1

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA 1 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 2 COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY 3 In re: HR 226 - SCI Camp Hill 4 * * * * * 5 Stenographic report of hearing held 6 in Room 140, Majority Caucus Room Main Capitol Building, Harrisburg, PA 7 Thursday, May 31, 1990 8 10:30 a.m. 9 10 HON. THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, CHAIRMAN Hon. Kevin Blaum, Subcommittee Chairman on Crime 11 and Corrections 12 MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY 13 Hon. Jerry Birmelin Hon. Nicholas B. Moehlmann Hon. Joseph A. Lashinger Hon. John F. Pressmann Hon. Christopher K. McNally Hon. Michael R. Veon 14 15 16 Also Present: 17 William Andring, Chief Counsel Mary Woolley, Republican Counsel 18 Marybeth Marschik, Research Analyst Katherine Manucci, Staff 19 20 Reported by: 21 Ann-Marie P. Sweeney, Reporter 22 ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY 23 536 Orrs Bridge Road Camp Hill, PA 17011 24

25

43 Hope x

ı		
1		
2	<u>INDEX</u>	
3		PAGE
4		
5	Joseph D. Lehman, Acting Secretary, Department of Corrections	3
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I'd like to open the House Judiciary Committee hearing.

This is the House Judiciary Committee hearing, and today we're going to hear from Joseph D. Lehman, Acting Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections.

And if you would care to make your remarks, Mr. Lehman.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Thank you.

Chairman Caltagirone and members of the House Judiciary Committee, my name is Joseph Lehman. I am the Commissioner-designate for the Department of Corrections here in Pennsylvania.

I thank you for providing me with an opportunity to personally address this committee so early in my tenure in the Department of Corrections.

I'm scheduled to receive a public hearing by the Senate Judiciary Committee tentatively for next Tuesday, June 5th, and I hope to be confirmed by the Senate sometime shortly thereafter.

My professional and academic career reflects 21 years of commitment to the field of Corrections. I'm confident that I can meet the many difficult challenges that face the Commonwealth and its Department of Corrections.

As the Deputy Secretary for the

Department of Corrections in the State of Washington, I
assisted the Secretary in the administration of all the
department's programs, including its community
corrections and prisons operations. My many years of
experience have allowed me to be involved in the full
range of the correctional program and field, including
the administration of its community programs,
industries, institutions, and the prison system. I
believe it is the breadth of my experience that will
enable me to be of assistance to the Commonwealth of
Pennsylvania and to this Department of Corrections.

As you probably already know, I was contacted by Ford Webb Associates of Concord,
Massachusetts, an executive search and management consulting firm that specializes in the public sector.

I was contacted by Mr. Webb relative to my interest in coming to the State of Pennsylvania, and after several discussions and interviews, I, in fact, was appointed by Governor Casey, or nominated by Governor Casey, for the position of Acting Secretary.

I came to Pennsylvania on April 18th, that was about six weeks ago, and about seven months after the public saw inmates at the Camp Hill institution destroy a significant part of that prison

complex. I came in a time when the concern was not only for Camp Hill but other disturbances. I came in the midst of a time when the State was facing a critical problem of overcrowding.

Currently, the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections is at 158 percent of its housing capacity.

Each month we are experiencing a net increase of 200 inmates. Your Pennsylvania Department of Corrections right now has approximately 21,700 inmates.

I know that this committee has been involved in a thorough review of the disturbances at the Camp Hill institution, as well as several other less serious incidents. I have no doubt that the committee's record of these events is complete. I think my time today will best be spent by briefly outlining what has occurred since my arrival at Pennsylvania and then responding to whatever questions you might have.

Shortly after I came to Pennsylvania, the State Police were removed from inside Camp Hill's security perimeter and relocated to outside that perimeter at the main gate. The reason for that, frankly, was to move the State Police who were carrying weapons outside the perimeter as we brought inmates off of lockdown and increased the amount of programming

inside the institution. We were also concerned at the time of doing it in such a way that we could ensure the capacity of the State Police to in fact respond immediately and in a timely fashion to any incident inside the perimeter of the institution.

The State Police are extremely visible during their continuous perimeter patrols in vehicles and on foot. We, in fact, conducted a number of simulated exercises to ensure that the State Police were able to respond immediately. Based on those exercises and the incidents which occurred in D Block, both Superintendent Beard and the State Police are convinced and confident that they, the State Police, have a capacity to respond to anywhere inside the perimeter of the facility from their location outside the main gate.

