Approved 6/16/89
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

The meeting was called to order by SENATOR WINT WINTER, Acting Chairman at
Chairperson

11:45 a.m.XXm. on APRIL 5, 1989 in room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:
Senator Burke who was excused

Committee staff present:

Research Department: Kathy Porter, Ed Ahrens
Revisor: Norman Furse and Jim Wilson
Committee Staff: Judy Bromich, Pam Parker

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Susan Irza, Division of Personnel, Department of Administration
Charles Dodson, Kansas Association of Public Employees, KAPE
Thomas Becker, Adjutant General's Office
Paul Klotz, Executive Director, Community Mental Health Centers of Kansas (CMHC)
Ted Ayres, Board of Regents
Duane Johnston, State Librarian

Senator Winter provided an update on Senator Bogina's condition.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Senator Gaines moved, Senator Johnston seconded, to reintroduce SB 630 from 1988 and refer it to the Judiciary Committee. The motion carried.

Senator Gaines moved, Senator Doyen seconded, to introduce a new "circuit breaker" bill which would amend Section 5 of 1989 Senate Bill 24 by changing $500 to $200 and $250 to $100. The motion carried.

Senator Doyen moved, Senator Gaines seconded, to introduce bill draft 9 RS 1376, an act concerning older Kansans employment programs. The motion carried.

HB 2553 - State pay plan increase and longevity pay, certain state officers and employees, appropriations for FY 1990

Susan Irza distributed and reviewed an analysis of HB 2553. (Attachment 1) In answer to questions, Ms. Irza stated that if the two additional pay matrix steps were added without the longevity measure it is questionable whether or not it would be in the long range best interests of state employees. She pointed out that she was neither for HB 2553 or against it, she was only providing an analysis and information.

Ms. Irza stated that because the KIPPS system only has records going back five years, they are trying to determine a dollar figure for the amount of time that will be required by each of the agencies to research all of their personnel records and try to calculate the number of months of satisfactory performance. She hoped to be able to provide additional information in the next few days.

The Acting Chairman asked Ms. Irza to present to the Committee other alternatives for the Committee to consider in regard to longevity and the pay matrix.

The next conferee was Charles Dodson. (Attachment 2) In answer to questions, Mr. Dodson stated that even though only 38 percent of the state employees will benefit from the pay matrix change this year, 100 percent of them support that change. Even though only 38 of the employees will receive longevity pay, a vast majority support it. He called attention to a letter to agency personnel officers from the Division of Personnel Services dated March 31, 1989 regarding the State Pay Plan/HB 2553. (Attachment 3) He submitted that every dollar the Committee votes on interferes with future COLA's for state employees. He stated that the state employees are saying that they know there is some risk but HB 2553 is what they want. Information on Kansas State Civil Service Basic Salary Plan, Basic Steps (Hourly Rates) was distributed. (Attachment 4)

Robert Talkington, KAPE, explained that HB 2553 was the second proposal provided by the Governor and it was proposed in order to try to bring costs down. The Acting Chairman asked the Department of Administration and KAPE to submit additional options to the state employee pay plan as outlined in HB 2553 and appointed a subcommittee comprised of Senators Doyen Feleciano, Kerr, Johnston and Allen to review those alternatives and present them to the full Committee. Staff distributed information on the Civil Service Basic Salary Plan. (Attachment 4)

HB 2537 - Federal disaster relief and assistance to individual and families, state share

Thomas Becker distributed and reviewed information relating to HB 2537. (Attachment 5) Senator Feleciano moved, Senator Kerr seconded, to report HB 2537 favorably for passage. The motion carried on a roll call vote.

HB 2554 - Community mental health centers authorized to expand funds for loans or scholarships for staff recruitment purposes

Paul Klotz stated this project would be funded from the CMHC budget, therefore no provisions are included in the bill for seeking State General Fund dollars. He explained that the program would be utilized on a statewide basis even though it had been initially started for the western portion of the state. Senator Rock moved, Senator Parrish seconded, to report HB 2554 favorably for passage. The motion carried on a roll call vote.

SB 391 - Retirement annuities and insured death and disability benefits for certain employees of the state board of regents

Ted Ayres, General Counsel, Kansas Board of Regents, appeared in support of SB 391 and stated that a written transcript of his testimony would be provided. (See minutes from April 7, 1989) Action on the bill was delayed to the end of the meeting.

