1	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
2	* * * * * * * * *
3	
4	House Bill 147
5	* * * * * * * *
6	
7	House Judiciary Subcommittee
8	on Crimes and Corrections
9	
10	Main Capitol Building Room 418, Minority Caucus Room
11	Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
12	Thursday, November 13, 1997 - 9:30 a.m.
13	
14	
15	00
16	
17	
18	BEFORE:
19	Honorable Jerry Birmelin, Majority Chairperson
20	Honorable Timothy Hennessey
21	IN ATTENDANCE:
22	Honorable J. Scot Chadwick Honorable Thomas Caltagirone
23	
24	
25	
	KEY REPORTERS  1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404  (717) 764-7801 Fax (717) 764-6367

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Good morning,

Major Doutt. We welcome you here this morning.

The House Subcommittee -- the Judiciary Committee
on Crime and Corrections is meeting this morning.

We had a meeting yesterday afternoon in Media, Delaware County; and we're continuing today with the people who are testifying on the bill in consideration before us is House Bill No. 147.

The bill deals with the restriction on police officers on the types of arrests that they can make for certain violations. The sponsor is Representative Lynch, who I don't see yet here this morning but has been invited, and he may join us at a later time.

Let me introduce the members of the Committee who are here with us this morning. To my far right is Representative Scot Chadwick. Bradford County, I believe. Immediately to my left is Representative Caltagirone from Berks County and his counsel, John Ryan.

And as we are joined by other members, which I'm sure will happen over the course of the next 2 1/2 to 3 hours, I'll do my best to introduce them so that you all know who they are.

Major Doutt, you've been before this Subcommittee before --

MAJOR DOUTT: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: -- and on a different subject; but apparently you're getting to be the testifier of choice for the State Police. And we appreciate your ability to be so well versed in all these issues and to share with us your testimony. We do have a printed version of it, and we thank you for coming. And feel free to begin your testimony.

MAJOR DOUTT: Thank you, sir. As you noted, I am Major Katherine Doutt, Director of the Bureau of Patrol for the Pennsylvania State Police.

On behalf of Colonel Paul J. Evanko,
Commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police, I
would like to thank you for inviting the State
Police to present testimony before the
Subcommittee on Crime and Corrections of the
House Judiciary Committee on rogue police
officers, unmarked cars, and House Bill 147.

As you well know, over the past few years, these issues have been the subject of considerable concern for the public, the

Legislature, and the police due primarily to reports of police impersonations by criminals.

Much of this concern has come from women who are afraid to stop at night for a police officer fearing it is not really a police officer but someone impersonating one.

As a result, some individuals believe the answer is to eliminate unmarked police vehicles for traffic stops, at least for summary offenses. However, before we look at this extreme solution, the Pennsylvania State Police would like you to seriously consider a number of related issues.

If the term rogue police officer refers to an officer abusing their authority and the public trust, the cases are extremely rare and eliminating unmarked police vehicles for traffic would have little consequence.

If the term refers to a nonpolice person -- that is, someone impersonating a police officer -- then we then we must try to address the frequency of the problem as well as all possible solutions, hopefully without diminishing public safety in any way.

In this light, the State Police

attempted to research the incidence or frequency of police impersonation. Because Title 18, the Crimes Code, does not differentiate between impersonating a public servant and impersonating a police officer, we instituted a computerized search through NEXUS for news articles or abstracts of articles for reporting on such cases in Pennsylvania.

In 1997, this research showed only ten such cases reported in the news, of which two were later verified -- or excuse me -- were later proved to be fabrications. There was only one verified incident involving the pulling over of a vehicle.

This occurred on the turnpike where the defendant used a spotlight and hand gestures to pull a male victim over. The defendant subsequently identified himself as a federal agent and, in the verbiage of the article, threatened to write the other motorist a ticket.

The two known cases of fabrication came out of Southeastern Pennsylvania where fears of police impersonation have been heightened because of a high-profile homicide.

Actually, in a relatively short period

of time, four incidents were received in that area of the state from members of the public believing they had been the subjects of traffic stops by people impersonating police officers.

Even the two cases which were proved false following extensive investigation allegedly reported the use of flashing blue lights -- not red lights or a combination of red and blue, which are used by police -- to pull them over.

A third report of police impersonation in this area also involved a motorist pulling over for a flashing blue light. This motorist, a male, was not approached by the offender and, to my knowledge, the case has not been resolved.

The fourth report when investigated revealed a traffic stop that was actually initiated by a State Police trooper. There was no impersonation and no abuse of power.

As you can see, the actual number of incidents reported in the news of police impersonation involving the stopping of a motorist was two: the one on the turnpike where the defendant identified himself as a federal agent and who was shortly thereafter arrested for driving under the influence,

impersonating a public servant, disorderly conduct, and harassment; and the one in Southeastern

Pennsylvania where the offender never approached the victim's car.

The concern for rogue police officers was nationally generated by the videotape of a South Carolina State Trooper out of control after a chase. The inflammatory film footage showed the trooper yelling at a female motorist, dragging her out of her car and striking her.

This incident is an anathema to every professional police officer, and the South Carolina authorities acted swiftly in dealing with the offending officer.

This type of incident, although horrifying, would not necessarily be prevented by eliminating the use of unmarked police vehicles for traffic stops. These incidents can only be prevented by the proper recruitment, training, and supervision of police officers.

There was a law enforcement tool in evidence in that situation, however, which helped clarify the events as they occurred and which aided South Carolina officials in taking immediate action.

That tool was a Mobile Video Recording

Device, also referred to as an MVR. This tool

over the years has recorded high- and low-speed

chases. It has recorded the interaction of

police officers with the motoring and ambulatory

public, and it has also recorded the murdering of

police officers.

It has immense value to all associated with police work. Although some police are wary such taping will be used in a punitive fashion, the fact is the MVR will usually exonerate the professional officer who conducts themselves in the appropriate manner in which they were trained.

The Pennsylvania State Police under Colonel Evanko has been able to acquire and equip approximately 65 patrol vehicles with MVRs. And although there are legal issues which we are trying to address through legislation relative to voice recording to supplement the visual recording, we anticipate this technology will show the high level of professionalism employed by and expected of our members.

I would like to address the effect we believe House Bill 147 would have on the overall

delivery of police services. And although I am here to plead the case for unmarked vehicles for patrol, it is important to recognize the majority of our patrol vehicles are, in fact, marked.

The State Police recognizes the majority of the public relates the term State Police officer or trooper to someone in the gray uniform with the gray, Smokey-the-Bear style campaign hat usually in a marked car patrolling the highways.

But as you know, our mission is much larger than that. We are charged with the enforcement of not only the Vehicle Code, Title 75, but the Crimes Code, Title 18; the Fish and Game laws; and other such responsibilities as the Governor may see fit to assign such as assisting other state agencies in the enforcement of laws applicable to them.

These enforcement duties are carried out throughout the Commonwealth, although we are primarily functional in those areas of the state without a full-time police department. In general, we protect the lives and the property of the citizenry of Pennsylvania.

In accomplishing this mission, the Pennsylvania State Police are first generalists.

Our troopers are initially assigned to patrol duties following their training, and the majority of troopers remain in that function.

Patrol, however, is not limited to traffic. In fact, as the demands for police services have increased, our preventive patrol has been severely curtailed and many selective traffic enforcement programs are conducted on an overtime basis.

It is extremely rare, if ever, that a uniformed trooper can exclusively devote their day or even most of it to a proactive enforcement and prevention effort; and, yet, it is the patrol trooper who is the first line of defense in preventing traffic crashes, easing congestion, preventing and discovering criminal activity, and reporting violations.

They are usually first to arrive at a crime scene, and the majority of initial criminal investigations are made by them. They are primary investigators of many of the less complex crimes.

By virtue of their general patrol assignments, they also solve many of these investigations because of their ability to

immediately follow-up with interviews of neighbors of victims or of known suspects.

They serve warrants on those who do not respond to court summonses, and they provide surveillance during their regular patrol of areas in which criminal activity has been occurring.

State Police selective traffic enforcement programs are aimed at reducing crashes and saving lives. We focus our efforts on drivers under the influence, aggressive drivers, and drivers who refuse to obey the speed limits and other traffic and motor vehicle related laws which you, the Legislature, have crafted and enacted for the safety of the public.

These efforts along with general traffic enforcement resulted in the issuance of 402,389 traffic citations in 1996 and 10,475 arrests for driving while under the influence by State Police troopers.

In addition, 347,523 police warning notices were issued and 64,683 motorists were assisted. Enforcement is often more successful using unmarked vehicles.

We are all aware of the automatic response of drivers upon seeing a marked police

vehicle. They first put on their brakes and then check their speedometer. They become cognizant of using their turn signals and following other vehicles at safe distances. They start to drive defensively and with courtesy.

All of these things are good things; however, this often means their driving habitsare not usually so careful, courteous, or safe. This is verified by the number of crashes occurring on our highways every year.

In our attempt to combat unsafe and aggressive drivers and decrease the number of crashes, unmarked vehicle can prove invaluable. By eliminating our ability to use unmarked police vehicles for patrol, the Legislature will also be taking away an important tool in criminal detection.

This type of vehicle is an observation platform for surveillance of areas where crime has been occurring, of people suspected of reported criminal activity, as well as of traffic-related violations.

Covert activities are an important part of our job and are not limited to criminal investigators or vice and narcotics

investigators.

In addition, many commissioned officers use unmarked cars in their day-to-day business. These same officers stop to help disabled motorists on their way to and from work and between appointments.

When in uniform, they also stop violators. This summer while in Western Pennsylvania observing selective traffic enforcement efforts for a day, I was returning to my lodgings and made two traffic stops.

The first was of a young man driving 20 miles per hour over the speed limit without a seat belt and with a registration violation.

The second was an older driver whose truck was weaving back and forth on the interstate.

These stops were initiated because of summary violations; yet if ignored or the stops not permitted, all could have had serious consequences for the motoring public.

Since then, I have stopped to help a disabled motorist and stopped to assist at the scene of a crash where the local police had already departed but an unsafe situation had occurred because of the location of the vehicle,

the increased volume of traffic, and the resulting traffic patterns.

Multiply these personal experiences by the number of commissioned officers and others not always in uniform who drive unmarked vehicles and not permit stops by these officers, and you will see a major decrease in the effective delivery of police services.

A fourth issue, that of emergency lighting, should at least be raised in discussions on the elimination of unmarked patrol vehicles.

It is the belief of the police community that the proliferation of organizations and individuals permitted to have various configurations of emergency lights creates confusion.