As you know, Camp Hill is slowly being rebuilt. Already, a Pennsylvania based firm is delivering steel reinforced pre-cast concrete cells to Camp Hill. This is the first of five planned maximum security modulars that will be placed at Camp Hill. The site preparation for that first facility is already completed, and the facility should be available for housing in August of this year.

Unfortunately, during the week of April

23rd, we experienced two additional incidents within the Restricted Housing Unit, D Block of that facility. Those incidents actually demonstrated, I think, quite clearly the fact that the housing units in Camp Hill are very fragile.

that all 128 cells of D Block be reinforced with steel plating and metal screening. This is being done to ensure the capacity of staff to control the inmate population within those units, as well as to ensure staff safety. It also sends a strong signal to the inmates, and that message being that the Department of Corrections staff will be and are in control.

After personally inspecting many of the State's prisons, I am painfully aware of the problems that confront the Commonwealth and the Department of Corrections. I do not say this lightly, I think the Department of Corrections staff should be congratulated. It is the Department of Corrections staff who, in fact, are holding the system together in spite of the significant overcrowding that exists. However, the department and the staff needs the help of the rest of the criminal justice system, needs the help of the courts, needs the help of the Parole Board, and it needs the help of the General Assembly.

1 I have already met with many leaders of 2 the State's criminal justice system and numerous members of the General Assembly. They have indicated 3 an understanding of the issues and a willingness to 5 address them, a willingness to commit themselves to address that. 6 7 In the near future I will be contacting 8 many of you privately not only to recognize your past 9 interests in Corrections but to ask for your assistance 10 in the future. I look forward to the opportunity of 11 working with this committee and with the General 12 Assembly in responding to the many challenges that face 13 the correctional system in the State of Washington --14 in the State of Pennsylvania. Sorry. 15 Again, I appreciate this opportunity to 16 address the committee and would be happy to respond to 17 any questions that you might have. 18 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, 19 Commissioner. 20 Questions from the members? 21 Nick. 22 REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: Commissioner, 23 did you pronounce your name Lehman?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN:

REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: Lehman.

Lehman.

Okay,

24

25

thank you.

I'm just curious, you indicate the first of five planned maximum security modular units for Camp Hill is expected to be completed by August. If that becomes true, how many inmates will those new units house?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Approximately 650.

REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: And are there more after that of the same sort of units that will be installed?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: At Camp Hill?

REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: Yeah, at Camp Hill.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Actually, we're looking at with a consultant relative to whether it is more cost-effective within Camp Hill to renovate existing cell blocks or in fact build new. You know, I think that determination needs to be made relative to what's the most cost-effective way.

If you look at the modulars in terms of the size, modulars are 128; existing cell blocks, in terms of cells at Camp Hill, are 125. So there's comparable space, and think it's an issue of what's most cost effective.

REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: Have you formed an opinion as to whether the existing cell blocks can be renovated?

be. I think that really you can go in and harden the cell blocks, you can in fact do what we're doing in D Block. More thoroughly, you can relocate the showers in terms of vision and supervision and line of sight, you can in fact locate a unit booth or control booth, construct one in there. You would have to go in and redo the entire locking mechanisms, of course, of the cell blocks. You would have to go in and harden the walls in terms of the hollow ceramic block, but yes, you can do that.

REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: Do you just steel plate those? Is that what you do?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Well, I think probably -- what we're doing in D Block is in fact steel plating them, so you could do that. That would probably be easier than tearing down the walls, unless you were going to rebuild entirely. It can be done.

The issue, as far as I'm concerned, is the relative costs of doing, one, retrofitting the existing and renovating, upgrading, hardening the cells versus building new.

REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: Is there a great difference in cost between the two?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: That's what we're looking at. You know, it may be that -- in fact, we may want to look at a combination of that. But the consultant really who's working on that, I think his timeframe in terms of providing a definitive statement of cost estimate would be around July 15th, I believe.

REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: I'd like to go to a slightly different subject. Recognizing that you've been in this State for six weeks and not really wishing to put you on the spot, I represent an area that contains Indiantown Gap. Indiantown Gap has been widely mentioned through the years as a wonderful spot to put lots of criminals. You may or may not know that some years ago we had a large number of the Cuban refugees that were quartered there and we had a lot of escapes and we had some riots, and the citizenry in the area has been highly sensitized to the question.

My question to you is, do you know of any plans to use Indiantown Gap to hold prisoners, or do you have any thoughts in that area?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: What was your opening statement about not wanting to put me on the spot?