SB 388 - Distribution of payments from grant-in-aid to libraries fund

Duane Johnson, State Librarian, presented testimony. (Attachments 6 and 7) Mr. Johnson responded to questions by stating that this is from the seven regional library systems and their administrators each have endorsed this plan and they were involved in the negotiation to devise the formula. There is not a single note of dissent that has been communicated to him on this issue.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

room 123-S, Statehouse, at 11:45 a.m./XXn. on APRIL 5, 1989

Senator Doyen moved, Senator Kerr seconded, to report SB 391 favorably for passage.

Senator Allen moved, Senator Kerr seconded, to report SB 388 favorably for passage. Both motions carried on a roll call vote.

Distributed to Committee members was a memorandum from the Secretary of Corrections dated March 30, 1989 regarding the Interim Plan to Preclude Early Release of Inmates. (Attachment 8)

The meeting was adjourned.

Testimony to

SENATE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

by

Susan Irza, Director of Personnel Services

April 5, 1989

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Susan Irza, Director of Personnel Services, Department of Administration.

I am here on behalf of the Department of Administration to offer information about House Bill 2553. We wish to bring to your attention several concerns about this bill. The impact of HB 2553 on the majority of state employees is as follows:

I. Selectively Benefits Only a Small Number of Employees

- o HB 2553 would reduce the Governor's proposed COLA for all classified state employees from 4% to 3%. On behalf of a small number of employees, the remaining 1% would be redistributed to help fund changes to the pay plan and longevity bonuses.
- o 70% of classified employees would not receive any benefit in FY 90 from the changes to the pay plan.
- o 62% of the classified employees would not receive a longevity bonus in FY 90.
- o The 4% COLA included in the Governor's recommendations is much broader. It benefits all employees because it permanently increases the pay matrix by 4%.

ATTACHMENT 1
SWAM 4-5 89
11:45am

II. Makes Permanent, Costly Changes

- House Bill 2553 proposes permanent changes to the pay plan as well as adding longevity bonuses.
- The Governor's recommendation of a 4% COLA is estimated to cost $32.8 million, of which $19.6 million is financed by the General Fund.
- House Bill 2553 would permanently change the state pay plan and provide longevity bonuses. For FY 90 it is estimated to cost $38.4 million, of which $23.0 is financed by the General Fund.
- For FY 90, House Bill 2553 means an increase of $5.6 million, of which $3.4 is from the General Fund.

III. Reduces Funds Available for Priority Employee Benefits

- In the future, HB 2553 would detract from funds available for <u>priority</u> employee needs including:
    - step movement;
    - health insurance cost increases;
    - implementation of all classification studies;
    - future COLA's to keep the pay plan current and competitive.
- Implementation of HB 2553 would also result in increased costs for implementing Phase III and future classification studies and would increase overtime rates.

IV. Gives Longevity Too Much Weight

- The state pay plan already provides <u>eight</u> longevity steps <u>above the market rate</u>. The top step already exceeds Step C (the market rate) by 20%. No other state has as many longevity steps.

- Addition of two more steps <u>PLUS</u> longevity bonuses creates double compensation for longevity. There is a limit to the value of any job in the labor market, even when longevity is considered.

V. Implementation Difficulties

- To comply with the Fair Labor Standards Act, longevity bonuses would have to be averaged into EACH employee's regular rate of pay for each week in which overtime is earned.
- Extensive reprogramming will be required in KIPPS in order to track and store the detailed overtime records to recalculate in the regular rate of pay. Supplemental payments will have to be made to employees at year end to pay the difference owed as a result of this recalculated regular rate of pay. DISC estimates this reprogramming cost to be $106,038.
- Reprogramming of KIPPS also will be required to address the issue of only counting time for satisfactory performance, conversion of part-time to full-time, etc. Performance records more than five years old cannot be accessed by KIPPS, thus necessitating manual research and substantially increasing the cost of implementation. Thus far, we have not arrived at the additional dollar impact of the hidden costs for these two requirements.

- Reprogramming KIPPS is of questionable value because the system is currently at capacity and is to be replaced by KFIS.

Thank you for your attention. I would be glad to respond to questions or comments.

KANSAS
ASSOCIATION OF
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Presentation to
Senate Committee on Ways and Means
Charles Dodson
April 5, 1989

House Bill 2553

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to speak to you in support of HB 2553.

In FY1986 there were wholesale changes made to the pay plan for state employees. Some of those changes were good changes. You passed a plan in FY86 that was balanced by making the movement from step-to-step, regardless of the pay range, a constant percentage. You made first year adjustments so that employees would not have to take a cut in net pay when their retirement deductions started.

