1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2	COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
3	
4	In re: Public Hearing on HB 2670 and HB 2671, Criminal Gang Activity
5	
6	* * * *
7	
8	Stenographic report of hearing held in Room 22 Capitol Annex, Harrisburg,
9	Pennsylvania
10	Friday,
- •	June 24, 1994
11	9:00 a.m.
12	HON WHOMAS D. SALWASTRONE SHALDWAN
13	HON. THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, CHAIRMAN
14	MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
15	Hon. Harold James Hon. Al Masland
16	
17	
18	Also Present:
19	Hon. Michael P. Sturla, Prime Sponsor Hon. Mark B. Cohen
20	Galina Milahov, Research Analyst Richard Scott, Committee Counsel
	Mary Beth Marschik, Republican Research Analyst
21	
22	
23	
24	ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY 3606 Horsham Drive
25	Mechanicsburg, PA 17055 717-732-5316



	<u></u>	
1	INDEX	
2	INDEA	PAGE
	Jacob Madagamashan District Betagan	
3	Joseph Madenspacher, District Attorney, Lancaster County	8
4 5	Gary Tennis, Philadelphia District Attorney's Office	12
6	Hon. Emanuel A. Cassimatis, Judge, York County	42
7	Hon. Thomas G. Peoples, Jr., Judge, Blair County;	48
8	President, Juvenile Court Section of Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges	
9	Hon. Paul W. Tressler, Judge, Montgomery County	54
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
L9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: We'll get started now.

My name is Representative Mike Sturla. Chairman Caltagirone
will be joining us shortly. He's tied up in his office
right now but he will be up here, I understand, in the very
near future.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank
Chairman Caltagirone and the members of the Judiciary
Committee for holding this hearing today to address the
issue of gang violence and the legislation I have proposed
that focuses on this issue. Gang violence is a very serious
and, unfortunately, growing problem throughout the country,
including the State of Pennsylvania. My own district in
Lancaster County is not immune from gang activity.
Recently, I've been learning of incidents where a police
record is a requirement for youths to be initiated into
certain gangs. It became clear that the time has come to
help every community stifle criminal gang formation and
criminal gang violence.

Criminal gang violence is no longer primarily associated with big cities like Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. The State Attorney General's Office says a serious criminal gang problem has infiltrated urban and lesser populated areas like Erie, Monessen, York, Lancaster, Allentown, Shamokin, and Kittataning. The criminal activity associated with these gangs is wide ranging from drug

dealing, gun running, theft, and extortion, to crimes of violence much like I detailed previously.

Our youth are opting to join gangs because they offer a sense of belonging, self-respect, and achievement they do not have or feel that they can obtain through traditional means.

Criminal justice experts say gang association and crime are attractive alternatives where legitimate economic opportunities are lacking and social order is weak.

My legislation is not a cure-all for gang violence, but I'm hopeful that these measures will help instill in juveniles a sense of responsibility for their actions by requiring restitution, a sense of accomplishment and belonging to the community through participation in community service, and a sense of what is right and wrong through placement.

My legislation will also create a criminal gang deterrence fund which would award grant moneys to community-based organizations that provide for alternatives to gangs, alternatives which fulfill the basic needs of self-worth, accomplishment, and belonging. This fund also would support groups that combat criminal gang activity.

Because gang involvement increases the possibility of future criminal activity, I believe we must

take steps now to help these youth break the cycle of crime which will most likely start with their initiation into a gang, and I feel this legislation is a step in that direction.

I would like to point out at this time that I have been working with the District Attorneys Association and various other organizations in terms of trying to look at possible changes, and I'd like to outline a couple of those changes that I've agreed to so that today when we talk about this legislation we can talk about what it hopefully will be as opposed to what may be some flaws in it right now in its current form.

The one change is that throughout both the pieces of legislation we simply refer to gang activity, and in all those cases I would like to refer to it as criminal gang activity. The intent of this legislation is not to try and deal with groups or associations that someone may construe as a gang but that isn't involved in criminal activity. This is to deal with those groups and associations and gangs that are dealing with criminal activity.

Secondly, in House Bill No. 2670, on page 4 there's a definition of criminal gang member and it's defined as a person who demonstrates affiliation with a criminal gang by any two or more of the following indicia,

we would like that to be any two or more of the following indicia, with the exception of an admission by a gang member himself. If the gang member himself wants to admit that he's a gang member, we don't think somebody else needs to prove that for him. So in that case we believe that that would be enough to be constituted as a gang member, and the other cases we would like two indicia.

There's also in House Bill No. 2670 one of the things that I had discussed with the Youth Violence Council down in Lancaster was that they're concerned about being able to share records, and on page 4 of House Bill No. 2671, lines 8 and 9, where it talks about fingerprint and photographic records may be disseminated to law enforcement officers, I would like it to say and used cooperatively by those officers also, because what we're seeing is gang activity that flows from town to town, and until there are crimes committed, those agencies aren't allowed to share some of that information.

Additionally, we talk about in the bill drug and alcohol treatment, and I would like that to be expanded to psychological and psychiatric treatment in some cases where it's deemed appropriate.

On page 6 of House Bill No. 2761, we had enumerated circumstances for community service, and we've eliminated some of those circumstances as a way of not being

able to do community service. I think in some of those things would be appropriate that even if you're less than 15 years old, that you do some community service.

And on page 7, we've sort of changed the way the allocation of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, how that allocation gets distributed. And I have copies of those amendments which I can share with members also.

Additionally, I guess if we could as people testify today, some of the things that I'm interested in finding out, there are age limitations in here which are consistent with Title 42, and in some cases I'm not sure that those age limits should necessarily apply to gang activity. We've seen juveniles in gangs carrying guns at age 11, and in some cases they don't fall under the jurisdiction of this legislation.

There's also a request from my local Youth
Violence Council that this information be shared with
schools. If in fact that is a case, I think it needs to be
done rather judiciously so that we don't just have files of
juveniles flying around all over the State.

There was also a request that there be an aftercare component, which I think is probably a very good idea. And at one point in time it was suggested to me by Gary Tennis that perhaps we look at vertical prosecution

units, and so if we can get into some of that also, in addition to the prepared remarks that those testifying might have, I would appreciate any input we could get on that.

1

2

3

4

5

ĸ

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I guess now we'll start out with testimony, and Joe Madenspacher and Gary Tennis are going to present first.

MR. MADENSPACHER: Good morning. Thank you for inviting me to be here.

I would like to talk a little bit about gangs and the problems we have particularly in the city of Lancaster. Whether it's a coincidence or not, detectives in the juvenile defender section of the Lancaster Police Department first began receiving information concerning youth gang formation in Lancaster immediately after the movie "Colors" came out. You remember, "Colors" was a movie that portrayed gang activity in Los Angeles that premiered in 1988. With that, one of the first groups that came to the police bureau's attention was a group of primarily African-American youths that called themselves Colors. Within a year, we were aware of as many as a dozen such groups at any given time. The groups were constantly disbanding, merging, and new groups were formed. And these groups tended to adopt the term "posse," which was the name the Jamaican drug dealing gangs picked as their definition for a gang. Some of these groups were called like Lime

Street Posse, Green Street Posse, Ann Street Posse; names which designated or represented their particular turfs.

These groups were and are still today essentially segregated along territorial and ethnic lines. In 1988, there were a number of Hispanic, African-American, white, and even a mixed race group called the Beaver Street posse. There was ususally a clear leader, and the attraction for youths seemed to be more novelty than actually commitment to gang life. Intelligence gathering was relatively easy, as most youth bragged about their involvement, particularly about membership. Most of the group's criminal activity involved occasional assaults of other group members without the use of weapons and petty thefts.

However, today our gangs are primarily Hispanic in ethnicity and strongly territorial. There are some African-American youth in the gangs, but we are presently unaware of any white or Oriental gangs in Lancaster city. Leadership is now obscure and often difficult to determine, and intelligence gathering is much more difficult. Because the members have become secretive about their involvement, it has been much harder for us to determine who is involved. These groups have matured, exhibiting more hard-core characteristics. Most of the gangs today are involved in drug dealing.

Drug dealing is not necessarily a per se for a financial gain of the gang itself, as most of the members seem to be individual entrepreneurs, but the gang does provide security resources to protect the dealers and the gangs throughout the turf. This has led to competition, which conversely has led to a dramatic increase in violence, especially involving the use of firearms.

The youth range in age from about 14 to 20, with some exceptions. Of course, some will be a little younger and some a little older. Members fit the traditional profile: Male, mid to late teens or early 20s, high school dropouts, no desire to work, a long history of either or both criminal and antisocial behavior. The gang provides the family that they may not have had, but more importantly provides security and protection for their criminal activity, which besides drug dealing includes weapon sales, auto theft, and theft from autos, especially car audio systems.

