

# **FACILITIES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS**

**Bulletin No. 101**



**LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION  
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU**

**STATE OF NEVADA**

**December 1972**

**Carson City, Nevada**



FINAL REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE  
FOR STUDY OF  
FACILITIES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS

Bulletin No. 101



LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION  
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

STATE OF NEVADA

December 1972

Carson City, Nevada



FINAL REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE  
FOR STUDY OF  
FACILITIES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14 Session of the Nevada Legislature (1971)	i
II. Assembly Bill No. 203 - 56th Session of the Nevada Legislature (1971)	ii
III. Report of the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee for Study of Juvenile Offender Facilities	1
IV. Recommendations	6

\* \* \* \* \*

LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

B. Mahlon Brown  
Carl F. Dodge  
James I. Gibson  
Warren L. Monroe  
Archie Pozzi, Jr.  
C. Clifton Young

Keith Ashworth  
Joseph E. Dini, Jr.  
Virgil M. Getto  
Zelvin D. Lowman  
Donald R. Mello  
Roy L. Torvinen



Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14—Committee on Legislative Function

FILE NUMBER. 104

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—Directing the legislative commission to study all facilities in the state for juvenile offenders.

WHEREAS, Recent national studies have shown the serious harm and many injustices created by inadequate facilities and provisions for juvenile offenders; and

WHEREAS, There are growing problems in Nevada in connection with the lack of adequate facilities for juvenile offenders; and

WHEREAS, Adequate provisions should be made for young offenders; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada, the Assembly concurring,* That the legislative commission is directed to make a thorough study of the facilities and provision made for juvenile offenders in Nevada and all problems related to such facilities and provision, submit appropriate recommendations and suggested legislation to the 57th session of the Nevada legislature.





Assembly Bill No. 203—Messrs. Hilbrecht, Lowman, Frank Young, Branch,  
Dreyer, Smith, Fry, McKissick and Mrs. Brookman

## CHAPTER. 261

AN ACT establishing a probation subsidy program for the rehabilitation of  
youthful offenders; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

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

SECTION 1. Chapter 213 of NRS is hereby amended by adding  
thereto the provisions set forth as sections 2 to 9, inclusive, of this act.

SEC. 2. 1. *It is the policy of this state to rehabilitate offenders, to  
effect a more even administration of justice and to increase the public  
welfare of the citizens of this state.*

2. *It is the purpose of sections 2 to 9, inclusive, of this act to reduce  
the necessity for commitment of youthful offenders to state correctional  
institutions by strengthening and improving local supervision of persons  
placed on probation by the juvenile and district courts of this state.*

SEC. 3. *As used in this act:*

1. *"Department" means the department of administration.*

2. *"Juvenile court" means the juvenile court of any judicial district.*

3. *"Special supervision program" means a probation program meet-  
ing the standards prescribed pursuant to sections 2 to 9, inclusive, of this  
act for the rehabilitation of offenders who were less than 18 years of age  
at the time of violating any state law, which does include:*

(a) *A degree of supervision substantially above the usual; and*

(b) *The use of new techniques rather than routine supervision tech-  
niques.*

SEC. 4. *From any legislative appropriation for such purpose and in  
accordance with the provisions of sections 2 to 9, inclusive, of this act,  
the state shall share the cost of supervising offenders in special supervision  
programs established in any county participating under sections 2 to 9,  
inclusive, of this act who would otherwise be committed to a state juve-  
nile institution.*

SEC. 5. 1. *Any juvenile court may make application to the depart-  
ment to participate under sections 2 to 9, inclusive, of this act for the  
sharing of the cost of special supervision programs.*

2. *The application shall:*

(a) *Be in the form prescribed by the department; and*

(b) *Include a plan or plans for providing special supervision programs.*

SEC. 6. *No juvenile court shall receive any funds provided for in sec-  
tions 2 to 9, inclusive, of this act until:*

1. *Its application is approved; and*

2. *It has complied with the provisions of this act.*

SEC. 7. 1. *The juvenile court shall use the amount received under this  
act for the purposes described in section 2 of this act to employ necessary  
probation officers who shall carry caseloads substantially less than required  
for normal or routine supervision.*

2. *The department shall determine the applicable costs to the state in  
calculating amounts to be paid to a juvenile court.*