Currently, there are fifteen types of organizations permitted to equip their vehicles with emergency lighting. Most these vehicles are also permitted to be equipped with an audible warning device.

There are also fourteen categories of privately-owned vehicles which are designated as emergency vehicles and may be equipped with

emergency lighting.

The picture becomes even more confusing not only to the general public, but also to police officers because scattered throughout our laws are the provision for enforcement of specific statutes.

Generally, these statutes provide code enforcement officers with police powers while acting within the scope of their employment. In some instances, these laws permit pursuit to apprehend violators of these codes.

Colonel Evanko, recognizing the increased fear of the public in being stopped by someone other than a police officer, issued strong new guidelines in July of 1996 for both the public and for our members.

Advice to the public was disseminated by news interviews and through public speeches and presentations. To our members Colonel Evanko stated:

Except in extreme circumstances, only uniformed members shall stop vehicles while operating unmarked patrol vehicles. Members shall wear the issued campaign hat at all traffic stops and highway incidents. Members shall use

emergency lighting and equipment when making traffic stops. With proper consideration for officer safety, the interior light of the patrol unit should be used to help the motorist identify the member as a State Police officer. The public address system should also be utilized.

In addition, in August of 1996, Colonel Evanko strengthened our policy by prohibiting unmarked cars on the midnight patrol except for exigent circumstances; by limiting use during periods of darkness except for special traffic enforcement; and at other times where covert or undercover methods are necessary.

And although drivers are required under section 3325 of the Vehicle Code to stop for police vehicles when emergency equipment is activated, our members are aware it is a defense if the driver cannot identify the operator of an unmarked police vehicle as a police officer.

By requiring troopers to take steps to help motorists identify police officers and by providing the public with information on the appropriate response to police stops, the Pennsylvania State Police believes we will be able to deal with many of the concerns which have

been raised.

Colonel Evanko and the Pennsylvania

State Police understand and share your concerns about the crime of impersonating a public servant, specifically, a police officer; about the general use of unmarked cars; and about the proliferation of emergency lighting which can create confusion.

His suggested resolution is not,
however, to legislate the prohibition of unmarked
police vehicles. Instead, he and the
Pennsylvania State Police suggest curtailing the
number of organizations and people permitted to
use emergency lighting.

We also suggest amending section 4912 of the Crimes Code, specifically addressing the impersonation of a police officer separately from the general offense of impersonating a public servant and grading the offense appropriately in accordance with the intent and/or actions of the offender.

Colonel Evanko and our department
believe each police department should establish
their own policy for the use of unmarked police
patrol vehicles. Recognizing the concerns of the

public, we believe those policies should be shared through a vigorous public information campaign.

In conclusion, it is our concern that legislation prohibiting or inhibiting the use of unmarked patrol vehicles will not resolve the real problem of people committing criminal acts under the pretense of being a police officer but will result in a less effective delivery system of police services and traffic enforcement and a more secure environment for criminals.

The State Police as well as all police charged with the protection of life and property need all of the available tools to accomplish our mission. The unmarked patrol vehicle is one of the most important tools we currently have.

Thank you for this opportunity to receive our input on this important topic, and I'll now try to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you,

Major Doutt. I turn to our chief counsel,

Preski, who's joined me on my immediate right.

When you had mentioned to me that when you had

talked about the separating of police officers in

the Crimes Code from public servants for identification purposes in the Criminal Code, there are already two bills that are addressed or introduced to address that.

MAJOR DOUTT: Good.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: You're way ahead of your time. I will turn over the next few minutes to our members here on the panel. And I'll first turn to Representative Caltagirone, who is also, as I forgot to introduce him, the democratic chairman of this Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Major, in your testimony you had mentioned that you had a number of cars. I was just wondering what the specific number of the marked and unmarked cars are approximately that the Pennsylvania State Police would have?

MAJOR DOUTT: Do you want just patrol vehicles, sir, or total fleet?

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Let's start with the total fleet, if you have it available. It doesn't have to be specific, by the way. Ballpark's good enough.

MAJOR DOUTT: If you'll just let me check -- I'll tell you what, sir, I can look it

up and give it to you before I leave instead of wasting the time right now.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Do you have any idea how many cars totally the State Police would have in the total fleet -- is it 2, 4, 5,000?

MAJOR DOUTT: No, nowhere near that. It would be more towards 2,000 and just under that.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: One of the reasons why I'm asking, in addition to this legislation, I've been talking with some of my friends in the State Police -- and this, of course, has been a concern of mine over the years -- the rotation of the vehicles with high mileage.

I know specifically what we're here for today with this legislation; however, the other concern that I had and since you were before us I just couldn't let the opportunity slip by, we have approximately according to the latest figures \$576 million in the surplus from the previous year's budget and we have approximately 112 million, I think it is, in the Transportation Department budget.

And I'm given to understand that,

again -- and this happens from time to time since we're talking about vehicles -- that we did not, in fact, go on the rotation of replacing high-mileage vehicles, especially the patrol vehicles whether they're marked or unmarked with newer fleets of cars.

Do you know if it's anticipated that the Colonel or the administration will be, in fact, replacing the high-mileage vehicles any time soon?

MAJOR DOUTT: I think the best way I could answer that, sir, is by saying that we replenish the fleet as appropriations are made to do so.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: So we need to talk to the Appropriations Committee then or the budget secretary. I share that with you because this has been a concern that has been addressed by some of the troops around the state.

And I wanted to let the other members become aware of that and, hopefully, we might be able to take appropriate action, at least letting the administration know that they, in fact, should start really to consider replacing as many of those high-mileage vehicles as possible.

Because as you well know in the high-speed chases that they get involved in on the interstate and the turnpike, it could, in fact, and does become life threatening if you have a vehicle with over a hundred thousand miles --

MAJOR DOUTT: It is a concern.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: -- in pursuit. Now, specifically with the legislation -- and if you could share that information with the Committee about the total number of marked and unmarked vehicles, I'd appreciate it.

And better yet -- and I know you wouldn't have this with you today -- if you could give us an idea how many of the vehicles that you have, have over a hundred thousand miles that are in service on the force.

MAJOR DOUTT: You are correct; I don't have that, but I will find that out. I can give you how much it would cost to convert our unmarked patrol vehicles to marked cars, which I also think would be a consideration considering you brought up a related topic.

25 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Uh-huh.

MAJOR DOUTT: And that's well over a million dollars just to convert the small number of unmarked patrol vehicles we have to a marked fleet.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Well, we were talking about this yesterday at our hearing. The patrol units that are on the interstate and the turnpike, they are always in uniform.

I don't ever recall in my 21 years in the Legislature that I've ever seen on patrol any of the Pennsylvania State Police officers not in uniform when they're on patrol duty. They do and are, in fact, required to wear uniforms; and when they get out, the hat goes on, right?

MAJOR DOUTT: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: So, I mean, as far as the State Police are concerned, they're pretty well identified even if they're in an unmarked vehicle when they get out of the car.

Of course, I see they put the flashing lights on and at night I've seen them put the interior light on and, of course, they have the identifying suit and everything else. So there's never really been any question, at least in my mind, that the State Police can be pretty readily

identified.

I think where the problem comes in is the local police. And I guess there could be some undercover units that from time to time will stop in rare instances, as you had testified; but normally, that is not the case with the State Police?

MAJOR DOUTT: Normally, that is not.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Okay.

Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative Chadwick.

REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Major, Representative Scot
Chadwick from Bradford County. You indicated on
the very first page of your testimony that there
really are very few incidents of people
impersonating a State trooper on a highway stop.

I wonder if you can tell me whether or not you know how often there's an incident of someone not stopping because they're not sure whether the person behind them is a police officer?

MAJOR DOUTT: To my knowledge, sir, there would be no way for me to gather that

information.

REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: It seems to me that during broad daylight on the turnpike there's not much of an issue here. But I live in a rural county with some very rural state roads. And after dark, I can understand how people might be concerned if an unmarked car was behind them in a very rural area where there was nobody else to help them, no other possible witnesses going to be driving by on a regular basis.

So it seems to me that the Department's policy to limit the use of these cars after dark for routine highway stops is very helpful. And the question I have is, If I or one of my constituents is driving on one of these rural back roads at night and a red light flashes behind us and the car's not marked, should we then assume it's not a trooper.

MAJOR DOUTT: No, you should not assume it's not a trooper. It very well could be a trooper who because of his assignments or her assignments that evening would need an unmarked car; however, if it's a patrol trooper, they will usually turn the inside light on so you can see the uniform and be able to identify them as a

1 State Police officer. 2 REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: Okay. Thank 3 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. you. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Chief Counsel, 5 Preski. 6 MR. PRESKI: Major, this is a question I 7 had from yesterday. I asked it of a local police 8 officer in Bensalem in Bucks County. 9 experience, what is the charge or what's the 10 offense for someone who doesn't stop? 11 MAJOR DOUTT: Um --12 MR. PRESKI: I mean, what can you do to 13 them if they don't pull over? 14 MAJOR DOUTT: There is a section -- it 15 would depend upon the total circumstances; and 16 that's why it's a difficult response to make --17 MR. PRESKI: I'll make a hypothetical. 18 Assuming it's someone who's afraid that there's a 19 potential attacker in a car and when they're 20 pulled over on one of Representative Chadwick's 21 rural roads, they proceed to a well-lighted area. 22 MAJOR DOUTT: We would not probably 23 charge them with anything. 24 MR. PRESKI: What could they be charged 25 with though?

MAJOR DOUTT: If it were perceived by the officer that they were trying to elude or flee, that is a part of the code that they could be charged under.

MR. PRESKI: All right. Then that was the same answer that I had gotten yesterday. My question is this: Is that if eluding is the only charge and the State Police have adopted a policy basically that officers would be identified, the concern that we have in the Legislature is that we have to make a policy that's across-the-board that the Philadelphia Police will follow as well as the State Police and everyone else.

In your opinion, if we gave the citizens basically a defense to eluding that said when the lights and sirens went on they didn't pull over but what they did is they went to the nearest lighted area or they went to the nearest public area, do you think that would work to curtail this problem?

Because one of the things that we're really here today for is the concern that you're going to get pulled over, the guy has what appears to be a uniform if he turns on a dome light, he has the blue dome light that pulls you

over, I'm looking in a rearview mirror, you don't know if that's a cop or not.

It was also -- Representative Wright has a bill in that he'd like to have a mandatory uniform identification system for police officers. We don't know how well that will work either.

But the one thing that we thought about and we think that might work is that if we had a defense available to the eluding charge that basically said if you've broken no other rules, if you've not gone through red lights, if you proceeded in a safe manner to a well-lighted area, that that would be a defense to an eluding charge. Do you have any comments on that?