There has been a recurring influence on the gangs from New York City drug dealers. These people bring with them what I call the big city experience and are particularly vicious with a strong propensity to violence. This influence has encouraged our locals to resort to violence to settle most disputes, and it's obviously been a significant factor in the explosion of violence in the city

in the past two years. Five years ago drive-by shootings were unheard of in Lancaster, and it was rare that a gang confrontation resulted in gunfire. It is a weekly, sometimes daily, occurrence. The weapon of choice is a semiautomatic handgun, however revolvers and sawed-off shotguns are used. When recovered by the police, these guns are usually found to be stolen.

The gangs were originally confined to the southeast section of the city but have moved into the southwest section, and their influence is slowly moving north. The violent nature of the groups has created an atmosphere of fear among residents living in areas of high gang activity, which permits the gangs to commit crimes, including murder, with impugnity. The single biggest obstacle to successful prosecution of a number of recent murders has been the stated fear of reprisal against eye witnesses should they cooperate with the police.

Operating in Lancaster city: The West Side Posse,
containing at least a dozen members. The Little Family,
with at least 30 members. The Mad Circle, containing at
least 25 members. The Hoodlum Brothers, membership
uncertain. Outlaws, membership uncertain. South Side
Gangsters, at least a dozen members. And the Green Street
Posse, at least 20 members.

House Bill Nos. 2670 and 2671 offer both real and psychological help in dealing with these gangs. First, the creation of the new crime of gang activity will let the gang members in the community they are holding hostage know that law enforcement is serious about this problem.

Second, the sentencing enhancements for crimes committed near schools, community centers, parks, public housing, and bus stops will help prevent and punish gang activity in the areas that we are trying to provide as safe havens from their activities.

Finally, the creation of a gang deterrence fund and resultant fundings for community-based organizations will offer every community realistic alternatives to our youth and enable them to channel their activities away from the criminal gangs they are now joining.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: Thank you. Questions?

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: No, not now. After

Gary maybe.

MR. TENNIS: Good morning. My name is Gary
Tennis. I'm the chief of legislation for the District
Attorney's Office of Philadelphia, and I just want to
clarify that I'm testifying today on behalf of the District
Attorney's Office in Philadelphia. The Pennsylvania
District Attorneys Association has not yet had a chance to
review and take a position on the legislation. They'll have

that opportunity in a few weeks, but until then, I really can't be speaking on behalf of them on the legislation.

I wanted to thank Representative Sturla, first of all, for working so closely with us and cooperatively, and also for just undertaking to tackle this very serious problem.

I also want to thank Sherry Petrich, a staffer for Representative Sturla and the Democratic Caucus, for doing a very competent job in drafting I think a very difficult and complex piece of legislation, one that the more we look into it the more complexities and difficulties and subtleties we find.

supports Representative Sturla's attempt to enact legislation attempting to address the growing problem of gang violence in Pennsylvania. This is kind of a, take a kind of a perverse -- it's refreshing in a kind of perverse way to have a situation here where there's a crime problem that the city of Philadelphia is not leading the State in. This is a problem that, according to my information, is actually I think most urgent in the counties of York County, Lancaster County, and Allegheny County. Philadelphia has some problem with this but nothing like we had in the '50s, '60s, and '70s. In fact, the chief of our asset forfeiture unit, George Mosey, recently was telling me about he grew up

in west Philadelphia and how he was nearly stabbed to death and his life was saved by a neighbor coming out, by a gang member of somebody who as part of their initiation was supposed to kill somebody. So in terms of even though some of the gangs now may, their levels of violence may vary, they tend to become increasingly more and more serious.

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

Much of the problem -- there are many problems, social problems that lead to these situations, and I wouldn't even begin to undertake trying to address all those, but there is a perception and I think a reality that the district attorneys feel that there is increasingly the juvenile justice system, the design of the juvenile justice system is not up to handling the problems of juvenile crime, including the gang problem, and that the legislature needs to take a new look at how that system is designed and whether it's capable of addressing the problems of the mid-It was designed at an earlier time, at a time when the social fabric of society structure was perhaps more Situations change now and I think the district stable. attorneys I know are trying to take another look at the system to see whether major changes need to be made.

I think additionally, much of the problem is due to lack of the correctional and rehabilitative resources for the juvenile justice system. I know just from my conversations with Jim Anderson he said there's a lot that

juvenile judges would like to do but the facilities aren't there - facilities like Abraxas that have very good track records working with juveniles that have had no success in other places, and much of this is going go to involve increased spending. I think most of the spending though that it would involve would end up being very cost beneficial in terms of greater savings in other areas.

б

Nonetheless, I think it is appropriate that
House Bills No. 2670 and 2671 are reflecting appropriate
legislative response to a growing problem of criminal gang
activity. Some of the provisions in there are
ameliorative. They are intended to try to provide more
resources and more help and use the offender's involvement
in the criminal justice or the juvenile justice system to
cause positive things to happen. Some of them are punitive,
and that's appropriate too. It does contain some mandatory
sentences, not unduly harsh, I don't think, but some
mandatory sentences for adult gang members who bring in or
involve minors in criminal gang activity, and I think that's
an appropriate response.

Basically, I think the public rightly wants, and I think Representative Sturla is rightly responding to what the public wants here, which is they want the legislature to be out front on this problem before it gets completely out of hand. It's one that's already become serious. I think

in looking at the experience of other States, I think you can predict that unless there is a strong response both by the legislature and by all branches of government to the gang problem, I think it will become, it's no doubt going to become increasingly serious, and I think it's a matter of time, although I'm up here saying that it's not one of our top problems in Philadelphia, I think it's probably only a matter of time that it will become that. I think we've been fortunate and I don't know why it hasn't become more of a problem in Philadelphia, but I think it will if we don't respond. This is an attempt, and I think a laudable attempt, to try to get out front on the problem before it becomes completely intolerable.

I want to just talk a little bit about the idea of the vertical prosecution units. The Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency has in the past, over the past 10 or 15 years, funded very successful efforts with vertical prosecution units both in the area of we've gotten, I think, one of the prime areas we've gotten was in the career criminal unit. Our office attempted many years ago, I think under District Attorney Ed Rendell, to try to target out that narrow class of offenders that just seemed to be committing a small number of people who were committing a huge number of crimes and tried to target them with vertical prosecution to get extra tough sentences and get them off

the street and just out of the system, given that we couldn't seem to be able to turn them around, and jail didn't seem to have much impact on their crime, we developed with a grant from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency a career criminal unit that was highly successful. They had a tremendous track record. The same thing has occurred, I believe, in the child abuse areas.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are examples of this around the country of these vertical prosecution units, and I would suggest that an appropriate response would be to, and again, this is more money and I understand you all have finished the budget, but I think to be realistic, in terms of to maybe even more important than legislation is if grant money were made available for the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency to give out grants to district attorneys like Joe Madenspacher or Stan Reibert or Bob Colville or wherever these problems are to develop vertical prosecution units, and I would recommend that they be contoured so you would probably want to see joint grants both by the police chiefs and the district attorneys, perhaps even other agencies, so that in addition to having prosecutors who can handle these vertical prosecutions you would also have additional police staff so they could get people to go under cover, infiltrate them. And we're not an expert. I'm speaking here on behalf of the District Attorney's Office. I'm not an expert on the

social side, but perhaps there would want to be some efforts
done in that area too, some kind of an integrated,

3 cooperative approach between various branches of

4 government. I think that that's the kind of thing that's

5 really going to help someone like Joe Madenspacher or Bob

6 | Colville or Stan Reibert to really go in and have an

7 | impact. And Joe and I spoke about this yesterday. He may

want to say a few more words about it.

Additionally, I would just like to, and maybe speaking more on my own behalf now, say a word about the drug and alcohol piece. It's an area that it's in this bill. It's an area that probably I'd be encouraged to see the legislature putting more and more resources into. The drug use forecasting statistics show that 80 percent of the crime in Philadelphia and 60 to 80 percent of the crime statewide, and I think those are conservative figures, the people being arrested, when they've done the surveys, have drug and alcohol problems, and that those have very much to do and are very much tied in with the criminal behavior. And also the lack of impact that we've had. Even though we've gotten a lot of tougher sentences, it seems to some extent that the crime problem has been resilient. It hasn't responded as well as we'd like it to.

I think there are approaches to treatment that have been ineffective and there are approaches to treatment

carefully into that issue and looks at how the criminal justice system can be used to coerce cooperation in the treatment system, which goes against the popular wisdom, but in fact it's a very effective approach, I think that additional impact will be had on the crime problem in general. Not to say that we should hold back or indicate any kind of weakening of the punitive side of the criminal element. I don't think anybody would suggest that because someone has a drug or alcohol problem, that they should be given special leniency. I don't think that would be good policy. But that's in here, and I think it's a very responsible piece that Representative Sturla has put in.

