

MINUTES OF THE
MEETING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SIXTY-FIRST SESSION
NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE
May 26, 1981

The Senate Committee on Legislative Affairs was called to order by Chairman Eugene Echols, at 2:05 p.m., Tuesday, May 26, 1981, in Room 243 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Meeting Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Eugene Echols, Chairman
Senator James I. Gibson
Senator Thomas C.R. Wilson (arrived later)
Senator Melvin Close (arrived later)
Senator Jean E. Ford
Senator Sue Wagner

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Betty Nader, Committee Secretary
Donald A. Rhodes, Deputy Research Director
Frank Daykin, Legislative Counsel

Senator Echols called the meeting to order. He stated he had invited members of the Research Department and the Bill Drafting Department to share with the committee. He stated that Senators Wagner and Wilson will be speaking on legislation for the prison study, as well as himself with the arrival of Senators Wilson and Close.

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 33--Directs legislative commission to conduct study of Nevada Occupational Diseases Act.

Senator Ford stated she had been asked to reconsider this bill, which had been indefinitely postponed at the last meeting of the committee, on the grounds that the Nevada Industrial Commission be requested to make the study. She would like to support the measure if this can be done, and proposed reconsideration with the arrival of the other senators.

Senate Committee on Legislative Affairs
May 26, 1981

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 684--Increases compensation of certain employes and officers of legislature.

Senator Gibson stated the area of Sergeant at Arms was separated by committee areas and building areas, as a matter of statute. The position of Sergeant at Arms does not work for the secretary, he stated. The responsibilities have been separated and committee hearings and building areas have been assigned to this position. Senator Close was in charge of a subcommittee to look into the reorganization and this had come out of their recommendations. Now the Sergeant at Arms receives less salary than a senior committee stenographer. Their responsibilities are entirely different and there is a status involved. Senator Gibson stated the salary ranges were recommended by the Senate and Assembly Secretaries, which involves both positions of Sergeant at Arms.

Senator Ford inquired about the compensation (repealer) for the Chief Clerk for the Assembly, which was an additional \$15 per day. She asked whether these people would be paid in the event of moving adjournment. Senator Gibson requested Mr. Daykin to reply. He stated he had not seen any recommendation to change the 3-day recess in Assembly Bill 684. He mentioned that NRS 218.127 was there by repeal, and there is language to cover the chief clerk.

Senator Wagner asked whether a motion was needed on this item, and Senator Gibson requested adjustment of this one item.

Senator Wagner moved for amendment to Assembly Bill No. 684 to make the salary of the Sergeant at Arms the same as that of the Assistant Secretary, for both houses, and for approval of the motion. (Exhibit C)

Senator Ford seconded the motion.

The motion carried, unanimously. (Senators Close and Wilson were absent for the vote).

Senator Echols asked for a preliminary hearing on the prison study bill and made a few opening remarks on the resolution.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 56--Directs legislative commission to conduct interim study of planning capability and future needs of Nevada prison system.

Senator Echols advised there is a tremendous problem with the prisons, many studies have been made, taking a lot of the time

Senate Committee on Legislative Affairs
May 26, 1981

of the directors and staff. He asked for correlation with the past studies, using the results of those studies. He requested Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Daykin and Public Works Board Director, Bill Hancock to attend the meeting. Further, he suggested they cooperate with the Public Works Board because the Board has already been allocated \$150,000, and perhaps coming up with some answers to the future needs of Nevada prisons, relieving the directors of the prisons for the next six months. Senator Ford stated she would be interested in hearing from Mr. Hancock how he expects to proceed to do what the Finance Committee has given him the money to do.

Mr. Bill Hancock, Director, Public Works Board, stated they have been appropriated \$150,000 to expand a study they had anticipated starting in 1982. Because of the concerns and expanding prison population they now feel it advisable to expedite the study, which is something the Public Works Department suggested to Director of Prisons, Chuck Wolff. They have been asked to do a wide variety of different things by a variety of different people. Basically, he said, under that study they propose to start out with an analysis of the prison population projections which everybody admits are short-lived, not knowing what validity they may have. They seem to be correlating pretty closely with what has happened, but only in existence for 10 months. Simultaneously, he said they will try to develop some sort of model to determine what percent of the prison population goes into the different categories, with the idea that the most expensive thing they might do would be to build more maximum-security or heavy-duty institutions.

