

CLOSING CAMP HILL

Pages to note  
12, 17, 26, 42  
47, 78, 80, 81

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

\* \* \*

Verbatim report of hearing  
held in Room 401, Main  
Capitol Building, Harrisburg,  
Pennsylvania, on Monday,

July 28, 1975  
1:00 p.m.

Hon. Charles P. Hammock, Chairman

MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE

Hon. Lucien Blackwell  
Hon. Ronald Cowell  
Hon. D. Michael Fisher  
Hon. William Hutchinson  
Hon. Raymond Lederer

Hon. Marvin E. Miller, Jr.  
Hon. Frank Oliver  
Hon. Joseph Rhodes  
Hon. David Richardson  
Hon. Anthony Scirica

Hon. George Wagner

Reported by:  
Marlene DePanfilis

Prepared under the direction  
of the Chief Clerk's Office,  
Vincent Scarcelli, Chief Clerk

INDEX TO WITNESSES

	<u>Page</u>
Dr. Jerome Miller . . . . .	4
John Mallingly. . . . .	23
Dr. Gordon Langmyhr . . . . .	45
Donald Hazel. . . . .	60

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to apologize for being about seventeen minutes late.

We have called this hearing for the purpose of getting an update on what is happening with the closing of the Camp Hill facility for juveniles and at the same time trying to assess what is to happen with other juvenile facilities around the state. We have been reading a lot in the press lately about what is taking place and what is yet to take place.

We had an earlier hearing, I believe, some time in the early part of May, and we said that we would have another hearing to familiarize the Legislature with what is happening and at the same time to perhaps bring to a more speedy and equitable conclusion for all concerned regarding the problems of juveniles.

This hearing is primarily to focus in on the Camp Hill facility. However, within the scope of this hearing there may be some other things we would like to talk about and you who have been called as witnesses today would want to talk about. We welcome anything you would want to tell this subcommittee. We intend to make a report back to the Legislature at the conclusion of this hearing. There may be another one. We are not

sure yet. In our role in providing legislative oversight of various activities of the Department, we feel that it is necessary for the Legislature at this point to have a total understanding as to what is to take place in this area.

We wish to welcome you to this hearing this afternoon. We would like to first call on Dr. Miller.

DR. JEROME MILLER, Commissioner, Children and Youth, testified as follows:

DR. MILLER: I believe most of the leadership of the Camp Hill project is in the room and will be testifying as to the progress in the various areas.

I would just say generally with reference to the Camp Hill project that it is our intention, as it has always been, to have in place by August 15 enough options to handle the new intake after August 15. It is not to empty Camp Hill as of August 15. I think there has been some misunderstanding of that in the press. We would hope to have a plan developed. I am sure Dr. Langmyhr will speak of that, as time goes by. We hope to have a plan developed that can be presented to the court with reference to every juvenile presently at Camp Hill. That is a plan to aid the court in developing plans for the individual juvenile. It does not mean that we will empty Camp

Hill on June 15. I would surmise that the majority of those juveniles will serve most if not all of the normal amount of time they would normally serve at Camp Hill, although we would hope we would find enough options so that we could move some of them out.

The bottom line of the project is to have in place enough options to handle the new intake. The intake has fallen dramatically at Camp Hill in the last three months, from a high of 58 in January. I believe it has been averaging between 15 and 20 for the last three months. It was somewhat close to a dozen, I believe, last month.

If that low intake were to hold, of course, I think we will be in quite good shape. If it does creep up, it will rest on this project and the Office of Children and Youth to create options necessary to meet those demands.

We do not anticipate that there will have to be a locked facility or locked plot, one for one for every juvenile at Camp Hill. We certainly do believe that for those juveniles who present major problems in terms of crimes against persons, in terms of crimes of violence or crimes against persons, for the most part there would have to be locked and/or extremely highly supervised options.

There is also an impression, I believe, that a

number of juveniles at Camp Hill are there simply because some of the judges, particularly in the rural areas, have not had the options that perhaps other courts have had. The project will be engaged in helping to develop those options as well, including group homes, half-way houses, advocacy programs, outward bound programs and some of the others referred to the last time this Committee held hearings.

I brought along as well for the Committee a list of the members of the Camp Hill Review Panel, which has met one time. This is a panel set up to monitor and review the progress of the project. It is a panel appointed by the Governor with membership from throughout the state. I will make those available to the Committee.

I also brought along, so the Committee would understand something of the ideology of the project, I brought along some of the thought with reference to new process safeguards that are being discussed at the present time by the staff and by the project. This has to do with due process safeguards for juveniles in the project. This probably will apply to not only juveniles here but juveniles in other settings as well. The lawyers who prepared this used the term "child." I would prefer it to be "juvenile", but it does speak to the question of due process safeguards.

Other than that, I have no other statement, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Thank you, Dr. Miller.

Let me introduce the Members of the Committee that are here: Representative Frank Oliver, Representative Ray Lederer, Representative Joseph Rhodes, and myself, Charles Hammock.

I have a few questions. Let me start out by asking you is it our understanding that as of August 15, there will be no more juveniles taken into the Camp Hill facility? Is that what you are saying?

DR. MILLER: That is my understanding of the meaning of the Attorney General's opinion, yes.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Oliver, do you have anything?

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: I have no questions.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Lederer?

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: I have nothing.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: No questions.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Let me ask you this. It has been reported in the press that as of August 15, the Camp Hill facility will be closed.

DR. MILLER: I think probably the article you are referring to has appeared in a Philadelphia paper, the Tribune.

It was grossly inaccurate. There is no way it could be closed in August.

What I said to that particular writer -- and I guess he didn't understand me correctly -- is that we would have in place by the 15th enough options to handle the new intake. We will not be able to empty Camp Hill as of August 15, so it won't be closed in that sense. It would be closed to new intake, as per the Attorney General's opinion. I am sure that as of August 15, there will be well over 300 juveniles still at Camp Hill, for which juveniles the project will be developing plans which I am sure they will be happy to discuss with the Committee. We would like to get all of those juveniles out of Camp Hill into appropriate options the court would agree to, but we certainly at the very least have to have the options for the new intake.

CHAIMRAN HAMMOCK: The committee that was appointed to help speed the process, you say they had one meeting?

DR. MILLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: What is the purpose of the committee?

DR. MILLER: The committee is there to provide some sort of outside monitoring of the project on a regular basis. I anticipate that they will break into sub-committees and have



certain committees to look at various parts of the project. It was really an attempt to be sure that we had outside, if you will, disinterested persons, persons not connected with the project, or myself, or members on the project, who could provide some kind of objective appraisal of the project and, very honestly, could also know what is happening in the project so that if the project comes under attack for various reasons that there be an outside group who can speak up to what is exactly happening. A project like this is very often controversial and, therefore, there often is misinterpretation of what is happening. This outside monitoring group is an attempt to relate to that need.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: And you say they have had one meeting so far?

DR. MILLER: I believe they have had one meeting.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Let me ask you another kind of question. I understand from reading the press and talking to individuals that there will be an effort made to close the YDC and similarly an effort to close the Philadelphia Youth Study Center. I would like to hear more about that.

DR. MILLER: I think, again, that is a misinterpretation of the press. I would have liked to see the Philadelphia Youth Study Center closed six years ago. I think it is an

abomination and a tragedy and it amounts to official child abuse and ought to be treated as such. That does not mean that juveniles who are dangerous should not be detained, but it does mean that they should not be detained in a place they could not turn off the heat for five years so that the temperature runs to 120 degrees in the middle of summer. It does not mean the kind of care that that travesty has pushed on youngsters over the last five years.

I do think that a facility such as that is inappropriate, particularly in view of the fact that a good portion of the juveniles at the Philadelphia Youth Study Center have not committed a crime. They are there for things such as run-aways, truancies and stubbornness. I would very much support alternatives to the Philadelphia Youth Study Center.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: There is no question, Dr. Miller, that the situation is well documented. What I would like to find out is whether or not your office is making any plans to close the Youth Study Center.

DR. MILLER: We have no authority to close it. I met with the head of the board recently and we are trying to work with them in finding other ways of handling the situation there. We certainly will support any moves to provide better conditions while they are there.

I understand, for instance, that they have been able to deal with some of the heat problems in the last couple of weeks, after some five years of being unable to deal with this. There is no plan on my part to close it. I have no authority to. If I was in charge of it, I would close it almost immediately, but I have no authority.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: What are your plans for Cornwall Heights?

DR. MILLER: Cornwall Heights has an excellent staff, an excellent superintendent, who has been trying to bring what is not as decent a facility into shape. I think they are doing quite a good job with it.

I have some concern about large facilities as to the people there, and I think over a period of time we would like to talk about more and more community-based programs and alternate programs there developing out of Cornwall Heights, but I don't think in any way it resembles the situation at the Youth Study Center.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: What is the present plan for Cornwall Heights?