That concludes my formal remarks. Maybe what I would like to do just real quickly is let Joe talk about his -- you had some conversation with the police chiefs about vertical prosecution through your detectives.

MR. MADENSPACHER: We do vertical prosecutions in a number of types of offenses. We've always done them in murder cases and we've expanded them more into most of the sexual related type of offenses. Of course, all of the child abuse offenses, arson cases, are all vertically prosecuted. It seems, as Gary said correctly, anytime you have a pure vertical prosecution, you have a much better success rate to deal with literally close to a 100-percent

conviction rate and you wind up getting your best possible sentences, best possible sentences from our point of view, with a vertical prosecution. Because these people are particularly dedicated to this particular area, since it's their -- if not their sole responsibility it's one of their primary responsibilities -- as opposed to the nonvertical cases which are many of thousands other cases that come through that you have different people handling at every level of the way and there really is not one person who's responsible for guiding that particular case all the way through.

I think that the vertical prosecutions, whenever they're done in any office, always are the best way to handle criminal prosecution.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: While they are up here,
I just wanted to first of all thank you for coming here to
testify. I just wanted to point out a few things, a few
question areas that I think might be helpful for the
district attorneys to look at.

I was glad to hear in Mike's opening comments that although I haven't prosecuted anybody for a while, I do think along the same lines, and when I read the definition of criminal gang member and saw that we were going to require an admission plus, I said, oh, no, we don't want to do that. If he admits it, he admits it, and that should be

sufficient. But I think you ought to look at that section as a whole because I see some proof problems. A trial within a trial. Well, they can say that this guy, there might be some tracking problems involved with law enforcement to keep track of how many offenses were previous gang offenses, and that's something that I think should possibly be discussed at your summer conference.

б

Some other things, and we're pulling this out of conspiracy, which it clearly is. It's a conspiracy. We're saying that section 903 doesn't apply, but then we have throughout Section 913 the word "conspiracy," "conspirators" is used, and I don't know if we're creating any definitional problem. I'm thinking more in terms of practically speaking when you go there to convict the person and you have to worry about points are charged and definitions, whether you might have any problems there. I think that might be something to look at, this gang member statute in that way as to whether you're ultimately going to get a conviction or whether you have to work on that language.

Just a couple other things I thought were a concern. I don't really know what to do about it. I think it's nice to set up a fund with a \$300 assessment, but I just don't know how practical that's going to be. We can assess these guys \$300, but will that really amount to anything? Will we be able to create much of a fund? And

the same thing, it's nice to create a civil cause of action 2 and allow for treble damages and allow them to go after any gang members that may know what's going on, but what assets are we going to get? I wouldn't say take that out, but practically speaking, what assets? Those are my comments, I quess, on 2670, and I would really be more interested in hearing from the judges about 2671 as to how that may impact them and whether we need to have these special provisions dealing with juveniles. Those are my only comments. I don't know, Gary, if you --MR. TENNIS: No, I think those are good points,

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and those are the kind of things we've worked through, there have been a lot of points like the ones you're raising that we've tried to work through and I think yours are ones we should have spotted and we'll look at that. Because there are a lot of questions about how to make this real and what can we do meaningfully to come in and put a little extra sting on people involved in gang activity. And how you do that, it's tough. But something does need to happen.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: It's a good point.

MR. TENNIS: There's a consensus there, but how to do it is tough.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: And just for the record, we do have gangs in Carlisle. At least we had. We

put them down and they came back, but it was a Ruthless Posse. They didn't have a street name or anything, but they were just as bad, I'm sure, and it doesn't have to be a third-class city or a first-class city, it happens in relatively small boroughs. So it is something that needs to be addressed, but my only concern is when we address it we want to make sure we get the convictions and we can actually get through them.

MR. TENNIS: Right.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: I'll point out we've been joined by Chairman Caltagirone, and I'll turn the meeting back over to him.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: No, I want you to continue. You're doing a good job.

I apologize for being late. As a matter of fact, I had a very special conversation with PCCD and we're looking at some probation money, and I was talking to the Department of Corrections when the budget went to Probation over \$5 million and we're wondering how that's going to work out with some of the things that we had envisioned to use that money for the alternative sentencing programs.

Let me just share with you a couple thoughts that I have about the hearing that we conducted, first of all, yesterday in Philadelphia and some of the things that I've talked with some of the religious groups about, and I

admit this upfront and I think those of us who are involved both in the legislative, the judicial, and in the prosecutorial area realize, number one, that government can't do it all. We can deceive ourselves into thinking, I think, that we can pass all the laws in the world, try to prosecute as many people as we can, and we cannot begin to start to change society to have any dramatic impact, and what I said was that government can't do it alone. And what I've been doing is contacting the various religious groups, because I think they're missing a part of this equation, and that's been a challenge that I've been giving to the council of churches, I did that this last week in my own city, I did it in Philadelphia yesterday, I want them to take it back to the Council of Churches, the Catholic Conference, and the Jewish Coalition.

Why am I saying that? Very simply put is that I think the churches probably have a bigger role to play than any other segment of society and they haven't really been tapped. And one of the things I proposed to them is that if they believe in what they believe in and leave their churches on a Sunday or a Saturday, whenever they to go pray, that those families have got to start taking much more of a keener interest and a more active role in their own society, in their own areas. And I've suggested that they adopt a family, and there may be single parent families,

whatever. But if each congregation, if each church, as an example we have 200 churches in the city of Reading, and it's also interesting that we have 200 liquor licenses. I don't know what the comparison is. It seems like on one corner you have a church, the other corner you have a bar, so it's like either choose God or the devil, but therein lies the problem. And I've asked them to try to implement something like that, and we're going to expand on that, and I'd like to see us do something with that this summer.

I sponsor a little league baseball team, knee high guys, and I've sponsored them for the last 10 years, to keep them off the street, to keep them active. I'm also getting involved with some really hard-core kids, about 200 of them, they call themselves the Blacktop Gang, in Reading, and they play basketball and they need equipment and uniforms and other things like that, so I'm involved with that.

You know, when you look at the phenomena of the gangs, they want to belong. That's their family. I think everybody realizes that. It's the brotherhood or the sisterhood, we're seeing more of that today than ever before. And I think there's a role that has to be played with the civic and social organizations, and I remember when I came back from Virginia in '67, we went down in one of the toughest areas of the city of Reading with the Junior

Chamber of Commerce, of which I was a member, and we started repairing old playgrounds and did a number of those projects to get the suburbanites -- I was a city guy and these were all suburban young junior execs coming up, now most of them are heading companies and businesses in Berks County, and I wanted to get them involved in the inner city to have them understand the problems that we have that's really eventually ours, sprawled out to the suburb areas because of the drug activity and other things like that.

But I do think that we need to look at those areas, and each of us plays a role in that because we all belong to either civic or social organizations, aside from the regular jobs. Everybody basically belongs to some kind of a church organization, and I think they should be involved in helping to deal with these kinds of problems. You have that in Lancaster. There isn't a city, I guess, or a community in this State that hasn't been touched with some type of gang activity.

We can't spend our way out of this. And I don't know if we really need to rewrite the book. I think the nature of the crimes pretty well remain the same. They are more heinous and you have the drug equation on top of that, but basically kids are kids. And if they can be directed in the right way and if you get them early enough, and I convinced Dwight Evans specifically, and others who kept

preaching this, we need to do more upfront, and I know Judge Cassimatis and we talked a number of times, this is the goal in this year's budget and we lost that battle, House Bill No. 1629 was going to give us the money to do those things with juveniles.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We talked about the Governor's Commission on Corrections report, Chairman Sweet, Allen Hornbloom and the rest of the commission members that were there yesterday. The amounts of money that we're putting into our prisons, and one of the things that I'm going to mention now, I'm going to put in a bill to decommission Graterford and also to decommission Rockview, and the reason why I'm saying that, rather than continuing to build additional facilities to incarcerate more of our people, I think we need to take a hard look at what we're doing with our resources. convinced that if we allocate more money with the juveniles, who really don't have advocates, other than those few of you that are in this room today, that to advocate for them, the senior criminals, the adults, have all these groups that advocate for them - The Prison Society, ACLU, there are many other groups even within the prisons. The juveniles don't. I feel convinced that if we put money in the front end of the system, we can divert a lot of these juveniles from becoming adult criminals. And I'm not saying we need to write off all the adult criminals. I think some can be

saved, but I think we're kidding ourselves.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I've said this time and time again: I'm not the least bit offended or opposed to the notion that hard, violent criminals need to be put away and put away for longer periods of time. I have no problem with that. I don't think anybody really has a problem with that in the legislature. What does trouble me is that there's approximately 40 percent of the nonviolent offenders that are being incarcerated that don't belong in a prison setting, and it's too costly to put them in those settings.

