1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
2	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
3	In re: Oversight Hearing of the Crime Victims
4	Compensation Board
5	* * * *
6	Stenographic report of hearing held in Room 140, Majority Caucus Room,
7	Majority Caucus Room, Harrisburg, PA
8	Tuesday, April 30, 1991
9	10:00 p.m.
	HON. THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, CHAIRMAN
10	Hon. Kevin Blaum, Subcommittee Chairman on Crime and Corrections
11	Hon. Karen Ritter, Secretary
12	MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
13	Hon. Jerry Birmelin Hon. Frank LaGrotta
14	Hon. Frank Dermody Hon. Christopher McNally Hon. Gregory Fajt Hon. Robert D. Reber
	Hon. David Heckler Hon. Christopher Wogan
15	Also Present:
16	Calina Milahay Majonity Baraangh Analyst
17	Galina Milahov, Majority Research Analyst Mary Beth Marschik, Republican Research Analyst
18	Paul Dunkleberger, Republican Research Analyst Katherine Manucci, Majority Committee Staff
19	
20	Reported by: Ann-Marie P. Sweeney, Reporter
21	
22	ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY
23	536 Orrs Bridge Road Camp Hill, PA 17011
24	717-737-1367
25	536 Orrs Bridge Road Camp Hill, PA 17011 717-737-1367 + 33 page 88 page
1	

1991-098

	1	
1	INDEX	
2		PAGE
3	Marianne F. McManus, Chairperson, Crime Victims' Compensation Board	4
4		
5	Patricia A. Crawford, Member, Crime Victims' Compensation Board	4
6	Judith Schimmel, Chief Counsel, Crime Victims' Compensation Board	4
7	June Snyder, Administrative Officer, Crime Victims'	4
8	Compensation Board	7
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	APPENDIX	57
14		J,
15	·	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		1
25	/	

1	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I'd like to get
2	started.
3	If the teacher with the class would like
4	to introduce himself and the class of students that's
5	visiting here with us today.
6	THE TEACHER: We are from Cumberland
7	Valley High School visiting the Capitol and the
8	Governor's Mansion and sitting in on your hearing.
9	It's a seniors government class.
10	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Very good.
11	Welcome. Welcome one and all.
12	This is the House of Representatives
13	Judiciary Committee. We are holding an oversight
14	hearing on the Crime Victims' Compensation Board, and
15	I'd like for the members and staff to introduce
16	themselves, those that are present today.
1,7	REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Karen Ritter,
18	from Lehigh County.
19	REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Greg Fajt,
20	Allegheny County.
21	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Tom Caltagirone,
22	Berks County.
23	REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Representative
24	Kevin Blaum, city of Wilkes-Barre.
25	REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: Chris McNally,

1	Allegheny County.
2	MS. MILAHOV: Galina Milahov, Research
3	Analyst.
4	MS. MARSCHIK: Mary Beth Marschik,
5	Research Analyst.
6	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay. And if the
7	ladies at the table would like to introduce themselves
8	for the record and then start your presentation.
9	MS. McMANUS: Marianne F. McManus,
10	Chairman, Crime Victims' Compensation Board.
11	MS. CRAWFORD: Pat Crawford, member of
12	the Crime Victims' Compensation Board.
13	MS. SCHIMMEL: Judith Schimmel, Chief
14	Counsel.
15	MS. SNYDER: June Snyder, Administrative
16	Officer.
17	MS. McMANUS: Good morning,
18	Representative Caltagirone and members of the Judiciary
19	Committee. My name is Marianne F. McManus, and I am
20	Chairman of the Crime Victims' Compensation Board. I
21	am pleased to be here today to talk about this
22	wonderful program that has benefited many victims and
23	their families.
24	Act 139 of July 1976 created a crime

victim's compensation program as a response to

financial losses incurred by innocent victims of crime. Individuals injured during the commission of a crime not only suffer physical and psychological pain, but also any out-of-pocket losses that result from medical expenses or loss of income. To qualify for compensation, an individual must have incurred a minimum out-of-pocket loss of \$100 or two continuous week's earnings, unless the victim is age 60 or older. A claimant may receive up to \$35,000 for actual losses, but compensation may not be paid for pain and suffering or for property loss or damage. It is the mission of relieving the uncompensated losses of innocent victims which the board strives to achieve.

б

This program has grown significantly since the days when the board received under 40 claims per week. A dramatic increase occurred after the passage of Act 114 of 1979, which requires that local law enforcement agencies give notice of the availability of compensation. However, the act currently permits the required notice to be given by detectives instead of the responding officers. Since not all crimes go to the detective division of a police department, there is a distinct possibility that a number of eligible claimants remain unaware of compensation availability. Accordingly, we suggest

that Section 17 be amend to require the provision of notice by the responding officer. At our request, this was done in the city of Harrisburg last summer and the number of claims has increased significantly.

Other amendments since 1979 have expanded the definition of loss of earnings to include stolen cash proceeds of Social Security, railroad retirement, and child or spousal support payments. House Bill 77 of 1991 further enlarged this eligibility class. Pennsylvania may be the only State which pays for stolen cash of any kind. New York reimburses \$500 for a cash loss. These payments are not eligible for Federal reimbursement.

The mission of the Crime Victims' Compensation Board. The Crime Victims' Compensation Board is committed to helping as many innocent victims of crime as possible. To fulfill this commitment, the board has a responsibility to administer the program in the most efficient way possible. Included in this is the continual monitoring of the Compensation Fund to insure that funds remain available to cover as many victims as possible. To further that goal, victims of drunk driving accidents, as passed in House Bill 77 of 1991, will be included among those to be compensated.