DR. MILLER: Cornwall Heights is to continue with staff training to help them better the place.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Is there any plan to integrate

the youths from Camp Hill into Cornwall Heights?

DR. MILLER: There is a plan for one closed facility for a dozen beds initially, yes. That is Cornwall Heights and New Castle, not for kids presently at Camp Hill. This would be for new intake, more difficult kids.

It seems to me that part of the problem with Camp Hill is the Department of Welfare has not responded to the needs of the courts in terms of a security facility. So, the plans are to make one building at Cornwall Heights more secure for this small population.

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: This number of beds, 50 at each facility, where does that come from?

DR. MILLER: That is a fail-safe or back up thing. It is my hope that we will go nowhere near 50. The number comes from the capacity of the buildings to hold 50 without too much difficulty, just in terms of feeding and sleeping and all of that. I would hope that we could keep it down to 20 or 25 maximum.

It is our hope that in handling the new intake, we can find enough options through the Camp Hill project to not have to back inordinately into this.

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: I would like to ask you a question pertaining to the Youth Study Center in Philadelphia.

The most recent episode involving that young girl, what is being done about that?

DR. MILLER: I don't know the episode.

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: The young girl who had to submit to this examination by a male.

DR. MILLER: I know of it. I know Mr. Hoggs and Mr. Johnson are involved in helping. I haven't gotten involved in the specific situation. I do know that there have been numbers of allegations about misuse of children at that facility. I am sure you are aware that members of the staff have been indicted at the facility for mistreatment of juveniles. I understand that the Legal Aid in Philadelphia is planning a major suit against the Youth Study facility in the next week or two.

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: I would think -- and I would hope you would agree -- that that type of examination should be done by a nurse, a female.

DR. MILLER: I would strongly agree with that. We had a similar situation in our Youth Study Center equivalent in Boston. This very often is a common practice in juvenile detention centers. We had it looked at by the Department of Public Health at Harvard, and they described it as a barbaric practice, and I think that is very strongly so. There is no

right to be given routinely vaginal examinations of young girls.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: Dr. Miller, when do you think Camp Hill will be devoid of all juveniles?

DR. MILLER: I would rather take a more conservative view that Mr. Mattingly would take. I would say that a year from now it would be devoid of juveniles, and I would hope that by December or January, it would be empty, but I wouldn't want to be promising things we couldn't deliver on.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: If you would have, say, 5 or 10 juveniles at Camp Hill in January of next year, won't it be expensive for your Department to staff for such a small number of juveniles?

DR. MILLER: For that small number of juveniles, I think it would be incumbent to find different facilities for those juveniles. I think the large jail setting militates against decent care despite the best efforts of the staff. I want to stress that in spite of the bad mouthing I have been doing about Camp Hill, it is in no way a reflection on the staff. It has excellent staff, excellent administrators. They have been extremely helpful and cooperative in this. My concern is that in a facility like that, it is just impossible to give decent care to juveniles.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Dr. Miller, some time ago when

you were last before the Committee there was some talk about the proposal that you had submitted to the Federal government. Can you give us the status of that?

DR. MILLER: That proposal is in the final week or ten days. The people from Washington will be down next week. We are having a meeting with them next week. I understand that the proposal itself has been recommended for approval at every level. We should know within the next few weeks.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: How much is that proposal for?

DR. MILLER: Approximately two million dollars.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: What is the overall purpose of the proposal?

DR. MILLER: The proposal is to help create and fund options for juveniles that would normally go to Camp Hill, and all that goes with that -- the liaison programs, the programs for diagnostic, and all of that.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: I am not sure that I understand. Could you elaborate a little bit more?

DR. MILLER: It would be a proposal that would fund a complete range of services for juveniles that judges in the past have felt unable to send anywhere but Camp Hill. It would involve funding group homes, half-way houses, some small locked facilities, whatever is appropriate -- for a juvenile that

would normally go to Camp Hill.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Let me see if I have this. We have a two million dollar proposal at the Federal government to fund group homes and half-way houses, and the like. For what period of time?

DR. MILLER: Two million dollars the first year. The second year, I believe, it is close to three million dollars. And the third year another two million dollars. It is a three-year proposal.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: So, the first year it is two million dollars and the second year it is three million dollars?

DR. MILLER: I don't have the exact figures. In the third year it goes back to two million dollars.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: And it is to establish this range of services?

DR. MILLER: That is correct, to enable the State to establish them and the State will have to assume responsibility to maintain the options.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: After the three-year period, what obligation does the State have?

DR. MILLER: The State will have the obligation to these juveniles that it presently has. This really isn't a Federal responsibility in the strict sense, but they have



offered to help us in this and the State, primarily the Department of Welfare, will have to continue with this.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Would I be correct in saying then that after the three-year period, the State may be requested to fund something in the neighborhood of a five million dollar project?

DR. MILLER: No.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Then how will these large services continue?

DR. MILLER: It will depend on the number of juveniles committed by the courts. I believe the per capita cost at Camp Hill is \$12,000 to \$15,000 per juvenile. Multiply that by 400 and that is what we are paying now. It would be a matter of diverting some of that money.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Let me see if I understand. I want to open a group home, and you give me the money under your proposal and it costs "x" number of dollars. After three years, I can no longer look to you or look to the State for money. Who do I look to?

DR. MILLER: You can look to a number of sources. The State ordinarily pays the per diem for juveniles, and that would be the case at Camp Hill, whether or not this program developed. You would also look to Title 20 for reimbursement.

?

Most of these juveniles would be eligible for that. There would be a number of options. I don't think it is assuming a new responsibility.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: It is a new program. If I don't have a group home, and if I get money for the State to open a group home, and I am guaranteed for three years that I will be funded. After that I have got to go and look around for money.

DR. MILLER: Well, I can't quarrel with that. It is a new program in a sense that one should ask that money be taken from existing programs and existing warehousing. That sounds all very good, but usually it is the Legislature that is called upon to provide an extra three or four million dollars to keep a program like that going.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: I just think we are moving into a new area of dealing with juvenile problems. I think it is incumbent upon those of us who are lawmakers to begin to find out how much it is going to cost. We get into these areas that we are on the floor fighting for money to keep these projects going and there is the opposite pull in the other direction, saying that there is not enough money to go around.

DR. MILLER: I can't quarrel with that. I would just hope that we would have legislative support when it comes time to suggest that where some of the money is going now is

perhaps inappropriate and inadequate and should be going in another direction. I am not one of those who believes that corrections need more money all of the time. In one sense corrections is vastly overfunded. The problem is getting the money loose from where it is and apply it in more meaningful ways.

To give an example, the Youth Study Center, I would guess that the per capita cost per year is somewhere over \$20,000 per juvenile to put them in a situation of child abuse. Now, if we have to have alternatives to the Youth Study Center, it is going to cost more money. Take, for instance, Camp Hill. We shouldn't be spending \$15,000 a year to place juveniles in a facility where they will be subjected to homosexual rapes and violence and criminalization.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: I appreciate what you are saying, Dr. Miller. Just let me preface this by saying that we are approaching a new era of dealing with the juvenile situation. You are pushing very hard to help accomplish that. I think the Legislature has its responsibility to deal with this. The problem is that we are faced with the same arguments every year. We are going to go to the Federal government and the Federal government is going to give us money, but it is the State and the State lawmakers that are on the hook to keep the program

going. At the same time, we have to deal with the executive branch of government, saying that we don't have enough money. These day care centers have been closing up one after the other because the State doesn't have the money to fund the program.

What I am really getting to is how we can best preserve these programs if and when they get started.

DR. MILLER: I appreciate that very much, and I couldn't agree more, Mr. Chairman. I would add this. I think it will be incumbent upon the executive and upon my own department to insure or guarantee the Legislature that they are using these monies and these programs for the target population presently at Camp Hill, for instance. I think part of the danger in creating these new options, unless we keep good control over it, is that they will be filled with other juveniles and this, indeed, will be an added cost to the State. I would hope that we could keep this very specific target population that is presently extending a great deal of money with very few results, keep this target population in mind so that they are the ones that are able to make use of the new program. Otherwise, there is no question that it could expand into a wide range of programs and we would have double the cost.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Does anybody else have anything?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Dr. Miller, we want to thank you for coming up today. I don't know where we go from here. As of August 15, you will have your alternatives developed and as of August 15, the Attorney General has said that there will be no longer any juveniles accepted.

I see from the panel that we have a number of distinguished jurists on the panel. Hopefully, this will impress the juvenile judges. We are having the juvenile judges here in another day or so and we will be talking to them.