We're going to need the district attorneys to be advocates on this type of an issue also, I might add. The amounts of money that we're looking at, and I know that Berks County, as an example, and I'm sure that Lancaster, we're coming over to Lancaster, as a matter of fact, with the beat patrolman, with the mayor. We have that set up as a tour and we're going to be touring a lot of the prisons this summer to see exactly what's going on there, and I think that what we need to look at in the long-range view of things is that we need to decommission some of our old facilities, we need to come up with the alternatives and fund those alternatives so that if you prosecute somebody involving an offense, let's say a drug abuse offense, and we have a compilation that we finally completed of all the programs, and there are some very, very good programs

statewide that are in effect in the counties, the State, Department of Health, and we've put that together and it's in publication now, I quess they're just reproducing it now, a week or so we should have enough of those to start sending out to the members of the General Assembly, it proves the point that it's much more cost-effective. We need to free up money for the juvenile programs, and the only way that I can see that we can do that, conceivably, is that we've got to do these other things with the adult alternative sentencing with the judges, and I agree, except for some very specific crimes for mandatories, I think we should lift those mandatories and put that discretion in the hands of the judges where it rightfully belongs. And I'm going to propose that also. Except for some specific crimes. And I would like the District Attorneys Association to work with us on that.

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the same thing with the alternative programs for those nonviolent offenders that we can extricate out of the system and put them in alternative programs, thereby freeing up enough money and hopefully at the same time while they're building, I guess it's Chester they're building a new one and Clearfield they're building a new one, State correctional institutions, that we decommission Rockview and Graterford and have the kind of savings that I think we really need to put that money then into the system with the

juveniles and into the alternative programs. But we need advocates. I know from a program last night that I watched that the number one fear in the country, here we go again, it's going to be politicized in this fall election: Crime, crime, crime. But the fact of the matter is if we believe the stats that we've been seeing, crime really hasn't risen that much, but the types of violent crimes are rising much faster. And I do think that we need to step back, take a look at where we're putting our limited resources both in the counties and at the State level and see if this really makes any sense to attempt that approach. I mean, all of these fine programs, and I know there are many of them out there that you've done in Lancaster, what we've been trying to do in Berks and Philadelphia and in many other areas around the State. But if we don't maximize the use of our resources to get a better bang for our buck, especially as it involves the juveniles, because I think a lot of these crimes that we're seeing and the troubled youth that we're dealing with, if we can spend resources in working with them to divert them from that life of crime, on the back end it will save us some money. That's what I wanted to say. Thank you for

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

being with us.

MS. MILAHOV: DA Madenspacher, I have a couple

of questions regarding the gang issue in your area. You mentioned that the gangs were escalating their violent activity and that some of the gangs were literally getting away with murder. Could you describe the number of murders that you feel are gang attributable, say, for the last four years and the success you've had in prosecuting these?

MR. MADENSPACHER: I don't have those numbers handy. There is at least one occasion that occurred approximately about a year or a year and a half ago which was a gang fight, is really what it was, and an individual by the name of Pikey Speller was killed by a .9 millimeter automatic in this particular gang warfare. Now, we know in addition to gangs that were involved in this thing that people down there, just Citizen A, B, and C knew who all was involved in this, including people who know one case of a person who works in the school district and they say they will not testify against them. They won't come in and testify for us.

There was another individual by the name of -
I'm trying to think of his name -- who was killed in January
or February of this year which we think was gang related,
but once again, nobody was willing to come forward. And
again, we know that there are people out and saw this.

Those are two incidents of murders that we are unable to
solve but we think that gangs -- we know for a fact that

gangs were involved in the one and we think that they were involved in the other. Those are the two that are currently outstanding.

Generally, our murder prosecution rate is very good because we're extremely aggressive with our resources in our murder cases. These are the only two that I can think of that are gang related. Others are drug related type of offenses and people may have had some sort of peripheral involvement with gangs, but it was not a gang fight or a particular gang activity. But it -- Krouse, that's the name. Those are the two that are outstanding right now that we are just unable to do anything with.

MS. MILAHOV: And how many murder cases do you have in your county a year?

MR. MADENSPACHER: We average approximately 10 to 12 per year.

MS. MILAHOV: Okay. And would you say that gang membership causes people to be more likely to commit murder and some crimes like this?

MR. MADENSPACHER: The gangs are a direct fault because they are more likely to resort to violence. We could have had a lot more murders that are gang related or drive-by shootings. I've said that it seems to me that our gang members have a lot of resiliency. They can absorb gunfire and not die. I can't even count the number of

people that have been assaulted. I mean, weapons assault, there have to be a couple dozen that are absolutely, clearly gang related. Drive-by shootings. We had an incident approximately three weeks ago where a bunch of gang members just started opening fire on, I think Representative Sturla might even remember this, just started opening fire on a rival batch of gang members, hitting none of them but hitting two to three people who just happened to be out on their porch in the area.

R

1.3

We had a gang killing that was solved about three years ago which was probably -- this is every parent's fear of what's going to happen with a gang. One group of gangs, all in this group, all four individuals that were prosecuted were under the age of 18 years old, who had a squabble with another gang, so they go out and they start shooting at them and he is on the playground. Well, naturally they miss him but some 15-year-old girl who just happens to be out on the playground is killed from a .45 to the head. That's a gang related murder right there that where innocent people are just being killed. It's gang related in the sense that gangs were involved in the thing but an innocent bystander was killed.

And to say we have a number of shootings, a lot of times the gang members won't even testify against each other. The police come up here and we know who did it and

they know who did it and they say they won't come in and testify.

1

2

3

5

б

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MILAHOV: One last question. Do you feel that defining the crime of criminal gang activity would curtail criminal gang activity, or if there is the chance that by naming this crime it would give more notoriety to the type of person who would join in and therefore defeating what we already have in our criminal justice system when we prosecute these people?

MR. MADENSPACHER: I understand what vou're saying. Of course, I don't know what it would have. We would hope that this would have some sort of psychological effect and deterrent effect. The psychological effect from the community. Just because, as Representative Sturla said, this isn't going to solve all the answers, but it does give the community a perception that we realize that these gangs are a problem and it gives them a perception that we are willing to do something about it. If we only have a half dozen prosecutions for this particular crime in a given year, you know, that, in my mind, is at least a statement that is out there that we're willing to move forward in this particular area. Not every piece of legislation that's passed is going to sweep in and create a lot of criminal arrests or a lot of criminal prosecutions. There have to be other intangible effects. We hope the one intangible effect would be the psychological effect in the community in that they feel that we're willing to do something about this, and hopefully the deterrent effect is to maybe these individuals that they think that they're going to get possibly more severe prosecution that they are a gang member, they won't join a gang.

But I think it's back to what Representative

Caltagirone said, we have to have something in our community

for these kids to do. And I in my testimony alluded to the

fact that these gangs, to some extent, are a family that

they don't have or never had. And so we have to provide

something for them, and I think if we're providing them with

literally the carrot and the stick, here we're going to set

up this new rec league basketball for you guys all this

summer and buy the uniforms and the balls and the officials

and the half-time refreshments and things like that, we want

you to do that. But if you go out and join a gang and get

caught doing these crimes, you're going to be dealt with

hard. I think that's the way to deal with youth. Carrot

and stick is the way to do it, and this bill has the

potential to do it.

We're not going to go out and make hundreds of arrests. If we get a half dozen or a dozen in a year it's a lot, but it does have a real potential for that, a psychological effect.

Cohen wants to make some comments, but if I could make a quick question. What this does is provides an additional tool for the district attorneys to use in terms of getting information back out of gang members and sort of breaking the grip that the gang has. If they get somebody in and they have the opportunity to charge them with criminal gang activity and say, but you give us who your drug supplier is, who your gun supplier is, who this is, we'll drop the extra two-year charge, we'll do some of these kind of things. It's an extra tool that they have to work and negotiate with.

Representative Cohen.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you, Representative Sturla.

In reading this several times, I think that the gang activity basically swallows up conspiracy. This offense is not limited to juveniles, is it?

MR. MADENSPACHER: No.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: So conspiracy is any crime committed by two or more people, and basically gang activity is now a crime committed by any three or more people. I mean, you don't have to be a juvenile, you don't have to have anything to do with juveniles to be in a gang, do you?

