

STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

FOR THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

In the Matter of the
Foster Care License
Revocation Appeal of
Eunice Pierro

FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS AND
RECOMMENDATION

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing before Administrative Law Judge Peter C. Erickson on August 30, 31, September 1 and 7, 1988, at the Office of Administrative Hearings, Minneapolis, Minnesota. John St. Marie, Assistant County Attorney, 2000 Hennepin County Government Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55487, appeared on behalf of the Hennepin County Community Services Department and the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Human Services. Carla Kjellberg, Attorney at Law, 767 University Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55411, appeared on behalf of the Licensee, Eunice Pierro. The record on this matter closed on January 20, 1989, the date of receipt of the final post-hearing submission.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to Minn. Stat. 14.61 the final decision of the Commissioner of Human Services shall not be made until this Report has been made available to the parties to the proceeding for at least ten days, and an opportunity has been afforded to each party adversely affected to file exceptions and present argument to the Commissioner. Exceptions to this Report, if any, shall be filed with Sandra Gardebring, Commissioner of Human Services, Second Floor, Human Services Building, 444 Lafayette Road, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-3815.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

The purpose of this proceeding is to determine whether the Licensee is in compliance with Foster Care License Rules 9545.0070, 9545.0080, 9545.0090, 9545.0100, 9545.0160 and 9545.0190, and if not, whether revocation is the appropriate disciplinary action.

Based upon all of the proceedings herein, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1, Eunice Pierro is a 56 year-old licensed foster care provider. She has been licensed since 1954 and has provided foster care for approximately 100 children over the years. Ms. Pierro has adopted three of the foster children on her own.

2. From late June of 1986 through October 2, 1987, Eunice Pierro provided foster care for two sibling children, Joseph and Amanda Witta, dob

b-2b-81 and 8-23-82 respectively. during this same period of time Ms. Pierro also cared for other infant foster children who are not involved in the complaints giving rise to this proceeding.

3. Joseph and Amanda Witt were removed from the home of their parents, Winston and Sherry Minor, on December 19, 1984. This "removal" was the result of the unexplained death of Sherry Minor's infant nephew while the child was in the care and custody of the Minors. Before Joseph and Amanda were placed with Eunice Pierro, they had been cared for by four or five other foster care providers.

4. Joseph and Amanda Witt were initially placed in Ms. Pierro's home for only two weeks of respite care. However, on July 9, 1986, the County determined that the placement would continue as a permanent foster placement. No written case plan was developed for the care of the two Witt children because of actions then pending in juvenile court. This was a very difficult placement because of the children themselves (both had speech impediments, they fought continuously, and had several bad habits, including smearing their feces on walls) and the fact that visits by the parents had to be closely monitored. Allegations of sexual abuse by the parents and the investigation of the "unexplained" death were still pending. The juvenile court had already made a finding of dependency and neglect for Joseph and Amanda by their parents. The court had ordered that no unsupervised visitation by the parents could occur.

5. In the early fall of 1986, the attorney representing the Minors in the juvenile court proceeding requested that the court permit Ms. Pierro to supervise parental visits in her home. The juvenile court judge then directed Linda McKeegan, the guardian ad litem, and Steven Heckler, the county child protection worker, to investigate this alternative and determine whether Ms. Pierro was able to adequately supervise parental visits. Both Ms. McKeegan and Mr. Heckler met with Ms. Pierro and fully explained to her that if she agreed to parental visits in her home, she must personally supervise the visits in that the children must be either within eyesight or earshot of Ms.

Pierro at all times during the visits. Ms. Pierro was also told that she could stop the visits at any time or contact the county if she was having any problems with the parental supervision. Ms. Pierro agreed to the visitation in her home and assured the County that she was a strong person, able to adequately deal with the parents and appropriate supervision. Based on Ms. Pierro's assurances, Ms. McKeehan and Mr. Heckler authorized her to supervise parental visits in her home on a schedule which she could determine.

b. Eunice Pierro's husband died on January 21, 1987. Because of an extended illness, he had been residing in an apartment away from the home during the period before his death. Shortly after Mr. Pierro died, Ms. Pierro's 21-year-old son, Charles, moved into the house. Charles spent much of his time at work as a disc jockey and living with several girlfriends. Consequently, although he had moved into his mother's house, he was only there intermittently. Eunice Pierro did not inform Hennepin County that Charles had moved into the home, however.