SEC. 8. *The department shall provide for the disbursement of such funds to each juvenile court proportionately on the basis of the population within the jurisdiction of such court, as determined by the last preceding national census of the Bureau of the Census of the United States Department of Commerce, but where it appears that any juvenile court does not intend to submit an application to the department, the proportionate share of such juvenile court may be disbursed to any other juvenile court.*

SEC. 9. 1. *Each juvenile court receiving funds under the provisions of this act shall report, on or before July 1 and December 31 of each year, the experience and results of such court in complying with the purposes of this act to the department of health, welfare and rehabilitation.*

2. *The department of health, welfare and rehabilitation shall compile such reports and submit them to the legislature upon its convening in regular session.*

SEC. 10. Chapter 244 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section which shall read as follows:

*The board of county commissioners may establish, in any county where funds are expended under the provisions of this act, special supervision programs for the rehabilitation of youthful offenders in accordance with the provisions of sections 2 to 9, inclusive, of this act.*

## REPORT OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE 57th SESSION OF THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE:

This report is submitted in compliance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14 and Assembly Bill No. 203 of the 56th session (chapter 261, Statutes of Nevada 1971) which directed the legislative commission to make a study of all state facilities for juvenile offenders. Senator Proctor R. Hug was designated chairman of the subcommittee and the following legislators were named as members: Senators Helen Herr, Emerson F. Titlow, Assemblymen Jack Schofield, Grover Swallow and Roy Young.

In this report, the subcommittee has attempted to present its methodology, findings and recommendations briefly and concisely. We feel that, if the report is voluminous and filled with statistical tables, its value as a useful guide to busy legislators may be less effective. Our minutes, parallel studies and our files contain extensive data that support our findings and recommendations. This report was approved by the legislative commission on December 12, 1972.

Respectfully submitted,

Legislative Commission  
State of Nevada

December 19, 1972



## FACILITIES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS

### INTRODUCTION

This subcommittee was appointed to carry out the mandate of S.C.R. 14, of the 1971 legislative session. The resolution directs the Legislative Commission to study the facilities for juvenile offenders in Nevada and submit appropriate recommendations to the 1973 legislature. Specifically, the subcommittee was directed to make onsite inspections of facilities to determine:

1. If adequate roads are maintained to the facilities;
2. If the facilities are providing academic, industrial and vocational programs;
3. If certain existing facilities, such as the Clear Creek Youth Camp, can be utilized as facilities for juvenile offenders; and
4. If the current facilities for juvenile offenders can be economically enlarged.

Additionally, the subcommittee attempted to relate the initial impact of the probation subsidy program, created by A.B. 203, 1971 session, to the state's facilities for juvenile offenders. The subcommittee visited many of the juvenile facilities maintained by the counties or private groups. However, the findings and recommendations are concerned primarily with the state institutions at Elko and Caliente.

### SUBCOMMITTEE STUDY METHODOLOGY

The subcommittee conducted its investigations by onsite inspections of the facilities, testimony from various officials concerned with juvenile offenders and review of available studies concerning juvenile offenders in Nevada.

The subcommittee held four separate meetings outlined below:

1. The first meeting was held in Carson City on September 17, 1971. The meeting resolved the plan of study for the subcommittee and included a tour of the Clear Creek Youth Camp.

2. The second meeting was held in Las Vegas, October 28-29, 1971. The subcommittee toured the Nevada Youth Training Center for Girls at Caliente, Spring Mountain Youth Camp, Home of the Good Shepherd, Zenoff Hall, Child Haven, Southern Nevada Comprehensive Mental Health Center, St. Jude's Ranch School and Southern Nevada Children's Home. The subcommittee also met with District Judge John F. Mendoza and Clark County juvenile officials.
3. The third meeting was held in Elko on April 20-21, 1972. This trip included a tour of the Nevada Youth Training Center, an evening meeting with the Governor's Advisory Committee to the Center and a discussion with District Judge Joseph O. McDaniel and Elko County juvenile officials. Several members of the subcommittee also visited the facilities for juvenile offenders in Humboldt and Pershing Counties.
4. The final meeting was held in Reno on August 28, 1972. This meeting included a tour of Wittenberg Hall, a presentation from the State Department of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation and a preview of evaluation reports on the training centers and probation subsidy by the consultant conducting these reports.