MAJOR DOUTT: I have a few, sir. You've set you up a number of variables to your circumstances. Number 1, you even mentioned blue light, which is not a police officer. So we obviously have to do some education and look at that proliferation of emergency lighting.

And as you noted, that was the only cases that we had was pulling over for blue lights, except for one who pulled over for a spotlight.

It could be a defense. But if you were in Representative Preski's (sic) area in Bradford County and you proceeded to a well-lit area, it might be twenty miles from where the stop was attempted to be, I would prefer it is a safe area so that you don't feel like you're going to be in a crash just because you're pulling over for the police officer.

The emphasis should be on the police officer should be able to identify themselves.

You need to understand that it isn't just traffic stops or it isn't just the traffic arena that we talk about when we start putting in defenses.

We already have people who under broad daylight every other circumstance exists for them to be able to identify the police officer as such will say, I didn't know it was a police officer, and leave and hope to get away with whatever it is they have done.

MR. PRESKI: I guess that brings me to my question though. You could still, though, write the citation for the eluding? If we give them a defense, basically it allows them to come into court and say under the totality of the circumstances, I didn't think this was an

1 officer.

If the officer comes in and testifies it was 12:00 on a well-lit day with plenty of berm on the road to pull over, I think a judge would be hard-pressed to find someone not guilty of the citation.

But, again, you raised the concern, one that we have to deal with in Philadelphia where I live -- and I'm only the counsel to the Committee. I haven't been elevated yet to member status.

MAJOR DOUTT: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. PRESKI: That's okay. It's far different where I come from, from Philadelphia than from Representative Chadwick and Representative Birmelin where the next light on a telephone pole might be 25 miles away. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Well, not quite 25 miles. Most of our lights are 5 miles. Representative Chadwick's district, however, is that rural; and he has asked for the ability to ask you one more question.

REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: Thank you, and I apologize for not asking this before. What

happens if one of your criminal investigators who clearly would be in plainclothes -- I'm a former district attorney and worked with them. I know a lot of them very well -- he's in plainclothes and he's in an unmarked car and late at night, he's out on one of my rural roads on his way out to interview somebody and he sees someone speeding or driving recklessly.

What happens in that situation? Because he's not wearing a uniform and he doesn't have a marked car, what happens then?

MAJOR DOUTT: Well, the police officer always has the discretion to arrest or not to arrest anyway. I would believe that the trooper would again look at the balance of it.

If it's a matter of, you know, six or seven miles over a particular speed limit, they may not want to effect a stop. If it's someone who is weaving and they believe may be DUI, they would probably call to see if there was a uniformed police officer in the area and, if so, would ask that uniformed police officer to intervene and make the stop.

If there was not and the trooper thought it was a very dangerous situation, I think they

would try to make a stop on their own by showing an ID, showing their badge, using their emergency lighting and their audible siren, all right, their audible devices to make that stop.

They weigh the danger to the public on what they're viewing and what they're dealing with. And that is a concern as we talk about all these things. The more you take away from a police officer for their ability to affect public safety or deliver police services, it's a huge impact.

REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: Would you concede that a citizen in those circumstances would probably have a fairly formidable defense to a charge that they didn't stop right away?

MAJOR DOUTT: Yes, I would think so.

REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you,

Major Doutt. We appreciate your testimony.

MAJOR DOUTT: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: The next gentleman who will be presenting testimony is Paul McCommons. He's the president of the Pennsylvania State Troopers Association.

25 Mr. McCommons.

Our Committee has been joined to my immediate right by Representative Hennessey, Chester County, I believe.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, yes.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Mr. McCommons, if you're ready, you may begin.

MR. McCOMMONS: Good morning. First of all, I'd like to introduce Trooper Lou Lazzaro. He's the heir apparent to my position after January. He'll be president of the association after that, and I asked Lou to come along with me today on this important issue.

As mentioned, Mr. Chairman, Committee members, my name's Paul T. McCommons. I'm president of the Pennsylvania State Troopers Association.

I represent over 4,000 active state troopers and would like to request that the Legislature reject any further restrictions on the enforcement tools that are presently being considered by the Legislature such as limiting the use of unmarked cars by police officers across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This proposed restriction -- I'd like to

use the metaphor as being a little farm boy from Butler County, as you will see here -- is like the farmer who shoots the horse pulling the wagon because the horse could no longer pull it after the farmer overloaded it beyond the capabilities of the horse.

With this legislation, it would only further restrict the capabilities of police officers in the use of unmarked vehicles in the enforcement of the Vehicle Code, such things as drag racing, disobeying signs, et cetera, and the Crimes Code of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

And in review of this legislation of House Bill 147, it would prohibit a police officer in an unmarked car in criminal instances suspect of criminal things. And it is not the police officers who are misusing unmarked vehicles but the criminals.

We urge the Legislature to turn their focus not on the police agencies that are enforcing the laws, but on the criminals who are committing the acts by increasing penalties and fines for impersonating police officers, enforcement officers, or agents of companies.

Another area that has to be looked at is

a regulation of citizens being able to purchase police uniforms, equipment, and especially the red and blue lights.

There needs to be a concerted effort in looking at standardizing police agency uniforms that citizens have the immediate ability to recognize a police officer from a security guard or an impersonator.

In the majority of the impersonation incidents, the perpetrator used a red or blue light to stop his victim. There needs to be a tighter control placed on the sale and use of the red lights and blue lights.

The State Police has a policy on the use of red lights in unmarked vehicles and the Vehicle Code also addresses it, but there should be a universal policy on the use of red and blue lights in unmarked vehicles.

On behalf of the membership, I want to thank you for the opportunity comment on this important issue; and I'll answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, sir. Your last page of your comments, may I ask you just one question?

1 MR. McCOMMONS: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: The State Police has a policy on the use of red lights in unmarked vehicles. What is that?

MR. McCOMMONS: As the Major just testified to is that after dark hours that the troopers are to use extreme consideration in stopping vehicles, turning on their interior lights, making sure that they're in full uniform by placing their hat on, and giving the people an opportunity to pull off into a lighted area.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Do they put a red light on the roof of the car --

MR. McCOMMONS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Just a small one? They reach around probably and magnetic maybe and --

MR. McCOMMONS: They have a little -- what we call a Kojak light that they must put on the outside of the vehicle. Now, a lot of local police departments use them. They just stick 'em up on the dash. Our rules and policies prohibit that. They must be placed on the outside of the vehicle.

And that is another area that has to be

looked at because the Vehicle Code requires a red light being viewed 180 degrees, and placing it on the dashboard that prohibits that.

б

And that is something I do believe we have a committee with State Police, the FOP, the Police Chiefs, even with the firemen and our association that is making recommendations on the use of red and blue lights, who can use the red -- who can use the red and blue combination and who can just use the blue.

So we are moving forward in that manner; but the problem is, is that everybody can go out there to the Army-Navy stores and purchase this. You can go out there and purchase a uniform, look like the State Police.

We changed our patch here several years ago in order to distinguish us from other agencies and so forth, and that's so people knew they were being stopped by a State trooper. The Constables Association went out, and except for the word "trooper" on the bottom of the patch, made it identical.

And I know of several instances out on the western end of the state where constables have stopped people. We've gotten a call at the

barracks saying this state trooper did this, this state trooper did that; and they weren't. They were constables.

And these are the type of things that need to be looked at and changed, mainly the use of them and the availability of purchasing them out there. And I think legislation along those two areas will go a long way in making us the true police officer out there.

And we've become complacent, there's no question, because everywhere you look you see it. So because of that, we don't question somebody running down the road with a blue light on their car any more.

We don't question somebody driving down the road with a campaign hat on anymore because everybody and his brother's allowed to have one out there, regardless of what he's allowed to enforce or isn't allowed to enforce.

These are the things along with setting a policy. Prohibiting it, I think, is the wrong thing to do. But making sure there's the fright universal policies, and I agree with that, so we're all on the same page; we're all enforcing the laws of the Commonwealth.

Not the State Police Crimes Code. It's the Crimes Code of the Commonwealth. So you're right, we should be doing the same thing in Philadelphia as the State Police is doing, as we're doing in the city of Pittsburgh, in the rural areas of Bedford County, and so forth on that. And we've got to move that direction.

But it's a monumental task; there's no question. And if we don't start moving in the direction of controlling those two items -- and that's the red and blue lights and the uniform look-alikes -- you're wasting all your time because all you're going to do is tell Corporal McCommons you can't use an unmarked car after nighttime; but yet every Tom, Dick, and Harry out there that wants to impersonate me can.

So you haven't accomplished anything.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Another question on the lights -- it hasn't been discussed yesterday or today yet; and that is, the alternating headlights, how they -- I've only ever seen that in police cars. I'm wondering, is that also something that Joe Citizen can imitate and put on his vehicle?

That to me is a -- when I see the

flashing red and blue bar lights but then I see the headlights alternating, I've never seen that on anything but a police car. Is that difficult for nonpolice cars to install or is that something they can do easily as well?

MR. McCOMMONS: It's not that hard to install, but now is an opportune time for the Legislature to take action to make sure only authorized police vehicles have it.

As a matter of fact, in a lot of states, it went to all four corner lights with strobe lights in 'em now. So when a police vehicle turns it on, it's not only just the flashing headlights but all four -- the two rear lights and the two parking lights come on in a strobing fashion. They're very bright.

And it may be something that the State of Pennsylvania -- as a matter of fact, I do believe our department is looking at those right now. And it may be something to take and for the Legislature to look at to make that a requirement.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: How are they installed? Is it just a electrical connection that is made somewhere under the hood or --

MR. McCOMMONS: Well, it would be a switch on the inside of the vehicle. Like now, our emergency lights are connected on a separate switch from the headlights and so forth; the same way with the alternating flashing lights.

Now, the problem is when you have -- the reason we don't use them that much on all of our vehicles is that they burn out the headlights very rapidly; and that can be expensive after a while.

But these new strobe lights they have are just a strobe bulb that are specifically made for that; and, again, they're made on a switch, an emergency switch inside the vehicle.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you. I'll turn over the rest of the questioning to the panel. Representative Chadwick?

REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: No.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative Hennessey?