7. On March 11, 1987, Hennepin County Social Worker Jan Darcy conducted an inspection of the Pierro home. During the inspection, Ms. Darcy observed Janitor in a Drum, bleach and other cleaning supplies located on a shelf adjacent to the children's play area in the basement. Additionally, Ms. Darcy

observed that there was an operational gas stove in the laundry area in the basement which was accessible to children. Ms. Pierro admitted at that time that children had, on occasion, turned the stove on. At the end of the inspection, Ms. Darcy became aware that one of the Witta children was sitting on a chair very quietly. Ms. Pierro stated that the child was being disciplined and had been placed in the chair shortly before Ms. Darcy arrived. Ms. Darcy had been in the home for approximately one and one-half hours when this child was observed on the chair. When Ms. Darcy exited the home, after discussing appropriate care and conditions in the house, Ms. Pierro stated that in the past, "We never got any of the fucking shit we get nowadays."

8. Ms. Pierro had been cautioned twice on previous occasions in December of 1986 and February of 1987 by county social workers regarding storage of cleaning products (Janitor in a Drum) adjacent to the children's play area in the basement. Ms. Pierro had informed Ms. Darcy on March 11, 1987, that she had recently placed the Janitor in a Drum where it was observed because it had been removed from her deceased husband's apartment.

9. On May 27, 1987, Eunice Pierro signed a "Provider's Agreement" with Hennepin County which stated, in part, that: (1) Ms. Pierro would keep the County informed about all persons living in the home and others having regular contact with the foster children; (2) that there were no other adults living in the home at that time; and (3) the County had requested that Charles not be used as a babysitter or spend any unsupervised time with the foster children.

10. During the summer of 1987, Steven Heckler specifically permitted Charles to accompany Sherry and Winston Minor and the Witta children on a trip to Valleyfair because MS. Pierro could not go along on the day scheduled.

11. Charles continued to reside at the Pierro home from late January 1987 through the time of the hearing.

12. Ms. Pierro did not drive and if Joseph or Amanda missed the school bus, she had to find alternative transportation for them. On several occasions, Ms. Pierro asked Mr. or Mrs. Minor to drive the children to school.

Other "friends" were also asked to drive the Witta children to school and did so several times. When the Minors drove the children to school, Charles accompanied them in the car on two occasions. The Judge specifically finds that Joseph and Amanda have been transported to or from school by their parents with no "third" person in the car.

13. In early September of 1987, Amanda came home after school with her underpants on inside out and her blouse on backwards, She offered no explanation when questioned by Ms. Pierro. On another day early in the school year, Amanda did not come home at the usual time. Ms. Pierro called the school and police regarding her "disappearance". The police called back to inform Ms. Pierro that "someone" had brought Amanda to a pizza place on Lowry and left her there. Amanda did not furnish any explanation for this incident either. Eunice Pierro reported both of these incidents to Steve Heckler.

14. Virginia Haiden, a child protection case aide, transported Joseph and Amanda to speech therapy appointments or out-of-home visitation by the parents. On September 9, 1987, Ms. Haiden telephoned Ms. Pierro to remind her that she would be transporting Joseph and Amanda to speech therapy on Friday,

September 11. Eunice Pierro suggested to Ms. Haiden that she (Haiden) take Amanda to school and then drop Joseph off at his parents' home so that his father, Winston, could take him to school. Ms. Haiden reported this conversation to Steven Heckler, who contacted Eunice Pierro regarding the apparent breach of the supervision arrangement. Ms. Pierro denied she had ever suggested to Ms. Haiden that Joseph be dropped off at his parents' home.

15. In early 1987, Eunice Pierro stated to Virginia Haiden in Amandd'S presence that she (Eunice) felt that Amanda Witta was mentally ill or crazy and that if Amanda ever had a baby, she would probably kill it like her mother did. (This refers to the unexplained death of the baby in the care of the Minors.)

