

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

February 9, 2000 LB 652

system instead of relying on a hodgepodge of things that are being developed out of coordination with each other, not cost effectively and at very high cost to property taxpayers in Douglas and Sarpy County. And you have the sheet which gets to the financial side, which, as a former county commissioner, I would have been terribly concerned about, but as a legislator I'm concerned about that; but I'm also concerned about the lack of oversight that we have with a system that operates this way and, as you can see, this is a new phenomenon. Really, until the early nineties, this wasn't happening. This has started happening out of frustration for the fact that our facilities are overcrowded and we lack the placements at the state level. So that's the first half of this amendment. What it will do is require the Office of Juvenile Services to take these youth who are going to out-of-home placements at disposition. The second part of the amendment deals with the facility transfer. In 1994, this Legislature, and some of you were here, did a major reform of the juvenile justice system and looked at the deficiencies in that system and began a process of adding more community-based services and focusing it in state government, through the Office of Juvenile Services, and also planned to build a juvenile facility, a facility under the juvenile system for serious and chronic offenders in the juvenile system, and to serve the younger youth who were convicted as adults in the adult system. On a floor amendment in 1997, the facility was transferred to the adult system, thereby precluding the juvenile system from accessing the system. We have just received this juvenile facility master plan and it is recommending, and that's what the pink sheet that you have, it is recommending a facility that's essentially the same as the Omaha facility--a treatment facility for serious and chronic youth in the juvenile system who are now part of the population at Kearney or in a lot of these other placements that Douglas and Lancaster County are paying for, and also a place for sex offender treatment. We have a policy decision to make here. We can begin a process to develop a new facility to serve those youth, or we can have a compromise to go back to the original plan in 1994 and use the current facility that's adult only, convicted as adults only, to serve both populations. The third option would be to spend money to add housing units at the current facility to double its housing size, and I think we need to get there. That's a possibility eventually. What this proposal does is to say, at