I just want to say to you that being a Legislator from the City of Philadelphia, I have had a number of calls and a number of letters about the proposed closing of these institutions. A lot of people are disturbed and a lot of people are anxious to see the best thing happen. A lot of people are disturbed about the closing of the Cornwall Heights facility, especially. A lot of people have put a lot of time and interest in seeing that facility move along and progress. I don't know what is going to happen in this area. You are in charge now and have the responsibility of seeing that it all works out beautifully.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Dr. Miller; I didn't hear all of your remarks, but are you responsible or did you have any role in the appointment of the Camp Hill Review Panel?

DR. MILLER: I recommended some names. We got names from a number of sources.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: I am from Allegheny County so I am particularly interested in one facet of it. I have no quarrel with the qualifications of Judge Smith. However, Judge Smith does not sit in the Juvenile Division of the Common Pleas Court. He sits in the Adult Division. Is there any reason why the juvenile judges were not appointed?

DR. MILLER: No reason that I am aware of. I think that we tried to appoint people who had not publicly committed themselves in terms of a strong stand on either side of the issue. We tried to appoint people that wouldn't have a real vested interest.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: I would strongly recommend to you that you seriously consider recommending to the Governor one of our two juvenile judges to be appointed to this panel because of their past interest in juvenile affairs in that county. They did almost agree with you at the last meeting this Committee had.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Fisher, I was going to say this to the judges later this week. Judge Williams hasn't sat in Juvenile Court since he has been appointed to the bench. I am very familiar with Judge Williams and how he feels about a

lot of these things. As a matter of fact, Judge Williams was my preceptor. He hasn't tried anything but homicide cases since he has been on the bench. I don't know why he is on the panel, but we were going to ask these juvenile judges that when we see them later in the week.

(Witness excused.)

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Next we would like to have Mr. Mattingly.

JOHN MATTINGLY, Director, Camp Hill

Project, testified as follows:

MR. MATTINGLY: I am John Mattingly. I would like to make a very few brief remarks to bring you up to date.

I would like to introduce the other members of the staff who are here and then perhaps you can address questions to me or to anyone else.

Just to bring you up to date, since the last meeting of the Committee, we received our first bit of funding, on Thursday of last week. We have been operating without any money since the inception of the project. I don't know when you can say it was born but as far as funding is concerned, the Camp Hill project began on Thursday.

We have had a number of staff people working with

us since March or April and a number of folks through May and into June or July without pay up until the end of last week. Some of them haven't been paid. I think that is indicative of our interest and concern in this problem and our commitment to developing quality programs and programs that protect the community's security at the same time.

Having said that, I would like to tell you where we stand. The so-called emergency relief project is underway in the Camp Hill facility now. Briefly, that involves some 10 staff members who are over there working with the juveniles. We are attempting to set up phone communications on the block, supervised by our staff so that the youngsters can in a systematic way frequently be back in contact with their families.

We are again setting up a visiting program whereby we make specific effort to help the families of youngsters from far away come and visit their boys in Camp Hill. We will also attempt to supervise those visits so we don't overflow what there are there in Camp Hill so that we can help out the Camp Hill staff during those visits so that visiting is a humane experience rather than a very short attempt to stuff a bunch of people in one room at one time.

In addition to that, we are attempting to set up a whole range of very basic sorts of services at Camp Hill,



such as more recreation. Again, we are helping to supervise the recreation and we are making an effort to bring in some outside entertainment groups to entertain the youngsters over the weekend. That is underway at Camp Hill now.

I call this the emergency program because we really don't have any statutory authority to do this. We feel morally bound to do whatever we can in the short run to help out the youngsters who are there. That is why we are doing it.

The needs assessment has been completed on the youngsters at Camp Hill, with some few exceptions.

We have developed and are ready to put on line a tracking system, a computerized tracking system so that the Camp Hill staff and the Department of Welfare and the juvenile court judges and the Committee, if you like, will be able to know at any particular time on any particular day where all of the youngsters who are in the Camp Hill project are located. I will introduce someone today who can talk to you about that.

Our regional coordinators have been hired and are here in the room: John Kappler from the Western Region, Tom Cater from Southeast Region, Don Carter from the Central Region, and Mike Cleveland from the Northeast Region.

We are now desperately seeking to develop and sign contracts between the Camp Hill project and the providers of

service. We have on line a number of things, including contracts with local clinicians, who can help us whenever we call them, to work up the needs of particular youngsters and to try to assess how dangerous they may or may not be and what sort of resources they need so that our resource development --

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Mattingly, let me ask you a couple of questions. Let me ask you very directly: To what extent have you involved people in local communities in all of this seven million dollar project? I come from North Philadelphia, as does Representative Oliver. We have some kids there that we are concerned about and some kids that get locked up at least once a week. I can assure you that not one minister, not one businessman, not one neighbor leader, not one community mother knows anything about these projects, and they keep reading this stuff in the newspapers. Tell the Committee -- if you will pardon my emotionalism about this, every time the bureaucrats get talking about what they are doing, I want to know what the people in the communities where these kids come out of know about these projects.

MR. MATTINGLY: Our effort up to this point has been to hire the regional coordinator, Tom Carter, and a resource developer, John Myers, from Philadelphia. I have talked to a number of people. Perhaps Tom can tell you where we stand. We

have not made a systematic effort to blanket the Philadelphia community and say: would you like to come in with a proposal. We weren't in a position to pay anybody anything.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: That is not what I am talking about, Mr. Mattingly. I am not talking about who you go out and hire. I have the greatest confidence that you are going to hire the best people you can to become coordinated. The question I am talking about is what effort is being made by your office to involve people in the communities that these kids come out of?

MR. MATTINGLY: That is what I am relating to. You see, we are not going to set up a system of services operated by the Camp Hill project. We are not going to go out and hire a bunch of people to set up group homes or security programs. What we are attempting to do is to go back to the local communities. Our design is to go back to the local communities from whence the youngsters come to find professionals and citizens groups in those communities and to contract with them for these services. That is our aim.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Let me get at it another way. In the first year's two million dollar proposal, how much is set aside, how much of it is to actually develop group homes, or whatever it is that is to be done -- the alternative?

MR. MATTINGLY: Of the two million dollars, all but approximately three hundred thousand dollars is for only the development of the services. Of the seven hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars that we have under contract with Welfare now, four hundred and sixty-some thousand dollars was for the development and resources.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: You have four hundred thousand dollars now and seven hundred thousand dollars from the project. Hopefully, you are going to have around eleven hundred thousand dollars to do this stuff, or however the math works out. The point I am trying to get to is how do you involve the people at the local level? That is what I want to hear, and I think that is what this Committee wants to hear, and I think that is what the people in the state want to hear.

MR. MATTINGLY: What I am saying is the only way we are going to develop services is by involving local communities.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: And what is your methodology to do that?

MR. MATTINGLY: To hire a local person as a regional coordinator. His job then is to develop a small group of resource and development liaison people. They then go to each neighborhood or community in which we have a lot of youngsters

and work with the community leaders and with the professionals in that community to develop whatever will meet the needs of these youngsters. We have no intention of doing it in any other way. We are not going to hire people ourselves to go in there and do it. We will contract with that group.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Maybe this is a question that would be better put to the regional directors.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Well, he is supervising the regional directors.

MR. MATTINGLY: I can give you some more specifics.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Do you understand my point?

MR. MATTINGLY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Does anybody have any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Does that end your presentation?

MR. MATTINGLY: I should mention that at the Review Panel meeting, to make sure that this has all been clarified, we worked for an entire day around the issues of how we would operate and primarily with the judges on the Review Panel we reached an agreement that Dr. Miller then ratified that the Welfare Department in order to back up our own services, which were developed solely with a security program, the Welfare Department has agreed to make available and to make secure and

to provide special programs for youngsters who would have been sent to Camp Hill after the 15th of August.

That is all I wanted to mention.

I should introduce Dr. Gordon Langmyhr, who was responsible through the University of Pennsylvania, for the needs assessment and clinical work. He can give you a presentation of that.

I would also like to introduce Don Hazel from Pennsylvania State University, who developed the tracking system.

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: Some of the youngsters at Camp Hill are under the impression that they are going to be leaving there on August 15. Has staff informed these youngsters that that is not the case?

MR. MATTINGLY: Yes. That was their first responsibility, to get in there and quash any of the rumors that were not founded. That is the first thing that I told them to do.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Before we proceed, I understand the Doctor has a tight schedule. What is your schedule?

DR. LANGMYHR: Well, I would like to do whatever the Committee wants, but I do have to review a portion of the contract and then also try to catch a train back to Philadelphia.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: How many people are now at Camp Hill?

MR. MATTINGLY: As of today, I don't know. As of two Fridays ago, it was 340.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Have you made a determination as to how many of the 340 would require a security setting?

MR. MATTINGLY: I haven't seen the report.

Dr. Langmyhr --

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Just roughly.