16. Linda McKeehan had scheduled an appointment to visit the Wittd children at the Pierro home at 4:00 p.m, on July 13, 1987. Mr. and Mrs. Minor had also scheduled a visitation the same afternoon. Before McKeehan or the Minors arrived, Ms. Pierro discovered that a mistake had been made on a money order she had obtained at a convenience store which needed to be corrected. Mr. and Mrs. Minor arrived at the home in separate cars and Ms. Pierro requested Mrs. Minor to drive her to the store to get a new money order. At that time, Charles was mowing the lawn. Mr. Minor remained at the home, with the Witta children, while Ms. Pierro was driven to the store by Mrs. Minor. Ms. McKeehan arrived at the home at approximately 4:00 and found Mr. Minor alone in the house with Amanda and Joseph. Ms. McKeehan walked through the first level of the house with the children and they got their bikes out of the bedroom. Ms. McKeehan told Mr. Minor that he should be aware that unsupervised visitation was not permitted. Mr. Minor then summoned Charles to come in from the front yard. Ms. McKeehan left and later reported this to Steve Heckler.

11. Eunice Pierro oftentimes had an additional adult "helper" in the home to assist her in supervision of the foster children. This enabled Ms. Pierro to use the bathroom or take a nap with the assurance that the children were being watched and cared for. These "helpers" included: Joann Walker, Ms. Pierro's natural daughter; Berness Burnell, a 69-year-old neighbor; and Lorraine Smaller, a long-time friend and neighbor. Ms. Burnell spent a great deal of time at the Pierro home on a regular basis.

18. Joseph and Amanda Witta shared a bedroom in the Pierro home. They

each had their own bed and the bedroom was very 'home-like', decorated with pictures and toys. One-half of the basement area was a remodeled children's play area where toys, games and other child activity "devices" were located.

19. Over the course of their 16-month stay at the Pierro home, Joseph and Amanda's speech improved, they stopped their continual fighting, and some bad "habits" were eliminated.

20. Amanda Witta was sexually abused by her father, Winston Minor. However, the Judge does not specifically find that this sexual abuse occurred either in the Pierro home or during the period of time when Eunice Pierro provided foster care.

21. In early September of 1987, Steve Heckler received two messages on his telephone recording device stating that the Witta children had been observed alone with their parents at the Minor home. These were anonymous

callers. Mr. Heckler took no action as a result of these calls but after Virginia Haiden informed him in mid-September that Eunice Pierro had instructed her to drop Joseph off at his parents' home, Heckler scheduled a meeting with Ms. Pierro on September 22, 1987. During the meeting, Eunice Pierro denied that she had permitted any unsupervised visitation by Sherry and/or Winston Minor. Additionally, Ms. Pierro told Mr. Heckler that the "system" was racist and unfair and that Mr. Heckler was "nothing more than a white boy in a white system."

22. Subsequent to the September 22, 1987 meeting, Mr. Heckler and Hennepin County Child Protection decided to remove the Witta children from the Pierro home. This occurred in early October 1987. Joseph and Amanda were placed in another foster home.

23. Subsequent to the removal of the Witta children from Eunice Pierro's home, the County continued to investigate allegations of unsupervised visitation and sexual abuse which had occurred to the Witta children while they were in the custody of Eunice Pierro. After the investigation was completed, Hennepin County recommended to the Commissioner of Human Services that Ms. Pierro's family foster care license be revoked. Ms. Pierro was notified, in writing, on December 11, 1987 by the Department of Human Services that her license would be revoked. Ms. Pierro filed a timely appeal of the revocation and this hearing resulted.

24. During the period of time that Ms. Pierro cared for the Witta children, she became friends with Winston and Sherry Minor.

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Administrative Law Judge and the Commissioner of Human Services have jurisdiction over the matter pursuant to Minn. Stat. 14.50 and 245A.08 (1988).

2. The Notice and Order for Hearing issued by Hennepin County was proper in all respects and the County and Department of Human Services have complied with all relevant substantive and procedural requirements of law and rule.

3. Pursuant to Minn. Stat. 245A.07, subd. 3 (1988), the Commissioner

of Human Services may suspend, revoke or Make probationary a foster care license if the license holder fails to comply fully with applicable laws and rules.