But, some of the changes were not so good. The plan in effect for FY1985 had $1200 or more per year built in for longevity after 20 years of service. This was eliminated. The pay plan was also shortened. A minimum of five percent was cut from each range. The impact of these two changes fell exclusively on long-term employees.

HB 2553 returns the longevity pay as a component of the pay plan, and restores the minimum 5% cut in each range to the pay plan.

In FY1987 Phase I of the Comprehensive Salary Study was implemented. Phase II was implemented in FY 1988 and one-half of Phase III was implemented for the last half of FY89 and the balance for FY90. These "phases" are parts of a complete examination of every job in state government to bring the salaries of classified state employees into line with salaries paid to the private sector employees.

Unfortunately, the methodology used in implementing these reclassifications did not provide for allowing employees to retain their relative position on the pay scale when moving to the new range. The result was that new employees might receive 20 to 30% salary increases on reclassification while employees with long-term service would be moved to a step on the range only 2-1/2% higher than the new starting salary.

400 West 8th Ave. Suite #103 Topeka, Kansas 66603 913-235-0262

ATTACHMENT 2
SWAM 4-5-89
11:45 am

The result has been massive salary compaction. That is, employees with less than one year employment earning virtually the same salary as employees with ten or twenty years service.

To correct these problems would cost more money than we could conceivably talk about here today. While I have no firm estimate of those costs, it would be tens of millions and possibly hundreds of millions.

HB 2553 asks for $3.4 million (SGF) more than recommended in the Governor's budget.

1. It restores five percent of the potential earnings removed from the plan in FY 1986.

2. It restores a longevity concept to replace part of that eliminated from the plan in FY 1986.

3. It allows employees whose relative salary has been cut by the implementation of the various "phases" to more quickly return to the step of the range they held prior to reclassification.

Over the years that I have worked with state employees I have had the opportunity to examine many pay plans. The strengths and the weaknesses of each, after a time, became readily apparent. I am convinced that the pay plan, after implementing the changes proposed in HB 2553, will be an excellent pay plan.

State employees are excited about these proposed changes, and we would urge you to report HB 2553 favorably for passage.

STATE OF KANSAS

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
Division of Personnel Services

MIKE HAYDEN,
Governor

SUSAN IRZA,
Director of Personnel Services

Room 951-South
Landon State Office Building
900 S.W. Jackson Street
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1251
913-296-4278

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Agency Personnel Officers

FROM: Susan Irza, Director SI
Division of Personnel Services

DATE: March 31, 1989

SUBJECT: State Pay Plan/House Bill 2553

Shelby Smith, Secretary of Administration, asked me to share this information with you regarding House Bill 2553 to help you answer inquiries from state employees about the impact of this pay plan and longevity proposal upon them. This is an alternative to the 4% increase to the state pay plan recommended by the Governor.

I. Selectively Benefits only 30% of Employees

- HB 2553 would reduce the COLA for all classified state employees from 4% to 3%, and on behalf of a minority of employees, would redistribute the 1% reduction to help pay for longevity bonuses and changes to the pay plan.
- 70% of classified employees would not receive any benefit in FY '90 from the changes to the pay plan.
- 62% of the classified employees would not receive a longevity bonus in FY '90.
- The 4% COLA included in the Governor's recommendations is much broader; it benefits all employees.

II. Reduces Funds Available for Priority Employee Benefits

- HB 2553 would detract from funds available for priority employee needs, including:
  - step movement;
  - health insurance cost increases;
  - implementation of all classification studies;
  - future COLA's to keep the pay plan current and competitive.

SI:csg
cc: Agency Heads

ATTACHMENT 3
SWAM 4-5-89
11:45 am

Attachment 4
SWAM 4-5-89
11:45 am

KANSAS STATE CIVIL SERVICE BASIC SALARY PLAN
BASIC STEPS (HOURLY RATES)

