

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

June 2, 1997

LB 512

money appropriated, it doesn't have to be spent. But we are looking at that this summer because we do have increased potential costs in this area that are going to be significant, much the same as it is now with the juveniles except that this says the counties shall not be liable for any costs for the care, custody, education, or maintenance of a juvenile pursuant to this case. And I assume then that means the state picks it up. We do need some more options. I understand there's a case here but I am concerned that \$6 million going into this program at this time. It is significant for counties, but it is also significant for the state and I do not see the necessity of the state picking this up this time. We're putting more money into juvenile services. Hopefully that should take care of that so I'm going to oppose the bill at this point.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Madam President, members. I, too, rise in opposition to the advancement of the bill at this time. I have supported it in the past and the concept seems appropriate, but I think we're approaching it in the wrong fashion. As I understand it, the whole problem that originated out of Douglas County can be, in fact, attributed back to Douglas County. They signed a contract for this out-of-state facility in Clarinda. They negotiated the terms of the contract, signed the contract which then opened up the possibility of the courts utilizing that facility. So here they are complaining about the costs of the facility, complaining about the situation they're in, but in fact they had some control and some responsibility for this occurring in the first place. And what they're suggesting under this, as I understand it, would continue the opportunity for the county to contract. It doesn't clarify this in here. They could end up continuing to contract for an out-of-state facility at whatever rate they contract with the state being on the hook to pay the cost. It's a blank check. What needs to happen, we need to work on this bill, and what we need to do is we need to clarify the role of the county and the state. We need to clarify the role of the court. We need to have some limits placed on the contracting and one of the articles that came out showed that Douglas County's contract, they ended up paying like 25 percent more rate than other similar situated entities were paying in the