4. Pursuant to Minn. Stat. 245A.08, subd. 3(a) (1988), the Commissioner must initially demonstrate reasonable cause for the proposed revocation of a family foster care license. If reasonable cause for the action is shown, the burden of proof shifts to the licensee to demonstrate, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the license holder is in full compliance with applicable laws and/or rules.

5. The County alleges that the following rules were not complied with by Eunice Pierro:

9545.0070 NOTICE to AGENCY OF CHANGES AFFECTING LICENSES

The agency must be notified, in advance, of any changes that would affect the terms of the license, such as a change of address or additional persons in the home.

9545.0080 ADULT ROOMERS OR BOARDERS

An FFH may not have adult roomers or boarders unrelated to the FFH provider without special permission of the agency. The FFH shall keep the agency informed about all persons living in the home and all others having regular contact with the foster child in the foster home.

9545.0090 PERSONAL QUALITIES OF FOSTER FAMILY HOME APPLICANTS

FFH applicants shall be kind, Mature, and responsible people with a genuine liking for children. They shall possess consistent and healthy methods of handling the lifestyle unique of their own families. Evaluation of applications shall consider cultural differences.

Reason: Children who must live apart from their own homes are uniquely in need of stable, understanding families. Many children needing placement are emotionally, mentally, or physically handicapped. These children need extra understanding and parenting to cope with their problems.

- A. Satisfactory Compliance: AN FFH license shall not be issued or renewed where any person (except foster children) living in the household has any of the following characteristics:
 - (1) a conviction of, or admission of, or substantial evidence of an act of assault, or child battering, or child abuse, or child molesting, or child neglect;

- B. Satisfactory Compliance: In order to protect children in foster care and assure them the maximum opportunities for growth and development, each family caring for children shall be evaluated on the following essential elements:
 - (3) be in touch with their own feelings, be able to express these feelings, and have a capacity to look at themselves realistically as to the kinds of children they Can accept and work with;

- (7 have the ability to give positive guidance, care, and training to a child according to his stage of growth, special abilities, and limitations;
- (8) have the ability to use discipline in a constructive rather than destructive way;
- (9) understand, accept, and seek to nurture cultural , spiritual, racial, and affectional ties of the child;
- (10) have the ability and flexibility to accept a child in placement who has special needs, treat a foster child as a member of their family, recognizing that a foster child has other family ties;
- (11) have the ability to accept the foster child's own family and maintain an understanding relationship with them;

- (14) be able to constructively resolve problems when difficulties arise.

9545.0160 PROHIBITION AGAINST ABUSE

No child shall be subjected to physical or psychological abuse.

Reason: Although families differ in their approach to discipline, harsh or threatening methods are particularly damaging to children in foster care. Discipline should be defined as an overall plan for teaching acceptable behavior; punishment is, more narrowly, negative reinforcement for unacceptable behavior. The carrying out of the individual plan for a foster child or the contract between the child and the foster parents involving specified consequences should not be construed as imposing punishment on that child.

Satisfactory Compliance:

- A. Methods of discipline to be used in the FFH shall be discussed with the agency during the application process. Child training and discipline shall be handled with kindness and understanding.

- C. No child in care shall be subjected to verbal abuse, derogatory remarks about himself or members of his family, or to threats to expel the child from the foster home.

9545.0190 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Subpart 3. Cleanliness and freedom from hazard. The house and premises shall be reasonably clean, reasonably neat, and free from hazards that jeopardize health and safety.

Satisfactory Compliance:

- C. All medicines, chemicals, cleaning supplies, and other toxic substances shall be stored out of the reach of children. They must not be stored with or immediately beside food products.

Subpart 4. Supervision of children. Children in care shall be adequately supervised at all times.

9545.0100 COOPERATION BETWEEN APPLICANTS AND AGENCIES

FFH applicants and agencies must be able to work in partnership.

Reason: The agency has overall responsibility for planning with the child. The service of foster parents is an integrdl and important part of the plan. The relationship between the FFH and the agency must be one of mutual trust and respect.

6. Hennepin County has established reasonable cause to support violations of Minn. Rules pts. 9545.0070; 9545.0080; 9545.0090B.7, 8 and 14; 9545.0100; 9545.0160; 9545.0190, subp, 3, subp. 3C and subp. 4. The Licensee has not proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she is in compliance with those rules.