EFFECTIVE FY 1989

Range No.	Step A	Step 1	Step B	Step 2	Step C	Step 3	Step D	Step D3	Step D6	Step D9	Step D12	Step D15	Step D18
3	$ 4.38	$ 4.49	$ 4.61	$ 4.73	$ 4.83	$ 4.95	$ 5.08	$ 5.21	$ 5.34	$ 5.46	$ 5.60	$ 5.74	$ 5.88
4	4.61	4.73	4.83	4.95	5.08	5.21	5.34	5.46	5.60	5.74	5.88	6.03	6.18
5	4.83	4.95	5.08	5.21	5.34	5.46	5.60	5.74	5.88	6.03	6.18	6.33	6.48
6	5.08	5.21	5.34	5.46	5.60	5.74	5.88	6.03	6.18	6.33	6.48	6.65	6.80
7	5.34	5.46	5.60	5.74	5.88	6.03	6.18	6.33	6.48	6.65	6.80	6.99	7.15
8	5.60	5.74	5.88	6.03	6.18	6.33	6.48	6.65	6.80	6.99	7.15	7.33	7.52
9	5.88	6.03	6.18	6.33	6.48	6.65	6.80	6.99	7.15	7.33	7.52	7.70	7.90
10	6.18	6.33	6.48	6.65	6.80	6.99	7.15	7.33	7.52	7.70	7.90	8.08	8.28
11	6.48	6.65	6.80	6.99	7.15	7.33	7.52	7.70	7.90	8.08	8.28	8.50	8.70
12	6.80	6.99	7.15	7.33	7.52	7.70	7.90	8.08	8.28	8.50	8.70	8.92	9.13
13	7.15	7.33	7.52	7.70	7.90	8.08	8.28	8.50	8.70	8.92	9.13	9.36	9.59
14	7.52	7.70	7.90	8.08	8.28	8.50	8.70	8.92	9.13	9.36	9.59	9.83	10.07
15	7.90	8.08	8.28	8.50	8.70	8.92	9.13	9.36	9.59	9.83	10.07	10.32	10.57
16	8.28	8.50	8.70	8.92	9.13	9.36	9.59	9.83	10.07	10.32	10.57	10.83	11.10
17	8.70	8.92	9.13	9.36	9.59	9.83	10.07	10.32	10.57	10.83	11.10	11.38	11.65
18	9.13	9.36	9.59	9.83	10.07	10.32	10.57	10.83	11.10	11.38	11.65	11.95	12.24
19	9.59	9.83	10.07	10.32	10.57	10.83	11.10	11.38	11.65	11.95	12.24	12.55	12.85
20	10.07	10.32	10.57	10.83	11.10	11.38	11.65	11.95	12.24	12.55	12.85	13.17	13.49
21	10.57	10.83	11.10	11.38	11.65	11.95	12.24	12.55	12.85	13.17	13.49	13.83	14.16
22	11.10	11.38	11.65	11.95	12.24	12.55	12.85	13.17	13.49	13.83	14.16	14.52	14.87
23	11.65	11.95	12.24	12.55	12.85	13.17	13.49	13.83	14.16	14.52	14.87	15.25	15.61
24	12.24	12.55	12.85	13.17	13.49	13.83	14.16	14.52	14.87	15.25	15.61	16.00	16.40
25	12.85	13.17	13.49	13.83	14.16	14.52	14.87	15.25	15.61	16.00	16.40	16.81	17.22
26	13.49	13.83	14.16	14.52	14.87	15.25	15.61	16.00	16.40	16.81	17.22	17.65	18.08
27	14.16	14.52	14.87	15.25	15.61	16.00	16.40	16.81	17.22	17.65	18.08	18.54	18.98
28	14.87	15.25	15.61	16.00	16.40	16.81	17.22	17.65	18.08	18.54	18.98	19.46	19.93
29	15.61	16.00	16.40	16.81	17.22	17.65	18.08	18.54	18.98	19.46	19.93	20.43	20.93
30	16.40	16.81	17.22	17.65	18.08	18.54	18.98	19.46	19.93	20.43	20.93	21.45	21.98
31	17.22	17.65	18.08	18.54	18.98	19.46	19.93	20.43	20.93	21.45	21.98	22.52	23.07
32	18.08	18.54	18.98	19.46	19.93	20.43	20.93	21.45	21.98	22.52	23.07	23.65	24.22
33	18.98	19.46	19.93	20.43	20.93	21.45	21.98	22.52	23.07	23.65	24.22	24.83	25.44
34	19.93	20.43	20.93	21.45	21.98	22.52	23.07	23.65	24.22	24.83	25.44	26.07	26.71
35	20.93	21.45	21.98	22.52	23.07	23.65	24.22	24.83	25.44	26.07	26.71	27.37	28.04
	21.98	22.52	23.07	23.65	24.22	24.83	25.44	26.07	26.71	27.37	28.04	28.75	29.44

PRESENTATION TO WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE (SENATE)

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee

Recent amendments to public law 93-288, now known as the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act revises eligibility for federal reimbursement of expenditures made by state and local governments during a major disaster. The maximum grant limit that can be awarded to Individuals and Families has now been increased to $10,000.