Not all of you may be familiar with the

operations of the board. An individual submits a claim form with supporting documentation. When all of the supporting documentation is complete, the claim is accepted for processing and is in an "open - no verification" status. The claim is referred to the verification unit, which asks for information from providers and criminal justice agencies. The claim is now in the "open - in verification" stage, which can take three weeks or many months, depending upon the cooperation of the entities involved. Hospitals, doctors, employers, local law enforcement agencies and clerk of courts, in that order, are most derelict in responding to our requests. While Section 19, added in 1986, subjected a provider to a civil penalty of \$10 per day for failure to respond within 30 days, no prosecutor is interested in pursuing this matter. suggest that more teeth be put in this section. At the very least, providers who fail to respond should forfeit their right to collect from the victim or other responsible person.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Once a legal assistant has collected enough information, the claim is transferred to "open - board member" status, while the member assigned prepares a formal report and recommendation to the entire board and a decision is also written. Prior to

submission to the board, the claim is reviewed by the Office of General Counsel for form and legality. It is then voted upon by the entire board and goes into an "open - awaiting acceptance" status, during which the claimant has 30 days to accept or reject the decision. Acceptances have been submitted much later than 30 days, especially if an attorney is involved, and we have accepted rejections after the 30 days if the claimant presents good cause for not meeting the deadline.

However, we have had claimants not accept an award for years, which is another story.

If there is an award of compensation and that award is accepted, a request is made of the treasurer through the comptroller to issue checks in accordance with the board's order. At that time, the claim is considered "open - in treasury" where it remains until the checks are mailed and it is then "closed - paid."

Supplemental awards. These are claims which can be opened multiple times. In the case of a paraplegic, for instance, there are ongoing medical expenses over many years. This claim would continue to be re-opened until the maximum award was made.

From the above description, you can see

ġ

that there are many aspects beyond our control provider response, receipt of acceptance, and
processing of checks. Provider delays account for 45
days, plus another 45 for a subpoena, if necessary;
acceptances, another 30 to 60 days; and
treasury/comptroller, an average of 42 days, for a

total of 147 days, or 29.4 weeks, or 7.35 months.

In addition to the actual processing of claims, the board has several other aspects of victim compensation which has taken enormous amounts of time. For example, contact is made with the appropriate office of probation and parole or Clerk of Court, whenever an award is made for two reasons. First, so that any amounts paid in restitution can be deducted from our award if appropriate; and second, to notify the county that future restitution payments are to be sent directly to the Commonwealth, pursuant to Section 13 of the act. These restitution payments are put into the General Fund and not into the Crime Victims' Compensation Fund, which was created by Section 15(c) of the act, added in 1984.

The board could be doing more, such as enforcing the Commonwealth's right of subrogation, but this Section 12 does not make it clear that all third party payments are affected, not just payments by the

offender, and such enforcement would require time and staff, neither of which is available.

1.

б

Even something such as the preparation for this hearing has a serious effect on operations. I do not have a secretary. Nobody has a secretary. All staff are assigned to the processing of claims. My presentation was written in longhand and given to a clerk typist who could have been working on 30 claims during the time it took to finalize this statement. The graphs we have for you were graciously prepared by the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. We have neither the personnel nor the equipment to draw the same.

The staff of the board is the same as it was in 1982 when there was a caseload of 129 claims per staff member. At the present rate, the board could receive 4,000 claims in '90-'91, or an average of 444 claims per staff member. This increase does not include DUI claims, which will totally swamp an already overworked staff. Compare our figures with that of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission, where 174 staff members handle 10,000 complaints, or an average of 57 1/2 per person, and I only use that comparison because we happened to sit in on the Human Relations hearing.

The fund needs major rejuvenation.

Figure 3 in your packet shows the trend of payouts and receipts. As the board increases efficiency and improves program administration, the amount of payout increases and the fund balance decreases. The impact of DUI claims could be as high as \$3 million, which is virtually equal to the board's present annual income. Payouts for 1990 calendar year exceeded revenues by \$941,022.51. Calendar year payouts, \$2,854,556.26, versus revenues from imposed costs of \$1,913,533.75. The situation can only worsen.

Notwithstanding staffing and funding problems, the board has accomplished a great deal since I arrived:

The board has promulgated new rules and regulations which more fairly guide the board in calculating actual losses.

The board has expanded public speaking and awareness campaigns on behalf of the Commonwealth and the Crime Victims' Compensation Board.

Goals and objectives, both long- and short-term, have been defined by the board to improve proficiency and accountability.

The first training seminar for staff and board was conducted over a three-day period.

_

A Claims Service Representative position was created and filled. This representative handles the inquiries from the 1-800 toll-free number, and this insures consistency and communication with claimants.

A major revision of forms and correspondence was implemented to expedite the processing of claims.

Two statewide training seminars were conducted for victim service professionals, police officers, and others who assist victims in filing claims.

A full-time attorney joined the Crime Victims' Compensation Board staff.

The first and second issues of a quarterly newsletter were published, and this is a new effort to expand outreach and update colleagues on program information.

Legislation was introduced to expand the compensable coverage of the program and to bring Pennsylvania into compliance with Federal qualifying guidelines.

A bilingual staff member was added to the board.

The Crime Victims' Compensation Board
Chairman was elected as an officer of the National

Association of Crime Victims' Compensation Boards.

.7

A new claim form and application was issued. This form provides more explicit instructions for the claimant, thus requiring less follow-up for the verifiers.

The board published a new brochure describing eligibility requirements and program benefits. 50,000 of these brochures were distributed during the fiscal year.

The initiation of utilization of homeowner's insurance to alleviate the cash loss of Social Security, railroad retirement, or child or spousal support, at a significant savings to the Commonwealth as yet to be determined.

In 1989-90, we had seven hearings, one appeal to Commonwealth Court, and two appeals to the Supreme Court of board decisions. So far, in 1990-91, there has been one hearing, out of 2,127 claims adjudicated through April. Most importantly, the number of claims adjudicated every month has risen from 90 to over 200. Once the third board position is filled, we have a member retiring, and the new member is comfortable with the process, we hope to be able to adjudicate over 250 claims per month, thus eliminating some of the mythical backlog.

б

budget request included cost to carry 14 existing positions, additional hearing costs, and adequate operational and equipment costs to recover from the prior year's 36-percent reduction in operating costs. In addition, we will submit a total program revision request to maintain the existing program by providing sufficient personnel, automated technology, and other resources, and to allow the board to expand outreach. Included in all of this is printing costs, an increase in personnel, and training to eliminate the backlog and handle the influx of new claims.

The Governor's fiscal year '91-'92 budget recommends General Fund appropriation, \$617,000, augmentation restricted revenue \$87,000, for a total of \$704,000. This is a 14-percent increase over fiscal year '90-'91 General Fund.