The alternative to that would be more honor camps, restitution centers, and this type of work. If they can determine the classification and then from that do the physical planning and investigations necessary to determine what has to be built, where it can be built and how much it will cost, he stated, they hope to be able to complete this study by November of this year. His initial reaction to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 56 was that maybe it would be better to wait until that study had been done; however after further reflection, and from the experience he had on the Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 40 study of efficiency and economy of Public Works Board during the last year, he felt it quite an advantage to have the Legislative branch involved in that sort of study. He felt to avoid an adversary position, which he thought they did avoid under Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 40 study, he may be able to solve a serious problem. He felt this proposed interim study should be done in conjunction with the State Public Works planning study, which

Senate Committee on Legislative Affairs
May 26, 1981

Senator Wagner agreed it made good sense to tie the two studies together. She felt Mr. Hancock had made a good case with one exception. She said of all the recommendations of the Prison Board which were submitted this time, over half of the recommendations have passed, and supported by all members of the subcommittee and the administration of the Department of Prisons, which made that job easier.

Senator Echols asked Mr. Hancock some leading questions regarding the opening remarks concerning policy or procedure to follow in this study, of the agencies working together closely the first six months and freeing the prison staff to go to work and manage the prison and allowing the committee to go to work and come up with a master plan. Mr. Hancock replied there is no way that the Public Works Board can do a prison study without involving the prison administration. They must indicate what sort of programs and how they see the prison developing, with respect to numbers and needs. He said if \$20 million appropriation for future prison construction materializes through Interim Finance Committee, decisions must start happening right after the first of the year, so it is doubtful they will be able to wait for the six-month period.

Senator Echols felt they were pursuing a collision-course and the decision has been made to build prisons. Mr. Hancock corrected this statement to say they are going to build prison facilities. He hoped the stereo-type institution of Northern Nevada Correctional Center, and another correctional center and the Jean Correctional Center could expand. He felt there were a lot of physical problems to solve but over and above those things, he hoped they were looking at honor camps and restitution centers. He mentioned speaking about \$72,000 per cell to build a medium security prison, the State cannot afford to do that every two years. Senator Wagner mentioned \$50,000 per bed at Indian Springs. He replied \$30 million and 600 inmates, at \$50,000 a block. He mentioned a study they had worked with Howard Barrett on as far as the bonding capacity of the State. They took that figure and inflated it 10% per year and you end up with \$70,000 a cell, so they must build as much as they can of the cheapest type of construction possible.

Senator Echols asked whether he knew of any out-of-state expertise sought on what they are doing regarding this construction with intelligent, and sophisticated documentation. Mr. Hancock said this is possible, and they had met with Chuck Wolff a number of times on this subject, who had cited South Carolina, Virginia and Nebraska; and is also coming up with some names as to who can help them with them with prison population projections and

Senate Committee on Legislative Affairs
May 26, 1981

classifications. Apparently, he said there are some experts in that field. In construction of prisons under way now, he said they are involved with one of the foremost prison architectural consultants, H.D.R. of New Orleans, and they are doing much the same thing Nevada is doing in many other states.

Senator Echols said many look with question upon the reports they get, but this can be proven. He stated he had a memo the other day from American Friends Committee which said the Federal Department of Justice recently commissioned \$1-1/2 million study for the nation's prisons and jails "I am sure that was the federal system". They concluded new construction was not an economically feasible or practical solution to the problem. They further concluded that 60 to 80% of the persons in federal institutions could safely be released without any threat to society. He assumed the comment could be verified, although a broad philosophical statement. He recommended looking at these reports when making decisions in the area of prevention and prevention of crimes and punishment for crime, and getting it into some sort of management implementation if it makes sense. He asked how extensive the planning might be. Mr. Hancock suggested for every hour the Department spends they will have to spend an hour.

Senator Wagner did not believe the prison administration would need to become involved in this type of planning. She said in studies across the country looking at what other areas have done and studying policy questions about who should be incarcerated, legislators should be involved. She said if it is decided that punishment is one of the major reasons we lock them up then we have to decide how we are going to pay for it.

Senator Echols cited the history in Michigan which was reported to the committee (over the past seven or eight years) which indicated to him that the prison systems in there 24 months should be telling the legislators, as opposed to the opposite. They thought the people of Michigan wanted the prisoners locked up, and most people want the prisoners incarcerated.