Actually, I had the pleasure of-REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: I said I
didn't want to. I didn't say I wouldn't.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Yeah, right.

I had the pleasure of meeting with General Sajer, and I in fact visited Indiantown Gap. Despite my attempts to assure General Sajer that we had a higher class of criminal here in Pennsylvania than what the community or Indiantown Gap was used to, he does have some continuing concerns about housing inmates on the fort.

I think the issue becomes -- I do not have currently any plans to do that. Frankly, as I indicated to General Sajer, I wouldn't want to foreclose that as an option in the future, depending upon how we are able to deal with the issue of overcrowding systemwide.

The reality is that you do have some structures on Indiantown Gap that were previously used, that are rundown, that could be secured and with adequate classification might be able to house minimum security inmates. At this point in time I do not have any plans, and I respect the General's concerns about not only the community's concerns about their history with the Mariel Cubans but also the reality that it

1 presents some problems in terms of base security and fort security. 2 REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: Just to 3 forewarn you, I would be amazed if in your Senate hearings Senator Brightbill did not want you to 6 foreclose exactly that possibility. 7 ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: I would anticipate that. 8 REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: Thank you very 9 10 much. 11 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 12 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. 13 Joe. 14 REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Thank you, Mr. 15 Chairman. 16 Mr. Lehman, I'm sure you can hear me from 17 here. I apologize for being late. I did read your 18 testimony, however. 19 I'm surprised at the absence of any 20 commentary on activities taking place at other 21 institutions, specifically Graterford, and how it 22 relates to Camp Hill. I'm from Montgomery County where Graterford is situated. I've been advised that there 23 24 have been 200 inmates transferred from Graterford back

to Camp Hill. Is that an indication that we can expect

25

future numbers of inmates to be transferred back out of Graterford?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Graterford happens to be -- has to be a priority. If you look at Graterford in terms of its capacity, if you look at Graterford in terms of the size of the cell blocks, if you look at Graterford in terms of its current use, both in terms of general population and classification, we've got to find a way to get the pressure off Graterford. There's no doubt about that.

At this point in time we are completing an assessment of space through the entire system. As you know, Representative, the Department of Corrections does not control the inputs to the system or the outputs. And we've got to find a way to either expand capacity, take the pressure off Graterford, or influence policy that results with people coming in or leaving the system.

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Are you committed to capping the number of inmates then at Graterford at a figure below its current level?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: I'm committed to trying to do that. I can't commit to do that because I don't control the influx or the outgoing inmates. I mean, I simply don't have control, the

department does not have control over that. The policies and decisionmaking that occurs relative to the number of inmates is controlled by other parts of the system.

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Well, maybe I disagree. I mean, I disagree. You control, through intake, the distribution of inmates. You don't control the numbers and the types, necessarily, but you control the distribution when you do intake on a prisoner, correct?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: That's right, and I'm at 158 percent systemwide, in some institutions at a higher capacity of crowding than Graterford.

Graterford's problem is, if you look at the percent, is about 150-plus percent of capacity. I've got institutions 160 and higher. The problem with Graterford, of course, size, particularly the cell block configuration.

What I'm saying, Representative, is I am committed to trying to take the pressure off Graterford. My capacity to do that is limited.

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: At a Senate hearing that was held at Montgomery County within the month, the prior Secretary indicated that he was committed to capping that number, that's why I asked

the question, and that he would reject the notion of any additional inmates being added to Graterford.

That's where the question came from.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Unfortunately,

I'm here to say that the number of population at

Graterford has increased over the last several months.

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Another problem systemwide but again one that needs to be emphasized at Graterford is the guard complement there and the ongoing problems. Every day in the newspapers we see the ads for hiring guards in the county. What's the status of guard hiring at that facility?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: At that facility specifically we've been working over the last several weeks and months with the Office of Administration. We, in fact, have initiated a very concerted effort to recruit. We have 457 applicants for positions at Graterford alone. We are testing — we've increased our testing in terms of we have one testing period at Graterford June 4th. We're testing at different locations around the State. We are making an effort to in fact fill not only the vacancies, which number about 59 at Graterford, but the additional 191 that were added to the complement recently.

We also have just in fact met with the

AFSCME, have in fact concluded an agreement to increase the entry level pay for correctional staff statewide and an additional bump in entry level pay for correctional trainings at Graterford. We are looking at the issue of how can we improve the problem of housing in terms of location for staff in the immediate area of Graterford. One of the areas that we're looking at in terms of possibility there is on the grounds BOQ, dormitory space.