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Yes. Thank
you. Corporal McCommons, let me just continue on
the strobe lights you talk about. This is not
the use of the headlight? This is actually an
additional light that's installed somewhere down

1 near the headlight? That is correct. 2 MR. McCOMMONS: 3 They're mostly installed inside the parking light receptacles is where they're installed in both 4 the rear lights and both the front lights. 5 you have 360-degree visibility of that vehicle, 6 7 the strobing of the lights. REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: 8 9 addition to that, do --10 MR. McCOMMONS: These are unmarked cars 11 now. 12 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Unmarked 13 Do the police also use the alternating cars. 14 headlights and taillights? 15 MR. McCOMMONS: They could, yeah. 16 In the other states where they have them, yes, 17 they also have that. 18 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: On page 3 of 19 your testimony, you talked about how there needs 20 to be a concerted effort to look at standardizing 21 police agency uniforms so citizens have the 22 ability to immediately recognize that they're

It seemed to me that's the purpose of the bill to get away from situations where we

dealing with a legitimate police officer.

23

24

25

have a multiplicity of occasions when a trooper may stop or a police officer may stop someone legitimately but since the officer's in an unmarked car, that the citizen can't feel very secure that he's being stopped by a legitimate officer.

And, you know, if you have an unmarked car, you immediately have that question. If you have cars with striping and a lot of identification on the side of the car or the front of the car, you take away most of those fears that, you know, someone's being stopped on a lonely, back country road with, you know, and have something to fear.

MR. McCOMMONS: One immediate way to correct the problem is, is if you pass the legislation which is being prepared from what I understand with the FOP -- and that is, if only police officers are allowed to use the blue and red combination -- that's going to give you the first indication no matter what kind of car is that that is a police officer.

The second most important thing is when you look in the vehicle if he turns the lights on if it's a requirement in your legislation, which

it should be, that the kind of uniform that they may able to -- or when they exit their car -- a lot of people, like I say, they dress like state troopers. You don't know whether they're State Trooper, local policeman, constables.

A lot of security agencies -- as a matter of fact, out there near us, Westmoreland Mall is one of the biggest malls in western Pennsylvania. What do they look like? State troopers.

Now, although they're not allowed to come off the mall, they do. And once in a while, our guys stop 'em and say, hey, you got to get back on there. You can't be out here with the way you're dressed.

The county police out there, they have their park police. Now they're wanting to expand their authority and so forth. What kind of uniforms do they have? They look like State troopers.

I used to be a city policeman out in Butler; and I really always felt that, you know, I enjoyed this distinction of being a city policeman from a State Trooper and so forth.

And I really feel that there needs to be

some color combinations that are required for city police, the county police, sheriffs, and state troopers to where you know what agency you're dealing with when you're stopped.

And it also restricts them people from going outside their jurisdiction and doing things out there what they shouldn't be doing or where they shouldn't be doing.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: The problem that I would see with that is that you might know what the color combinations mean and who is stopping you but "John Q. Public" is not going to know that.

I mean, if I see somebody with a flashing light behind me, I generally slow down and pull over because I know I'm going to get stopped.

You know, to try to have different arrays of lights and different colors of lights, only a very select few people in the Commonwealth are going to know who this is pulling up behind them.

MR. McCOMMONS: Well, I think it's incumbent upon the Legislature, the State police, and police agencies to do what you're saying and

helping the new media to educate the public.

I think one of the things that we've failed in the past is when we do things in the legislature or we change policy of a department and that, we don't get out into the public and do the educational aspect of it.

When we -- seat belts, I mean, look how much educational things we do on that. This important issue here you hear very little about it other than the controversial things that you want to do to the police officer to get the public support.

But whatever we do, if we change the requirements to prevent look-alikes that you only have to stop for a red and blue light, that's going to take education. And I think we need to all jointly together take a concerted effort and educate the public to that.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative Caltagirone.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a follow-up to what I had asked the Major earlier, if you have the answers or

would know the answers about the number of vehicles that are over a hundred thousand and rotation of the replacement, because we're talking about vehicles; and I was just curious if either of you have had any information on that.

MR. McCOMMONS: I don't presently have it, Representative. We are asking for that information to talk to the legislators with it. I know there's quite a few well over a hundred thousand miles, many of our vehicles out there.

Needless to say, being a state agency, we travel a lot more miles per day than what a local agency would and our cars are much more and plus the roads are in pretty bad shape yet.

I mean, we're working to get 'em fixed. You guys are doing a good job, but we got a long way to go yet; and our cars become deteriorated much guicker.

And, unfortunately, in previous administrations over the years we've sort of got behind in getting the cars replaced; and there is a big need to bring the cars up to a higher status.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: One other 1 question, Mr. McCommons. The Pennsylvania State 2 Troopers Association, is that only an association 3 4 of active State troopers? MR. McCOMMONS: No, sir. We also 5 represent the almost 3,000 retirees also. But 6 all we represent is State troopers is correct. 7 8 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Is that in 9 addition to the 4,000 that you've indicated here? 10 That's correct, sir. MR. McCOMMONS: 11 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: So it's roughly 12 7,000? 13 MR. McCOMMONS: That is correct. 14 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: The Association, 15 what is the nature of it? Is it just so that 16 State troopers have a voice as a unified group? 17 It's not your bargaining agency, is it? 18 MR. McCOMMONS: Yes, sir, it is. 19 complete. We do -- we don't necessarily like to 20 call ourselves a union due to the fact we only 21 represent troopers. We don't represent any other 22 entities or agencies or anything like that. 23 But we also do public service stuff for 24 educating the public. We try to do things.

try to support legislation that dealed (sic) with

25

victims rights, the laws protecting; and that's why it's a very concern of ours that we do something in this area to protect our female members of the Commonwealth.

It is the very thing -- I know out west we've had a few instances of females being stopped. And I have a 31-year-old daughter, and I know I don't look that old --

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Yes, you do.

MR. McCOMMONS: But it's always a concern to me because she lives in Pittsburgh. She travels back and forth from my place in Latrobe, and I'm always worried about that. I'm very interested and I have a very vested interest in this that we see we make some changes to protect the public out there.

But we've got to make the right moves.

Just restricting the police officers from using that I think is the wrong direction to go. We're sending the wrong message out there. I think we need to stiffen the penalties and then control buying some of them type of stuff and the use out there by the general public.

From what I understand reading a little bit of the Committee work and that that

we've had on it already, the funeral directors

want to be able to use a purple light now and

some others want to use a green light. And, you

know, where is it going to stop?

And I think time we put the brakes on,

take a strong look at it. and make the

And I think time we put the brakes on, take a strong look at it, and make the corrections that we need to make to make it a safer place out there for everybody.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I do know in the thirteen years that I've been in the Legislature we have almost always constantly had requests for more people to use more lights.

MR. McCOMMONS: Right.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Police enforcement are the only people that have said less lights, and you are outnumbered.

MR. McCOMMONS: There's no question.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Politically as well. But we do thank you for your time here. Thank you for sharing with us.

MR. McCOMMONS: I appreciate the opportunity to be able to testify.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Excuse me. I wasn't aware that we did have one other person that wanted to ask a question. Counsel

Ryan for the Democratic Committee would like to ask you a question.

MR. RYAN: Trooper, are there any sections in the Pennsylvania Drivers Manual that addresses the issues concerning procedures that the public is obligated to follow upon a police stop or that identifies the type of lights that police vehicles have?

MR. McCOMMONS: Yes, there are -- there is a section in there saying you're being approached by emergency vehicles you must pull off to the right and so forth. But I do not believe that there's any real detail dealing with what a, especially a female operator, should do when approached by a vehicle after dark.

MR. RYAN: Any operator as far as a police stop as far as identifying for them the type of lights that police vehicles exclusively have, what their obligations are as a motorist when a police officer is attempting to pull them over what they should be looking for and what other possibilities exist or procedures that they can follow?

MR. McCOMMONS: No.

MR. RYAN: Do you believe that is

something that would be helpful in adding that?

MR. McCOMMONS: Not only there; but like I say, I think there has to be a concerted effort to educate the public in a lot of different ways as far as what police officers are going to do or not going to do if they're stopped and what they're going to look like and what they're going to use. I think we need to start a concerted effort in that way.

MR. RYAN: Do you also think that it would be possible to come up with a uniform regulation similar to what's been described here by you that could be imposed upon all police departments statewide concerning the procedures to be used upon nighttime stops?

MR. McCOMMONS: Seriously, I do. And the Police Chief's Association is working in concert with the FOP, the State Troopers
Association, and the State Police -- we have a committee together -- to do that very thing, from what I understand.

MR. RYAN: Do you think that could be done through a regulation on the Vehicle Code on the sections that deal with lights as far as enacting a regulation in that particular area

by the Department of Transportation?

MR. McCOMMONS: If you had resistance to it out there would be one way to force it to occur. But the important thing is in looking at 147 here, as Lou just mentioned, one thing that really bothers me in reading this and reading some of the other proposed legislation is when you have at nighttime when a lot of robberies take place, especially convenience stores, you couldn't stop a car.

MR. RYAN: I noticed that was one of the things that concerned you. This is in the Vehicle Code and it exempts out certain serious highway offenses.

But having a background in law enforcement myself and being in a prosecutorial end, I realize that more often than not your unmarked vehicles are going to be used in traffic situations that involve more serious nontraffic offenses.

And I immediately began to think, Will this restrict the use of it -- you're right -- after an armed robbery, after a flight from a rape or other serious crime? Because the evening's hours are the times that you run into a

lot of your more serious offenses and when your unmarked vehicles can be used most productively in patrol and enforcement.

MR. McCOMMONS: And I've been in police work for 32 two years, like I say, on the local level and with State Police; and I understand the importance, especially on the local level, of needing to be able to use unmarked cars at night after dark and being able to stop vehicles for learning who's around and who isn't around in order to prevent crimes in neighborhoods and so forth.

In doing this -- and I understand your concern and I sympathize with it. But you're taking that tool away, of which I really think it's sort of going to open up the floodgates here and give the criminal more opportunity to go into the neighborhoods and do some of the dastardly things that we're trying to prevent here.

And like I say, there's no one simple answer here. And it's almost like a lot of the legislation that's being introduced are trying to take one approach and think that's going to solve everything.