Senator Wagner stated it had been agreed to approve the study, and they now must decide how to make the study work. She felt Mr. Hancock's suggestion was a good one in terms of some members of the Legislature working with the Public Works Board in this whole area. She felt this was reasonable and a good use of the money appropriated and comment about working together and being ready for the next session was logical, and they should make a decision and move on it.

Senate Committee on Legislative Affairs
May 26, 1981

Senator Echols asked to make a point about the episode which had happened in Michigan, where they submitted a bond issue to the people, that if they wanted the people locked up they must support a bond issue. They had not voted it in, but had turned it down two to one, and subsequently the Legislature went into special session and gave the Governor privilege as the only alternative to release the less serious offender. The voters were diametrically opposed to what the Legislators thought they wanted to do, and this could be the same situation in Nevada. Senator Wagner said it might suggest the legislators are not in tune with the people they represent. He suggested looking for different means than in the past for solutions to the problem and there had been some progress made by Mr. Hancock being present.

Senator Close arrived at 2:40 p.m.

Senator Ford asked whether Senator Wagner had suggested on Line 20 that the Legislative Commission be directed to appoint "x" number of legislators to work with the Public Works Board in carrying out their planning activities prior to the next session.

Senator Close suggested the resolution is broader than the planning activities, so he felt they could work with the Public Works Board only as far as the planning activity is concerned and then carry on from there. He recalled they were going to take out "planning capability" and put in "future needs of the prison" and put in something else to go beyond that.

Senator Close stated in the Public Works Board study the \$150,000 would not get into this problem of sentencing, etc., but was a population projection project, based on verification of need.

Senator Ford agreed that this is policy, and the realm that legislators should be involved in, but it is obvious what the consensus of the Legislature is, and that is to continue the thought that punishment is the main reason for putting someone in prison.

Mr. Frank Daykin stated he had pretty well covered anything that he would have to comment on, and felt there would be merit in trying to utilize as much as possible the several studies we have. He mentioned a study involving Senator Wagner and Senator Lamb, two years prior to that time, plus a number of lateral studies. He advised them not to restudy, but make effective use of the data already collected and focus that on the present problem in trying to decide what kind of prison system is needed and the cost to implement it.

Senate Committee on Legislative Affairs
May 26, 1981

Senator Echols asked for information, whether any of them had looked at the studies that have been completed, noting those on the rostrum, specifically the bottom five which are extensive studies. He said in addition to this group there was consideration by the Interim Finance Committees, who have come to the legislators and been deeply involved with the budget department and each member of the house and subcommittees and committees, appearing on every bill that comes up. He said he did not know how they have time to do anything at the prison facility.

Senator Close stated what is being reviewed is correspondence which relates to studies. He felt this had been resolved in the previous meeting on Thursday when they had adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 56, subject to language change, Line 21. Senator Echols stated that Senators Wilson and Wagner were to bring in new language. Senator Wagner stated this committee established they could indeed work with the Public Works Board. It is obvious they are happy and comfortable with that meaning the areas that would be similar. She did not believe the resolution had to be redrafted to make it fit into the Public Works Board, but that could be done in a voluntary way. She suggested changing the language and passing the resolution.

Senator Ford asked to hear the recommendation for the change of language.

Senator Wilson arrived at 2:50 p.m.

Senator Wagner advised that she and Senator Close and Wilson had met at the close of the last meeting, and the amendment is limited to planning of future needs. She felt this could be spelled out by removing the word, "capability" on Line 21. It does include the scope of the master plan which could tie in with the Public Works Board. She also said because the last thrust was alternatives to incarceration, which should continue to be of interest to the Legislature, and it was clear that even the Secretary of the Public Works Board suggests that. She felt in this study they should look back and see what is happening in those alternative programs they have established, to see if they are working, with a report back in terms of their effectiveness, whether they could be expanded. We know they are cost effective, and assuming they are going to work, and have no information to date except on the honor camp. The basics are there: planning, master-planning and you might add a word suggesting looking at the alternatives they had established to see how effective they have been.

Senate Committee on Legislative Functions
May 26, 1981

Senator Wagner outlined what she is trying to accomplish: Plan, master plan and review the reports and studies of recent years and the program as implemented as a result of legislative and executive action.