So we are looking at a number of strategies which are intended to alleviate some of the problems of recruitment and retention.

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: During this time lag, however, there continues to be a problem of understaffing, critical understaffing. There are stories of four guards on a block at Graterford, which, I think, you would agree is critically -- would equate to being critically understaffed.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: That's right.

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Is there any possibility of getting a reassignment from other facilities of temporary guards already in the system?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: We, in fact, have discussed that. The problem is -- first of all,

in terms of that coverage, I think there's a

misunderstanding. We do have a number of vacancies. However, of the 191 that we talk about in adding to the complement, actually 124 of those or 86 posts are already manned posts. The problem is we're manning them with overtime. So I don't want to -- I don't want to miscommunicate. We are in fact manning 86 posts that are not part or was not until recently part of the complement through the use of overtime. We can't continue to do that, Representative, and we need to hire those people. But we will continue to man the critical posts using overtime.

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Do you expect to reach a decision shortly on the reassignment issue?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Yeah. In the reassignment issue I think comes down to it's the estimation of both the AFSCME and of the personnel departments that there are not going to be many staff who are going to be volunteering in terms of that duty at Graterford, that we are already drawing upon significant numbers of correctional staff in Camp Hill and continue to do so, and so I can't really report too much hope that that's a realistic alternative.

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative

Birmelin.

1

2

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: Mr. Lehman, I want to thank you for coming here today and you've only been on the job for about six weeks, you probably have a lot to learn and have a lot more ahead of you, sort of being grilled like you are here. This is going to be a friendly one, I guess, today. Hopefully in the future will be as well.

When I was at Waymart Correctional Institution a couple of weeks ago at the media day I mentioned to you earlier I met with Superintendent Zimmerman and I said to him, I said, is there any way that you can have a work release program where these prisoners can get out and do, you know, good will projects in the community, whatever that might be, fixing up, painting up, repairing, cleaning up, et cetera? His answer to me was, I wish we could. And I was talking to some other people since then and I'm getting a conflicting viewpoint as to whether or not he in fact was able to allow a work release program for his prisoners to do those types of projects, and I'm not expecting an answer to that but I'm just wondering if maybe you or your staff could get an answer back to me that tells me conclusively whether or not legally you can do that and what the parameters are for a

program of that sort.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think it's especially important in the Waymart facility because my understanding is these are not hard-core criminal types. They are first-time drug offenders, many of them, people who are classified under minimum security, something like that. We don't have to worry about running the neighborhood amok, kidnapping people and killing them and all that sort of thing, at least hopefully not. But the reason why I bring that up is because I think in our particular area, in northeast Pennsylvania, I think that sort of a program would be well received and in turn would be very good for the prisoners who are there to do that sort of a thing. Whether or not we pass legislation here in the General Assembly that allows for earned time credit towards reduction of their prison sentences in that regard remains to be seen, but I think in and of itself it has a virtue of the fact that they would be getting out of prison and working and accomplishing some good and perhaps getting some skills or some training.

So while I'm not asking you for an answer today, I would ask you to research that and see whether or not you know where you stand legally on that and whether or not that can be implemented and if nowhere

else at least in lower minimum security type institutions.

than happy to get back to you. I think probably part of the confusion there is a matter of semantics. The fact is that there is existing programs and there is a program in Greensburg, for example. We're not on work release. I think the work release assumes that somebody does not have supervision and that people just go out to jobs. That probably would not be appropriate.

However, there are programs in existence where you have some minimum security inmates who go out and do work for a community under direct supervision, and that's not the same as work release, and that program does exist at I believe Greensburg and one other institution and is well received by the community.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: Well, that's what I had in mind, you know, under supervision primarily, but I know that we do it with the county prisoners. It's been a very successful program. Of course, they have an incentive because their program is you work two days and get one day off your sentence. Well, that's a pretty good incentive. I'm not sure

we'd be willing to do that on a State level, but I think in our area, particularly in the Waymart facility area, there's an abundance of work for them to do as well as the community probably would be fairly receptive to it, as opposed to Representative Moehlmann's constituents.

Thank you very much for coming.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative

Pressmann.