1 MR. MADENSPACHER: No, you don't have to be. 2 effect, it creates basically another conspiracy statute or similar to Section 908, the corrupt organizations. 3 MR. TENNIS: 4 RICO Act. 5 MR. MADENSPACHER: The RICO statute. In that 6 sense is it somewhat duplicative of what we have? Yes. 7 half of our criminal laws duplicative of what we have? Yes. To that extent I think you're correct. It creates a R 9 crime that in theory we could proceed under with the 10 underlying offense as well as to criminal conspiracy, and 11 taking the whole thing as a package, the sentencing 12 alternatives and the other aspects of it does have --13 REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: It says here conspiracy 14 shall not include gang activity. 15 MR. MADENSPACHER: Right. REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: So it would seem to me 16 17 that every single crime involving three or more people is 18 now gang activity, and you're not going to have a half dozen 19 crimes in Lancaster to prosecute, you're going to have 20 hundreds of them every year. 21 MR. MADENSPACHER: No, but it would have to be 22 done by a criminal gang member. Remember, it's pretty well 23 defined in there. 24 ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: And if I could, you're 25 looking at House Bill No. 2670, page 2?

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Yeah.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: One of the things we're proposing to do is to strike outlines 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: Because that point had been raised earlier by the District Attorneys Association.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Okay.

now is just have Section 1, Title 18 of Pennsylvania
Consolidated Statutes is amended by adding a section to
read, and we get down into criminal gang activity, Section
913. That was one thing I pointed out early on in the
meeting. In my meeting with the district attorneys,
anyplace in either of these bills where it talks about gang
activity we have also proposed calling it criminal gang
activity, because we don't want the Knights of Columbus to
be considered a gang. That's not the intent of this
legislation.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Okay. I think it might be worthwhile to further refine it so gang activity just doesn't become a catch-all phrase for any conspiracy. I mean, any conspiracy worthy of its name could commit two crimes in three years. I mean, that's not a very difficult standard to meet. I mean, white collar crime. You know, if

Representative Caltagirone, Representative Sturla and I decided to commit some crime and get together, we could be a gang. If we commit two crimes, as long as we committed two crimes in three years on separate occasions, we might even be able to commit two crimes in one day, and then we're a gang. I mean, I think it has more meaning if it is more narrowly targeted and doesn't become this all-embracing thing like RICO does.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think the problem with the Federal RICO statute is that now only a small percentage of the RICO crime statute is aimed at what has traditionally been organized crime. Most of what we think of as organized crime has gotten off under RICO, and I think the emphasis on juveniles gangs is going to get lost if almost any conspiracy is a gang. I mean, I guess it depends, I mean, how close you are to schools. I mean, in Philadelphia there the City Planning Commission will be able to answer this better than I do, but two-tenths of a mile within a school or a public housing project or the other things you've listed, I would guess off the top of my head that 75 percent of Philadelphia would fit in that definition. Maybe I'm exaggerating. Maybe it's only 35 to 40 percent. just seems to me that we're swallowing up conspiracy and swallowing up, I guess, the case law involving conspiracy, and if that's the goal, maybe we ought to discuss what it is

with conspiracy case law that we want to get rid of.

MR. TENNIS: Just as a practical matter, my experience with conspiracy prosecutions is we would charge those in any crime where you had two or more people involved in it and it was clear that it had been thought about before the crime, and the vast majority of conspiracy prosecutions would not involve some kind of ongoing organization, it would just be a one-shot deal. If you have two people sitting there and they decide, let's go rob a store and they rob it, that's a conspiracy and a robbery under the law. So just as a practical matter, that's how --

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Don't they often decide, if they successfully rob one store and they're not caught yet, let's go rob a second store?

MR. TENNIS: Sure. Right, but as a practical matter, in terms of the cases that are brought to us that we get, it would usually be -- I mean, I think if I confirm that, it would usually be a one-shot deal.

My reading of this would be, and I was just talking to Joe about this, is that in a lot of these instances you could actually charge the underlying offense. If there was a conspiracy, you could charge that. This has additional elements beyond conspiracy, so I think arguably you might be able to charge both conspiracy and gang activity.

MR. MADENSPACHER: I understand what you're saying, but as a practical matter, most of the conspiracies that are prosecuted are once and done kind of conspiracies. And if there are other instances where this can be brought into account where maybe that wasn't the original intention to do so, I certainly don't see any particular harm in that. For example, this is not targeted at outlaw motorcycle gangs in the sense of the word, but if we could somehow or other make a prosecution against them under this section, even though, again, this is clearly not designed for that, I don't see --

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Well, it certainly would include motorcycle gangs. It would include groups that are labeled as the Mafia or Cosa Nostra. It would include just about everybody, as well as street partners and accounting firms who want to cheat the State government of taxes.

MR. MADENSPACHER: Well, I don't necessarily think that's a detriment that it goes beyond what was originally proposed. It has the effect of doing things that were not in the minds of the drafters. I mean, you still are criminals who are engaging in criminal activity. I just don't see too much --

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: I guess what I'm objecting to is that the testimony assumes this subject deals with juvenile gangs, and in fact juvenile gangs are

1 only a tiny percentage of the people who are affected by 2 this legislation. And you talk about there are only six gangs, the following gangs are operating in Lancaster, and 3 you counted them, and then you give the definition of the 5 bill, which probably means there are thousands of gangs operating in Lancaster under the definition of this bill. 6 1 quess what I'm objecting to is the labeling. 7 8 I have no further questions. 9 ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: Okay. Thank you. 10 Any further comments? 11 (No response.) 12 ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: Okay, next on the 13 agenda, the Juvenile Court Judges Commission. We have the Honorable Emanuel Cassimatis, the Honorable Paul Tressler, 14 15 the Honorable Thomas Peoples. 16 JUDGE CASSIMATIS: Committee members Sturla, 17 Cohen, and York County legislator Masland, and Cumberland 18 County. We're proud to have him also representing York 19 County as well. Thank you for the opportunity to appear 20 before you to discuss House Bills No. 2670 and 2671. Joining me today are Judge Tom Peoples from Blair County, 21 22 and Judge Paul Tressler from Montgomery County. Both are 23 experienced juvenile court judges and former prosecutors. In addition, Judge Peoples and Tressler are serving 24 25 respectively as the president and president-elect of the

Juvenile Court Section of the Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges. Moreover, Judge Tressler is an instructor for the Federal Department of Justice gang program. Both have agreed to share their perspectives regarding these bills and related issues following my remarks.

The issue of youth violence, including that committed in the context of gang membership, is of critical concern for the Pennsylvania juvenile court judges.

Representative Sturla is to be commended for his legislative proposals which, regardless of their fate, can serve to bring additional attention to the need for a comprehensive strategy to both control and prevent gang violence.

And let me Amen the comments of Chairman

Caltagirone earlier in his remarks when he stressed two

things: Community responsibility for dealing with the

problems of violence. The communities must accept

responsibility for it, and that's where the initiative has

to come, with help and support, of course. And secondly,

the need to become proactive rather than reactive; to deal

and focus on prevention rather than on punishment and

reacting to the violent personality after it's been

developed.

Our views regarding how best to approach the issue of youth violence are set forth in the guiding

principles governing the control and prevention of youth violence adopted by the Juvenile Justice Policy Group earlier this year. Our policy group, for which I served as a convener, felt that a set of principles such as these could serve as a point of reference for anyone interested in the issue. These principles were the basis for my testimony before the House Select Committee on Violence and were also distributed at the informal roundtable discussion with the Judiciary Committee on juvenile justice issues chaired by Representative Caltagirone last March. Representatives James and Masland were also there. The principles had been endorsed by the Juvenile Court Judges Commission, the juvenile court section of the Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges, and the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers.

As drafted, House Bills No. 2670 and 2671 would amend Title 18 to create the offense of gang activity.

Title 42 would be amended to create new mandatory sentencing provisions for persons convicted in criminal proceedings of this offense, while requiring judges to make every effort to order a disposition involving out-of-home placements, fines, or restitution in juvenile delinquency proceedings where the offender is found to have committed gang activity. In these juvenile cases, courts would also be required to order an evaluation of drug or alcohol dependency. If it is

determined that the juvenile is alcohol or drug dependent, the court would be required to order the juvenile committed for treatment at a facility or institution approved by the Department of Health.

This legislation would also require courts or probation officers to include constructive community service alternatives as a component of dispositions for juveniles adjudicated delinquent or placed under a consent decree if the child is not a danger to the community, the community service alternatives are available, the child is 15 years of age or older, and it is the child's first or second offense.

It is the position of the Juvenile Court Judges Commission that amendments to the Juvenile Act are not the key to enhancing the Commonwealth's ability to respond to violent juvenile offenders, including those involved in gang activity. The Juvenile Act already provides judges with broad dispositional authority to order dispositions which are consistent with the protection of the community and the treatment and supervision needs of juvenile offenders.

In addition, the act provides an effective mechanism to transfer for criminal prosecution any juvenile offender over the age of 14 when there is a prima facie case that the alleged crime is a felony and the court has determined that the offender is not amenable to treatment in

the juvenile justice system. The crime of murder, as you are aware, is excluded from the definition of "delinquent act" in Pennsylvania and is handled from the outset in the adult criminal justice system.