K.S.A. 48-938 limits a state grant to $1,250, which is based on 25% share of the previously established limit of $5,000.

In most disasters low costs loans are the major means of helping citizens recover from a disaster. If an individual or a family is not eligible for a loan, then the Individual Family Grant (IFG) grant become the other vehicle for recovery. When a major disaster is declared by the President announcements are made by our Congressmen and federal and state governments as to the type of assistance available. Since this type of grant does not require repayment it become a highly visible part of the assistance announced by the news media.

The award of any grant is based on providing funds for specific items that are damaged because of a disaster. In some cases the maximum grant is awarded because of the complete destruction of eligible items. In most cases the amount awarded is less than the maximum amount. In the last 10 years, the average grant has risen from $1,800 in 1979 to $3,800 in 1986. Of this, the State paid $25%. The rise in the average grant is directly related to raises in the price of items and materials. It is for this reason Congress has raised the grant limit from $5,000 to $10,000 with a provision for annual adjustment to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index.

The fiscal impact of this legislative change will depend on the severity of the disaster and the number of grants to be awarded. In fiscal years 1984 and 1986 presidential disasters were declared and we had 68 grants awarded for $5,000, the maximum limit allowed by law. Total cost was $340,000 of which our state's share was $85,000. If the revised limit had been in effect the cost would have amounted to $479,948, of which our state's share would have been $119,987.

I recommend passage of HB 2537 to insure citizens of Kansas receive IFG assistance in the amounts authorized by federal law.

In your hand-out I have enclosed excerpts of the Senate Congressional record pertaining to the IFG program.

ATTACHMENT 5
SWAM 4-5-89
11:45 am

EXCERPTS FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD --- SENATE

SEC. 102. AMENDMENT TO SHORT TITLE.

(a) AMENDMENT TO SHORT TITLE.—The first section is amended by striking out "Disaster Relief Act of 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof the "Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act".

(b) REFERENCES.—Whenever any reference is made in any law (other than this Act), regulation, document, rule, record, or other paper of the United States to a section or provision of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974, such reference shall be deemed to be a reference to such section or provision of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

SEC. 103. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to make a grant to a State for the purpose of making grants to individuals or families adversely affected by a major disaster for meeting disaster-related necessary expenses or serious needs of such individuals or families in those cases where such individuals or families are unable to meet such expenses or needs through assistance under other provisions of this Act or through other means.

"(b) COST SHARING.—

"(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of a grant to an individual or a family under this section shall be equal to 75 percent of the actual cost incurred.

"(2) STATE CONTRIBUTION.—The Federal share of a grant under this section shall be paid only on condition that the remaining 25 percent of the cost is paid to an individual or family from funds made available by a State.

"(c) REGULATIONS.—The President shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section and such regulations shall include national criteria, standards, and procedures for the determination of eligibility for grants and the administration of grants under this section.

"(d) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A State may expend not to exceed 5 percent of any grant made by the President to it under subsection (a) for expenses of administering grants to individuals and families under this section.

"(e) ADMINISTRATION THROUGH GOVERNOR.—The Governor of a State shall administer the grant program authorized by this section in the State.

"(f) LIMIT ON GRANTS TO INDIVIDUALS.—No individual or family shall receive grants under this section aggregating more than $10,000 with respect to any single major disaster. Such $10,000 limit shall annually be adjusted to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Department of Labor.".

Senate Ways and Means Committee
April 5, 1989

Subject: Senate Bill 388

Effect: Amends K. S. A. 75-2555, within the Grant-In-Aid to Libraries Act, which identifies the method of allocation of the state funding.

Objective: To establish authorization for a formula for the allocation of the one-third of the annual funding which goes to the regional systems of cooperating libraries. Current wording of the statute stipulates the one-third shall be divided equally among the seven systems.

Background:

1. In recent years there has been increasing feeling among some of the regional library system boards and system librarians that the equal division of the system state aid is unfair in that a disproportionate amount of the funding goes to the least populous areas of the state.

2. It has been asserted that service demands and related expenses in the more populous areas require a greater concentration of the funding.

3. It is also asserted that service delivery in the more rural system areas is made more expensive than similar service delivery in the urban areas because of the large territory over which the service must be delivered.

4. The formula for the allocation of the system aid funding which has been negotiated would establish a base grant for each system in the amount of the current level of grant allocation. Any additional funding received into the program would be allocated by a formula which would place a percent of the additional funding in the base grant and then divide the remainder of additional funding using a formula which includes the two factors of square miles of territory in each library system and the total population in each library system.