The fiscal year '90-'91 operational costs of \$47,000 were depleted as indicated in the sunset audit. This situation was relieved by permission of usage of \$15,000 from restricted revenue to partially satisfy the shortfall. This makes perfect sense since everything in the office is essentially for victims.

I have distributed packets which contain information about the board and what we need in the way

of information for the individual claims. This, I'm sure, will be of some help if the claim is to be facilitated.

In summary, I am pleased to report that the performance of the board since the last sunset hearing has substantially improved, but it cannot function at optimum efficiency until it is adequately staffed and funded. I would also point out the board has already implemented or begun the implementation of many suggestions in the sunset audit.

I thank you for your attention, and I will try to answer any questions that you may have.

I'll tell you why. Working without a secretary, number one, I think anybody on this panel trying to work without a secretary finds it absolutely impossible. And number two, the job that you're doing, I must compliment you. I think you're doing an extraordinary job.

MS. McMANUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: For not only the legislature that helped to create this but also the crime victims, which is the most important thing that we are here to address.

You have some charts that you wanted to

review. Did you want to do that now before we got into some questions? So that the members could understand what these charts are all about.

1.3

MS. McMANUS: Sure. This chart is prepared for another purpose, but I brought it along today just to give you an idea. What we have here are Crime Victims' Compensation Board costs received less claims paid. In other words, the payments coming in from the county versus the cost or the payment going out for victims. You will see the ones in red are running a deficit. And I just bring that to show you that in some cases the revenues coming in are keeping pace. In other instances, they are not. And compensation costs, recovery is a difficult situation, and some counties are having a problem with it.

These are revenues versus expenditures for fiscal year '89-'90 to fiscal year 1993-94 projected and actual.

These are the Crime Victims' Compensation Board award totals for fiscal year 1987-88 to '92-'93. And the Social Security is the area that you see here in dark color.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I must say that you have a very good track record with the adjudication. I must compliment your attorney that

with all the cases that you have handled that you haven't had more of a problem with the appeals. So evidently you're handling them pretty fairly so that people are not complaining.

MS. McMANUS: They do have the option to reject a decision that we make. In that case, if they can send any documentation that will help us to change our mind or to look at other aspects of the claim, they may receive a different report and recommendation.

That's report and recommendation on reconsideration.

After that is over and they reject that decision, then they can ask for a hearing. So they have several options open to them if they do not like the decision that is made.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Questions from the committee?

Ladies first.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: I just wanted to

-- I was making some notes on some of the suggestions
that you made about changes, and the one that I saw,
the first one that you mentioned included a requirement
that victims be given more information. House Bill 90
includes a requirement that all victims be given
information in writing within the first 24 hours by the

-- by whoever, the responding officer or whoever has

contact with that victim, so that is already included 1 in the bill that we passed. But the other one, you're 2 saying now that the restitution payments that you 3 receive from the counties goes to the General Fund and 4 5 not to your fund? 6 MS. McMANUS: Um-hum REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Does that make 7 sense? 8 9 MS. McMANUS: Because it says 10 restitution, in the act it says, "restitution to the 11 extent of the award shall be subrogated to the 12 Commonwealth." It does not say to the Crime Victims' 13 Compensation. 14 MS. SCHIMMEL: Of course, it's not a lot 15 of money anyway. It was only \$33,000 last year that 16 the counties managed to collect. 17 MS. McMANUS: In restitution. REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Over and above 18 19 what was paid out, you mean? MS. McMANUS: Total. 20 MS. SCHIMMEL: They only collected 21 \$33,000 in restitution of that amount that we awarded, 22 23 the \$4 1/2 million that we awarded. 24 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Why aren't all those numbers in the red then? 25

1	MS. SCHIMMEL: No, no, no. What's up
2	there is the \$10 cost.
3	MS. McMANUS: Those are the fine and
4	costs on the offender.
5	MS. SCHIMMEL: Those are the fines, not
6	restitution.
7	REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Oh, all right.
8	But that goes to you?
9	MS. SCHIMMEL: That goes to us. That is
10	the Compensation's Fund.
11	REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: So anything that
12	the county manages to the offender walks in and
13	says, I want to pay you some money for the victim, is
14	that what you're talking about?
15	MS. SCHIMMEL: No, we're talking about
16	the court ordering the payment of restitution.
17	REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: And that's all
18	that was ordered or that's all that was collected?
19	MS. SCHIMMEL: That's all that was
20	collected.
21	REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Do you have any
22	idea how that relates to how much was ordered?
23	MS. SCHIMMEL: As a matter of fact, we
24	did a little bit of work
25	MS. McMANUS: Not on restitution she's

1 talking about MS. SCHIMMEL: Oh, but the restitution is 2 no more successful than the collection of the cost. 3 discovered that the district justices collect 90 4 percent of the amounts that go into the Compensation's 5 Fund, and the Courts of Common Pleas collect only 10 6 7 percent. MS. SNYDER: We do not see this money. 8 9 It goes directly to the Department of Revenue and we 10 get reports. 11 REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: To tell you how 12 much money is available in your account? 13 MS. SNYDER: No, the money is not 14 available to us. 15 REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Under this? MS. SNYDER: There are two sets of money. 16 17 These are the imposed costs, and that goes into the restricted revenue account. 18 19 jurisdiction? 20 21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Under your jurisdiction?

MS. SNYDER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: They would like you to use the microphone so they can hear. There is some very relevant testimony.

MS. SNYDER: Okay. Can you hear me now?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes.

MS. SNYDER: There's a great deal of misunderstanding about restitution money and the imposed cost. The imposed cost money goes into our account and we pay victims from that account. It's in a restricted revenue account in the General Fund.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: And that's where the State appropriation would also go?

MS. SNYDER: No. No.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Okay, never mind.

MS. SNYDER: The State appropriation is only for administrative costs at this the point.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: Okay.

MS. SNYDER: And that is this money, this graph. The restitution money comes in from the Clerk of Courts and the district justices to Revenue. We never see that. They send us reports and I pull up, you may be familiar with the CMIC Report 10. I pull those Revenue reports and that's how we found out it was \$33,000.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: All right, so in other words, Revenue just says, we collected \$33,000 and you can't have it, basically?

MS. SNYDER: Well, it goes into the general operating account, and no, we can't have it.