It is our impression that the issues which have the greatest impact on the ability of the juvenile justice system to deal effectively with serious juvenile offenders are those involving the availability of resources. The degree to which resource issues are affecting the system is illustrated by the results of a resent survey conducted by the Juvenile Court Judges Commission in response to increasing concerns about detention center overcrowding and waiting lists at public and private residential treatment programs. The survey confirmed that waiting lists at public and private residential programs are contributing significantly to overcrowding and capping juvenile detention centers.

On April 29, 1994, Pennsylvania's 21 county juvenile detention centers held 613 juvenile offenders, representing almost 109 percent of their combined licensed bed capacity of 563. On that date, more than 200 of these juvenile offenders were awaiting transfer to a residential placement following an adjudication of delinquency. These youths represented approximately 32 percent of the juveniles being held in detention at the time of the survey. A survey

of seven private residential delinquency programs during the week of May 1, 1994, determined that of their combined population of 2,264 juvenile offenders, 619, or 27 percent, were from States other than Pennsylvania.

Currently, judges are able to give consideration to whether an offense is gang related when conducting dispositional proceedings in delinquency cases. As drafted, we do not believe the provisions of House Bills No. 2670 and 2671 would enhance our ability to deal with juvenile cases involving gang activity. However, we applaud Representative Sturla's rejection of the concept of mandatory delinquent dispositions in this legislation. We would strongly oppose the inclusion of mandatory placement provisions in these bills or in other legislative proposals.

The provisions in House Bill No. 2671 which would require courts to order treatment at a facility or institution approved by the Department of Health for juveniles found to have committed gang activity and to be alcohol or drug dependent could be problematic. Very few programs licensed by the Department of Health accept serious juvenile offenders for placement. The creation of a State funding system to support the gang deterrence activities of community organizations may be worthy of consideration, although we are uncertain as to the viability of the specific proposal in House Bill No. 2670.

It should be noted that PCCD, Pennsylvania

Commission on Crime and Delinquency, has recently announced a new community-based delinquency prevention and youth violence reduction program under Title V of the Federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. This initiative is based on the Communities That Care model, which has been successfully undertaken in a number of jurisdictions across the country. The Pennsylvania communities that become involved in this initiative will engage key community leaders in identifying and prioritizing delinquency risk factors operating in their communities and will develop a comprehensive three-year plan to reduce the impact of these risk factors on their children. A State funding stream of some type could be helpful in replicating this important PCCD initiative in other communities.

In closing, I want to re-emphasize that there is no basis to believe that amendments to the Juvenile Act will enhance our ability to respond to serious juvenile crime. Rather, we must focus our attention on supporting neighborhoods and communities, in taking responsibility for the development, implementation, and ownership of comprehensive violence and delinquency prevention strategies, and on insuring that the juvenile justice system has the resources to enable an immediate, effective, and individualized response to the risks and needs presented by

each juvenile offender.

б

I will now ask first Judge Peoples and then Judge Tressler to share their perspectives on the issue before you today.

Judge Peoples.

JUDGE PEOPLES: Thank you, Judge.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I will attempt to be brief. I apologize, I do not have prepared remarks for you. My hope is that I can, in a matter of a few moments, highlight just a few thoughts that I think I would like very much to bring to your attention on behalf of the judges who sit in juvenile courts in the Commonwealth each day of the year. Judge Tressler joins me, I'm sure, as we attempt to bring to you the concerns of those judges who are laboring in the fields of juvenile justice.

One of the most encouraging things I've heard here this morning comes from you, Mr. Chairman, in your view as you have expressed it that there is a desperate need in the juvenile court system for a concern for funding at the local level to make the system work. I join Judge Cassimatis in his expression to the members of the committee here this morning that the belief among juvenile judges is not that the Juvenile Act is defective or in need of great repair, nor is the Crimes Code of this Commonwealth

defective to any great extent and in need of serious repair. We believe that you, the legislators, have furnished to us the vehicle by which we can function within the juvenile court system. But we must have the manpower and womanpower to bring it about.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I listened here this morning very carefully to the concerns expressed by the representatives of district attorney's offices of the Commonwealth and the need to send forth a message and to let it be seen in the general community that there is a concern about these activities. Certainly, I am sure that not one of the three judges who are here this morning come here to in any way belittle or demean the seriousness of the problem of gang activity. I will simply bring to your attention and express to you the concern that juvenile judges across the State, and particularly those in my position as a president judge, have in that each day I labor to hold -- first to recruit, and secondly to hold in our employ qualified, very, very ardent, and mostly young people, as juvenile probation officers. We're losing the fight to keep them. There is no question We're losing them to insurance companies, we're about that. losing them to investigative companies, we're losing them to anybody who can use those skills that we instill into them. We train them and then they offer them \$10,000, \$12,000, \$15,000 more to start than we can pay them, and they're

gone. Naturally. I've encouraged some of our young people to take those better jobs.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I said that I was concerned here because I'm hearing that there's a need to send out a message to the community, let the community see what's going on, and so In the county from which I come, this morning were you on the highways in that county, I think you would see evidence of one of the best messages sent anywhere through the juvenile justice system, and that's what we call the trash pickers. Kids who have been in the juvenile court system are out with the orange vests on under supervision by our juvenile probation office picking up trash off PennDOT roadways and right-of-ways, in return for which they are paid. From that pay we take the restitution that is owing to the victims, as well as the costs to the prosecution that brought them before the court. No clearer message is sent to the members of our community than that very visible sign that's out there right now. It's made possible by the legislature. No question about it. And I simply point to you and tell you that if we are given the funding that allows us to staff with good, competent people those probation offices, what we have in the way of controlling legislation in the Juvenile Act and the Crimes Code gives us more than enough of a vehicle.

I strongly urge that you seriously consider also

the current dilemma that Judge Cassimatis has already spoken of. It is one of gigantic proportion, that it's necessary for us to warehouse young people who have to wait for places in facilities. When I see a young person in my court within the time parameters set by the Juvenile Act, and I believe juvenile courts across this Commonwealth make every effort possible to meet those time limits and to provide swift disposition of cases for juveniles, once we adhere to those time limits of the law, we then have to warehouse a kid who is going to a commitment for a month, two months. Far, far too long. As consideration is given here now to whether or not there is a need for more commitments and for putting more kids in facilities, I plead with you, please also consider the impact on the system. It isn't adequate to handle it right now. The system of placement facilities is simply not adequate.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Further, I bring to your attention, and I fully realize that this may be outside the realm of this committee's concern, and I bring to your attention the concern that I and other juvenile court judges have in this State, what is on the horizon in terms of a new set of regulations that come from the Welfare Department which will drastically impact upon the financial operation of private providers. Private providers are to us the lifesavers. The YDC simply can't handle all of the customers. The private

providers are providing an excellent job in the main. They are very, very quickly being influenced by these impending regulations to serve as few Pennsylvania children as possible and get their clientele from outside this State. I tell you, gentlemen, without any question in my mind, the reverse will happen also. If those placements dry up for us in private placement facilities in Pennsylvania, we, the juvenile court judges, will be forced to look at placements outside Pennsylvania in other facilities. And if you want to talk about financial impact, I assure you, this is something that must have your attention. And I urge you to take this to your colleagues in other committees of the legislature and bring this to their attention.

would be brief. In the bill there is provision for the assessment of I believe it's \$300 for a fund. Let me tell you, as a president judge who tries desperately to have a functioning costs and fines department that collects and not just sits there and works on tally sheets but collects, the burden already is breaking our backs. It was brought to my attention the other day that for a traffic ticket of \$25, the total price is now in excess of \$100, with all the extra fees that are tacked on. Now, that may be all well and good to say, well, let the wrongdoer pay the bill. The problem is we have to collect it. And our problem is almost

gigantic in proportion in trying to collect it. In addition to that, I suggest to you many of the people who will be subjects to this assessment of the \$300, if that's the mandatory assessment, don't have it. And our trying to get it will continue, but it will be a fruitless effort. So I seriously and strongly urge the members of the committee to give serious consideration to whether or not that is a prudent provision to include, whether it be for juveniles or whether it be for adults.

I've taken more time than I expected to. I appreciate the opportunity to speak here this morning on behalf of the judges of the juvenile court system, and I am imploring that you give serious consideration to the message that we're attempting to bring.

Thank you very much.

JUDGE TRESSLER: Might I stand and move over here?