Based upon the foregoing Conclusions, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following:

RECOMMENDATION

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that the Commissioner of Human Services affirm the decision to revoke Eunice Pierro's foster care license.

Dated this 7th day of February, 1989.

PETER C. ERICKSON
Administrative Law Judge

NOTICE

Pursuant to Minn. Stat. 14.62, subd. 1, the agency is required to serve its final decision upon each party and the Administrative Law Judge by first class mail.

Reported: Taped. Transcript Prepared by Mary Ann Hintz.

MEMORANDUM

The record in this matter is clear that Charles Pierro moved into Eunice Pierro's home in late January of 1987 and continues to reside there. Although Charles may not be present in the home for a substantial portion of each week, the record shows that he has unlimited access to the home and could "live" there on a daily basis if he so desired. The provider's agreement that Ms. Pierro signed on May 27, 1987 stated clearly that she would inform the County "about all persons living in the home and all others having regular contact with the foster child in the foster home." Additionally, Ms. Pierro "signed off" on the statement that there was no other adult living in her home. Pursuant to the provider's agreement, and Minn. Rules pts. 9545.0070 and 9545.0080, Ms. Pierro had an obligation to report Charles' presence in the home to the County. She did not and thus violated the rules and provider's agreement.

The record shows that during Jan Darcy's visit to Eunice Pierro's home on March 11, 1987, Ms. Pierro was disciplining one of the Witta children by having that child sit on a chair for an extended period of time (approximately one and one-half hours). During another visit by Virginia Haiden, Eunice Pierro made several derogatory statements to Ms. Haiden concerning Amanda Witta in Amanda's presence (see Finding 15). Although Ms. Pierro denied making the statements, the Judge finds it highly unlikely that Ms. Haiden would "make up" the comments she stated were made. These two incidents constitute inappropriate behavior and discipline in violation of Minn. Rules pts. 9545.0090B.7 and 8 and 9545.0160. The Judge does point out, however,

that the overwhelming weight of the record shows that Eunice Pierro was a very loving, well-meaning foster parent. These two incidents appear to be isolated and not indicative of a course of conduct.

The record is also clear that Ms. Pierro stored dangerous cleaning products in her basement on shelving adjacent to the children's play area. She had been warned about this on two previous occasions before being cited for the allegation herein on March 11, 1987. Additionally, she was aware that children could be in danger by turning on the burners of the gas stove which was accessible to them in the basement. This condition could have easily been corrected by the installation of a gas turn-off valve in the gas line. Ms. Pierro contends that if children were in the basement, they were closely supervised at all times. However, it takes very little time for a child to turn on a gas burner and be burned or reach for and swallow harmful liquid in a container. Neither of these conditions should have been present in the home and both constitute a violation of Minn. Rules pt. 9545.0190, subp. 3 and subp. 3C.

The record herein shows that Eunice Pierro had a very "combative" relationship with County Child Protection Worker Steve Heckler and others on the social service staff. It is evident that Ms. Pierro felt that actions taken against her by Hennepin County were racially based. There is no support for that allegation in the record. Ms. Pierro's inability to deal with problems that arose without citing race as a motivating factor for the County, and her more general inability to admit and face "responsibility" issues concerning the Witta children, constitute a violation of Minn. Rules 9545.0100 and 9545.0090B.14.

Both Joseph and Amanda Witta stated, without contradiction, that they were transported to or from school by their parents without anyone else in the car. There is no other evidence to corroborate this allegation except for Ms. Pierro's statement to Virginia Haiden that she should drop Joseph off at the Minor home so Mr. Minor could take Joseph to school. No one testified at the hearing that they observed one or both of the Minors alone with either of the Witta children transporting them to or from school. Eunice Pierro denies that she ever permitted the Minors to transport the children alone. The Judge has not been convinced, however, that Ms. Pierro did not permit unsupervised transportation at some time. Consequently, the Licensee has failed to meet her burden. The Judge points out, additionally, that it is quite possible

that the Minors may have picked the children up after school without Eunice Pierro's knowledge. This might explain the circumstances set forth in Finding

13. Although the Judge has not found that Eunice Pierro permitted a specific incident of unsupervised transportation, he has also concluded that the Licensee has not met her burden to show that she never allowed that to occur.