And it really has to have several

approaches here at one time in order to attack 1 2 the whole problem. And that's what I would hope 3 that the Legislature will do on this issue. Trooper, the unmarked MR. RYAN: 5 vehicles that are used for regular traffic patrol, don't they have -- unless I'm mistaken, 6 7 and I'm not speaking from personal experience -- don't they also have flashing 8 9 lights in the grill, red and blue lights in the 10 grill --11 MR. McCOMMONS: No, not our cars. 12 MR. RYAN: All right. Maybe it's 13 local --14 MR. McCOMMONS: Some of the local police 15 departments do have them in theirs, yes, sir. 16 MR. RYAN: Do you believe that could be 17 an added addition that would be helpful in 18 identifying it as police vehicle? 19 MR. McCOMMONS: Well, I think first you 20 must do the requirement that police officers use 21 a red and blue and they're the only ones that are 22 going to do it, educate the public, and then 23 require that as part of your stopping mechanism. 24 MR. RYAN: Okay. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY:

Thank you

25

1 very much. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I want to thank 2 you, Mr. McCommons, for your work. Are you 3 retiring now from --4 State police? 5 MR. McCOMMONS: No. No. I'll still be around for a few more years. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: You're just not going to be the president of the association 8 9 anymore? 10 MR. McCOMMONS: Time for somebody else 11 to take the lumps. 12 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Your right-hand 13 successor there needs to understand that you were 14 treated very well today and he may not be treated 15 as well on some other subsequent opportunities if we have to question him. 16 17 MR. McCOMMONS: I hope so. I hope 18 that's the way that is. 19 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Not that I 20 wouldn't treat you that well, but I can't speak 21 for fellow members of the House. But thank you 22 for your testimony. 23 MR. McCOMMONS: Thank you. 24 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: We're going to

be doing something a little bit different at

25

this time. If I could have your attention, Major Doutt has parked a marked and an unmarked State Police car in front of the fountain on Commonwealth Avenue for us to go out and to see how they actually operate.

What we're going to do is we're going to take about ten minutes to go down and take a look at the vehicles, see how their lights work, what they do in an arrest, et cetera, et cetera.

So the Committee meeting is now going to shift gears. And I want to thank Mr. Bierling for agreeing to hold off on his testimony so that we can take this brief hiatus.

And if you would join me down in the front of the fountain on Commonwealth Avenue, we're going to check out both the marked and unmarked police cars.

(At which time, there was a pause in the proceedings.)

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: We are back and ready to begin again. Our next testifier is John Bierling. He is the fire chief of West Manchester Township -- you'll have to excuse me, my lips are still a little cold from being outside -- in York County; and he has come to

help us this morning to testify on this piece of legislation that we've been looking at, House Bill 147, dealing with the restriction on police officers' arrest powers in unmarked vehicles.

And Mr. Bierling, we appreciate your patience in giving some of us on the Committee an opportunity to go down and see an unmarked vehicle and talk to the trooper about the procedures that they follow when using unmarked vehicles at night. I think that was helpful to some of the Committee members.

But at this point in time, we'll turn over the testimony that you have for us and you may begin.

MR. BIERLING: Thank you. I think that was an excellent opportunity for you to actually see what it is they're talking about. Good morning.

I would also like to introduce John Brenner, the Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Fire Services Institute, who is with me here this morning.

I'm testifying as a member of the statewide Fire Advisory Board and on behalf of the Pennsylvania Fire Services Institute. As a

municipal fire chief, I'm also testifying from the local operational perspective.

While this legislation does not directly impact the fire service, I appreciate the opportunity to testify on emergency vehicle lighting and the public perception of emergency responders.

The Pennsylvania Fire Services Institute is a statewide, nonprofit fire and emergency medical service organization. We work on behalf of 107 volunteer and career fire and emergency service groups at the local, regional, and state level.

Every major emergency service organization in Pennsylvania is represented on our statewide fire advisory board. The Institute's mission is to educate the public, including our elected officials, about the important role of emergency services in our Commonwealth.

In recent months, the Institute has worked closely with the Pennsylvania State Police, the Pennsylvania State Troopers Association, and the Pennsylvania State Lodge Fraternal Order of Police regarding lighting and

audible warning signals on emergency vehicles.

The Fire Service and law enforcement community agree that public education regarding emergency vehicle lighting is needed and essential.

The public must understand that red and blue combination lights are for law enforcement vehicles only. In the past, fire department owned fire police and fire police captain and lieutenant personal vehicles have run with red and blue combination lights.

Approximately two years ago in my fire department, we removed the red and blue lights from all the fire police vehicles and replaced them with all red emergency lights.

There's been absolutely no change in our ability to respond to emergencies and move through traffic in a safe manner when responding to emergencies.

The Pennsylvania Fire Police Association supports the use of red and blue combination lights for law enforcement only. Fire department owned fire police vehicles and fire police captain and lieutenant personal vehicles should be using red lights only.

Recently in a few isolated incidents, fire departments and fire chiefs have been threatened with traffic citations for using emergency lighting while backing the emergency service vehicle into the station.

We believe we are permitted under Title 75 to use emergency lights while backing safely into the station. Common sense would dictate that when you are backing a 20-ton vehicle and you must momentarily block a state route or a main artery of traffic, activation of your emergency lights would be a safe and proper practice.

Concerning blue lights, while the issue of volunteer fire fighters using blue lights seems to generate controversy, it is important to recognize the purpose of and use of these lights.

The primary purpose of a blue light is to identify a volunteer fire fighter and allow that person entry in the emergency scene where the general public is denied access. A secondary purpose centers on getting to the fire station or emergency scene more easily with the public granting the right-of-way as a courtesy.

An individual displaying a blue light on

their vehicle has no right or reason to violate any traffic law or to place the public in danger while using that light. There is adequate legislation already in place on this issue. An infraction should be handled at the local level by the fire chief or the municipality.

Concerning green lights, the fire service has been implementing the Incident Command System as the proper means of organizing and effectively managing our operations at emergency scenes.

Incident command formulates an organizational structure similar to the chain of command in the military. Incident command is most effective when multijurisdictional departments or agencies have become involved in an incident.

A flashing or revolving green light located on a stationary emergency vehicle indicating the incident command post is the most appropriate use of the green lights. We do not advocate placing green lights on personal vehicles or on moving emergency service vehicles.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on this important issue. The Institute

will certainly continue our efforts to work with the law enforcement community, the Legislature, and the administration regarding emergency vehicle lights. I'll be happy to answer any questions that you have.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you. The one statement you made was -- that I was concerned about was the red and blue combination lights.

MR. BIERLING: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: You said, In the past, fire department owned fire police vehicles and fire police captain and lieutenant personals have run with red and blue combination lights. And then when you took them off, was that voluntary or was that as a result of law?

MR. BIERLING: It was in response to a change in the law that said the police should be the only ones -- the law enforcement police agencies should be the only ones to have those lights.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Currently, blue lights I know are used by fire police; but I think in your testimony that you're saying that also any volunteer fire fighter can put a blue

light on?

MR. BIERLING: Yes, at the discretion of the local fire chief. They have to have written permission from the local fire chief in order to have a blue light; but most of the time, that's granted. So any volunteer fire fighter can have a blue light.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Did you have any specific thoughts about the legislation that are in today, House Bill 147?

MR. BIERLING: When I read that legislation, I thought that that was really more appropriate to, of course, the police response to emergencies.

So I went to our local police chief,
Chief Tim Bolton, and I asked him what his
opinion of it was. And he had some concerns, if
you'd like me to share his thoughts with you,
because I think that's more appropriate than what
my thoughts would be.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: If you could do so briefly.

MR. BIERLING: Sure. He was concerned that this bill affects of the fleeing and eluding section of Title 75. And he felt that that would

limit the ability of the police to effectively uphold the laws.

And we discussed that at length, and he said if the concern is about unmarked police cars safely pulling over a motorist, then he felt it should be addressed more appropriately under the emergency lighting section of the law as opposed to the fleeing and eluding section.

And he said if the issue is unmarked cars in hot pursuit, then let's look at that as an issue of hot pursuit. And he felt that the bill as it's currently worded would create some confusion in the mind of the public as to when they should pull over.

If, let's say, I was responding to an emergency call, should they pull over or should they stay in front and wait till they get to a lighted or a populated area; and he was concerned about that confusion.

Which comes back to the public education issue that we, the Fire Service Institute, can certainly assist with, you know, providing some education to the public.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you very much. I'll ask members of our Committee if they

have any questions. Representative Hennessey.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Chief Bierling, when you say on
page 2, the bottom paragraph, "The public must
understand that red and blue combination lights
are for law enforcement purposes only," is that a
position of the Pennsylvania Fire Services
Institute?

And if so, can you tell us whether or not fire companies throughout the Commonwealth are moving in the direction your company moved, which is to eliminate the red and blue combination lights?

MR. BIERLING: Yes. It is the position of the Fire Services Institute, and we've developed that position in cooperation with the various police organizations.

I think -- and, of course, I don't have personal knowledge of all the places around the Commonwealth -- but I think most places are moving to remove those; but I suspect there are some municipalities, some fire police agencies which have not done that yet. But I certainly think that they should. Is that a fair representation?

MR. BRENNER: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: You can't give us any idea in terms of percentage of companies across the state that might have moved or --

MR. BIERLING: No, I can't -- John -MR. BRENNER: There was a large

percentage that were using -- the fire police

particularly -- using the combination that are

now moving just to the red, as they should. To

give you a number of exactly how many are doing

but they're not supposed to be, we don't really

have that at this time.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: One of the problems I guess is the expense. Once somebody's bought the bars or those lights, having invested it, they might not just want to give it up and move to a different color combination. Can you change that just by changing the reflectors --

MR. BIERLING: Either the reflectors in the light if it has a clear lens or most of them have either a red or blue lens on the outside and the lens can just be removed and a new lens put on. It really shouldn't be a cost issue.

I think that the issue really is, is

protecting the public and making sure that
everybody recognizes that law enforcement should
be the only ones using that red and blue
combination.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, and thanks for the work you've done to get that word out to the fire companies; and hopefully, it'll be a standard practice across the state.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you,
Mr. Bierling --

MR. BIERLING: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: -- for your testimony. We appreciate it. Our next testifier is Frederick Engle, who is the liaison for the Fraternal Order of Police. Mr. Engle. Welcome to Mr. Engle, and thank you for coming to testify. It's all yours.

MR. ENGLE: Thank you for the invitation. Again, my name is Fred Engle. I am the liaison to the Pennsylvania Fraternal Order of Police as well as a member of the Harrisburg City Police Bureau.

On behalf of the 35,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police as well as State President Francis Paul Bascelli, I thank the

House Judiciary Subcommittee for the opportunity to testify on the issue of rogue police officers.

There is tremendous concern among law enforcement professionals and members of our communities regarding police officers making traffic stops, particularly while patrolling in an unmarked vehicle and most particularly at night.

The idea of prohibiting law enforcement from making such stops in unmarked cars seems to have gained some support. While I understand the concern, I must respectfully disagree with the concept. Many good arrests arise from what people view as a simple traffic stop.