Gentlemen, you have a rare opportunity. The question was asked, how many murders occurred in Lancaster? It doesn't really matter. The point of the matter is the gang problem in Pennsylvania has not yet solidified. We're not Los Angeles. We're not San Diego. We're here, and many of the problems that we have are problems that they had 20 years ago. They didn't address those problems. For us to go off at this point and just start passing legislation

might or might not be a good idea. I think the importance of this committee is the fact that we brought the problem out. And one of the difficulties, for example, with California, and I've been out there in doing my teaching. I've been in every State except two, and one of the things that I found is that in Los Angeles, they've addressed the problem on a haphazard basis and haven't really put a dent into it. There are third generation gang members out there. San Diego, on the other hand, which came in earlier and made more decisive legislative movements, doesn't have nearly the problem that Los Angeles has, although they do certainly have a problem. One of the things that I'm concerned about in this act, and most of the act I don't have a problem, but one of the problems I have is with any kind of mandatory sentencing for juvenile judges, and I want to tell you why. I've been all over this country and I have talked to people in the juvenile system from almost all the States. absolutely dumbfounded by what we have here in Pennsylvania. We have, without a doubt, the best system in this country not because of the judges but because of the powers you've given us. I just want to take a moment to remind you of where we are right now. The reason our system works is

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

these three reasons:

Number one, we have judicial discretion. The advantage that I have over somebody writing a piece of legislation is I've got the youngster in front of me. I've got the parents in front of me. I can see whether that child is arrogant. I can see whether that child is scared. I can see whether or not that parent is in the neighborhood. None of that shows up on a piece of paper.

б

And not only that, the reports that are said, I know which probation officers I can trust. I know which ones I have to worry about sometimes. I also know which way. So I've got an advantage, and every judge that sentences a juvenile has that advantage. It's the eye-to-eye contact, it's the feel, just like you have a feel as you sit here in this room.

The second advantage we have is these indeterminate sentences. You know the advantage of an indeterminate sentence? Whenever I sentence a youngster, every kid says, how long, Judge? And you know what I say to them? Don't ask me, ask yourself. You've got a review in six months or in nine months. If you come back and you cooperate with this program, and these people are going to know whether you cooperate because they're the experts. You come back and they tell me you're ready to go home under some type of supervision or even go home or go to a foster home without supervision, I'll listen. I'll listen. But it

gives them an incentive, the incentive to change.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And remember, these are kids. We can't change a lot of these adults. I agree absolutely with what the Representative said, the chairman said. We can't change most of them, and if we do, it will cost us an inhibited amount of money. These kids are young. These kids don't have set life patterns. These kids still are at the educational level where they would have been anyhow, just get them into schools. And we've got to address these things we do these in indeterminate sentences. The concept of freedom is what motivates these kids. Unfortunately, most of the programs we have are good enough to really be honest with us and tell us which kids can go home and which kids can't go home. I never want to be a juvenile court judge, and I will never be a juvenile court judge if a kid says to me and gets the idea when he walks out of juvenile court, well, all I've got to do is serve a year or two years or three years, then I've paid my debt to society. isn't a debt issue, this is a growth issue.

The third thing is our State has programs nobody else has. Especially our private system. Glenn Mills, Vision Quest. Any program. George Junior. Lordsmont. These are programs that work. Why do you think 27 percent of our kids in those private programs come from out of State? It's because they're good. So any act at any time

that this body considers that takes any type of discretion away from juvenile court judges, I tell you, you're going to destroy the system.

Now, there's another problem with gangs. I don't know how much investigation the district attorney from Lancaster has done, but gangs have structures, and there are three basic gang structures. I'm not going to go into the one where you're dealing with people going across the country. We're going to forget about that, the enterprise structure. But I want to talk about the two basic gang structures and point something out to you that's really relevant to that act.

Number one, you have a gang structure where you have one leader, Jesse James, so forth and so on. You have these gangs. Most of these gangs today in the United States that have the one leader with everybody else acting under them are Asian gangs. Most of the other gangs are not that way. Most of the other gangs are set up this way: There is a hard core right here in the center. That's why they call them the hard core. It is a very small number. In a gang of 60 or 70 there may only be 8 or 10. These people are the killers, these people are the planners, these people are the people that are totally unacceptable in the juvenile system. Then you have the active members. These are the ones that set up the rock houses, these are the ones who

wear the colors, these are the ones who go out and mug people. They are active. They're usually sent by direction. Some of these people we can work with, whether it's at the adult level or at the juvenile level.

of what we call the wannabes. These are people who want to be in. These are the young kids. These are the 14, 15, 16 year old kids. What do they do? They carry drugs. They're the mules. They might be the kid that's the lookout when you hold up a store. These kids, most of these kids, if we get them into a program and we get them into a system, we can help them. We've done that. Eighty percent of the kids in my county don't come back a second time to juvenile court, and only 12 percent of the kids, 1 1/2 percent of the kids graduate to adult court because we employ these things you've given us and we treat them as individuals.

Now, Representative Reber's not here. I understand he's on the committee. He would vouch for you, we've had many arguments. He's always been the liberal, I've always been the conservative. So you understand that what I'm saying here is not from any standpoint of a rally, it's from the standpoint of the fact that it works.

My question is, you're asking me to put wannabes, whether they're in this act as adults, in with everybody else. I can quarantee you one thing: You give me

a wannabe and you put him in prison as an adult or a juvenile for two years, and he's going to come out a hard criminal. No question about it, because he's got no place else. And by the way, what do you intend to do when you put these people in prisons? Are you going to let the gangs run the prisons? How are you going to set it up? How are you going to segregate them? These are problems that are causing serious, serious problems in California, and these are things that you have to consider when you write these types of acts. There's no question that something has to be done. It has to be done. There's no question with the ability here with the district attorney's office, with the judges, with the probation department, with you people, certainly something can be done.

And I have a couple of just suggestions for you just to think about. Number one, if the district attorney can tell me as a juvenile court judge and bring me evidence that a kid is a hard-core member, I'm going to certify him. I don't want him in my system because he doesn't belong there. That type of adult I really don't have a problem with what you do with him. You want to give him a mandatory sentence? I don't have any problem with that. But I want these people identified.

How do you do it? One of the ways you do it is with grand juries. We got the grand jury system. We use it

for drugs, we use it for everything else. Get these people in. Get people there, keep them confidential and find out what's going on in the community. You can go down to the store -- and by the way, I was born in Lancaster, Ruby Street. I saw the Ann Street gang and I got upset. My relatives still live there -- you get the local people, they don't want these gangs, but they can't talk. But you could bring them into a grand jury confidentially and you can find out the structure. You can find out where Paco is and where Ramone is and where Julio is and where he fits. Then come into my court and either by a preponderance of the evidence or clear and convincing evidence or whatever, at the sentencing process you tell me this kid is hard core and I'll handle him. I guarantee it.

The second thing, I think we should be here thinking about coordinating juvenile court and the adult systems. One of the difficulties is that you've told us we have to sentence these kids within 30 days. I have no problem with that. One of the problems I had as a DA, and I'm sure the district attorney of Lancaster County is, a lot of times you get juvenile offenders in with adult offenders when you're talking about gangs. Yet you have 180 days to try adult offenders, you have 365 days if they're not in jail, and yet many, many times I'd like to use a juvenile offender to come in and testify against an adult, but once

1 I've sentence the kid, which is the end of 30 days, I lose

2 | control of that, because there's no contempt for juveniles.

3 | I can't bring a juvenile into the adult system and say

4 testify, and if you don't testify, you're going to be held

5 | in contempt. We don't have that power.

So one of the things we should do, I suggest that you should consider, and the district attorneys I think would not be opposed to this, is you ought to have a good cause portion of the law, they have it out in San Diego uses it, out in California, where if you have good cause, the judge can waive this 30 day thing. You can slow down the juvenile system, you can speed up the adult system.

You talked about the idea of vertical prosecution. That's an excellent idea. In the cities that really have gang problems, maybe you ought to have one or two special judges just to handle gang cases. That would make it even better. That would mean you can speed up the adult system where if you need these juveniles to testify, you would have them.

A third thing, interagency information. There was some comment about this, I believe Representative Sturla had mentioned it. This is a tremendous idea. When I have a kid on juvenile court and he's a gang member, I have a disposition sheet where I say he can't associate with the other people on that gang. Now, the police watch for him

outside when he's out on the streets. Who watches him the rest of the day? The schools. Yet we have some schools won't even accept the disposition because they say, well, we don't want to know that, that's a confidential issue. We've settled some of this in our county because we have one person assigned to each school to know what the terms and conditions of every kid who's on probation there. Maybe we should make all schools or maybe we should redefine confidentiality. Or maybe we should include schools in part of law enforcement. I mean, I would want to know if I were a superintendent of a school or a principal of a high school if I've got a rapist in my school, and yet we don't. would want to know if I had an arsonist, but they don't. Now, we can do it through court orders, which is what my county has done, but there ought to be some type of a redefinition of the term "confidentiality" so that some of this information can be shared appropriately. I agree with you, you don't post it on a bulletin board or put it in a teacher's room.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Also, you got to have a witness protection program. Absolutely essential. I don't care whether you take a kid from west Philadelphia and move him to south Philadelphia, you got to have these things. Some of these kids ought to be moved out of the county. And by the way, when you're talking about gangs, you're talking about

retaliation, as was pointed out by the district attorney from Lancaster. They don't retaliate just against the person who testified, you might have to move a whole family. We're not talking about one person the way we used to talk. This is an entirely different system because these people are different.