MR. MATTINGLY: Well, this would be an assumption on my part, not based on the clinician's report because I haven't seen it. I would say 100 youngsters need to be locked in, need security. Now, that does not necessarily mean they need to be locked in throughout the whole course of their stay.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: What was the average stay before the Attorney General's pronouncement or declaration?

MR. MATTINGLY: My understanding is that it was 18 months.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: 18 months?

MR. MATTINGLY: That is my understanding.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Now, Dr. Miller pointed out that there has been a drastic reduction in intake in Camp Hill since the announcement of the August 15 target date. To what do you ascribe that?

MR. MATTINGLY: Well, it could be a number of

factors. This, again, is all assumption. I think the publicity as to bad conditions has a lot to do with it.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Where has the intake been dropping?

MR. MATTINGLY: It has been dropping across the Commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Dauphin County, for example?

MR. MATTINGLY: I have heard that Dauphin County has not dropped.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: That would mean that half of them are from Dauphin County.

MR. MATTINGLY: The last time I looked, it was 80. They were committing at a faster rate than Philadelphia.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Do you think the publicity about Camp Hill has had this effect?

MR. MATTINGLY: I think the courts began to take a hard look at why they were sending to Camp Hill and began to pull youngsters out.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Have you had any chance to look at the proportion of the current intake at Camp Hill as to whether or not the proportion of what we would call potentially dangerous kids, has that proportion remained constant or has it been simply -- has the intake become a harder intake?



MR. MATTINGLY: I don't have the capabilities of doing that.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Do you plan to do that? Are you interested in that because that would affect the ability to place later.

MR. MATTINGLY: What we need to do is to get the needs assessment. When we talk about a judgment as to how violent or dangerous this youngster is, it is not something that you can feed into a clinician system and get right back immediately the way you would like to. All we can do is send our clinicians in and evaluate as it comes in and then tabulate it. We haven't been able to do it yet.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: The status of commitments, has that been accomplished?

MR. MATTINGLY: I don't know.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: I would be interested in knowing whether the mix in terms of the kinds of commitments at Camp Hill since we started the exodus, has the mix in a sense been improved. Are we making it a harder mix? That is what Camp Hill was supposed to be all about.

MR. MATTINGLY: Now, starting with the 15th, say the mix gets harder. My assumption is that after the 15th the mix will remain the same.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: I am talking about the intake that would have gone to Camp Hill.

MR. MATTINGLY: It comes to us. That mix will maybe get smaller, but certainly harder.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Have you worked out any priority system between the kids who are there and the intake? First of all -- what I am worried about and one of my concerns is that since the Attorney General of the Administration has made a firm commitment not to take any more kids into Camp Hill and there are already kids at Camp Hill -- let's say your establishment of alternatives is not as successful as you would like it to be. I, for one, hope it is terrific. If it isn't, are you in a political bind where we will be forced to place kids of new intake or what would have been intake into Camp Hill into these new programs of beds and placements and the kids who are already at Camp Hill would spend more time at Camp Hill as a result of this program. Is that likely to happen?

MR. MATTINGLY: It has very much entered into our concern. It seems to me that the first thing we have to do is see to it that we can handle the new intake so that there is a place that is secure to which the courts can commit for very serious offenses.

However, as a second goal which has got to follow

then is to go back to the courts case by case, day by day and have the youngsters at Camp Hill placed in the project as well.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: I am asking you a very simple question. You have one bed that opens up in one facility. You have one kid at Camp Hill who has been there ten months and needs a secure bed, and you have an intake which is pretty much in the same area. Now, who gets the bed? Have you worked that policy decision out?

MR. MATTINGLY: As of August 15, the new cases have to get that secure bed.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: I was suspicious that that might be so.

MR. MATTINGLY: I have no other way to go. If we don't find a bed for that new case, then there is no place where the youngster can be sent.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Then there is a danger of some people at Camp Hill staying there pretty long?

MR. MATTINGLY: What I am trying to do to resolve some of that -- you see, the pressure on the courts, the liaison people and the region coordinators will be that new intake. They will be back in the home regions working in the courts every day. The pressure will have to be on that new intake. What I have done is starting tomorrow morning -- the first

meeting is tomorrow. Our emergency people in Camp Hill are going to be meeting with our regional coordinators so that I can set up a pressure point from the people working at Camp Hill on the regional coordinators so that we can even that out. I feel a very strong moral commitment to get the youngsters out of there.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: I was very surprised to see how positive the judges were about the whole program.

MR. MATTINGLY: We have already worked with them in a lot of cases.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: If the judges decide to up the intake, they can do it just by a stroke of the pen. You could have a situation where you wouldn't get anybody out of Camp Hill.

MR. MATTINGLY: The judges feel a commitment to the youngsters who are in there now. They feel a commitment to those youngsters too. They are pressuring us already to help out.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: So their voluntary reduction in commitment is implicitly supporting the very basis of what you are trying to do?

MR. MATTINGLY: I believe so. There is support already in the Commonwealth that is holding out a number of

cases for the August 15 deadline in order to send them to us. You see, we don't have money to purchase services. Cases they would have sent to Camp Hill, they are holding them out. That is positive.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Let's get down to brass tacks. I know you don't have money. The regional people are going to tell us pretty much the details as far as the problems of setting up. You must have some determinations about whether you have the placements or not. Whatever your way of measuring how far along the line are you, how far along the line are you?

MR. MATTINGLY: We are very close to start. We are about three steps away from start, about three yards away from start and still a hundred yards to go. That is about where we are. What we do have is what I have mentioned already.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: What you are saying is you are 97 percent of the way towards having the placements you need on August 15?

MR. MATTINGLY: No, 3 percent.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: You are 3 percent of the way?

MR. MATTINGLY: 3 percent. I think that was a major step, but we do have the money, getting the money from the State bureaucracy and putting it in place is a major accomplishment.

In terms of having the programs out there to which the youngsters can be sent on August 15, new programs all ready, we are a long way along.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Let me ask you this question: Will you be able to handle on August 15 all of the new intake?

MR. MATTINGLY: No.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: What are you going to do?

MR. MATTINGLY: We will be able to handle by August 15 in most of the areas -- and I think our regional people should talk about this individually. We will be able to handle upwards of 50 percent to 60 percent of new intake, the ones that don't need to be locked up, the ones that need to be put into structured community programs and provided with a great deal of supervision.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: That means that 40 percent or 50 percent will be in the dangerous category. Assuming you are going to house 50 percent or 60 percent of them in a non-secure setting, what are you going to do with the other percent?

MR. MATTINGLY: We are going to have to push ahead in getting a secure program set up.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: I am asking a very simple question though. What happens on August 16 when you don't have the secure beds in a secure situation?

MR. MATTINGLY: If a youngster is dangerous and needs security, we will have to recommend that he be committed to Cornwall Heights or --

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Let's take Cornwall Heights and New Castle. I get complaints all of the time in my side of the state that New Castle is flooded with kids. Is that true?

MR. MATTINGLY: I don't know.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. MATTINGLY: His guarantee to judges at the Review Panel was that there would be 50 beds made available and (inaudible).

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Let's hope the judges cooperate out there. I wonder what is going to happen to the kids who are at New Castle now.

MR. MATTINGLY: My assumption is that the Commissioner is working on community programs.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: But the way it stands now, you will have to fall back on New Castle and Cornwall Heights on August 15.

MR. MATTINGLY: That is right.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: As you see it now, are all of the new secured placements starting August 15 going to be at New Castle and Cornwall Heights -- you have no secure facilities

right now anywhere?

MR. MATTINGLY: Unless we get very lucky by August 15.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: But as you see it now, all of the secure settings will be at Cornwall Heights and New Castle as of August 15, is that right?

MR. MATTINGLY: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: How long will that take, the best estimate you can make?

MR. MATTINGLY: I would say by October 1, by the outside the end of this year we will have our secure program set up. Don't misunderstand me. I want to emphasize that I believe that only one-quarter of the youngsters at Camp Hill need security, at the most.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: When you say October 1 for secure setting, do you mean a combination of the new intake that needs secure setting and the current population of Camp Hill that needs secure setting or just the new intake?

MR. MATTINGLY: October 1 - new intake. End of the year - all. That is my estimate. I want to emphasize that most of the youngsters don't need this.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: What is your timetable for the non-secure setting?



MR. MATTINGLY: We expect to have a number of beds operating immediately. First of all, I would say we have already worked with the courts to develop programs, even though we don't have any programs that are already operating.

Let's take the case of the youngster who is ordered out of the Muncy institution by the Superior Court. We just had the hearing last week in which this youngster was placed in a group home. We did that whole process. We have done a number of cases in Montgomery County and we are working on cases in Dauphin County. We are trying to simply take our staff and utilize resources already there that perhaps have not been available to the courts. That is already underway. By August 15, we expect to have community residential centers with the very structured group homes we talk about, anywhere from 8 to 14. We expect to have that in place in at least 3 of the 4 regions. That is anywhere from 8 to 14.

