

you want to keep in mind that the public health and safety is paramount, public welfare and safety is paramount to how you make these decisions. Number two is a caveat that we have a little bit, that we found in the select committee and that is we do have a very large probation system right now as most all states do where you have a lot of people that are on probation as opposed to incarceration. It's probably safe to say it's very overcrowded. The caseloads are so high for our probation workers that it's very, very difficult to keep as good a tab sometimes as you'd like on some of these people on probation. So you establish an intensive probation and instead of having caseloads of somewhere maybe as high as a hundred or more per probation officer on regular probation, we are looking at intensive supervision where your caseloads will be down more in the 15 to 25 range of number of probationers per person and probably 20 would be a pretty good number to use, that you have 20 cases per probation officer so that they can make daily checks, random and spontaneous checks of the residents to make sure that they have contacts all the time and at various times to make sure that these probationers are fulfilling the terms of their probation. But what we don't want to do is have this system become instead of a diversion from incarceration, we don't want this to become just an expansion of the regular probationary net. Now, admittedly, we are taking a little bit of risk here because what could possibly happen is that the judicial system could just be expanding a person who would normally go to regular probation and saying, we're going to put you on intensive probation. And if you do that, then you really haven't diverted anything from our incarceration problem. You have just made a bigger net of probation. We will save no money. We will not have any diversion and we'll just have a more intensive supervision for a person that would normally be on regular probation or a candidate like that. So I do feel it's important that I say for the record that is the intent of LB 1212 and now being amended into LB 220 that our goal with this intensive supervision probation is actual diversion from incarceration, and that the judicial system will look at that as our intent to suggest we do want to divert people from incarceration, those candidates that will not jeopardize unreasonably the safety and the welfare of the general public and that we'll cut down on costs of incarceration and numbers of incarceration for an identifiable public, identifiable candidate that can fall into this category, and that we don't want this to become just an additional probation system that just adds more people, instead of being on the regular probation they go into