REPRESENTATIVE PRESSMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lehman, approximately .05 percent of the population of Pennsylvania is now in the State prison. I don't know how many people are in county prisons. Based on demographics and everything else, what can we expect in terms of population growth over the next 10 years?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: If we don't -if the General Assembly doesn't change any of the
current policy that drives the system, and it's the
policy that's set by the General Assembly does that,
I'm not sure about 10 years but I've seen figures that
suggest that we're going to have as many as 27,000 by
the year '94 or '95.

looking at numbers more than I want to in the last few weeks, but if I look at the numbers in terms of what we're planning and attempting to do and trying to do in terms of capacity expansion and I look at the timeframes in relation to planning and construction and I superimpose those assumptions on the population projections, whatever figures you want to look at, the reality, unfortunately, is we never catch up. And I think ultimately, ultimately the General Assembly in the State of Pennsylvania and the citizenry needs to deal with the issue can you build your way out of this problem? There is no doubt in my mind that we need to build. The question is how much and how long are we going to do this?

REPRESENTATIVE PRESSMANN: That's the reason I've asked you the question. I used to be a county official and when I was a commissioner, I built a prison. My successors are building another prison because back in the early '80's when we built this prison, we were told based on demographic trends and everything else that was happening that actually maybe we didn't need as many cells as we were building because criminal activity usually happens within a certain age group, and declining birth rates and they

superimposed all these things on it and they said, this is how many cells that Lehigh County would need into the 21st century. Well, they were very much wrong and I was wrong and we were all wrong, and I guess the question I have is I guess Crack has changed the whole outlook in terms of prisons. We have a whole new criminal class, we have a lot more people that are involved in illegal activity than 6 or 10 years ago. I guess the question is, what is going to be the permanent need for prisons in Pennsylvania and is there any possibility that we're going to put ourselves in a situation where we're going to build prison cells that because of demographic trends 20 years from now are going to be empty? I guess that's the real question.

in the last 21 years would be no, they are not going to be empty unless you have a policy change, unless you change the rules in terms of how people get in, how long they stay, or when they leave.

What we're experiencing in Pennsylvania, frankly, is not a whole lot different than what's happening nationwide, and I think that's a base that you have to start from.

I think part of the problem, frankly, lies with the Corrections profession. We have not

done, in my estimation, a very good job of helping policymakers like the General Assembly, giving the General Assembly options relative to how do you control and/or punish offenders, and are there more cost-effective ways to do that? We've not done a very good job of that as a profession. I happen to think that there are probably — the public can appreciate the fact that not all offenders are the same. I think the public can appreciate with the advance of technology there are probably ways that you can in fact reach a system of punishment that in fact are not as costly as simply building. I think ultimately that's probably a long ways off because we have a lot of education and work to do on it.

REPRESENTATIVE PRESSMANN: In the area of rehabilitation, and I guess it's a philosophical question if anything else for you, and actually I have a couple philosophical questions for you as Commissioner of Corrections, and I guess some very general questions. Do you believe rehabilitation works?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Um, yes. I think some things work for some people. The challenge in terms of Corrections is finding what works with what subpopulations and when. I'm not -- I am of the belief

that people do have a capacity to change, of the belief that we have to provide an opportunity for them to do that, and frankly not to do so is not cost-effective. That's not to say that there is any panacea, and you will find me before this committee and a General Assembly in years ahead telling you it is not a panacea. It won't work for everybody. But we have to provide an opportunity for people to engage in different kinds of programs and an opportunity to change. I am not interested, frankly, in operating a prison system with no hope.

ask that question, from all the numbers I've looked at rehabilitation, and I admit that I think a strong argument can be made that not enough money is spent on rehabilitation, but based on the numbers that I have seen on actual and recidivism of criminals has led me to believe that rehabilitation does not work, prison does not deter crime, that the only purpose that prisons can serve as is for warehousing people and putting people out of circulation so they can't commit another crime.

If we just look at our drug situation, obviously the criminal justice system is no threat to crime because the drug situation is dealing on a pure

economic situation. You have a market, you have a product, you have a profit level, so the profit level is so high and the chance of enrichment is so great that it's worth any risk you take in terms of confronting the criminal justice system. So in terms of our drug problem, obviously whatever we do, all the tough bills we passed in this committee and sent to the floor to become law, all the prison cells we're building, everything we're doing is not doing anything to the drug trade from what I can see driving through the streets of my district and watching what's happening on the street corners.