How about expanding your RICO statutes? Right now you have to go to the Attorney General to get an okay to do a RICO prosecution. Why shouldn't the local district attorney have that opportunity? Now, maybe he doesn't want to use it. Does he have to use it? No. Maybe you should have it both criminal and civil matters.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Excuse me, isn't this bill in effect an expansion of the RICO statute?

JUDGE TRESSLER: It does that somewhat, but I'm saying you don't need a bill to do that. I'm saying, if you do that, that's true. That's why I brought out RICO. I thought I'd mention it. Obviously, I didn't write this after you had brought up that issue. It was something I was concerned about.

And finally, and this is something that really is a judicial thing but maybe your input can be helpful.

When a gang member is on probation or he's on parole and he commits a new crime, there's a decision that is made by the courts, either you have the probation hearing or the parole

hearing right away or you have it until after he's tried on the new charge. Most judges wait until after the new If the person is acquitted on the new charge, then charge. obviously you don't have to have the hearing. suggesting you have the hearing immediately, and I'll tell you why. If you have a probation hearing violation on a person who's a gang member and the district attorney from Lancaster comes into my court, he doesn't have to prove him quilty of the new charge beyond a reasonable doubt, he only has to prove him guilty by a preponderance of the evidence. He doesn't have a jury trial. He comes in front of me as the sentencing judge and he doesn't have to worry about the exclusionary rule, which he does in the original prosecution. Plus, the fact that these types of hearings can be set up within a matter of weeks.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So a lot of times you have these gang members go out, they come back, they've got these records, they're on parole, they're on probation, and we sit there for 180 days or 360 days or whatever the defense will agree to a continuance to in order to prolong this thing. I'm saying, let's get them in now. Maybe the courts should be told or maybe a discussion with the Supreme Court should entail a decision wherein in gang activities we don't wait until after the new charge is disposed of. Get it done right away and a lot quicker. What's the advantage to that? We get

them out of the local areas, we get them into the State facilities, if that's where he belongs. Also, if you talk about sending a message to the people, that sends a message to the people.

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 hope I didn't exceed my time here. I do want to commend you for the start you've made. There are some parts of this act I think are excellent, there are other parts I don't.

The other thing I might want to mention to you is, and this is just something that's gratuitous, there's a Federal program in Washington, and what they do is they talk about the gang problems throughout this country. One of the components of that is to have a judge, a prosecutor, a probation officer, a prison official, and also community leaders who are handling and combating the gang problems, to come in and address whatever that particular group is. don't know what your policy is here, it's the first time I've ever been here, but I really think that perhaps the whole committee should take an opportunity, since it's available to you. It's only going to cost you food for the people coming in and maybe a night overnight, because they'll be flown in here and they'll be paid by the Federal government. There's a fellow in Washington named Ron Laney. He's with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. I think I have his address

somewhere, although I'm not sure. But if you call him, I am sure that he will be happy to get people to tell you all the problems, because these are the people that have been through it, in most cases. Prosecutors from San Diego. probation officer, I believe, is from the west coast. of them is from Denver. The prison official is from These are the people that have been through this and they've seen some of the problems and perhaps rather than having an ox to gore, which I guess, I mean, everybody comes before you and everybody wants money and everybody wants this and everybody wants that. These people don't have any ox to gore. They'll just tell you what they've experienced, and maybe that's the consolidate and give you direction on how you want to go, because you've started, but I think it's -- we learn from history, and rather than repeat failures, I think we ought to go and look at the successes, because there are some. I thank the committee very much. ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: Thank you. Comments? REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: I just want to say it's easy to see you're a former prosecutor. I haven't seen a judge stand up and use a flip chart like that for quite a Should we find him guilty? while. JUDGE TRESSLER: No. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I just want to say that I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

appreciate the time you've given us today, both the district attorneys and the judges. I'd like to take you up on that, and I know Galia has written that down.

JUDGE TRESSLER: I will get you that. I might even have the address with me, but if I don't, I'll certainly see that you get it.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We can certainly plan to do that this summer, but I'm reminded by staff that we're not sure exactly when the Senate impeachment trial is going to start, and being one of the Managers of that, I'll be tied up over there anywhere from four weeks to six weeks to when the cows come home. I'm just not sure how that's going to play out over there, but I don't want it to interfere with the business of the committee.

We do have tours coming up. We've been very involved, by the way, with the Glenn Mills situation. They've been up here lobbying and we've toured that facility on two different occasions. I was very impressed with what they've done. We've had conversations, very loud conversations, with the Department of Welfare about this very issue, and we've told them in no uncertain terms to back off what they're doing, because it's not a veiled threat with Glenn Mills. They told us pointblank if the State, and I understand where they're coming from. They don't want the State telling them what to do with their

money or how they should handle their programs. They're doing a very effective job. They don't need us in there. They don't want us dictating to them, and I agree absolutely with what they're saying, and with the money that they save, they send a number of students on to a full college scholarship.

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

JUDGE TRESSLER: Any youngster who gets accepted at a college from Glenn Mills is guaranteed at least two years total free, and they're trying to make it four.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: They have a tremendous track record, and here you go again, government intrusion into the private sector that's been doing a heck of a better I've taken this committee around to just about, and he's been one of the troopers that everything that you could imagine we've been there, because I agree, seeing is believing, and when you come back with the image of what they've been doing in some of these facilities, you get a better handle on what we might be able to do to facilitate the help or just stepping away from it and let them do their thing. I am so fearful that if the Department of Welfare pushes what they want to do, they're going to create tremendous chaos in the State, but if they think they're paying a lot of money now, wait, wait until the big ticket comes in when with you have to start sentencing kids out of State and we lose our State facilities that are privately

run. And you know, I don't understand where the administration is coming from on this issue. I absolutely don't understand.

JUDGE PEOPLES: If I might just add one note on that subject. Judge Cassimatis and I had the opportunity to meet at the Welfare Department a couple of months ago with regard to the very problem. We were told then that this set of recommendations has been hacked at and hacked at for 12 years and suddenly now, and one of the worst times in terms of needs for us as juvenile judges, now we're told this is the time they're going to implement these regulations, which is going to cause a reverse in the flow of the stream. I'm virtually positive of it. We will have to start placing kids outside of Pennsylvania. And as you said, that's a big ticket.

JUDGE CASSIMATIS: May I make one comment about sharing juvenile information with schools. This is very important. And in York County we do it, as Judge Tressler does in Montgomery County. We have identified persons in the school district, this is done by court order, we have the authority to do this by court order, to make information available to that person, who in turn on an as-needed basis then shares it. So the point is I think the mechanism already exists to be able to do this and to structure this. We now have actively underway an informal group between

juvenile justice and the Department of Education, seeing if we can come up with some guidelines or regulations, so that the concern that you expressed that we just don't make this information available to anyone who wants to see it, but it is available for those who need to know.

So we're hopeful that something will come out that will address that issue, just as we have in York and Montgomery Counties.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: One comment and a question also. On the dissemination of this information to the schools, do you believe that it should just be to public school officials or should it go to private school officials also?

JUDGE CASSIMATIS: My personal belief is if the youngster is in a private school and there is a need to know, depending on the particular behavior we're concerned about, I think it would be shared with them, again, on the same basis as we do with the public schools.

JUDGE TRESSLER: We share it with the private schools, but one of the things you find is if you have a youngster who's troubled, he's not just troubled in the outside, he's troubled in school, and they throw him out and he goes to public school. So there aren't that many kids I have in probation committed someplace and are who are private school individuals. Usually the conduct that they

exhibit in the outside is exhibited in the school, and the private school has that luxury which the public school doesn't.

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: And you all mentioned points that are palatable or acceptable in this bill and other points that you would oppose in any situation. your spare time, which I know is tough, if you could or would take the opportunity to mark up some of this legislation and say absolutely get rid of these portions, here's a suggestion how this can be strengthened. You may just want to change this word here or there. Any of that kind of information that I could get I would greatly appreciate. My background is not as an attorney or with the judicial system or anything like that, so I come from this as someone who is trying to represent the concerns of my community dealing with gang violence, and any ideas you have about how I can help my community work with the gang violence situation, why I would appreciate that. you.

I believe Commander Gwen Elliott from the Pittsburgh Police Department is not here and she will be faxing her comments.

MS. MILAHOV: She'll have to spread her comments on the record at another date.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: All right, any other

```
1
    questions, comments?
                 (No response.)
 2
                 ACTING CHAIRMAN STURLA: Okay, thank you.
 3
                 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at
 4
    11:05 a.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

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. 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 3606 Horsham Drive Mechanicsburg, PA 17055 717-732-5316