Senator Close added "Review the effectiveness of alternates to incarceration as provided by our study previously and implemented during the session." Senator Ford felt it should not be alternatives, alone, because that was one study, but there were others, she said.

Senator Wagner agreed to work with Mr. Daykin on the language of the resolution, reviewing the studies and working with the Department of Public Works.

Senator Echols stated that Donald Rhodes had done an excellent job for the committee and of itemizing the studies.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 56--Directs legislative commission to conduct interim study of planning capability and future needs of Nevada prison system.

Senator Close moved to amend Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 56 in accordance with the language proposed by Senator Wagner and for approval of the resolution. (Exhibit F)

Senator Ford seconded the motion.

The motion carried, unanimously.

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 33--Directs legislative commission to conduct study of Nevada Occupational Diseases Act.

Senator Ford moved for reconsideration of Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 33, whereby the committee had voted for indefinite postponement. (Exhibit G)

Senator Wagner seconded the motion.

Senator Gibson asked for an explanation prior to voting on the motion. Senator Ford explained a proposal before them asking for the support of the study on the grounds the Nevada Industrial Commission agreed to do the study, submitted by Mr. Gebb. Senator Gibson stated his objection had been to the legislators study. Senator Ford asked that the motion read "The Nevada Industrial Commission would do the study and report back to the Committee at the next session of the Legislature." Senator Gibson

Senate Committee on Legislative Affairs
May 26, 1981

Senator Ford moved to amend and approve Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 33 to include a study by the Nevada Industrial Commission.

Senator Close seconded the motion.

The motion carried, unanimously.

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 48--Provides for compensation of clergy for services rendered to assembly and senate in 61st session of Nevada Legislature.

Senator Wagner moved for approval of Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 48. (Exhibit D)

Senator Gibson seconded the motion.

The motion carried, unanimously.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 70--Directs legislative commission to study mass transit for cities and means of funding.

Senator Echols suggested the study could be done by the Committee on Taxation. He stated they had a proposed bill from Mass Transit and they had asked that the bill be drafted and studied. Senator Wagner pointed out Subsection 3 of the bill dealing with how to provide the money to operate the system. She stated any number of funding methods could be raised, but they may not be reasonable in light of the budget constraints. Senator Ford suggested this be studied by the committees on Taxation and Transportation.

Senator Gibson pointed out that the bill indicates the need for \$6 million which he felt could not come out of the general fund. Senator Echols suggested the Department of Transportation take care of No. 1 and No. 2. Senator Ford felt the commission should be directed to appoint a committee made up of persons from the Transportation and Taxation Committees and from the two houses. Senator Wagner suggested that be written into the bill.

Senator Wilson moved for adoption and approval of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 70. (Exhibit E)

Senator Wagner seconded the motion.

The motion carried, unanimously.

Senate Committee on Legislative Affairs
May 26, 1981

SENATE BILL 647--Limits distribution of free copies of and provides adjustable charges for legislative publications.

The Committee discussed this bill and the change might have negative affects on the system.

Senator Gibson moved for indefinite postponement of Senate Bill 647. (Exhibit F)

Senator Wilson seconded the motion.

The motion carried, unanimously.

Discussion ensued about late filing of legislative bills and Senator Ford proposed a rule which for next session would require a deadline for bill drafts for individual requests be moved up 20 days. Senator Wilson argued that the agencies are slow in presenting their bills, and many bills arrived after the deadline this session. He felt the problems may have involved more than deadlines. Senator Wagner mentioned setting up deadlines for bill introduction and requests and following on through, based on a 100-day session or whatever number of days is slated. Senator Wilson felt it frustrated the purpose to limit bills to a deadline. He said the committees were the only relief to an agency with major legislation, speaking of bill draft requests. He also suggested a frank discussion be held with staff members at the following meeting.

Senator Ford suggested holding a recess after the deadline or having no floor work so they might concentrate on getting this work out.

Senator Echols called a meeting for Thursday, May 28, 1981, in line with the request of Senator Wilson to discuss the bill drafting situation and anything that comes up in the interim.