And so I guess what I've led to, rehabilitation doesn't seem to be working and it doesn't seem to be taking people out of circulation and stuff and cut down on crime.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: I think you need to separate the issues. One, I think you ought to send people to prison because it's a form of punishment. I mean, that's what prisons are. Or because that kind of control is necessary to protect the public. I mean, that's the primary purpose of prison. I think when you make those decisions, then you in fact I think have an obligation to provide the treatment to those you incarcerate to try to change

them. I mean, I hope Pennsylvania would not want a prison system that just took people in and released them in worse shape than when they sent them to prison. But I think you need to separate -- I wouldn't advocate that you send people to prison for treatment. You understand the distinction I'm making?

I think first the issue is just desserts in terms of punishment. I think the next issue is the level of controls inherent in the prison setting that is required to control the offender, and then the separate issue is the issue of treatment. I mean, if you could treat a drug offender and control that drug offender's behavior in another environment at the same time and provide a punishment that satisfied the public's need in terms of the retribution, then I think we better find more cost-effective ways to do that than simply throw them in prison, and that's my belief.

REPRESENTATIVE PRESSMANN: The amount of prisoners that are either HIV-positive or full-blown AIDS patients in our system, I'm not sure what kinds of numbers there are in that area, what would you propose? I mean, some States have seen astronomical growths in the amount of inmates with AIDS. Would you propose having separate facilities or in the general population, or how would you propose to handle that

population which from all trends is going to grow expediently in the prison system in the next few years?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: The AIDS issue has been a very difficult problem for prison systems to Originally we, including myself, deal with. anticipated that there would be significant numbers of inmates who were HIV-positive. Actually, the trend that you look at in terms of prison inmates is very similar to what the numbers are in the general population. The systems that I'm acquainted with, and I'm acquainted with some systems that separate inmates, I'm acquainted with systems that don't separate. My experience is the middle of the road is probably the best, and that is that you educate your prison population and you educate staff that you have to respond to everybody within that environment as if there is a potential that they have or they are HIV-positive. That you need to in fact respond in terms of separating inmates from other inmates based on two variables - medical needs or behavior. If an inmate starts acting out in such a way that there is body fluid transferred, then that inmate needs to be separated. The inmate needs to be separated not though simply because of the AIDS but because of the behavior, and that's how you should respond.

REPRESENTATIVE PRESSMANN: The previous Corrections Commissioner and this legislature pursued the idea of the prison camps, boot camps, whatever you call them. What is your feeling about that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

actually, you'll appreciate this. I have testified in two other legislative sessions against boot camps, but you have to put it in the context of which it was. It was a determinate system.

My impression of boot camps is, one, they are more costly, and you need to know that upfront. They are more costly to operate. They are not a panacea, and this is my main concern. They will work with some offenders. But don't assume that the discipline that you teach within the context of a boot camp can be generalized to the environments these offenders are released to. I mean, it's not the same thing as going through a military boot camp, going through the experience of the discipline and the regimentation and then being assigned to a unit where the unit structure reinforces all the things that you've learned within the context of that boot camp. So it will work in some cases, but I don't want people to perceive it as a panacea. It won't solve the problem. It is more costly.

1

3

.

5

O

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, if you were to say, will you consider a boot camp and we'll use that boot camp on selected offenders in lieu of long-term incarceration and will you include an education/treatment program and sufficient aftercare, and I'll say yes. If I can create those aspects plus the ability to reinforce after release the kinds of behaviors that are taught during it, then yes. But with all those things, I think you need to be careful about what you're buying.

REPRESENTATIVE PRESSMANN: Part of my concern about the boot camp idea is the idea that it is maybe a fad in Corrections, one; and number two, I have this image of well-conditioned criminals coming out of camp with thin waists and big chests and strong arms and stealing purses at a much greater speed because they are in much better shape and clean for maybe once in their criminal career. And the concern about the expense, because I think that there was an initial feeling by a lot of people that this somehow was going to be cheaper because there wasn't the big expensive cell blocks and things like that, and I think we have to be a little more careful and we have to realize that this is going to work and can work on a very small percentage of inmates that are in prisons.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: In fact, it is

more expensive if you operate just as an expansion of your existing program. If you look at New York's system, and New York, I think, probably has the best example, if you use it and you are truly selecting people who would otherwise spend longer time in prison, then you can make it cost-effective. But it is entirely contingent upon that fact. If you're just adding it to a system and you're not in fact diverting people who would otherwise spend longer, then it's more expensive.

REPRESENTATIVE PRESSMANN: On guard recruitment, are you having the same problem with guard recruitment in other prisons than you are having with guard recruitment at Graterford?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: If you look at

-- I've looked at the entry salary level of

Correctional Officer trainees against many of the

counties throughout the State, and it does go beyond

Montgomery County, and we in fact -- that's the reason

we in fact have increased the entry level statewide.