#### PARALLEL STUDY GROUPS

Shortly after the start of its study, the subcommittee learned that several other similar studies were being conducted by other groups. These included self-assessment by the Department of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation, consultants hired by the Department of HWR and funded by Law Enforcement Assistance Act, the Governor's Advisory Committees for the Boys' and Girls' Schools, and the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Institute (an HEW sponsored group composed of Nevada legislators, judges and state and local officials dealing with juvenile offenders). Each of these groups is reviewing various aspects of juvenile delinquency in Nevada with the objective of recommending action programs to the Governor and the legislature. The subcommittee attempted to meet with or review the studies prepared by these groups to minimize inconsistent findings or duplications. In several instances, the findings are similar, and these will be noted in the appropriate portions of this report.

In addition, several recent studies of the various institutions have been conducted by the Federal Government, the State Department of Education, the State Department of Administration, the Legislative Commission and the State Department of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation. These studies were reviewed by the subcommittee, and reactions to their findings solicited from concerned officials.

### PROBATION SUBSIDY

The 1971 Legislature adopted A.B. 203, which established a pilot probation subsidy program for the rehabilitation of youthful offenders in Nevada. A companion bill, S.B. 572, appropriated \$50,000 each year to match available Law Enforcement Assistance Act funds for probation subsidy. This program is designed to reduce the commitment of juvenile offenders to state correctional institutions by strengthening and improving community supervision of juveniles placed on probation by the district courts.

The probation subsidy program is based on the following assumptions:

- \*1. The most effective correctional services are provided in the local communities where the problems are, where they must be resolved and where both the offender and the correctional agency are subject to local influences and control.
2. Probation has a greater total responsibility for the supervision of offenders than any other local correctional service.
3. Straight probation (without jail conditions) is the least costly correctional service available.
4. Probation is as effective, if not more effective, than most institutional forms of care.
5. Probation grants can be safely increased without increasing the rate of violation by probationers.
6. The actual rate of probation grants is determined by the decisions of probation officers and not the final dispositions made by the courts.

\*These assumptions are adapted from Robert L. Smith's A Quiet Revolution! Probation Subsidy, Washington; Government Printing Office, 1971.

7. Organizational or institutional change can be achieved by rewarding probation departments for engaging in approved behavior, providing that behavior is clearly defined.
8. At least 25 percent of the new admissions to state correctional agencies can safely be retained in the local communities with good probation supervision.
9. The cost for improved probation supervision in the community can be offset by savings made at the state level.

In Nevada, the probation subsidy funds are divided among the juvenile courts in proportion to population and only after submission of an approved plan of action. Projects approved under probation subsidy include such items as additional probation officers, additional counselors, training of personnel, equipment, facility renovation and expansion, foster care, group homes and residential centers. The projects were not started until late in fiscal 1971-72; therefore, conclusive evidence to measure their impacts is not available. However, commitments to the state juvenile institutions have decreased significantly with subsequent decreases in institutional populations. For example, the August month-end population at Elko was 104 boys, with a capacity of 160. At Caliente, the August month-end population was 61, compared to a capacity of 100. Many observers attribute much of these decreases to the probation subsidy program. The Department of HWR is contracting to prepare an evaluation of this program for presentation to the 1973 legislative session.

#### FINDINGS TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

As mentioned in the introduction, the subcommittee was charged with answering four specific questions. The findings in each of these four areas are listed below:

##### Question 1--Are adequate roads maintained to the facilities?

The subcommittee found that excellent roads are maintained to the various facilities.

##### Question 2--Are the facilities providing academic, industrial and vocational programs?

The subcommittee found that the institutions are all providing these programs. The programs are certified by the State



Department of Education and can lead to a high school diploma. Evaluation reports by the State Department of Education and private consultants indicate that the programs are generally high quality and the Department of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation is correcting deficiencies cited in these evaluations.

Question 3--Can Clear Creek Youth Camp be utilized as a facility for juvenile offenders?

After visiting the facility, conferring with several officials who have explored the feasibility of the camp for offenders and reviewing reports by other study groups, the subcommittee finds that the Clear Creek Youth Camp is (as it currently exists) inadequate as a facility for juvenile offenders. In summary, the following considerations weigh against the camp as a juvenile offender facility:

1. The camp provides for no reasonable security.
2. It is located close to a major population center and transportation route, and would, therefore, tend to encourage runaways.
3. The construction costs to provide security, combined with the operating costs for maintaining a 60-capacity facility, are economically prohibitive.