Officers in unmarked cars have a greater advantage over the officer in a marked unit in that they have with them the element of surprise. Several months ago, the Fraternal Order of Police took the initiative to address this issue by forming a task force consisting of representatives from groups that might be affected by this issue.

The committee consisted of the Fraternal Order of Police, Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association, the Pennsylvania State Troopers

Association, the Pennsylvania State Police, the Pennsylvania Paid Fire Fighters Association, the Volunteer Fight Fighters Association, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and others.

The task force discussed the concern of officers making the traffic stops in unmarked cars and came up with two major issues contributing to this problem.

The first problem identified was the matter of the light bars. It seems anyone can virtually obtain light bars or bubble lights personally. While they were some restrictions for their use, they are not enforced.

The second area of concern was the uniforms. There are nonpolice agencies wearing uniforms very similar to those worn by police officers. We attempted to address these two areas. The general consensus of the group was there was too much confusion regarding what light colors belonged on what group.

There were volunteer fire fighters and fire police who were permitted to have red and blue lights mounted on their personal vehicles, other volunteer groups were permitted blue lights

only, and then there was the matter of the yellow lights.

It was very confusing to us, so we can well imagine how the public must feel. Our general consensus was that police vehicles only should be permitted and authorized to mount the combination red and blue lights on their marked and unmarked police cars.

The volunteer groups that were currently allowed the red and blue combination would then be allowed red lights only. The volunteer groups currently allowed to exhibit blue lights would remain the same.

The other area that we feel greatly contributes to the concern of unmarked cars is the matter of the uniform. There are far too many look-alikes or people who want to be police officers but for whatever reason cannot be a police officer.

Most private security agencies outfit their guards in uniforms very similar to that of the local police agency. This is done, in my opinion, purposely to give the guards the appearance of being police officers and therefore appearing to have more authority than they

actually possess.

The same is true with the Pennsylvania State Constables. Their uniforms are virtually identical to that of the Pennsylvania State Troopers, even down to their patch.

Security guards and constables have a very distinctive job to perform. That job is not to be a police officer and therefore not give the appearance of being a police officer.

There is no reason for either group to have any lights mounted on their vehicles, and they should not give the appearance of being police officers. Their uniforms should be distinctly different from law enforcement.

By mandating that security guards work in slacks and blazers with constables either in similar fashion or a distinctly different uniform than a law enforcement officer, we feel would help reduce the incidents that may be occurring involving people who are not police officers making traffic stops.

We respectfully request the Legislature not take another tool from law enforcement. We are committed to working with this body in an attempt to address the concerns surrounding the

1 issue.

It would be our recommendations that for an officer to make a traffic stop on an unmarked car there would be four requirements:

First, activate the red and blue light combination; second, activate the audible warning device; third, that the officer be in full uniform; and fourth, that the officer activate the interior dome light.

And I thank you for this opportunity to voice our concerns, and I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: This committee that you addressed on the bottom of page 1 of your testimony, how many times have you met?

MR. ENGLE: Approximately five or six times.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Over what period of time?

MR. ENGLE: The past year.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Have you put into writing any of the recommendations that you as a committee are interested in seeing occur in the Legislature or to address the problems that you see?

1 MR. ENGLE: Yes. Ron Plesko, who's with 2 the Pennsylvania State Police, is working, I believe, with Representative Geist to draft 3 legislation that would include the matters that 5 I identified. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: You don't know 7 what state that legislation is in, do you? 8 It's my understanding it's MR. ENGLE: 9 ready to go to print, but I think he wants to 10 bring it back to the committee to have the 11 committee meet one more time to review it before 12 they seek sponsors. 13 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Does that address 14 also the uniform issue? 15 MR. ENGLE: Yes, it will. 16 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Do you have any 17 idea what the recommendations of the committee 18 would be? 19 MR. ENGLE: As I testified, possibly in 20 slacks and blazers or a very distinctive uniform. 21 I haven't seen the language that Ron has proposed 22 through Representative Geist. 23 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I don't know 24 whether or not we run afoul of any constitutional

issues dealing with telling people how they can

25

dress or how they can't dress. I just wonder how we handle that.

MR. ENGLE: Well, again, the concern that we have with the uniforms is that people are out there and, again, the constables when you take a first glance at a constable in their uniform, you absolutely have to believe that they are indeed State troopers.

Their patch, the only difference in their patch where it says Pennsylvania State Troopers, it says Pennsylvania State Constables; but it emulates everything that the State troopers wear.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: And I would also add to that that most people think they have police powers.

MR. ENGLE: Yes, they do.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Even though they don't.

MR. ENGLE: That's correct. And they also in the Harrisburg area, they were riding around with red and blue lights on their vehicles; however, they --

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Should have told the state policemen to go get them.

1 MR. ENGLE: They've been directed to 2 remove those. 3 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative Caltagirone, do you have questions? 5 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: No questions. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative 8 Hennessey. 9 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Yes, thank 10 you. Fred, on page 2, you indicate your general 11 consensus -- the middle of the second 12 paragraph -- Our general consensus was that 13 police vehicles should only be permitted and 14 authorized to mount red and blue lights. 15 we have to do, in your view, as a legislature to 16 accomplish that? 17 MR. ENGLE: Hopefully, that'll be 18 addressed in the proposed legislation; however, 19 the volunteer fire fighters have voluntarily 20 agreed with us and have taken steps to remove the 21 blue lighting from their light bars. So I don't 22 think that's going to turn into a problem with 23 the volunteers.

But I think that it is confusing to the

public. I think that we should move in

24

25

Pennsylvania to let the citizens know that police officers alone will be the only ones having red and blue combinations.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I guess the only thing that gives me some concern is the fact that the previous witness indicated that changing the colors is not really too much of a problem because of the availability of different colored inserts.

MR. ENGLE: Um-hum. It would not be very costly; and I'm sure part of our proposal is going to be a much stiffer penalty for someone that would go out and purchase the red and blue lights and mount them and, in essence, pretend to be a police officer, whether they're activated or not.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you,

Mr. Engle. We appreciate your testimony today.

Our next testifier is Edward Connor. Is he here?

Yes, he is. Thank you. Edward Connor is

testifying as the Chief of Police for the

Ferguson Township Police Department in Centre

County.

Mr. Connor, we have your written testimony; and anytime you're prepared to give that, you may proceed.

MR. CONNOR: Thank you, sir. My name is Edward J. Connor. I am a 33-year veteran of law enforcement. I spent my first 22 years with the Philadelphia Police Department, and I'm privileged enough to be the chief of police of Ferguson Township in Centre County.

I am also privileged to serve as chairman of the Law Committee of the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association and as a member of their traffic committee.

I appreciate this opportunity to address this Committee on the important issue of whether or not this panel will recommend denying the police officers of this state the ability to stop a motor vehicle if the officer observes it breaking the law and that officer happens to be operating a fully-equipped vehicle which just happens to be unmarked.

The Chiefs of Police Association recognizes the seriousness of recent incidents involving individuals using emergency lights and, in some cases, police uniforms to pull people over

and then proceed to commit other crimes.

These criminal acts need to be addressed, not the denial of an important law enforcement tool which is utilized by the men and women in police service.

In that vein, representatives of the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association have been working with representatives of the Fraternal Order of Police, the Pennsylvania State Police, the State Troopers Association, the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, and representatives of both professional and volunteer fire fighters, emergency response services, and fire police.

In a series of meetings earlier this year, the aforementioned representatives developed the following recommendations to more adequately address this issue rather than penalize law enforcement.

One would be to increase the penalty for impersonating a police officer to a felony, including the act of using an emergency light to force a motorist over in the definition of impersonating a police officer; identify the type of lighting authorized for each respective type

of emergency vehicle; educate the public and the users of such equipment and then strictly enforce those regulations.

As Sergeant Engle previously testified, members of the Pennsylvania State Police are in the process of researching and developing such protocol. That development is following the suggestions and recommendations of the representatives of the groups and agencies that I already mentioned.

Number 3 in our suggestions were,

Prohibit and strictly enforce the use or

possession of emergency lights by unauthorized

persons. In order to effect a vehicle stop, an

emergency vehicle must have both visual and audio

signaling devices.

All representative groups have agreed to work together to educate the public and their own members in the proper use of emergency lighting and what to do if an operator is unsure of the identity of the person attempting to pull them over.

The Pennsylvania State Police have already developed a public service video depicting appropriate measures a motorist can

take to ensure the person pulling them over is, in fact, a police officer.

In conclusion, the professional and volunteer emergency service providers in Pennsylvania have recognized that unmarked police vehicles are a necessary part of law enforcement and play an important part in not only traffic safety but in DUI enforcement, narcotics investigations, and major felony arrests.

Many significant arrests have been made using unmarked vehicles when the initial reason for the stop was a minor traffic violation. We request you listen to our recommendations and direct your ire at the perpetrator where it belongs and not on Pennsylvania's police officers. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Mr. Connor, on page 1 you indicated that you were working with these other groups, just as our previous testifiers have done. I know you were here for at least the last testifier.

MR. CONNOR: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: May I ask you, since it seems that you are at odds with the constables or security officers, why they were

not included in your discussions with these other groups?

MR. CONNOR: They have never been recognized as law enforcement officers, sir, and nobody felt the need to include them.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: They may not be law enforcement officers; but what you were suggesting affects them, does it not? I mean, the suggestions that you and the last testifier have indicated quite clearly are that they should wear something different and they should not be allowed to use certain lights, et cetera.

So it would seem to me -- you know, I deal with the political realm. And anytime we do something that affects somebody, we try to include them in the discussions on how they're going to be affected.

It would appear that this organization or those organizations, if you will, of different police professional and volunteer fire, et cetera, should have at least made some attempt to include the constables and security officers in your discussions if for no other reason than to let them now what you were doing and see whether or not they were amenable to what you're doing.

I think what I'm reading between the lines here is we have an adversarial situation that is going to hit the fan, so to speak, when it gets in legislative form, as our previous testifier indicated.

MR. CONNOR: I think in some parts of the state it's more adversarial than others. I do recognize the concern that many of my colleagues have where nonpolice persons appear to be police persons and attempt to act like police officers. That is a concern we all share.

As far as the constables' concerned, they were never -- again, I state that they were never recognized as a law enforcement entity. To so recognize them, I don't know if my -- if my association would go along with that.

Personally, I don't care whether they come or not. I don't care whether we invite them or not. I do feel though that we would give them recognition that they might not deserve or be entitled to.

We were talking strictly with the professional law enforcement entities at the time. Again, they -- the constables and security people were not considered professional law

enforcement.