But Graterford we're having much more significant

problems because I think it's a combination of things.

It's transportation, housing, it's certainly the higher

labor market or higher Philadelphia jail system

competition. So I think that we are experiencing in

other areas, but it is certainly much worse at Graterford.

REPRESENTATIVE PRESSMANN: Is the department thinking about any possibility of having different scales for CO's depending on where they were, entry level?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: I'm sure the department is not considering that at this point. I'm sure there has been discussions about that with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, and I can assure you based on my limited interaction with them they would be opposed to that.

REPRESENTATIVE PRESSMANN: Part of my concern is based on whether or not, you know, we're going to face a permanent situation at Graterford in terms of recruitment of guards, and people have been interested in that work. I understand in some of our more rural settings where maybe there's higher unemployment rates the recruitment is not as difficult. In fact, we've seen a proposal for a prison in Greene County that is fairly highly accepted by the population, except the people immediately adjacent to the prison weren't as happy about it, but the idea that it would create a number of construction jobs and permanent Corrections Officer jobs, what they consider

good jobs, whereas in the Montgomery County job market they are not considered particularly good jobs, and I'm just wondering long-term if any prison expansion program we consider which we would be looking more to our more rural areas for prisons because of the higher range of pay. One of them may be Waymart.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative Lashinger.

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I noted in your prepared statement, Mr. Lehman, that you also talked about needing help from the Parole Board. At this Senate hearing that I mentioned to you previously, that was a problem that was emphasized time and time again. The Superintendent at Graterford indicated that there were approximately of the population 4,700, is that where we're at, although the reduction?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: 45.

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Of the 4,500 inmates at Graterford, that it was his opinion that there might be between 800 and 1,000 technical violators at the institution. Included in that figure would also be individuals that were waiting for parole

reports, that were delayed from the Parole Board, people that were actually there at the institution longer than they would have normally been because of delays from the Parole Board preparing the report. My quick comment, my kneejerk reaction was maybe the crisis isn't as bad as we think it is, that the problem is the Parole Board, one of the major problems is the Parole Board.

violators? Some of the actual cases were individuals who had been at the facility, been recommitted in excess of 90 days because of a change of address that they had failed to report, maybe they had been picked up in a domestic violence situation, again, another violation and committed to the institution and were awaiting a report from the Parole Board. I mean, if we have 800 to a thousand technical violators at that institution and a large share of them fit that classification, something's wrong.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: The numbers are significant, Representative, and they're a concern of myself and not only the Superintendent at Graterford but Superintendents at the other institutions that have the diagnostic classification centers.

Let me tell you, one of my big concerns

about the Pennsylvania system is its fragmentation. There's no capacity to provide for continuity at a policy level let alone at a decisionmaking level. Department of Corrections doesn't have the capacity to influence, through the current system, to influence the Board of Probation and Parole. The Board of Probation and Parole is a system that is off here, you know, operating on its assumptions of what it has to do, and that is from primarily a public safety perspective. And I understand that perspective. The problem I have is there's no vested interest in the way the system is fragmented to get the pieces to work together. I mean, there's no way other than through collaboration, and I've had meetings with Fred Jacobs and we will continue to have meetings and we're going to try to work together to solve the very problems you're talking about. But I'm talking from a systems perspective, from the way the General Assembly and the policy has been set up it is very fragmented, and that's causing the very problems that you're talking about.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: The one common denominator that you have is the Governor. And I would assume that the Governor could insist that the parole reports be done in a more timely fashion, because I understand -- I shouldn't be telling you this, I should

be telling Mr. Jacobs this, but you need beds, you have a common denomiator of the Governor, and if we've got technical violators, and especially the specific cases, and there are actual cases, I think you'll agree, of the person who failed to report a change of address, and it is a violation and technically that person does belong back in the institution, but I'm not sure we need the situation at Graterford.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: See, the only thing I would suggest that first of all I think it's a responsibility of the Department of Corrections, myself, and other people in the criminal justice system to try to work those issues out and deal with them, and I will continue to do that, but I think one of the problems is I don't think it is simply the Governor, and if you look at the structure you've created here in Pennsylvania, you have a Board of Probation and Parole that is a commission. It's independent of the executive branch. So the issue I raise is what influence do you have, other than resources? And I'm sure Fred will come to you, as he's come to me, and say I can't do those things because I don't have the resources.