The meeting recessed until Thursday, at 2 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:


Betty Nader, Secretary

Senate Committee on Legislative Affairs
May 26, 1981

APPROVED BY:


Senator Eugene Echols, Chairman

DATE: June 4, 1981

REVISED

SENATE AGENDA

3:30 p.m.
Posted 5/22/81

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Committee on Legislative Affairs, Room 243
Day Tuesday, Date May 26, 1981, Time 2:00 p.m.

Hearings

A.C.R. No. 48--Provides for compensation of clergy for services rendered to assembly and senate in 61st session of Nevada Legislature. (BDR 2127)

S.C.R. NO. 70--Directs legislative commission to study mass transit for cities and means of funding. (BDR 2126) Posted 5/25/81 Noon

Committee Work

S.B. No. 647--Limits distribution of free copies of and provides adjustable charges for legislative publications. (BDR 17-1698)

S.C.R. No. 56--Directs legislative commission to conduct interim study of planning capability and future needs of Nevada prison system. (BDR 1868)

A.B. No. 684--Increases compensation of certain employees and officers of legislature. (BDR 17-2114)

Any items referred to the Committee between now and Tuesday will be added to the agenda, as received.

ATTENDANCE ROSTER FORM

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON Legislative Affairs

DATE: 5/26/81 2 PM 11

<u>PLEASE PRINT</u> NAME	<u>PLEASE PRINT</u> ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	<u>PLEASE PRINT</u> TELEPHONE

A. B. 684

**ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 684—COMMITTEE ON
LEGISLATIVE FUNCTIONS**

MAY 16, 1981

Referred to Committee on Legislative Functions

**SUMMARY—Increases compensation of certain employees
and officers of legislature. (BDR 17-2114)**

**FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: No.
Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: Yes.**



EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

AN ACT relating to certain employees and officers of the legislature; increasing their compensation; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

1 **SECTION 1. NRS 218.230 is hereby amended to read as follows:**
2 **218.230 1. There [shall] *must* be paid to the several officers and**
3 **employees of the senate and assembly, for all services rendered by them**
4 **under the provisions of this chapter, the following sums of money for**
5 **each day's employment and no more:**

	Senate		
8	Assistant secretary.....	[\$51]	\$65
9	Assistant sergeant-at-arms.....	[32]	45
10	Clerks.....	[25]	35
11	Committee stenographer.....	[44]	55
12	History clerk.....	[45]	59
13	Journal clerk.....	[45]	59
14	Minute clerk.....	[45]	59
15	Page.....	[24]	33
16	Secretary.....	[65]	80
17	<i>Senior committee stenographer</i>		57
18	Sergeant-at-arms.....	[42]	55
19	Stenographers.....	[38]	48
20	Supervisor of clerks.....	[38]	48
21	Supervisor of stenographers.....	[45]	59
22	Typist.....		40

Assembly

1			
2	Assistant chief clerk.....	[\$51]	\$65
3	Assistant sergeant-at-arms.....	[32]	45
4	Assistant supervisor of clerks.....	[35]	46
5	Chief clerk.....	[65]	80
6	Clerks.....	[25]	35
7	Committee stenographer.....	[44]	55
8	History clerk.....	[45]	59
9	Journal clerk.....	[45]	59
10	Minute clerk.....	[45]	59
11	Pages.....	[24]	33
12	Senior committee stenographer.....		57
13	Sergeant-at-arms.....	[42]	55
14	Stenographers.....	[38]	48
15	Supervisor of stenographers.....	[45]	59
16	Supervisor of clerks.....	[38]	48
17	Supply clerk.....	[31]	38
18	Typists.....	[28]	40

19 2. During periods of adjournment to a day certain, employees of the
20 legislature whose service is required shall perform duties as assigned and
21 are entitled to be paid the amount specified in this section for each day of
22 service.

23 SEC. 2. NRS 218.235 is hereby amended to read as follows:

24 218.235 When proper claims are filed with the director of the legis-
25 lative counsel bureau from time to time and approved by him pursuant to
26 law, there [shall] *must* be paid to the secretary of the senate *and to the*
27 *chief clerk of the assembly* from the legislative fund the secretary's
28 expenses *and the chief clerk's expenses* of initial travel from home to Car-
29 son City for a regular or special session of the legislature and return travel
30 after adjournment sine die of the session, and a subsistence allowance
31 must be paid to the secretary *and to the chief clerk* for each day of such
32 travel and each day of duty performed in connection with or during the
33 session, and when the legislature is in adjournment for more than 3 days
34 if [his] *their* services are required. The travel expenses and subsistence
35 allowances must be paid at the rates provided by law for public officers
36 and employees.