Amanda Witta has denied that she was ever sexually abused by her father. Joseph Witta described, with life-like detail, how his father committed at least one act of sexual abuse on Amanda. The Judge has little doubt that this did in fact occur at some time. Joseph's demonstration of the sexual act on the videotape can lead to no other conclusion. The County contends that at least one act of sexual abuse did occur at the Pierro home when Eunice Pierro was absent and the Minors were permitted unsupervised visitation. In Joseph's first interview conducted on December 10, 1987, he stated that he witnessed an act of sexual contact between his father and Amanda at Ms. Pierro's home in the "upstairs" bedroom while his mother was downstairs. He further stated that his mother had come into the room, observed the activity, and gotten mad at his father. Joseph said that his mother hit his father at that time. During Joseph's second interview, videotaped on January 8, 1988, he again

stated that he witnessed his father having oral sex with Amanda at Ms. Pierro's house. However, when the interviewer repeated his statement, Joseph corrected himself and said that the sexual contact had occurred at his parents' house in a bedroom. He went on to state that his mother was in the kitchen and came into the bedroom, observed the activity, and Slapped his father. Later in the interview, the interviewer asked a "leading" question concerning the sexual activity that occurred at Ms. Pierro's house, to which Joseph responded in the affirmative, saying that Ms. Pierro was at the store when this occurred.

As the Judge has stated above, it is clear that Winston Minor engaged in some sexual activity with Amanda at some time. However, because Amanda has denied that any sexual activity occurred with her father and Joseph is not clear about where the activity occurred, the Judge cannot find that the sexual conduct occurred in Ms. Pierro's home. it seems likely that this activity occurred at the Minor home before the children were taken away and that Joseph's statement concerning Ms. Pierro's home was made primarily because that is the living situation most recent in his memory. His first interview statements that the mother was downstairs while the activity occurred would not seem to make very much sense if the activity had occurred in the Pierro home because the kitchen and bedrooms are located on the first floor. The record does not reflect what the "layout" is of the Minor home.

The County alleges that "neglect", pursuant to Minn. Stat. 626.55b, subd. 2(c), has been shown because Ms. Pierro permitted unsupervised visitation either in the home or in transporting the children to school, which had an imminent and serious endangerment for the Witta children's physical or mental health. The Judge has not concluded that neglect has been shown. In the instance set forth herein (July 13, 1987 -Finding 16) where Ms. Pierro permitted unsupervised visitation, the Judge does not find that she was aware that imminent danger to the children could result. At that time, Charles was present in the front yard when Mr. Minor was alone with the children in the house. Joe County had already authorized Charles to "supervise" a trip to

Valleyfair with the Minors. Eunice Pierro had become well acquainted with the Minors during their home visits and saw no basis for risk or endangerment to the children. Although the Judge has found that Mr. and/or Mrs. Minor had transported the children "alone" to or from school, it has not specifically been found that Ms. Pierro permitted the Minors to come to her home and take the children to school without someone riding along. It is quite possible that the Minors picked up the children after school on several occasions to gain unsupervised access. Consequently, the Judge has not found a Violation of part 9545.0090A.(1) based on neglect.

The Judge has found, however, a Violation Of Minn. Rules pt. 9545.0190, subp. 4, "Adequate Supervision", because the Judge has found at least one occasion when unsupervised home visitation was permitted with only Charles present. this was in direct conflict with the directives of the County and constitutes a violation of the rule.

The Judge must further point out that in almost all respects, Eunice Pierro provided a more than satisfactory foster home for Joseph and Amanda Witta. These were difficult children, however, and Ms. Pierro's frustration became apparent at times. Additionally, her inability to drive and the requirement that both of the children get to school placed an additional burden on her energies. Her friendship with the Minors, in conjunction with

the restrictions and cautions imposed by the County, created an "approach-avoidance" situation in which the race issue arose. Although the Judge has concluded that there are grounds to revoke Ms. Pierro's foster care license, it is apparent that she could satisfactorily function as a foster-home provider with less difficult and stressful placements. The Judge urges that this alternative be considered prior to a final decision on the revocation.

P.C.E.