So, you know, I think you've got to work in terms of trying to collaborate with the other parts

of the system to solve the problem, but I think we have 1 a very significant problem in the fragmentation that 2 3 exists in the State of Pennsylvania. REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Thank you. I'm sorry, I said thank you too quickly. 6 Do you know what the numbers are? 7 ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: I would be happy to get that to you. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Could you get 10 that to us? ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: I would be 11 12 happy to get that to you. Yes. REPRESENTATIVE LASHINGER: Thank you. 1.3 14 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Mary. 1.5 MS. WOOLLEY: Mr. Lehman, hi. ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: 16 Hi. 17 MS. WOOLLEY: Could you give us the status of the 800 inmates we have in the Federal system 18 19 and when we can anticipate their return to 20 Pennsylvania? 21 ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: I'm not going to be very responsive. I'm a little nervous about 22 23 when, frankly, and I can't recall the exact -- the contract specifies the time, and I can't recall the 24 25 specific time, but I will get that back to you.

I'm nervous, frankly, and I have not contacted the bureau because I felt we needed to straighten out our capacity to pay them first before I initiated contact, and one of my concerns is how long can they provide assistance to the Commonwealth, because I don't have 800 beds to put people in and I can't at this time tell you how long the bureau would be willing to continue that, but--

MS. WOOLLEY: Do you have the capacity to pay them?

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: We have in fact, through recent legislation, been given the authority to do so and we are in fact paying them.

MS. WOOLLEY: We were advised by the Commissioner of Crime and Delinquency when they did their overcrowding report in March that we could anticipate 23,000 inmates by the end of the year. My understanding is now we might hit that by mid-July. That's my understanding of the population projections of the PCCD Sentencing Commission. Do you have the ability to handle that population, absent turning to conversion of an Indiantown Gap or some other facility?

REPRESENTATIVE MOEHLMANN: My own counsel.

MS. WOOLLEY: His own counsel.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Representative, 1 2 see, it's not simply me. MS. WOOLLEY: All right, let's say some 3 other type of government, State or Federal government, 5 you know, Wernersville? ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: The answer is, 6 7 no, we don't have the capacity. 8 Secondly, we are, in fact, looking at additional capacity and potential capacity other than 9 10 what's already outlined in--11 MS. WOOLLEY: That you will be able to 12 use by mid-July? 13 ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Probably not by 14 mid-July. No, definitely not by mid-July. 15 MS. WOOLLEY: The modulars you mentioned 16 at Camp Hill, 650 is it? The new modulars that are coming on? 17 18 ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: (Indicating in 19 the affirmative.) 20 MS. WOOLLEY: Do you intend to double cell those? 21 22 ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Probably not, 23 if I have control over that. One of my concerns in the 24 system that I immediately was confronted with is I 25 think we have a problem at two ends of the system in

terms of capacity. One in administrative segregation of housing, restricted housing, and at minimum, and we've got everybody -- frankly, we don't have enough space to lock up those inmates that are problematic and acting out. And that's causing some of the problems that we're having. We've got a general population space in this system that is currently being used as segregation space and we're missing populations and we're inviting our own problems because we don't have sufficiently designed space.

Frankly, the Graterford modulars -excuse me, the Camp Hill modulars will provide some
relief and we are looking at other space to do that.
Part of your capacity to make an environment safe for
those inmates that want a program and want to do things
is the capacity to lock up those that won't let them,
and we have a problem with that.

MS. WOOLLEY: I just have a comment with regard to the boot camp proposal. It's Representative Evans' proposal and Hagarty's, and is something that's clearly tied to vocational and educational and tied to placing those offenders who would do less time in boot camp who would be in longer absent boot camps.

ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: And aftercare?

MS. WOOLLEY: Yeah, it's tied to

1	intensive parole.
2	ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Okay.
3	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are there any
4	other questions?
5	(No response.)
6	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Commissioner,
7	thank you very much. We look forward to working with
8	you and best of luck in the Senate.
9	ACTING SECRETARY LEHMAN: Thank you.
10	(Whereupon, the proceedings were
11	concluded at 11:45 a.m.)
12	
13	
1.4	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Î
I hereby certify that the proceedings and
evidence are contained fully and accurately in the
notes taken by me during the hearing of the within
cause, and that this is a true and correct transcript
of the same.
0 0 0
ann-Marie & Sweeney
ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY
THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION DOES NOT APPLY TO
ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER
THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR SUPERVISION OF THE CERTIFYING
REPORTER.
Ann-Marie P. Sweeney
536 Orrs Bridge Road Camp Hill, PA 17011