37 SEC. 3. NRS 218.237 is hereby repealed.

A. C. R. 48

**ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 48—
COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE FUNCTIONS**

MAY 20, 1981

—○—
Read and adopted

SUMMARY—Provides for compensation of clergy for services rendered to assembly and senate in 61st session of Nevada legislature. (BDR 2127)

—●—
EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—Providing for the compensation of clergy for services rendered to the assembly and senate in the 61st session of the Nevada legislature.

- 1 **WHEREAS**, During the present session of the legislature certain clergy,
2 representing various denominations, have rendered daily religious serv-
3 ices to the assembly and the senate; and
4 **WHEREAS**, A reasonable compensation should be provided for such
5 services; now, therefore, be it
6 *Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada, the Senate concur-*
7 *ring*, That the state controller is authorized and directed to pay the sum
8 of \$20 per service out of the legislative fund to members of the clergy
9 who have performed religious services for the assembly and the senate
10 during the 61st session of the Nevada legislature.

S. C. R. 70

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 70—
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

MAY 22, 1981

Referred to Committee on Legislative Affairs

SUMMARY—Directs legislative commission to study mass transit
for cities and means of funding. (BDR 2126)

EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—Directing the legislative commission
to study mass transit for cities and means of funding.

- 1 WHEREAS, The continuing growth in population of the cities of Nevada
2 combined with the increasing need to conserve fuel has made more urgent
3 the need to plan for improved systems of mass transit; and
4 WHEREAS, Efficient systems of mass transit would decrease air pollu-
5 tion and traffic congestion in the populous areas of this state; now, there-
6 fore, be it
7 *Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada, the Assembly con-*
8 *curring,* That the legislative commission is hereby directed to study the
9 problem of mass transit for cities in Nevada; and be it further
10 *Resolved,* That the study include an examination of:
11 1. The particular needs of the various cities and other urban areas;
12 2. The type of system best suited for each of these areas; and
13 3. The various alternatives which may be available for obtaining
14 money to finance the development and operation of the systems;
15 and be it further
16 *Resolved,* That the results of the study and any recommendations for
17 legislation be reported to the 62d session of the legislature.

S. C. R. 56

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 56—
SENATORS WAGNER AND WILSON**

MAY 6, 1981

Referred to Committee on Legislative Affairs

SUMMARY—Directs legislative commission to conduct interim study of planning capability and future needs of Nevada prison system. (BDR 1868)



EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—Directing the legislative commission to conduct an interim study of the planning capability and the future needs of the Nevada prison system.

- 1 **WHEREAS,** The Nevada legislature has appropriated over \$15 million
2 in 1975, over \$10 million in 1977, and over \$34 million in 1979, for
3 prison construction; and
4 **WHEREAS,** In 1979 and 1980 the legislative commission conducted a
5 study of the present and future needs of the state prison system includ-
6 ing the need for additional construction, as directed by Assembly Con-
7 current Resolution 41 of the 60th session of the legislature; and
8 **WHEREAS,** That study showed that the techniques used by the depart-
9 ment of prisons to estimate the future population of its institutions did
10 not provide an adequate basis for recommendations concerning the need
11 for future prison construction; and
12 **WHEREAS,** The need for an effective plan to project the future popu-
13 lation of the prison was also pointed out by a consultant from the
14 National Institute of Corrections, who was recently requested to assess
15 the problems of Nevada's prison system; and
16 **WHEREAS,** Plans are being discussed by this legislature to provide for
17 the issuance and sale of state bonds in the amount of approximately \$20
18 million to finance additional prison construction; now, therefore, be it
19 *Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada, the Assembly concur-*
20 *ring,* That the legislative commission is hereby directed to study the
21 planning capability of the department of prisons and the future needs
22 of the prison system; and be it further
23 *Resolved,* That the results of the study and any recommendations for
24 legislation be reported to the 62d session of the legislature.

Exhibit G

**THIS EXHIBIT IS MISSING FROM BOTH THE ORIGINAL
MINUTES AND THE MICROFICHE.**