It's not for us. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: Mr. Chairman, 3 can I ask a question about the restitution? REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: It's all right. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 5 Okay. 6 REPRESENTATIVE MCNALLY: I would think that restitution would be restitution to the victim. 7 Τ mean, maybe the Department of Revenue is a conduit, 8 but, I mean, is the defendant paying restitution to the 9 Department of Revenue and then the Department of 10 11 Revenue sends money to the victim? MS. McMANUS: No. 12 No. 13 REPRESENTATIVE McNALLY: Oh, it's 14 restitution to the State? I see. MS. McMANUS: In other words, if we have 15 16 made an award, restitution to the extent of that award must be paid back to the Commonwealth. So if we make 17 18 an award for \$2,000 and then they receive \$1,900 in 19 restitution, that money must come back to the 20 Commonwealth. REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: But it goes to 21 the Commonwealth and not to you? 22 23 MS. McMANUS: That's correct. REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: And you've paid 24

the award out of--

MS. McMANUS: Right. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: It doesn't make 3 sense. MS. CRAWFORD: May I say something? 4 The only problem is in most cases we have 5 6 already awarded before restitution even starts to be paid because the criminal may have been in jail for a while or whatever, and as a result of that, and we 8 9 don't have the resources to actually go after that 10 money ourselves. So it really--11 REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: But if it comes 12 in it should go to you, I think. To go to your fund. MS. CRAWFORD: Well, it's supposed to. 13 14 We put in a subrogation clause in our claims that we 15 adjudicate saying that the victim must repay us if that 16 is received. Judy can explain, though, that if there 17 are other costs such as property loss costs, and I think a few other things, that would come off the top 18 19 before we would be eligible to receive for personal 20 injury or loss of earnings or anything like that. 21 REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: 22 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative 23 Fajt. 24 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: I've got a couple 25 of questions. I'll start with the easy ones first and

then I want to get back into the money because I'm not sure I understand it.

First of all, I think you ought to be congratulated also with keeping your staff at the same level that you had it in 1982 and with the significant increase in the number of cases you handle. I really think that of all the agencies that we've seen, we've done oversight hearings so far this year, I can tell you that you're the only one that's been able to make that claim and you're really to be commended for it, especially in light of these tight fiscal times.

BY REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: (Of Ms. McManus)

- Q. Where are you located?
- A. We're located at 333 Market Street, lobby level.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. That's in the Education Building.
- Q. I thought that you had mentioned on your testimony that there was a maximum on the amount that somebody could be paid. Did I hear that correctly?
 - A. That's correct, \$35,000.
 - Q. \$35,000.
 - A. Um-hum.
- Q. Okay. Back to the numbers again. Your budget is \$704,000, as I saw it in the report here, and

that's your administrative budget?

- A. Um-hum. That's right.
- Q. Okay. On top of that, you made a statement in there that you paid out I think this year somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2.9 million, on page 8. Payouts for 1990 exceeded revenues by \$941,000, calendar year payouts of \$2.8 million versus revenues of \$1.9?
 - A. Um-hum.
- Q. Okay, so your payouts were \$2.8 million.

 In the sentence before that, you say that the impact of

 DUI claims could be as high as \$3 million.
 - A. Um-hum.
- Q. Which I guess I had a question there, how could they be \$3 million when your total payouts were \$2.8 million?
- A. Okay, I'll you tell what that was based on. We took the median, an average of anywhere from between, what was it, 200 to 1,300 claims that we could probably expect to receive for DUI.
 - Q. I see.
- A. We took a median of that and said 500. Looking at that and taking the average payout, which we are understanding is consistently about 2 1/2 times the average awards, 2 1/2 times higher, because most of

26 these people have personal injury and extensive medical 1 bills, we took that figure also and we came up with the 2 That's only a projection of what we could. \$3 million. 3 It may be high. We don't know. 4 5 Q. Okay. Just to get back to the numbers, so we have a \$704,000 appropriation for administration? 6 Um-hum. 7 Α. Q. These costs here, are -- is each 8 defendant assessed a \$10 charge? What is that \$10 9 10 charge? 11 A. Judy can answer.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SCHIMMEL: It's part of mandatory costs that are assessed against everyone who is found guilty, pleads guilty or nolo contendere. It does not, at this time, include drunk driving or anyone on ARD. That would be added by House Bill 77.

REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Who pays the \$10?

MS. SCHIMMEL: The defendant pays it.

REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Okay.

MS. SCHIMMEL: These mandatory costs are included in those with PCADV, the additional \$5 for PCCD as well.

REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Okay. So that \$10, and excuse me for beating a dead horse, but I'm not sure I understand it, that \$10 goes into your account,

your separate account? 1 MS. SCHIMMEL: Yes. Yes. It is not a 2 separate fund. 3 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Okay. 4 MS. SCHIMMEL: It is only a separate 5 account. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Okay. What moneys are paid from that account? 8 9 MS. SCHIMMEL: The only thing other than actual awards to victims paid out of this account have 10 11 been hearing transcripts and medical bills for 12 independent medical examinations of claimants through 13 December. 14 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Okay. 15 MS. McMANUS: Excuse me, let me make a 16 clarification on that. We do not pay for the 17 transcripts out of the Compensation Fund. That comes 18 out of administrative costs. . 19 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Okay, out of the 20 \$704,000? MS. McMANUS: That's correct. And also 21 22 any -- I can only think of one instance where we asked 23 for an independent medical opinion, and that cost was going to come out also of the administrative costs. 24

REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Okay, so in

addition to the \$10 per defendant, they can also be 1 2 assessed, and often are assessed, an additional amount 3 of payment that they have to make into the General Fund? 5 MS. McMANUS: No. REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: 7 MS. SCHIMMEL: No. A defendant may be ordered to make restitution to a victim. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Right. 10 MS. SCHIMMEL: That is separate and 11 distinct from the mandatory costs that must be imposed 12 on a particular defendant. REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: 13 Right. That money 14 goes into the General Fund. MS. SCHIMMEL: That money goes into the 15 General Fund only if the Crime Victims' Compensation 16 17 Board has made an award to that particular victim, and 18 only to the extent of that award for any duplication. 19 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Okay. I got an 20 understanding of that now. So back to the chart here, 21 you're saying that the \$10 assessed per defendant in 22 Allegheny County, for instance, Philadelphia County, 23 which are obviously the most glaring counties that are 24 operating in the red, that \$10 cost is woefully low

based on what we're paying out to plaintiffs in those

- 25

1	Countles?
2.	MS. McMANUS: The collection of those
3	REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Amounts are
4	woefully low.
5	MS. McMANUS:amounts. And for
6	instance, to give you an example, in '89-'90, for
7	Allegheny County, the number of claims was 157.
8	REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Um-hum.
9	MS. McMANUS: Okay. That amounted to
10	\$276,000, rounding it off. The collection from the
11	imposed costs was \$173,000. The year before we paid
12	out \$206,000, and then the imposed costs were \$164,000
13	REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Um-hum.
14	MS. McMANUS: So the costs, the imposed
15	costs are always running behind, in some areas.
16	REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: The imposed costs
17	or the collected costs?
18	MS. McMANUS: The collected costs.
19	Clarification. Collected costs.
20	REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Is there anything
21	you can see that we can do from here to try to increase
22	those collections?
23	MS. McMANUS: I really don't know what
24	the answer is to that. I mean, we've certainly looked

at it. I think we were extremely surprised to find

that the majority of the money was being collected by 1 the district justices and not the courts. 2 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Um-hum. 3 MS. McMANUS: I think probably until they have the uniform court system and the -- I don't know. 5 I really don't know what the answer is as far as б -collections. 7 REPRESENTATIVE FAJT: Okay, thank you. 8 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative 9 10 Reber. 11 REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Thank you, Mr. 12 Chairman. Turning first of all in your testimony on 13 14 page 11, you referenced that there was one appeal in '89-'90, one appeal to Commonwealth Court and two 15 16 appeals to the Supreme Court. Briefly, what were the issues involved that brought those appeals about? 17 18 MS. SCHIMMEL: One of them was an appeal 19 by a young man who had lost his hand in a meat grinder. 20 He had gone to work for a meat packing company in Adams County. The employer did not have workers' 21 22 compensation insurance. They claimed that the failure 23 to carry workers' compensation was a crime within the

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Next case?

24

25

meaning of the statute.

(Laughter.)

MS. SCHIMMEL: Another one was a challenge to the act's exception of crimes involving the use of motor vehicles. The Supreme Court then dismissed that appeal as improvidently granted and agreed that it did not cover it.

The third one involved a police officer who was injured in the line of duty, and we maintained the act was not intended to cover police officers, and the Commonwealth Court agreed.

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Okay. Changing the issue now, Social Security benefits. In your brochures and in your application forms, when you're talking about claims for Social Security loss, the statement is made that it has to be the main source of income. Could you give me a little bit further background? Is that statutorily mandated?

MS. McMANUS: Yes.

MS. SCHIMMEL: Yes.

MS. McMANUS: Has to be your primary source of income. In other words, more than 50 percent.

more than 50 percent language law?

MS. SCHIMMEL: Yes.

1 REPRESENTATIVE REBER: How many claims have been made that were denied because of that in your 2 3 investigation? MS. SCHIMMEL: That it is not their 4 primary source of income? 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Yeah. Do you find a lot of claims made or people just don't do it because 7 8 they read that and don't file? MS. McMANUS: I don't think that we deny 9 a lot, and I couldn't give you accurate information, 10 11 but I would say maybe no more than a dozen. 12 MS. SCHIMMEL: And usually that's because 1.3 there's a spouse that has income, monthly income, that 14 far exceeds the Social Security benefit. 15 REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Okay. MS. SCHIMMEL: Now, if both spouses 16 receive Social Security benefits, then of course 17 there's no problem, but occasionally we'll have a 18 19 spouse that gets like \$2,400 a month from a private pension or a spouse that's still employed making more 20 In that event, we do deny the claim. 21 REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Switching gears 22 23 now a third time, this committee has been involved over the past year and a half, two years, with the 24

forfeiture issue relative to moneys confiscated from

drug raids and then is forfeited to be used by the respective police departments, district attorneys offices, if you will. There have been attempts by so-called community based interest groups to have some of those moneys allocated to them for worthwhile activities in the war on drugs.

First of all, have you had any kind of attempts made or claims made on the personal side?

Now, recognizing that personal property claims are not permissible for reimbursement under the law, do you get a lot of dialogue in that area or do you get any contact that something like that should be carried out or it should be allowed in the course of dealing with victims where there's personal injuries that also have certainly property that is stolen or otherwise not available to them as a result of the crime? In the course of that, do you have any dialogue with these people? What's the reaction, if any?

MS. McMANUS: Well, to answer the first part of your question, we really do not have a lot of dialogue with the victims. I mean, our staff does, but the victims service groups are very active in the individual counties and they probably talk to them more hands-on than we do.

As far as, is your question as far as

compensating property damage or--

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 REBER: I think my question is two-fold. First of all, do you find that a lot of victims that you do process also have had property damaged that is not compensated?

MS. McMANUS: Yes, but I would say that we have a limited number of claims that even indicate that or that we even find out about them.

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Now, I guess my next question is, if there was a total revamping of the concept, because I always have a fundamental concern with the forfeiture situation as it currently is. my feeling that virtually all -- I shouldn't say virtually all, but a good majority of the fruits of the drug operations are really fostered by stolen property, and it just is, in essence, feeding that particular situation, and it seems to me that a lot of times the victims of personal property thefts in some way should be reimbursed when these goods are, in essence, forfeited, and I was just wondering if you people have had any kind of thoughts on that issue, if there's been any dialogue with your staff or internally, administratively on that, you know, type of concern. You probably have enough problems you don't go looking for ones that aren't vested upon you already.

1 MS. McMANUS: The answer to your question 2 is no, we have not had any dialogue regarding that. 3 REPRESENTATIVE REBER: If in its infinite 4 wisdom the General Assembly in some way, shape, or form could find a way to dovetail a system, would that be a 5 massive change in the necessities for your staff to б 7 plug in the personal property side to adjudicate claims 8 if there could be some system set up, do you think? 9 Are we going in a monumentally large, different 10 direction than you're currently going? 11 MS. McMANUS: I think it's a different 12 direction, and I am not really sure of the answer to 13 that question. 14 REPRESENTATIVE REBER: All right. 15 MS. McMANUS: Without doing some further 16 investigation. 17 Okay, thank you. REPRESENTATIVE REBER: 18 Thank you. 19 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative -20 Dermody. 21 REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: I just had a 22 question and an observation. 23 On the fines and costs, 90 percent, I believe, of the fines and costs are collected in the 24 25 district justice offices, is that correct?