If it would make more sense to include the constables, I don't have a problem with that and I would so recommend it to our group, which is an informal committee.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: You're going to have to deal with them sooner are later. I mean, if you're going to make recommendations that find its way into legislation that affect lights and/or uniforms of either security officers or constables, you're going to have to deal with them sooner or later.

And if you've not included them in any of the discussions you've had, that's why I suggest that you may be setting up an adversarial confrontation that becomes a political football which becomes more difficult for those of us in the Legislature to come down on one side or the other.

MR. CONNOR: I will go back to the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association and so recommend that we include the state constables in any further discussions --

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: They may not like what you have to say; but at least you've said

to them, Here's what we're planning on doing and here's what we're recommending. We'd like to have you on board. Probably won't get that.

Then you can at least when you come to the Legislature with a bill or two you can say, Well, we did talk with them. We did tell them what was needed and why we felt the way we did; and they don't agree with us.

I know my personal perspective is that when you tell me that you were writing legislation that affects a group of citizens and you have had no dealings with them and no discussions and you have not included them in any of your plans, I as a legislator say, Why not, which is what I'm saying to you today.

And from a political perspective, then you have a more difficult time achieving what you would like to do. If you have shut the door on those groups who then will find out about this bill and they will have something to say about it and they will speak loudly.

MR. CONNOR: I think I share your concern. I don't like to be blindsided on anything. And if I was a constable, I don't think I would like surprises either. And, again,

I'll support your recommendation. I don't, again, personally object to it; and it's not a bad idea.

If we are going to have discussions that affect them, I think it's only reasonable that we include them in those discussions.

Again, whether or not they agree with us --

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: And I'm not assuming that they would. If you say to the Constable Association, We're going to take away your uniforms, I think you're going to find that they're quite upset about that.

MR. CONNOR: We anticipated that, sir.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: We had one of the spokesmen for the constables yesterday when we met in Media, and I'll guarantee you he'll be upset. If you were there yesterday, you'd know what I was talking about.

But, you know, I'm looking at this from the procedural aspect of how are you deriving at this bill with Representative Geist that you're going to lay down in the front of the Transportation Committee and before all legislators.

And some of the questions are going to

be, Well, who's proposing it and what is it doing and how do the people that it's doing something to feel about this?

MR. CONNOR: The issue started out originally where the concern was unauthorized persons acting as police officers pulling somebody over and it just got a life of its own and began to expand.

It went into what kind of emergency lighting should be standardized and then whether or not this group or that group should have what kind of uniforms. I think the original issue was still whether or not you could pull somebody over with an unmarked car.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Yeah, the issue has expanded far beyond the horizons of House Bill 147; and, quite frankly, we've been giving a lot of leeway here to those who are testifying who basically in some cases aren't even testifying about the legislation. They're talking more about lights and everything else.

But that's okay because I think it's constructive to do that, but that's just my thoughts on the subject. I don't know if any of the other members have had that same thinking;

but for what it's worth, I would share it with vou. Representative Hennessey.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Chief Connor, your recommendations
on the second page, I'm a little confused, I
think, about the first one.

Is it the suggestion of your group that we increase the penalty for impersonating a police officer in every case or is it more tagged onto the latter part of recommendation, which is to make it a felony for impersonating a police officer if in the act of that impersonation they're using the emergency lights?

MR. CONNOR: No. The recommendation would in any case and any time a person identifies himself as a police officer and they are not, it should be considered a felony.

The addition to when a person uses their emergency lights, we are requesting that that be added to the definition of impersonating a police officer, not just displaying the badge or a uniform and saying I'm a police officer.

But when you start to pull somebody over using unauthorized emergency lighting, then that should be considered impersonating a police

officer and, again, included in with the whole group going up to the degree of a felony.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. So if you're using -- if a person's using the lights to create the impression, you would agree that that's more serious than simply impersonating an officer in other circumstances? Or is it simply a case-by-case basis?

MR. CONNOR: I think they're all equally serious. Anytime an individual attempts to identify themself as a police officer, whether they do it within a vehicle or walking up to a person or attempting to serve a bogus warrant, for example, you have the propensity there for a very serious crime to occur.

Normally, these people aren't just doing it out of fun; they're doing it out of something more serious. So if we're going to be serious about curtailing this type of activity, then let's make it a felony.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I don't know that I would necessarily agree with you. I would think that sometimes -- we've had a lot of discussion here about whether or not the uniforms of constables and other people who are not law

enforcement, some security officers, are intentionally made to look like police officers so they imbue themselves with some sort of appearance of authority they may not have.

But the purpose is not, I think, self-gratification. The purpose is so that people will cooperate with them and listen to the instructions, which I think most people would agree a security officer has some power or some right to give instruction and to try to do some things for crowd control.

We obviously don't want to threaten those people with charging them with a felony because they're trying in a sense to ride the coattails of the public perception that they have some authority and therefore we better follow what their suggestions are.

MR. CONNOR: I would look at the totality of the circumstances and look at the abuse of that authority. And not just a person being in uniform not taking overt action, but a person who overtly identifies himself as a police officer in any manner, whether it be a display of uniform or a badge or the red and blue lights.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Aside from

the issue of using lights, which is a relatively recent phenomenon, it seems to me, has there been a longstanding position of your association that impersonating a police officer should have been upgraded to a felony a long time ago?

MR. CONNOR: I've been a member of the Pennsylvania Chiefs now almost twelve years, and it has been a topic of conversation along with other issues. But, yes, it was always considered a serious crime that did not seem to be taken as seriously as it should be.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CONNOR: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Counsel.

MR. RYAN: These recommendations that you have here seem to be very similar to ones we've heard, I guess, from the other witnesses. I don't know if you were present for all their testimony.

Do these recommendations apply to all stops of vehicles or have you just delineated or addressed situations where they're initially brought about because of violations of traffic offenses?

MR. CONNOR: All stops of vehicles, sir.

MR. RYAN: That would be whether this is flight from a criminal homicide, a bank robbery, or anything that you would characterize these particular qualifications?

MR. CONNOR: A vehicle stop is a vehicle stop no matter what you make it for. The importance or seriousness of the vehicle stop can change, but a vehicle stop is still a vehicle stop.

And the biggest problem for law enforcement and as a matter of officer safety is the fact that when you approach that vehicle you have no clue what you're going to find when you get there.

What appears to be a mild, gentle person behind the wheel can very easily have a handgun on their lap; and, of course, it has occurred in the past. So any vehicle stop should be addressed with caution from, again, officer safety position. But when we were making these recommendations, they are for whatever level.

MR. RYAN: Even if an undercover narcotics officer's vehicle who at the scene of an undercover buy goes to make an arrest and you

have flight, if he didn't have an audio signal device in that car, he wouldn't be able to do a pursuit or stop the vehicle?

MR. CONNOR: That's absolutely correct, sir. If it does not have audio signalling devices, it should not be permitted to make a traffic stop.

MR. RYAN: Even after the immediate view of the officer of an offense where he's then going to capture the perpetrator and it's an undercover situation?

MR. CONNOR: There are other means to do so. And I know somebody testified -- I think it was Paul McCommons testified before me -- there's no answer to everything.

What we in law enforcement are attempting to do is resolve this issue without losing a tool. And if we have to give up the ability to make a certain type of stop, we're willing to do so. We'd prefer not to, and we'd be more than happy to work with this Committee to address that particular issue.

I would like to see, having worked narcotics in the city and have working knowledge of how narcotics investigations are conducted up

country, it is not always practical to have audio signalling devices in these unmarked cars.

But we always have a little bag hidden somewhere with a little revolving light in it that we'd throw up on the hood or on the dashboard and take off. We -- again, when I personally worked narcotics and I know some of our narcotics investigators now have made vehicle stops using just the lights.

But our concern there is we were going to lose -- we in law enforcement were going to lose the ability to make any traffic stop if we set on that issue.

MR. RYAN: Don't you think it would be better then just to address this issue to what are initiated as vehicle stops because that seems to be where the problem has been, that this is better just addressed to where the initial purpose of the stop is for a vehicle violation under Title 75?

MR. CONNOR: Well, if it's going to be for a vehicle stop, then let's stay with it, it must have audio and visual and a specific type of visual -- red and blue. Not just red, not just blue; red and blue.

1 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you. 2 MR. CONNOR: Thank you, gentlemen. 3 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony. Our last two testifiers are Gurn Weber, from the Central 5 Pennsylvania Constables Association and Vern 6 7 Smith, Sheriff of Clarion County. I don't see either of them here; 9 although, we are approximately 25 minutes ahead 10 of schedule, which is unheard of in Harrisburg. 11 So what we're going to do is take a brief recess. 12 And when either of those gentlemen come, we will 13 resume the Committee meeting. So we are recessed 14 until the call of the Chair. 15 (At which time, there was a pause in the 16 proceedings.) 17 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: We are ready to 18 resume. We have the gentleman, Mr. Vern Smith, 19 who's the Sheriff of Clarion County who was 20 scheduled for 12:30; but since our 12:00 is not 21 here, we will expeditiously move you to the head 22 of the line and ask you to present your 23 testimony. 24 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Mr. Smith, we've

25

had several people -- as you've been notified from the sheet that I gave you earlier, several people have testified before the Committee already this morning and we have before us some members of the House Judiciary Committee as well as some of our counsel here.

And after your testimony, we may ask you some questions. If you'd sit for those, we'd appreciate it. You may present your testimony now.

MR. SMITH: Okay. First off, I'd like to thank you for the invitation. It's certainly a privilege and pleasure on my part. When I first received the invitation accompanied by a proposed legislation and I saw the term "rogue police officers in unmarked police cars," you certainly got my attention.

Of course, I've heard of the stories of unmarked cars pulling over motorists and some person in plainclothes showing what was purported to be police identification, later there was a complaint filed about this policeman asking for a date or whatever.

I know of one instance in my county where this happened. Of course, he was not a

policeman but what we calm a wanna-be. He was arrested and received a sentence before the court for impersonating a police officer.

I, like everyone, am concerned about the policeman who has strayed from the normal, a person who has crossed the line; and no agency, of course, wants this to happen. But does the fact that an unmarked police car was involved make a difference?

My own personal opinion is that the solution is somewhere in between. Certainly, the system has failed. The police chief or the sheriff did not recognize the rogue trait when the officer was first interviewed, hired, during his or her probation period, or when the very first complaint came in.

Somewhere there should have been a sign that this officer was a rogue. How do you explain the fact that applicants for this job, police job, must undergo a physical and psychological exam and these instances still occur? I can't.

We all know the courts and the state statutes presently limit what an officer can and cannot do when not in uniform. The term

"emergency vehicles" is clearly spelled out.