We will have our outward bound program in place by August 15, able to handle 10 kids for a two week intake and 10 more for a two week intake after that, for a total of 22. That will be in place by August 15.

The community advocate program whereby we will pay an advocate a salary to simply sit with the youngster anywhere from 15 to 30 hours a week, that will be in place throughout the

state on August 15, capable of handling up to 100 youngsters. That is primarily a model to hook into other services. That will be available to us.

We are looking at a number of group homes and foster homes that have come to us and talked about proposals, but we didn't have the money.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: When do you plan to have the total non-secure placement program totally functioning?

MR. MATTINGLY: By the end of the year, handling 500 youngsters.

The point I wanted to make before is that I expect that the intake to the Camp Hill project, the mix will be foster because since we are there with programs, a lot of courts may begin to use us more than they would have used Camp Hill. There are courts that have a lot of difficult cases that they never sent. So, we have to be on our guard that we don't fill up the Camp Hill project with youngsters who really belong in other Welfare programs or local programs.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Just one last question: What percentage of the non-secure placements would you estimate would be completely new programs -- what percentage of the beds, or how do you describe the placement for beds, when you finally get fully operated at the end of the year will be new programs

as opposed to expansion of existing programs?

MR. MATTINGLY: It is hard to answer your question because, you see, we might go to a service in the community which is operating a number of group homes and you might say you want them to expand and to develop a more supervised structure. It would then be new or expanding.

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Are you making that kind of a determination for yourself? If you are, I would appreciate knowing about it.

(No audible response.)

REPRESENTATIVE RHODES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your indulgence.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Does anyone else have any questions

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: Will staff be phased out or transferred, say, by January 1, 1976, at Camp Hill?

MR. MATTINGLY: I can't answer that. That would be up to the Department of Justice. You see, we are just there representing Welfare in the short run. What they do with their staff after the juveniles arrive, I don't know.

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: How many cells do you have there for these juveniles?

MR. MATTINGLY: There are three blocks. I am not sure how many cells. Each youngster would have his own cell.

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: Of his own?

MR. MATTINGLY: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: How near are the adults to these juveniles?

MR. MATTINGLY: Well, I don't work in there every day, so I will just give you a general picture. Up to now either the youngsters have been locked in most of the day or else when they go to the commissary, when they go to eat, when they go to the shop, or when they work in the kitchen, they are mixing with the adults. I could bring in folks who work in there all of the time to talk to you about it the next time.

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: Are you aware of any of these juveniles being molested?

MR. MATTINGLY: Am I personally aware?

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: Yes.

MR. MATTINGLY: Having only visited there twice, no.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: John, who is doing the needs assessment?

MR. MATTINGLY: Dr. Langmyhr.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: He is going to make some comments later?

MR. MATTINGLY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Thank you very much, Mr. Mattingly.

We will continue to have you before the Committee as long as it is necessary and until we feel you are well underway in serving the best needs of the people of the Commonwealth.

I would like to have next Dr. Langmyhr.

DR. GORDON LANGMYHR, Diagnostic Unit,  
Penn State University, testified as follows:

DR. LANGMYHR: I have various materials here that you might like to have. I am from the University of Pennsylvania, and I have been working with a group of people on the assessment part of this project. There are descriptions in that folder of the administrative structure as well as some of the supervisors, and so on.

I would very much like to have had Dr. Michael Parrish with me today, since he has been the main professional supervisor of the activities, along with Dr. Sadoff, and a couple of other people as the activities at Camp Hill have progressed.

Let me just begin by saying that what we have done is not all our own. We have known that other people have done

assessments like this. We did consult with other authorities, primarily Dr. John Russell from Boston. We also consulted with Dr. Wolfgang of the University of Pennsylvania, a well-known expert in criminology, and others.

What we did was to, first of all, develop a group of people that we thought had experience or the experience with juveniles and the interest in doing this kind of clinical assessment. We developed a full range of contacts all the way from the Department of Psychology and the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania, the Child Guidance Clinic at Norristown State, Haverford State, University of Pittsburgh, and so on.

One of the things that Drs. Parrish and Sadoff decided to do was to develop two forms which you have in your possession called "Information from Records." And the "Interview Information."

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Doctor, before you get to that, let me just ask you a question. I want you to understand this question. It is somewhat of a sensitive question, and I believe it is a sensitive area. I don't want you to take this remark as a racist question, but how many of these are from the black population?

DR. LANGMYHR: On the staff --

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: I mean on the administrative structure.

DR. LANGMYHR: On the administrative structure, none.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: You see, one of the problems that we who are minorities face, at least in terms of representing our constituency, is the constant interrogatory from people in the communities as to why is it that always programs are planned for people who are mostly minorities and don't involve any minority persons in the structure. I don't know whether that is within your area to answer or Mr. Mattingly or Dr. Miller, who has gone. Somewhere along the line we have to face that question, and I think we faced that same question in many areas. Here you are. You have submitted a proposal to the Federal government, all kinds of affirmative action programs with equal opportunity clauses, and yet as I go through this structure which is to provide some kind of psychiatric review, I find no equal employment provisions being provided for us in a very critical area. I mean, if you are talking about the psychic, kids who get involved in crime, why not involve people who perhaps could have some identification with those kids to get involved in those? Perhaps you can answer that question, but I think it is always very interesting to observe that.

MR. MATTINGLY: I can't answer for Dr. Langmyhr, but maybe for the project as a whole. Perhaps Dr. Langmyhr would like to talk more psychiatrists. I would like to talk about our staff. I am firmly committed to having at least half of our staff minority.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: I was specifically referring to the psychiatric involvement.

MR. MATTINGLY: In the clinicians that will be working in the region, we are very much concerned about that. We have already talked about this. The profession, it is often very difficult to locate minority psychiatrists.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: No, it isn't. I can think of about ten off the top of my head.

MR. MATTINGLY: It is a concern and I am quite willing to prove that it is a concern as we go along.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Don't get me wrong now. I am not making any accusations, but I think as an observation, it is important when you begin to talk about certain kinds of kids who have certain kinds of problems, you talk about how we deal with that psychic, you know, to include those people who may have some speculative point of view. Some of these people from the University of Pennsylvania, I have had occasion to witness them. I don't know them personally. I have no doubt about



their professional competence, and I don't intend to make an issue out of it. I do think that somewhere along the line, we ought to begin to think about some minority involvement from the psychiatric point of view. It may open a whole new world, even to you, perhaps, of some things that you want to consider.

I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt the presentation.

DR. LANGMYHR: May I only say that I hear what you are saying, and Dr. Sadoff and Dr. Parrish were, I think, aware of this problem. Our main problem was one of urgency, and I wish we could have recruited some of the people you are referring to.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Well, there are some good ones around.

DR. LANGMYHR: There certainly are.

What was developed were these two items I referred to: information from records and the interview information. This was a way to assess the clinician, to scrutinize the records available to him, to make the proper examination and at the same time to structure his interview which we planned, based on the opinion of a number of people, to be about two and a half hours long.

We asked clinicians to submit a report of

approximately two to three pages, which he dictated right then and there. The sequence went this way. Mr. Goosa, who is the administrative coordinator at Camp Hill, helped us to schedule the boys. The records were available. Clinicians would come in, sit down and scrutinize records and then interview the boy for the appropriate length of time, and then meet with the supervisor. I must say that the supervisory session was mandatory. In other words, you didn't write your own reports unless you had that supervision, particularly if you felt there were problems, and you then dictated your report.

The report was typed in rough draft, sent back to the clinician for any technical errors. He wasn't asked to be an editor, or anything like that. It has been scrutinized by the supervisor on the particular case.

We estimate that we will have 100 of the reports available at the end of this week. We have hopes that the additional 250 will be available by the 20th or the 21st of August. Under circumstances that have been at the same time trying but also very challenging, we have found this a very important and challenging experience.

I would be glad to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Representative Fisher?

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Doctor, in your report,

your two forms that we have in this folder, they appear to be fairly comprehensive in all regards. You have indicated that you have about 100 that you are hoping to have ready by the end of this week. Now, what would you say would be the most important criteria for you to determine whether or not a youth needs ongoing security?

DR. LANGMYHR: We chose to do this. We chose to write a description of each boy which would include a number of things -- his I.Q., his personality structure, his development, his family history, his delinquency record and arrest, along with the boy's particular concern, his motivations, and so on. Therefore, I think we have in the view of Drs. Parrish and Sadoff, who developed this system, a number of criteria which enable them to describe the boy.