-

3 0

MS. McMANUS: The majority of the fines are collected in the district justice.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: I'm from Allegheny County, and those numbers hold up for Allegheny County DJs too?

MS. SCHIMMEL: We just happen to have Allegheny County's figures here. In Allegheny County, the Court of Common Pleas collected \$16,129.20. The district justices collected \$156,981.17.

thought I have on that is that when you're at a district justice's office or you're pleading guilty or being found guilty at a district justice office, the likelihood of going to jail is minimal, and oftentimes whether it's right or not DJs sentence an alternative, 30 days or if you pay your fines and costs you're off. So there's a little more incentive at that point to pay.

MS. SCHIMMEL: Well, it's also understandable that your collections on summaries are going to be higher than your collection on misdemeanors, and misdemeanors more than felonies. I mean, someone doing 8 to 10 doesn't care about \$10 of imposed costs.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: In Allegheny and

1	Philadelphia, the most glaring here, most serious
2	crimes are probably committed in those two large urban
3	areas, and most of the people going to jail are
4	probably from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.
5	MS. SCHIMMEL: Well, as the situation is
6	explained to us in Philadelphia, because of the
7	shortage of prison space, they concentrate on felonies,
8	where the collection rate is the lowest. Therefore, we
9	don't have the advantage of the summary collections out
10	of Philadelphia.
11	REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: The \$33,000 that
12	was collected through restitution, that only involves
13	cases where there was compensation awards?
14	MS. SCHIMMEL: Yes.
15	MS. McMANUS: That's correct.
16	REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Thank you.
17	That's all.
18	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative
19	McNally?
20	REPRESENTATIVE MCNALLY: No.
21	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative
22	Heckler.
23	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Yes, thank you,
24	Mr. Chairman.
25	I just wanted to get it straight. I was

1	just a bit confused. When you speak of restitution,
2	the court, in most cases, will order restitution as
3	part of its sentence, that is correct?
4	MS. McMANUS: (Indicating in the
5	affirmative.)
6	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: And that
7	restitution is administered by the county department of
8	probation?
9	MS. SCHIMMEL: (Indicating in the
10	affirmative.)
11	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: You folks don't
12	get involved in that at all, is that correct?
13	MS. McMANUS: That's correct.
14	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Okay. If the
15	victim, the question of whether the victim has received
16	an order of restitution at the Court of Common Pleas
17	level is one of the factors you're going to consider in
18	whatever if an application is made to your board as to
19	what relief you would grant, is that correct?
20	MS. McMANUS: If there is an indication
21	that restitution has been ordered, we try to check that
22	before the award is made.
23	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Okay.
24	MS. McMANUS: When possible.
25	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: And you would

integrate that? 1 MS. McMANUS: We would deduct that from 2 any award that we would be making. 3 REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Okay. MS. SCHIMMEL: To the extent it has been 5 paid. Because you may not --6 MS. McMANUS: Not if it has just been 7 ordered. 8 But only to the extent 9 MS. SCHIMMEL: restitution has been paid is it deducted from an award. 10 11 REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Okay. 12 have or is that subrogated? I mean, it occurs to me 13 that in many cases you have a typical sentence, let's 14 say, for somebody who is a repeated theft offense kind 15 of individual where they are going to spend a certain period, say less than a year of incarceration and then 16 17 a fairly long tail of parole. The restitution 18 obviously isn't going to be made in any significant 19 measure during the period of incarceration, it's going to be made later. Are you then subrogated in some way 20 21 as those restitution payments come in?

22

23

24

25

as those restitution payments come in?

MS. McMANUS: They must still be paid back to the Commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Okay, and is that--

MS. McMANUS: If we've made an award. 1 REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Okay, if you've 2 made an award. Now, is that handled by the probation 3 or parole office? 4 MS. McMANUS: Yes. 5 REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: So that this 6 system does sort of -- the hoop closes. If a judge 7 orders Defendant X to pay back \$2,000 because he 8 vandalized a house when he burglarized it or whatever, 9 he goes to jail for say two years with a six-year tail. 10 You folks, in the meantime, award \$2,000 in restitution 11 to these folks for the damage to their property, or 12 that that may not be a good example because there might 13 not be insurance, but--14 MS. McMANUS: We don't have a property 15 16 damage. REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Oh, okay. 17 sorry. You're right. Strictly personal injury. 18 19 MS. McMANUS: Right. REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: A personal 20 21 injury claim. MS. McMANUS: Of \$2,000. 22 REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Then the fellow 23 gets out and starts making payments because the judge 24

ordered those, that restitution to be paid. Whoever at

the county level is administering that is going to be essentially short circuiting those payments and sending them to you?

MS. McMANUS: Not necessarily. They will go into the fund. If we have made an award and they know about it, then we will be reimbursed for the award to the extent--

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Well, see, that's where I'm getting confused.

MS. McMANUS: I mean, as far as the General Fund. As far as it going back into the restitution fund.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Well, I'm not worrying about where it comes. I mean, that's the problem. There are several different issues.

MS. McMANUS: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: One is once it gets paid to any part of the Commonwealth, who does it go to? Does it go to the General Fund to help the Governor balance his budget or does it come to you folks? You know, whatever. That's one guess. What I'm trying to get at is before that. You can make an award and do make awards whether or not restitution has been ordered. You're completely independent from the judge's sentencing options?

MS. McMANUS: That's correct.

-

T 0

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: What concerns me is, or interests me, let's say, is if the judge has elected to order restitution to the crime victim directly, and you also make an award, is there an integration of that process? Now, if you make the award, let's say the judge doesn't order restitution at all, you make an award.

MS. McMANUS: Um-hum.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: The law says the defendant has to pay you back.

MS. McMANUS: Um-hum.

MS. McMANUS:

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: And that then gets also administered by the county or State parole officer, whoever is the supervising authority, right?