The proposed amendment to Title 75, section 3733, limits when unmarked cars can be used to stop or attempt to stop a moving vehicle. The sections cited are very serious offenses, but do they by themselves correct the situation?

A proposal with such wide, sweeping repercussions should be given careful thought. I can only surmise that this legislation is yet another hasty reaction to those few but widely-publicized incidents where police officers become criminals. Bad cops are bad cops -- in a uniform or out, in a marked car or not.

House Bill 147 does create a legal nightmare for the honest cops. When such legislation is proposed, one must first imagine such ludicrous legal defenses and decisions that will result.

In the case of this proposal, the potential for adverse results are many. The Bill does not address violations of Title 18, the Crimes Code. Will this bill restrict officers to making traffic stops only when specific violations occur?

Does that mean that I will have to watch

someone kidnap a child and not be permitted to stop the car when I'm driving a unmarked unit? Lets examine what the proposals permit.

How will an honest and intelligent officer testify that he suspects a violation of Title 75, section 3731, when he hasn't stopped a suspected vehicle to observe the driver?

Nearly every DUI offense starts with some other violation and the stop, additional information that develops from probable cause to make that DUI arrest.

My officers never suspect any driver of DUI solely on the basis of driving habit, and neither should any other officer. There won't be any DUI stops under this bill if the officer is in an unmarked unit because the officer can't stop for the initial violation observed.

Questions also arise over what is considered not clearly identifiable by its markings as a police vehicle. Even I have seen marked police cars that don't look real. Anyone can purchase magnetic markings that are easily removed and replaced, and so can any other citizen.

Are we going to enter a courtroom and

engage in a debate with the defense regarding what does and does not constitute what looks like a real police car? If the defense raises that question, we'll have to defend the markings on all our cars in most traffic proceedings.

Let's try something that takes into account what the effect will be on thousands of law enforcement officers who will have to work with it.

An marked police car can play a very important role in police work; and I believe this bill, as it stands, will further tie the police officers' hands.

Take for instance that two deputy sheriffs who are serving a Protection from Abuse Court Order, because the alleged abuser is a known troublemaker and the fact that the court order directs that all firearms be confiscated, the deputies are using an unmarked police car for the element of surprise.

Proceeding to the residence in uniform, they observe a vehicle run a stop sign and nearly cause an accident. Should they not pursue this vehicle and stop it? Are they derelict in their duty if they do not? The only solution would be

to follow and try to get a clearly-marked vehicle to assist.

I'm sure you're well aware that some departments are already doing just that, limiting the use of unmarked vehicles for traffic stops; but should it be the law?

The suggestion that possibly restricting the use of flashing or revolving red lights to police officers on duty and in marked EMS and fire vehicles should be considered.

Let's make it a misdemeanor offense to possess a flashing revolving red light by anyone else and make it a felony for impersonating a law enforcement officer. We the cops are the good guys. The actions of a few criminals who manage to get into uniform doesn't change that.

I happen to believe that most people are good people, and I believe that most cops are good people too. We need the unmarked vehicle to deter criminal activity. Some departments only have a couple cars. If one breaks down, they have to use the other one.

The officers I know don't rape female motorists, they haven't beat anyone up, and seldom become involved in a pursuit. They're

decent, upstanding citizens just trying to do a job that never ends.

I would add that I believe you're on the right track in asking for input from the law enforcement community. In these two days of testimony, you have, I'm sure, heard many varied and interesting stories on why and why not we should be further restricted in the type of vehicles we use for law enforcement.

Perhaps the time of day is more important than anything else. Visibility does play a factor in all vehicle stops, and the officer should use common sense during hours of darkness.

We want the motorists to be safe. We tell our loved ones not to stop for anyone who they are suspicious of, that they should be sure it is a policeman. Should we ask the public to be less cautious?

Seasoned officers wait to reach a clearly-lighted area before attempting to stop the vehicle. They turn on the dome light. They light up the vehicle. I must also mention the word "liability." Should we, can we, pass up a violation of the law?

Thank you for the invitation. I know it didn't take fifteen minutes, but that's pretty much what I had on my mind.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: We thank you,
Sheriff Smith. On page 1, your third and fourth
paragraph, it says, I know of one instance in my
county where that happened. That is referring to
somebody purporting to be a policeman who wasn't.
Could you tell us a little bit how that happened?

MR. SMITH: Okay. This happened at night. A lady pulled into her driveway and followed in by a car, a very, very plain-looking car.

The person got out and purported to show some sort of identification -- he was not in uniform -- showed identification that he was a police officer, was upset that she had supposedly committed some traffic violation back the road and which angered him, apparently, and he threatened all kinds of things.

The person -- the lady was sharp enough to get some identification, which a follow-up was made and we found out who the person was. And he was a person who had actually failed to make the requirements or be hired by a police agency.

He was what we call a wanna-be. You know, he wants to; but he can't quite make the grade. But that was the only one that I'm currently aware of.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Some other of your folks who have testified before you have suggested that one of the problems is the wide number of people or organizations that use uniforms.

When a person wears a uniform and the closer that uniform appears to look like a police officer's uniform, it lends credibility to them even though they haven't earned it.

Do you find that to be a problem in your area of the state that there's a proliferation of uniforms and the people don't understand what that uniform means from whether or not it's a constable or a security officer or a sheriff or if it's a State Police or local police?

MR. SMITH: A very good question, and, yes, that's true. I believe that probably the most imitated uniform there is the State Police uniform. In my area, constables have a almost identical uniform.

Sheriffs are -- I'm a former state

policeman. I'm a retired state policeman, but now I'm a sheriff. And sheriffs generally wear a brown uniform. They're a little bit different in color and show the patch and so forth.

But I also feel that the purchase of this equipment is too easily accessible. Anybody can walk into a -- a catalog can order a uniform. Of course, that doesn't make them a policeman, but it makes them look like one. And the fact that I covered about the magnetic decals and so forth further enhance that I think.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you.

Representative Caltagirone, do you have any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative Hennessey.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: You -- I was just trying to scan your testimony briefly here. And you had suggested that the impersonating a police officer should be made a felony. We've had some other indications from other witnesses with that same suggestion.

I'll ask the same question. Do you

think that it should be a felony in every case or do you think it should be a felony if in addition to conveying some indication, telling someone that you're an officer and then showing some badge or some other phoney identification that in conjunction with that you also use the emergency lights, do you think it should be a felony across-the-board or only when that additional element of using emergency lights is present?

MR. SMITH: Okay. You brought up a good point that I hadn't thought about, the other elements that might enter into that. Of course, we allowed the courts great jurisdiction -- not jurisdiction, but latitude -- and I think that should be the case.

You know, I believe the court is wise in most of their decisions and they can weigh that. I would think a Felony 3 probably would be with circumstances that would add to that credibility, you know. Maybe an M-1 if it wasn't a vehicle or something like that, if they didn't have the flashing light or something like that.

But I think we need to -- we send a message that, you know, this isn't right. They shouldn't be doing these things because I said --

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: It seems to me that adding the element of the emergency lights, you know, usually after dark on some deserted or not well-traveled highway, obviously the potential for danger is a whole lot more than, you know, happened in the case that you mentioned when somebody comes into somebody's driveway and says I'm a police officer and I'm mad because you cut me off in traffic.

MR. SMITH: Yes. We have the different -- I would say that if a person is going down the highway, they see the red light come on and so forth, they indicate naturally they think that this is a police car or a emergency vehicle anyway behind them, and they pull off or move over.

A difference between the person pulling into their driveway and a car coming up and not marked, there's been no red light and yet this person passes himself off, is still doing the same thing. He may have not done it with a red light because he didn't happen to have one maybe or, I don't know, was afraid to use it, I think that --

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: You're not

likely to use it in somebody's neighborhood or in somebody's driveway as likely as you would on some deserted country road perhaps. Should it be a felony in every case or should it be a felony when those added elements are involved? Because it seems to me the danger is heightened in those circumstances.

MR. SMITH: Well, I think you have to pretty much draw the line -- in your criminal complaint when you type that up, you would add these other things which would strengthen your case, I think, in the eyes of the court.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Certainly the use of the lights could be -- could be seized upon by the judge to --

MR. SMITH: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: -- increase the range of -- increase the sentence that's given within the permissible range under the sentencing code now -- or sentencing guidelines.

MR. SMITH: Well, I think like the badge, you know, showing some purported sign of authority is a violation of the law. And I think, you know, by maybe strengthening that law we'll send a stronger message to the people who

1 are doing this type of thing, you know. REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Sheriff, in 2 3 your capacity as sheriff now, do your people -- what kind of lights do your people use in your cars? MR. SMITH: We have the red and blue 7 lights. We're allowed to have those. REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Red and blue. 8 9 MR. SMITH: Yes. 10 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: 11 you -- aside from -- who is it that uses red and 12 blue -- State Police, any local police, and the 13 sheriff's office, not constables --14 MR. SMITH: No, constables are not 15 allowed to use those. 16 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Is there any 17 clear-cut definition that applies across the 18 state that you know of when as far as who can use 19 what combination of lights? 20 MR. SMITH: Yes. It's in the Vehicle 21 Code. It's under classification of emergency 22 vehicles, which spells out those vehicles that 23 can have both red or blue. There are some that 24 can have only one or the other. And I believe

25

under --

1 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: The emergency 2 people can use blue --They can use both, red and 3 MR. SMITH: That's your ambulance, your fire, your 4 5 State Police, borough police, sheriff --6 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: So that would 7 be the section of the code we'd have to change if 8 we wanted to standardize red and blue for just 9 law enforcement? 10 MR. SMITH: I would think so, yes. 11 Constables are not considered emergency vehicles, 12 those people; so they are not allowed to have 13 that. Now, there are some that would like to 14 have it that way; but that's not the way it is 15 now. 16 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. Thank 17 you. I don't have any other questions. 18 Okay. Thank you very much. MR. SMITH: 19 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, 20 Sheriff. We appreciate your coming. And because 21 our 12:00 testifier is not here and is apparently 22 quite late, I'm going to adjourn the meeting. 23 And if he does show up at a later time, we'll ask 24 his testimony in writing to be distributed to 25 Committee members. So the meeting is adjourned.

(At or about 12:14 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.) CERTIFICATE I, Deirdre J. Meyer, Reporter, Notary Public, duly commissioned and qualified in and for the County of Lancaster, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my stenotype notes taken by me and subsequently reduced to computer printout under my supervision, and that this copy is a correct record of the same. This certification does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under my direct control and/or supervision. Notary Public. expires August 10, 1998.