I am not trying to evade the question, but I am trying to describe a process that professionals by and large get into in an area which in a sense is not as hard as certain other areas, for example, of medicine. It is based on this description that we come up with an assessment of each juvenile.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: I sense, and I may not have any support on this position by other members of the Committee, but I sense that the furor with the Camp Hill project and the concern with the Camp Hill project is one that the communities

and the people who have been involved in juvenile justice have put a lot of faith in the people who are from the juvenile court around the state, particularly judges in their decisions, to determine who is to be incarcerated and who isn't. I draw a parallel to the pre-release and furlough system throughout the state. And that is that you can look at all of these other criteria, and you can see a boy or a girl from a broken home who may have psychological problems, and you may be able to pinpoint psychologically the one particular juvenile who maybe there for a simple theft might be much more dangerous than the juvenile who got his temper up one night and went out and stabbed a friend of his, and this may be the only offense this young boy may commit. But nevertheless, when this project begins, I think with the inception of this project we have heard a lot of judges say, particularly judges from my part of the state who say: the only ones we commit to Camp Hill are the ones who commit the most serious crimes. And I can see this project being undermined if those who are involved in serious offenses are not treated somewhat differently, at least in the needs assessment, than those who are involved in rather minor or maybe continuing minor offenses. Once the community hears that we have one of these community centers that a couple of young boys or girls who are involved in a number of

rapes or a number of murders go back in the community, everyone will come yelling to us -- why don't you do something about this Camp Hill project? That is not the right approach, but this is the community feelings. All they have to hear is murder or robbery, and they don't want to hear about the fact that he may never commit another such offense. I guess my question is: How much are you directing your approach to try to overcome the community feelings that are going to be generated?

DR. LANGMYHR: I think the best answer is that when we considered the proposal, there was what I felt was an early judgment, which very frankly frightened me that we would have the power to recommend, and it was at that point that I said that I would prefer to have nothing to do with the project until it was explained to me. What we would do is provide the clinical assessments which would go to the Camp Hill project, which in turn meant that the project people, through regional directors and the liaison people would then work with the judges, who would then use these reports in ways that were suitable. It was at that point that I got interested in the project. It is that kind of knowledge which makes me feel much more comfortable with what we have been doing.

I have carefully looked at some of the newspaper reports, one of them appearing in yesterday's Philadelphia

paper. Unfortunately, that kind of sequence has been omitted again and again, and I wish it hadn't been omitted. I think it is a very important sequence that people should understand.

I hope that answers the question in the detail you need.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: I am not sure, Representative Fisher, that this Doctor is really in a position to answer that question. I think that goes to the heart of the matter. To me, this issue is starting to become a political football and starting to become something for the press and others, you know, to continue to write about as if something major is being accomplished, when in fact something major may be happening to send us backward.

I get this same kind of interrogatories Representative Fisher gets, and I am sure others on this Committee do also. We are talking about returning kids back into the community from which they came and those communities, the communities are saying: get these kids out of the community because of the involvement, you know. So, I for one am concerned that some understanding develops at the local level. I don't care whether we are talking about Pittsburgh or Philadelphia or Mercer County, or wherever. People should understand what it is that you are trying to do. I haven't heard anywhere along the way in more

than three hours of hearings on this project a clear definitive explanation as to how we are going to get the people in the local communities to understand what we are trying to do.

We have the same problems in the drug and alcohol abuse area where half-way houses were being opened in neighborhoods, and people say, anywhere else is fine, but not in my community. Until that is worked out, I don't see how you are going to be successful.

MR. MATTINGLY: The traditional approach has been that the state would move in and open a house and then sort of say: what are you going to do about it? Our approach is going to be first to go to the community leaders and ask them to take the responsibility for these programs.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Mattingly, I hear you, and I heard what you said earlier when you testified, and I heard what you said the last time, but you have not told us how you intend to work that out. Maybe that is something we are going to hear from the project directors.

MR. MATTINGLY: It is going to be up to them to do it specifically.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: All I have heard is nice-sounding words and no methodology.

MR. MATTINGLY: I don't know what you mean by

methodology.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: If you don't know how, I don't know.

MR. MATTINGLY: I think I do know how. That is what I am trying to explain.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Let me ask you another question. These group homes, will they be owned by the Commonwealth or privately owned and paid for by Commonwealth funds?

MR. MATTINGLY: They will be leased.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: By whom?

MR. MATTINGLY: A group will come to us or an organization or agency will come to us with a proposal. We will write a contract with them. Part of that contract will be for buildings and maintenance, and that kind of stuff.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Have you had any legal opinions as to whether or not you intend to abide by the zoning regulations in the particular areas?

MR. MATTINGLY: We intend to have that in our contract.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Have you given any thought I think you get right down to the point where you are just not going to be able to handle certain classes of offenses in this project without incurring the wrath of the community, wherever



that community may be. Have you given any thought as the project director of actually getting to the point where you would go and recommend to the juvenile court judge that a particular individual be certified as (inaudible).

MR. MATTINGLY: We are not going to do that because we will have security. We will have our own secure program. If a youngster is dangerous, we will recommend that the court place him in a secured place, and that youngster won't necessarily be able to be moved until the court agrees.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: I don't understand that. What is your secure program going to be? Try to explain for me and the other members of the Committee what this ultimate secured facility is going to be like?

MR. MATTINGLY: It will be something like an 8 to 10 bed unit which is locked, perhaps with a fence. There are several options we are looking at now in buildings that exist near communities, but not in town. We are looking into leasing parts of detention homes that are new and half-filled, and then we are talking about bringing in a lot of expensive programs, bringing in a lot of people who are experienced in the field to work with small numbers of youngsters.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Sort of a mini-jail somewhere?

MR. MATTINGLY: It will be a very high-priced jail, but we have to lock up some of these youngsters.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Have you made any estimates of what this will cost per juvenile incarcerated in one of these?

MR. MATTINGLY: It would cost \$100 per day for one of these programs.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: Doctor, you say roughly there will be 100 reports done by the end of the week?

DR. LANGMYHR: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: Out of that 100, could you give us an idea of how many of these juveniles will need secure institutions?

DR. LANGMYHR: I can't give you the precise statistics. Dr. Parrish, had he been able, would have accompanied me. Dr. Parrish has estimated that probably 100 boys out of the total group will need the kind of treatment that Mr. Mattingly has referred to. Now, out of that 100, there is still not known how many boys need to be in that kind of secured facility Mr. Mattingly is talking about. I am afraid, since I was asked to come here on Friday afternoon, that I couldn't get the records and even begin to give you any better idea than that.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: Mr. Mattingly, out of the

408 that will be studied, 100 may need a secured institution. Do you have any idea at this time how many you can place?

MR. MATTINGLY: How many we can place today in a secured setting?

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: Yes.

MR. MATTINGLY: We can place none today.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: By January 1?

MR. MATTINGLY: Well, by January 1 we will be able to handle somewhere -- well, just at the Camp Hill project, not including the two Welfare securities with 100 beds total, we will be able to handle 50 or 60.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: This is by January 1?

MR. MATTINGLY: That is right.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: What would happen to the other 40?

MR. MATTINGLY: Well, the other 40, many of them may have already been released. Some of them may have to go into one of the other two facilities, Welfare facilities.

REPRESENTATIVE OLIVER: After reviewing the assessments of these individuals, realizing their potentials, whether they be good or bad, what procedures do you use and what recommendations do you make and to whom?

MR. MATTINGLY: Our emergency staff at Camp Hill

working with the counselors and the staff at Camp Hill, just the staff, and utilizing the reports made available by the clinicians, and their own knowledge of the youngsters and youngsters' families, will through Superintendent Patton send a plan to the court and to our regional staff, suggesting what the needs of the particular youngster are, what the strengths and weaknesses of the youngster are, and the type of placement that would be most beneficial. It is then on our liaison staff, the court liaison people to locate the spot and to recommend to the court the appropriate commitment.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Does any other member of the Committee have any questions for Mr. Mattingly or Dr. Langmyhr?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: If not, we would like to have about a five minute recess, and we will pick it up from there.

(Brief recess.)

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Donald Hazel.

DONALD HAZEL, Tracking, Penn State University, testified as follows:

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Hazel, do you have any opening remarks you would like to make?

MR. HAZEL: Nothing really special, except that the

design of the tracking system, as John said earlier, is mainly just to show where the juveniles are at any one particular time. Now, it has other benefits. It provides certain outputs such as critical incidents that happened in the last couple of weeks, what type of juveniles are in for which charges, classification of juveniles, the number of available beds. In general, it is sort of a statistical summary of what is going on with the juveniles.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: I just thought of a question. Perhaps this gets a little bit into tracking and maybe John Mattingly can help you out on this question. Out of this program is there going to be a sort of juvenile, community centers where the juveniles are on the outside, a pre-release or furlough-type of situation with the juvenile program? In other words, will these juveniles in these programs have access to the outside?

MR. MATTINGLY: Oh, sure.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Say a juvenile who is on the outside from one of the centers gets involved in another offense. Will there be some way that this input from the arresting agency would be able to be put into your tracking system to alert the project director that perhaps the community center this juvenile is in is not the appropriate one for him?