The camp is currently used extensively for other functions, such as coaching clinics, YMCA and YWCA outings, training seminars, recreation activities and Boys' and Girls' State. The subcommittee would encourage this use rather than the creation of another juvenile institution.

Question 4--Can facilities at the state institutions be economically expanded?

The capacity at the boys' school is 160, and there was unanimous agreement that no further capacity be added. This recommendation is shared by the Superintendent, the Department of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation and the subcommittee.

The capacity at the girls' school is 100. It appears that the capacity could be expanded by two 20-room cottages without loss of program effectiveness or increase in treatment staff or support personnel. (Staff additions to

supervise the cottages would, of course, be needed.) However, the current population is 61 girls, and, in view of the probation subsidy program, no new cottages are requested or recommended this biennium.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The State should continue the Probation Subsidy Program for the 1973-75 biennium.

The probation subsidy program offers an alternative to expensive capital improvements at the juvenile institutions while fostering more effective treatment for juvenile offenders in the community. Preliminary statistics indicate that this program is working as expected. Correctional institution commitments and populations have been sharply reduced without apparent increase in the delinquency rate in the community. The August, 1972, report of the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Institutes endorses the program with the following comments and statistics:

The Probation Subsidy Program, authorized during the last session of the Legislature, without a doubt has had the greatest impact on juvenile court services, the community and our children of any program in the last two years \* \* \*.

During the first seven months of 1971, new commitments to institutions numbered 156. During the same period in 1972, while probation subsidy was in effect, only 114 youngsters were placed in institutions, or a 27 percent reduction--without increasing the delinquency rate in the community.

From January through July 1971, there were 167 total commitments to Nevada Youth Training Center, Nevada Girls Training Center, Spring Mountain Youth Camp and Home of the Good Shepherd, compared with 116 during the same months in 1972, a reduction of 51 youngsters or 30 percent \* \* \*.

Law Enforcement Assistance Act officials indicate that federal funds in support of probation subsidy will not be available in 1973-75. Therefore, if the 1973 legislature continues this program, state general funds must be appropriated for this purpose. Preliminary cost estimates prepared by the Department of Health, Welfare and Rehabilitation project an appropriation of \$415,000 in 1973-74 and \$470,400 in 1974-75.

An evaluation report on the program is currently being prepared by consultants to the Department of HWR and will be ready by the 1973 session. If the program is continued the next biennium, evaluation should continue for reporting to the 1975 legislature.

2. There should be no further expansion of the capacity of the Youth Training Center at Elko.

Authorities indicate that the current capacity of 160 is near the optimum, and added capacity at this location could result in loss of program effectiveness. In any event, with continuation of the probation subsidy program, no capacity expansion is needed during the 1973-75 biennium. The August, 1972, resident population was 104, and there appears to be sufficient capacity for additional delinquents during the next biennium.

3. There should be no further expansion of the capacity of the Girls' Training Center at Caliente during the 1973-75 biennium.

The current capacity at the Girls' Training Center is 100 girls while month-end populations for June through September, 1972 were 72, 74, 61 and 63, respectively. If the Probation Subsidy Program is continued, there appears to be sufficient capacity for additional delinquents during the next biennium. However, unlike the boys' school, it appears that the girls' school could be economically expanded to a capacity of 140 (or 2 additional 20-capacity living units) if the population increases develop in subsequent years.

4. A new well and irrigation system should be developed at the Youth Training Center at Elko.

The current well and irrigation system at the boys' school is inadequate to maintain the grounds and provide adequate fire protection. These projects were recommended by the consultants evaluating the school, and rank as priority No. 3 on the capital improvement projects submitted by the Department of HWR. The Nevada State Planning Board estimates the cost of this project at \$154,500.

5. The Clear Creek Youth Camp should not be utilized as a facility for juvenile offenders.

Because of the costs of converting the camp and high operating costs, the subcommittee recommends against the camp as a facility for juvenile offenders. If the legislature desires

to maintain state control of the Clear Creek facility,  
it should continue its current programs rather than  
convert it to a correctional institution.