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: So that one of his conditions of parole after he gets out of prison is going to be to pay this back, or maybe he will or maybe he won't, but to the extent that he does, the county forwards that on to you?

Yes.

MS. SCHIMMEL: No.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: I'm sorry, forwards it on to the Commonwealth, Department of Revenue?

MS. McMANUS: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: And they sock it away. The question I have is if the defendant is ordered by the judge in sentencing to pay \$2,000 restitution to the victim and you folks also pay the victim \$2,000, what's -- who does the defendant pay restitution to?

MS. SCHIMMEL: The defendant pays restitution to the county, who in turn issues another check. Whether the money is to go to the victim or the Commonwealth, the money is always paid to the county first, and it's usually the county clerk of courts.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Right. I framed my question incorrectly. Let's say the defendant is paying restitution and they pay it to the county. Who does the county send it to?

MS. SCHIMMEL: Okay. That really depends on the extent of the Commonwealth's right of subrogation. If some of this restitution is to go for property damage, then the restitution designated to cover property damage goes first to the victim.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Uh-huh.

MS. SCHIMMEL: If it duplicates the bills that the Crime Victims' Compensation Board paid, then it is to be sent to the Commonwealth. Now, we have, we

had one county who refused to follow that very specific section of the statute. They continued to make restitution payments to the victim, even though we had made awards. When I pointed out the circumstance to the Solicitor, it was indicated that, well, the president judge had never heard of it before. And I said, well, I'm sure you will rectify that. This same county now has been told by the president judge to only count for restitution purposes property damage, nothing that's covered by Crime Victims' Compensation.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Okay. Well, the judge could do that in his order to begin with, if he wanted to work his way around that.

We're curious as to what county that is.
MS. SCHIMMEL: Erie.

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Okay. It's the wind blowing in off the lake there.

Okay, I thank you. I think I understand how that works then, and do we have -- we know that Philadelphia is doing a miserable job, a strikingly miserable job of collecting these fees from your chart, just the standard defendant comes through the -- that's right. They're in the thrall of just plain laziness, but all these, just the regular, everybody that comes through the system isn't paying their \$10. How are

1	they doing with regard to restitution where you have
2	made awards? Do we have a chart for that or do we have
3	some sense of how we're doing?
4	MS. McMANUS: No, we do not.
5	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Do you have any
6	general, or do they do it well or badly? One would
7	expect badly.
8	MS. McMANUS: Well, the total amount that
9	was in the that was subrogated back to the
10	Commonwealth in restitution for the entire year was
11	\$30,000.
12	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Oh, okay.
13	MS. McMANUS: So I don't think that, yo
14	know
15	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: It's kind of
16	nobody is doing very well?
17	MS. McMANUS: Right.
18	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Okay. Thank
19	you.
20	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative
21	Blaum.
22	REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Thank you, Mr.
23	Chairman.
24	The number I heard earlier, \$704,000,
25	What is that exactly?

MS. McMANUS: That's the administrative costs.

.21

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: And could we have a breakdown of that as to how those \$704,000 are spent? I can't find that in our budget sheets or some of the pages that you handed out to us.

MS. SNYDER: Notice the sheet I am holding up, and I think Galina put it in the package.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Um-hum.

MS. SNYDER: This is, at this point, the breakdown of those moneys. What will happen at rebudget time, we will go back in and say we have 14 positions, we will need X numbers of dollars for the salary moneys, we will need X numbers of dollars to maintain the computer, to take care of printing costs, hearing costs, and so forth. We will have to redevelop and redefine where that money is going to go because it's less than we asked for.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Um-hum.

MS. SNYDER: So we will now say we have 14 people, that's fixed. And we will calculate those dollars and that will be after the budget is passed. We will then say we have certain things we have to spend the moneys for and then look at the other things that we had asked for. So to give you a definite

1 answer now, I can't do that. I might say--2 REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Why not? 3 MS. SNYDER: Why not? 4 REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: I'm not talking about the '91-'92 budget. Let's go back to the '90-'91 5 6 budget, the money that the Compensation Board is 7 operating under now. 8 MS. SNYDER: Okay. 9 REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: What I'm 10 interested in is a breakdown of how each dollar is 11 spent by the board, okay? 12 MS. McMANUS: Well, we can tell you as 13 far as operating costs, everything in the board is 14 geared to victims. I mean, we have printing costs, we 15 have postage costs which consistently are increasing. 16 As we increase our payouts, the postage increases. A11 17 the things that go with it. We physically mail the 18 checks from our office to every provider and every victim. 19 20 REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: That's okay. 21 just asking, do we have that? Do we have the breakdown 22 of how--23 MS. McMANUS: I don't know that we have 24 that with us. If we don't, I can certainly get it for.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: That's all right.

MS. McMANUS: I would be happy to.

1.3

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Yeah. Thank you.

MS. McMANUS: We have it in personnel, operating costs, and fixed assets.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Right. Just broken down. You know, the personnel broken down, fixed costs broken down, assets broken down.

MS. McMANUS: I think you may get an answer in a minute.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Is that okay?

MS. McMANUS: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: PCCD has a similar problem with collections in Philadelphia, and I sympathize with the Crime Victims' Compensation Board because I don't know what you do, and I think it's incumbent upon us to try and do something about that. At PCCD we are getting to the point, I have asked our staff to begin thinking very seriously about, we hand out mini grants, not only having to do with victims, and I have had it up to here (indicating) with, as Representative Heckler said, the laziness and inefficiency of Philadelphia in not collecting that money which goes to victims resource centers. If you were to take any action against Philadelphia, you'd be hurting crime victims, and nobody wants to do that.

1

That's correct. MS. McMANUS:

goes to the most vulnerable people in this

14 15

13

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: You don't have another hammer, another angle that you can use against the city of Philadelphia or the county of Allegheny, and one or two others. I think as we go into the sunset of the Crime Victims' Compensation Board hearings that we have to begin looking at ways to tie lack of collections in these counties to other funding that the State hands out, and that is if they are not going to make these collections, the money of which Commonwealth, then they are going to suffer in other ways. And we don't want the crime victims to have to pay for the inefficiency of the courts, but those counties should have to pay in some other ways, and I think that our committee should begin looking at that.