MR. HAZEL: All of the information of that type will first come here to Harrisburg, and this is what we might call a critical list, where something has happened out of the ordinary. The people in Harrisburg will know it here first. It will then be put on the system as a critical incident and then maybe we want to have an analysis of the critical incidents of this site to see if perhaps by chance more things are happening at this one site or this one juvenile. This all can be worked in. We have a capacity for special reports. At the end of the month they want to know which sites have the most critical incidents.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Your function, Mr. Hazel, in operation and design is relatively new. Have you had any experience in the past in developing a tracking system?

MR. HAZEL: We have a system not directed to juveniles but we have numerous ones working right now that involve keeping track of our employees, what they are doing. We have one system in particular working with interviewers that tells what they are doing on the outside, what their costs are, what their past history is. It is basically the same type of information applied to juveniles. We have never done a tracking system with adult criminals or juveniles per se, but we have done tracking systems.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: It is my understanding that you work for the University of Pennsylvania?

MR. HAZEL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Which department?

MR. HAZEL: The Pennsylvania Research Lab.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Is that a creature that is funded by the Legislature in any way?

MR. HAZEL: It has some funding through EPW, some funding through the college, some Federal funding. We operate several surveys throughout Pennsylvania.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: It is my understanding that this information will be fed into a computer, is that right?

MR. HAZEL: The information will be fed into a computer, minus all specifically identifying facts. In other words, the name, home and address, and things like that. All of that information will be kept here at Harrisburg and Harrisburg will furnish us with a number. As far as we are concerned, that is a number so there will be no confidentiality problem or anything like this.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: You will be tracing a number?

MR. HAZEL: If someone says they want information on child 1002, we can get information on that child. We will have no way of knowing who that child is.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: What kind of information will you get?

MR. HAZEL: Well, a history, what their prior offenses are, the reason they were brought into the system, where they had been within the system. There might be several different fights during their course of stay, and we will have a history on that. We have comments from counselors, and we also have special incidents.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: What are they?

MR. HAZEL: Suppose he has had a runaway in the last two weeks. We keep that on record.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: What is the definition of critical incident? Was the definition of critical incident part and parcel of the proposal or did it derive through your dialogue? How did you arrive at the definition?

MR. MATTINGLY: The definition, of course, isn't final. It was simply derived at from our needs for information about what goes on in our system. We had to figure what kind of things would we need to hear about right away. That is what we defined to be a critical incident.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: How long has this operation been in use, Mr. Hazel, at the University?

MR. HAZEL: You mean the tracking system?



CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Yes.

MR. HAZEL: This was simply developed before the Camp Hill project.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Do you have a legal opinion from your counsel as to whether or not it is legal to use this system?

MR. HAZEL: Legal to use the system?

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: For this particular purpose?

MR. HAZEL: No, we are simply contracted to develop the system.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Who will have access to this information?

MR. HAZEL: Basically, John is going to be the main person that will have access. After the system is developed, I will probably lose access myself. Mr. Helms will be responsible for updating the system. All people that have access will have to have identification codes. They will have to know the password to the information for that day in order to even get into the system. Basically, there will be two people that can get into it, and the password will be changed in order to keep security.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Well, if the same person who has access is the person who will be making the input, what

value will the system be over and above the mere keeping of records by that same individual?

MR. HAZEL: It would be rather difficult for Mr. Mattingly to sit down upon request and in a couple of days or a couple of hours come out with a chart that is requested by the Legislature for distribution of juveniles by criminal type within certain types of sites or certain classes of facilities. You have to sit down and practically count them by hand. Keeping it on the computers is not difficult.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Hazel, I don't have any further questions. As a matter of suggestion to you, I would think you would want to get a legal opinion from house counsel as to whether or not you are subjecting the University to some unnecessary legal risk by use of computer tape for this type of activity.

Does anybody else have anything further?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: We have four more people who I understand are regional directors: Mr. John Kappler -- is he here?

MR. KAPPLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: You are the director of which region?

MR. KAPPLER: The Western Region.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: And that includes which area?

MR. KAPPLER: The western 23 counties.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: And Mr. Thomas Carter?

MR. THOMAS CARTER: Here.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: You are director for which region?

MR. THOMAS CARTER: Southeast Region, 5 counties.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Including Philadelphia?

MR. THOMAS CARTER: Including Philadelphia and 4  
suburban counties.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Michael Cleveland?

MR. CLEVELAND: Here.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: And you are director of which  
area, Michael?

MR. CLEVELAND: Northeast.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: And that includes how many  
counties?

MR. CLEVELAND: 15.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: And Mr. Donald Carter?

MR. DONALD CARTER: Here. I have the Central  
Region, consisting of 24 counties.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: How many counties?

MR. DONALD CARTER: 24.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Let me ask this question of Mr. Mattingly before we have questions for the other people.

What criterion of selection for your regional directors?

MR. MATTINGLY: People who were, first of all, concerned for the needs of youngsters and who have had some experience working in the field of juvenile justice or service to them. Thirdly, they had to have some contacts with the juvenile courts.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Kappler, would you tell us what your experience with juvenile courts is and has been?

MR. KAPPLER: Yes. I began work at Allegheny County in 1970 as a probation officer. I worked for them for a period of two years and then worked at the Institution of Youth Development Center at Warrendale.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Would you speak louder. We can't hear you.

MR. KAPPLER: Following my two years at the Allegheny County Probation Office, I worked for a year developing the community alternatives program for the youth development at Warrendale, which was a program entailing transferring children from the YDC to group homes and group foster homes and back into the community. Following that, I worked for a year in a

regional office of DPW as an assistant to the regional director of youth services. I was there for a year and then accepted a position as director of youth services for Southwest Mental Health and Mental Retardation, which is worked out in the City of Pittsburgh in cooperation with the state police and juvenile court.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Carter, would you give us your experience in the juvenile court area?

MR. THOMAS CARTER: I don't know if it would be accurate to say juvenile court. I have had experience with juvenile corrections, and that started out here in Pennsylvania where I acted as special assistant to the commissioner of corrections and then moved to Illinois where I had responsibility for all programs for inmates, both adult and juvenile.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Donald Carter?

MR. DONALD CARTER: Well, I have no direct experience other than working for the sub-committee on corrections this past winter with regard to juveniles, but I have had experience running training programs for adults. (Inaudible.)

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: We can't hear you too well.

MR. DONALD CARTER: I work for (inaudible) training institute, which was a training institute designed by some service companies in the Harrisburg area, and it was designed

to employ those hard-core, unemployed people who had trouble finding employment in service-type, middle management-type positions.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Mr. Cleveland?

MR. CLEVELAND: I worked for a year and a half as a probation officer for juveniles in Northampton County and for the last five years I have been involved in various programs involving adult and juvenile correction throughout the 15-county Northeast Region. I am finishing up this last year as director of a half-way house serving both adults and juveniles.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Does anybody else have any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: I have a question for Mr. Tom Carter. How many programs do you expect to have in Philadelphia County itself?

MR. THOMAS CARTER: I think the premise on which the project is operating would mitigate against me saying how many in number of programs we would either stimulate or use. What we would attempt to do through the vehicle of the finances we receive is to provide the services to the children. The children will be placed, and we intend to initiate at least one residential or one entity in each residential-type of placement from high intensity security through independent living

situations. Beyond that, I really couldn't give you a number. In other words, we don't want to limit ourselves and think of numbers as much as we want to think of service to the particular child. We do have flexibility through the project to offer specific services to specific children because we have the vehicle of the dollar to act as the medium of exchange. We would be infinite in terms of our reach to provide the services to meet the needs of the child.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: I understand that John Myers is going to be working with you. Will you be taking steps to contact the community to make them aware of these programs?

MR. MYERS: That has already happened in Philadelphia.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: John, would you identify yourself for the record?

MR. MYERS: My name is John Myers, and I am working in the capacity as consultant to the Camp Hill project on a statewide basis to help them identify the program in specific communities.

As far as Philadelphia is concerned, we have been contacting initially those groups and community organizations that we have come in contact with that have had interest historically in juveniles, and corrections in general. Also, we

have been contacting the young people's organizations such as urban coalition, et cetera, to enlighten them in terms of what the program is about.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDERER: Say that I have a house and want to make a contract with the Camp Hill project. Would you say it would be your job before giving me the contract or input into the contract to make sure that I have contacted the community and possibly have talked to the community leaders?

MR. MYERS: That would be the region director's responsibility to follow up on that. For example, if we sat down and I was in the conversation and once we had the proposal and alternatives to the program, I would get together with the regional director and have him talk to you. (Inaudible.)

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: Representative Fisher?

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: I want to ask Mr. Kappler some questions.

