the department, the parent has a chronic substance abuse problem, and the parent's prognosis indicates that the child will not be able to return to the custody of the parent within a reasonable period of time, considering the child's age and the need for a permanent home. The fact that a parent has been unable to provide safe care of a child for a period of 12 9 months due to substance abuse constitutes a chronic substance abuse problem;

2

4

б

8

10

12

14

16

18

20

28

30

32

E. The child has been placed in the legal custody or care of the department for at least 12 9 months, and the parents have been offered or received services to correct the situation but have refused or have made no significant effort to correct the situation.

Sec. 9. 22 MRSA §4055, sub-§2, as amended by PL 1995, c. 481, $\S5$, is further amended to read:

2. Primary considerations. In deciding to terminate 22 parental rights, the court shall consider the best interest of the child, the needs of the child, including the child's age, the 24 child's attachments to relevant persons, periods of attachments and separation, the child's ability to integrate into a substitute placement or back into the parent's home 26 and the child's physical and emotional needs.

SUMMARY

This bill shortens the time periods in child protective 34 proceedings and elevates the best interests of the child to first priority in determining child protection and termination of 36 parental rights.

Page 3-LR1116(1)