5. The proposed formula would be defined in a regulation of the State Library.

6. All of the seven regional library systems of cooperating libraries have participated in the negotiation to define the characteristics of this proposed change and the related formula and have given endorsement.

ATTACHMENT 6
SWAM 4-5-89
11:45am

FACT SHEET

SUBJECT: SB 388, State grants in aid to Regional Systems of Cooperating Libraries.

1965-68 KSA 75-2547 through 75-2552 inclusive were passed creating seven Regional Systems of Cooperating Libraries in Kansas.

1974 KSA 75-2553 through 75-2561 inclusive were passed creating a grants in aid program for public libraries and regional systems of cooperating libraries.

KSA 75-2555, the grant distribution law, prescribes state aid to public libraries in terms of per capita aid whereas aid to systems is described as one-third of total aid divided into seven equal grants.

Rationale in 1974:
In 1974 there was considerable debate among the systems concerning division of the proposed state aid to systems. Debates, both pro and con for aid on a per capita basis arrived at no general agreement. In its place agreement was arrived at that a basic amount of aid would be required, no matter how many people or size of area served. Since aid proposed was of such a small amount, equal divisions of aid were consented to by all involved. It was also noted that agreement among the systems was absolutely necessary if legislation were to be passed.

1989 Legislation allowing increases in state aid are being proposed this session. Those increases further illustrate a discrepancy in the per capita support granted to systems of low population density as compared with those of high population concentrations.

As a result of meetings over the past several years, there has finally been created an agreement among systems that a more appropriate manner of state aid distribution to systems be created. This has been done and a formula using both the factors of area and population within a system is unaminously agreed upon among the seven systems.

The following examples will illustrate what is to be accomplished using the formula proposed and authorized by the requested revision of KSA 75-2555. (See attached document)

ATTACHMENT 7
SWAM 4-5-89
11:45 am

EXAMPLES

	Least Populated System Northwest	Aid Per Capita Ratio	Highest Populated Northeast
1974 Population	59,880		841,961
State Aid 1975	$28,571		$28,571
Aid Per Capita	47.7¢	14.5/1.0	3.3¢
1989 Population	53,800		923,400
State Aid	$51,875		$51,875
Aid Per Capita	96.4¢		5.6¢
1990 Proposed Aid	$68,451		$68,451
Aid Per Capita	$1.27	17.2/1.0	7.4¢
1990 Proposed Revision			
State Aid	$61,971		$80,574
Aid Per Capita	$1.15	12.9/1.0	8.9¢

Gp

KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

MIKE HAYDEN, GOVERNOR
ROGER V. ENDELL, SECRETARY

LANDON STATE OFFICE BUILDING — 900 SW JACKSON
TOPEKA, KANSAS — 66612-1284
913-296-3317

RECEIVED MAR 30 1989

TO: Senate Ways and Means Committee
~~Gus Bogina~~, Chairperson

FROM: Roger V. Endell
Secretary of Corrections

DATE: March 30, 1989

RE: Interim Plan to Preclude Early Release of Inmates

During my appearance on Friday, March 24, 1989, the Committee requested I submit my plan for dealing with the inmate population between now and completion of a new facility. I have prepared the attached outline of that plan for your review and consideration. If you or the Committee have questions or wish to discuss the options further, please let me know.

RVE:GLS:mkb

Attachment

cc: Governor Mike Hayden

ATTACHMENT 8
SWAM 4-5-89
11:45 am

KDOC
3-30-89

Recommendation

- Governor's 768-bed Maximum Facility, New Site
  256-bed Mental Unit, Larned

- Request court delay order abandoning two KCIL units until June, 1991 - 118 additional interim placements (will require use of contingency or supplemental depending on construction schedule of new dormitory).

- Senate restore funds removed by House to fund 200 C.R.C. placements under revised contract. ($700,000 of $1,060,000)

- Provide contingency $2,445,600 - line item appropriation for FY 1990, Governors release to cover cost of additional KCIL placements and/or for purchase of space from Missouri or placements in other state operated facilities as available.

Options Not Recommended

- Furlough/Early release
  Does not appear popular option - Would need additional parole officers for intensive supervision, minimum one officer per 20 releases.

- Add emergency temporary housing space at existing facility
  Temporary housing becomes permanent and restricts operating flexibility - Does not offer long term solution - More permanent type additions would take months to accomplish and not solve short-term problems, would be expensive, would strain current infrastructures and programming and, in many cases, system would be further pressured to make marginal security placement decisions.