One question I have --

MS. McMANUS: Excuse me.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Go ahead.

MS. McMANUS: This chart was prepared for another reason, and so I didn't single these counties It was just merely something that we had that we brought along for today.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: I understand, you know, where you're coming from.

MS. McMANUS: Right.

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

REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: But when we see those numbers, if you didn't put them in red we see red anyway because, I mean, the other counties are doing their job. Here is a county where we would expect a huge amount of funding to come into the State to help victims, and they're not doing their job, yet you are doing your job by paying out money to victims who happen to reside in those counties. And it's not fair to crime victims across the Commonwealth. Those moneys should be coming in from those elected and appointed officials in those places. When I look at your chart, I look at other things. Like the county of Montgomery, who last year had a deficit of \$38,000. What did they do to, in one year, turn that deficit, which is somewhat substantial, into a surplus of \$4,000? And if they can do it, why can't these other counties do it?

MS. McMANUS: I'm not sure I know the answer to that. I can tell you that '88-'89 in Montgomery County we paid 152 claims. The payments amounted to \$154,000, rounded off. The costs collected were \$115,000. In '89-'90, we paid 45 claims to Montgomery County, \$121,000, and then their costs collected increased to \$126,000. So they collected more.

1 REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: I'm just I look at Washington County, which was 2 wondering. running a surplus of \$18,000, and all of a sudden now has a deficit of \$3,000. Do you, you know, when you 5 see those numbers, you know, take action either to 6 congratulate Montgomery County and find out what they 7 did and use them as an example for Allegheny and 8 Philadelphia to follow? And at the same time, you 9 know, get in touch with Washington County to see what 10 in God's name is going on down there that all of a 11 sudden they fall into a deficit situation? Now, if 12 they have a couple of huge claims--13 MS. SCHIMMEL: That's what's going to do 14 it. If you have a large death claim with a \$20,000 15 loss of support payout in some of these smaller 16 counties, that's going to skew everything. 17 REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Okay, so that 18 might be something that is responsible for the deficit 19 in Washington County? 20 MS. McMANUS: That's correct. 21 REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: Okay. Thank you 22 very much. 23 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Berks County, of 24 course, ranks third. I'm curious as to what the

explanation is in my home county.

MS. SCHIMMEL: We hope you get the 3 2 answer. MS. McMANUS: Berks, in '88-'89, we paid 3 76 claims to Berks County for a total of \$68,000. 4 Their costs collected were \$44,000. In '89-'90 in 5 Berks we paid 38 claims for \$59,000, and their costs 6 collected were \$47,000. 7 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Is the PJ and the 8 Clerk of Courts cooperating with you then, if you have 9 that information? I happen to have lunch with the PJ 10 11 every month. MS. SCHIMMEL: Berks County, you had 12 \$40,000 collected from the district justices, and 13 \$7,410 collected in the Court of Common Pleas. 14 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Could you get that 15 16 in letter form to me, if you wouldn't mind, so that when I sit down with him next time we have lunch I can 17 tell him? 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: That's where 20 he's spending the money, taking guys out to lunch. 21 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: He hasn't sprung 22 yet. 23 I think one of the things to be pointed 24 out to the members of the committee, the importance of House Bill 77 and how it impacts on your total 25

operation, especially as it is tied into the Feds. Do you want to get into that?

MS. McMANUS: Okay. We are mandated by the Federal government to cover drunk driving or lose our Federal grant money. So if we lost our Federal grant money, that would have a significant impact on us. House Bill 77 includes that and includes the increase in the fines and costs, which we feel are specifically needed. And so we don't want to lose our Federal money. We are one of, and I'm not sure that we are not the only State now but I won't say that, who has not passed the legislation to include drunk driving.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: As a matter of fact, what they are doing is they are holding money down there, there's money down there waiting for us to tap into, and the longer we delay, the longer that money just sits there, is that correct?

MS. McMANUS: That's correct, but actually we will not realize that until the grant process is finished, and that would probably be around October that we would actually get that money. But we need to be prepared, we need to start building up the fund and so forth, and so it's very important that the legislation pass. We only skimmed through by the

1.	extension that was granted or we would have lost our
2	Federal funding.
3	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: So before we go on
4	summer break, we really should deal with that issue in
5	the Senate so that could it get to the Governor's desk?
6	MS. McMANUS: Absolutely.
7	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Is that your
8	timeframe?
9	MS. McMANUS: Absolutely. Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Have you had any
11	indication from our counterparts in the Senate as to
12	how they feel about that?
13	MS. McMANUS: We are coming up for sunset
14	review.
15	MS. SCHIMMEL: Thursday.
16	MS. McMANUS: Maybe they will let us
17	know.
18	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are there any
19	other questions?
20	REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: When do they
21	come up for sunset review?
22	MS. SCHIMMEL: Thursday.
23	MS. McMANUS: We have a sunset hearing.
24	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Any other
25	questions?
	1

1	(No response.)
2	MS. McMANUS: I think our Administrative
3	Officer has the information that Representative Blaum
4	wanted.
5	MS. SNYDER: I apologize. I'm always
6	looking to next year and forget about this year when
7	it's almost over.
8	We were initially, in this fiscal year,
9	allotted \$617,000. The breakdown was \$568,000 for
10	salaries.
11	REPRESENTATIVE BLAUM: You don't have to
12	give that to me now. I just would like a copy of it
13	and how those salaries, break down the salaries,
1.4	everything broken down into number of positions and so
15	forth.
16	MS. SNYDER: Okay. All right. We'll
17	do.
18	MS. McMANUS: We'll get back to you.
19	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. We
20	will now adjourn the meeting.
21	(Whereupon, the proceedings were
22	concluded at 11:12 a.m.
23	
24	

1	I hereby certify that the proceedings
2	and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the
3	notes taken by me during the hearing of the within
4	cause, and that this is a true and correct transcript
5	of the same.
6	
7	ann-Marie P. Sweeney
8	ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY
9	
10	
11	THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION DOES NOT APPLY TO
12	ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER
13	THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR SUPERVISION OF THE CERTIFYING
14	REPORTER.
15	
16	
17	Ann-Marie P. Sweeney
18	536 Orrs Bridge Road Camp Hill, PA 17011
19	717-737-1367
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	