John, your background seems to qualify you very well for the position you are in. How long have you been onboard with this project?

MR. KAPPLER: I have been onboard since the first of July.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: What steps have you taken in the Western Region to begin to implement the duties that you



will have in the future?

MR. KAPPLER: So far I have been talking with several different counties around the kind of resources that we are funded to develop and attempting at the same time to get a feel from that county of what they would be comfortable with and, in addition to that, what kind of agencies exist in that county to provide that service. The counties that I have been talking with have been very cooperative along these lines, extending invitations to me and also giving me introductions to various agencies or groups who traditionally have had an interest in juveniles. Beyond that, setting down rough framework, explaining exactly what we are about. That is about as far as I have gone.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Would you know of the availability of any secured facilities that may be available in the near future or by January 1st of next year in the Western Region, other than the Youth Development Center at New Castle?

MR. KAPPLER: Yes. We have lines on several different facilities that, number one, would meet the L and I requirement for a secured facility or, number two, could be converted with minimal kind of renovations, also bearing in mind the locations of these facilities. I would prefer that a secured facility be not dead center in the middle of a community but

rather far removed, not thinking that the facility would be large, but a small facility maybe on the outskirts of a city would be more what I am looking for.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Are you willing to divulge any locations at this point?

MR. KAPPLER: I think it would be premature at this point to divulge any exact locations.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: How about estimates of numbers of beds for secured facilities, based on what you know now?

MR. KAPPLER: I would say that I would need in the Western Region approximately 10 secured beds.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: How many?

MR. KAPPLER: 10.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Are you talking about the initial first month, or what? I thought Mr. Matterly indicated that there would be at least 100 of the existing people at Camp Hill who needed secured facilities and approximately 500 people in the first year. Was that your estimate?

MR. MATTINGLY: 500 in the whole program.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Maybe another 100 in the secured?

MR. MATTINGLY: Do you mean of the 500, would 100

be in secured?

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Yes.

MR. MATTINGLY: No, not necessarily.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: What you are saying is that basically you project only the need for about 10 in the Western Region?

MR. KAPPLER: Yes. I feel that way. I feel that maximum security in and of itself does nothing.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: We are not talking maximum or minimum, just some place that is secure within the guidelines that have been set down by your project.

MR. KAPPLER: Yes. I think 10.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: Have you people discussed this facet of the program among yourselves?

MR. MATTINGLY: Yes. We are not coming from two different directions at all. If you have 10 youngsters locked in at a given time, that does not mean that you have 10 youngsters locked in for the whole year.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: I understand that.

MR. MATTINGLY: Even with the most difficult cases of holding a youngster behind bars for 18 months and then letting him go, we want to move that youngster through security and then out into locations where we can watch them 24 hours a day and

then out into a group home, foster home, day care.

REPRESENTATIVE FISHER: I would just like to make the statement that I think your figures conflict as to what your projections are. Mr. Kappler has a 23-county region. I am not being critical of him, but he says he needs only 10 secured beds. Yet you have a projection of 402 beds around the state. Your projections and certainly what I can see from the population at the present time would indicate that we have a much greater need and perhaps the regional director should be aware of that much greater need.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: I think we have come to the end of today's hearings, and I just want to make a brief statement for the record.

We referred earlier this morning to articles that have been appearing in the various newspapers about the Camp Hill project. This legislative committee has the responsibility of providing legislative oversight at the direction of the Department of Welfare and also the Commissioner's office. I just would like to say that from what I have heard at the last two hearings of more than three hours of testimony, we have heard a lot of vague generalities and we continue to press for some specifics. We have heard conflicting evidence in terms of the number of beds that will be provided as opposed to the

number that is needed.

Quite frankly, I think we are at the point where the Legislature is going to be hard pressed pretty soon to continue to sit quietly and wait for this development. We said at the last time that we would have you back at the end of July. We said that at the end of June, I believe. Here it is the end of July. There has, unquestionably, been a reversal in your position. The original position that was enunciated was that the facility would stop on August 15. That is a matter of record. I can appreciate the reversal, but we still have heard a lot of vague generalities.

I can't say what the Legislature is going to do. I think it has a responsibility to try to continue to be of help. I said that to Dr. Miller the last time, but how can we be of help when we don't get accurate information. I don't think we have received it.

Does anyone else want to say anything?

MR. MATTINGLY: It has never been my position -- and I would like to review the record -- that we would leave Camp Hill by August 15. I don't believe that that has ever been Dr. Miller's position.

As to the fact that we do not have programs operating, I think that is absolutely the fact. Until we got the money

there was nothing we could do.

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: But you indicated that on August 15 you would stop intake. I don't think it is useful for us to continue to sit in legislative halls and continue to debate the issue. Either you are going to do it or you are not. Either we can be of help in this process or we can't. I said to Dr. Miller this morning what is going to happen. You are going to get that Federal money. You are going to run a project for two to three years and it will become a political football. You are going to make a lot of noise in the newspapers, and three years from now you are going to come to the Legislature for 5 million dollars. That is what is going to happen. And what is going to happen is that the Legislature is not going to give you 5 million dollars, and it will be just like the programs in the day care centers. So, you will open something for three years, and then within a three to five year period, you will be closing them down, and that is going to reap more havoc on local communities, in my opinion, than anything else. You will open a group home and then in one or two years you will close it down. It is going to reap havoc on the kids. I may be wrong. I hope that I am. Hopefully, people like John Myers, and others, can help smooth that process, but it is going to get down to two very basic issues as I see the whole program:

One, will the local communities accept it? Secondly, who is going to fund it? When the Federal dollars run out, what is going to happen? You have got to begin now to project how you are going to get that payment, and that money is going to have to be appropriated by the Legislature. I can tell you right now that the Legislature will not buy that because they don't see the necessity for us to be doing what we are doing in the first place.

We have Representative Cessar here. I don't know whether you want to say anything, Representative Cessar.

REPRESENTATIVE CESSAR: I just came up because I am from the western part of the state, and I am interested in what is going to occur. I appreciate the comments you made, I think they were very succinct and to the point about the members of the General Assembly.

(Discussion off the record.)

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: We have had two hearings now, more than three hours of hearings, and we have had some very specific questions. One of the Representatives was here earlier, and he asked some very specific questions about the whole issue of secured facilities, how many are available. That whole area of secured facilities has not been adequately answered.

I have continued to press how local communities are

going to be plugged into this whole process, and what kind of an approach is going to be made to people in the community to do two things in that community. Number one, get the message to those people who want to plug into the process. Number two, what procedure has to be taken to get local communities to accept the youth back in those communities that have just come out of those communities and people say they don't want them back into the communities again. I think that that is a two-prong area there that has to be addressed. I have asked those questions now every time we have a hearing.

Maybe one of the project directors can tell us how we are going to do it. I know some of the things that you and I can talk about as it relates to specific communities in Philadelphia. Take southwestern Philadelphia and the Baltimore Avenue area and other parts of Philadelphia, and there is that gap.

I think the other area that has to be addressed is the question of financing. Dr. Miller was here this morning, and I raised this question with him. They have asked the Federal government for 2 million dollars; 2 million dollars the first year, 3 million dollars the second year, or close to 3 million dollars the second year and then 2 million dollars the third year. Over the course of three years, that is 7 million



dollars. And then I asked what will happen after that. I can just tell you as sure as I am sitting here that this legislative body in Pennsylvania is not going to appropriate 7 million dollars. I think that the rationale has got to be dealt with in terms of the Camp Hill project.

Laying all of that aside, we still have the question of how do we deal with the judges. As Representative Fisher pointed out, you have an advisory committee appointed by the Governor of some 3 or 4 judges, none of whom are juvenile judges. Judge Robert Williams hasn't sat in Juvenile Court since he has been on the bench. Do you know what I am saying? So, I think we have a lot of problems. We have a lot of problems. And I hope you are not saying that by August 15 because we are not taking any more kids that you have accomplished something. I dare say that you may end up having an adverse effect, and I for one will not continue to labor with you. I have tried to do everything that I can as a reasonable human being.

Representative Fisher has a long way to journey here. He is from your part of the state. And he knows that in some 23 counties in western Pennsylvania, you need more than 10 secure beds. You probably need more than 50 in the 23-county area out there. So, there is a lot of give and take that has

to be developed. I appreciate what you are trying to do. If it is the youth of the state that we are seriously worried about and not somebody trying to build a political reputation, then I think it is the youth that we should start to plan for.

Is there anything further?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HAMMOCK: That concludes the hearing.

(The hearing was concluded at 4:00 p.m.)

\* \* \*

I hereby certify that the proceedings and testimony taken by me before the Pennsylvania House of Representatives Committee on Corrections and Rehabilitation are fully and accurately indicated in my notes and that this is a true and correct transcript of the same.

---

Marlene DePanfilis  
Reporter