HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

* * * * * * * * *

House Bills 1168, 1169, 1170 & 2698

* * * * * * * * * *

House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crimes and Corrections

The Inn At Nichols Village 1101 Northern Boulevard Clarks Summit, Pennsylvania

Tuesday, September 22, 1998 - 9:30 a.m.

--000--

BEFORE:

Honorable Jerry Birmelin, Majority Chairperson Honorable Brett Feese

IN ATTENDANCE:

Honorable Jere Schuler
Honorable Frank Serafini
Honorable J. Scot Chadwick
Honorable Frank Dermody
Honorable Kathy Manderino

KEY REPORTERS

1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404

(717) 764-7801 Fax (717) 764-6367

1998-099

C O N T E N T S

1	CONTENTS	
2	WITNESSES	PAGE
3	Opening Remarks Honorable Jerry Birmelin	4
4	Honorable Frank Serafini	6
5	Ernie Preate	12
6	Former Attorney General	12
7	Lester Lewis, M.D, Medical Director	22
8	PA Department of Corrections	22
9	Harvey E. Yancey, Major of the Guard	29
LO	Rockview State Correctional Institution	23
L1	Stanley Gabriel, Major of the Guard Dallas State Correctional Institution	34
L 2		
L3	Edward Sweeney, Warden Lehigh County Prison	66
L 4		
L5	Edward Harry, Staff Representative	74
16	AFSCME, District Council #87	
17	Angus Love, Executive Director PA Institutional Law Clinic	94
18		
19	Patrick O'Malley	110
20	Corrections Officer	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I'd like to get started. Good morning. I'm Representative Jerry Birmelin. I'm the Chairman of Judiciary Subcommittee on Crimes and Corrections for the full House Judiciary Committee. We are having a public hearing today on 1168, 1169, 1170 and 2698. The author of all those pieces of legislation is Representative Frank Serafini. Representative Serafini, if you would join me here at the table.

We're going to begin the meeting as soon we can. We have a schedule of several people who are testifying, and we also had a request from two people who are not on the schedule to testify. We're going to give them, if we can, accommodate them and give them the opportunity to make a few brief remarks.

Before we start, I just want to let you know that this hearing is not simply about the bills that we have, but it may encompass some of the other issues about prisons. These particular bills address the issues that, I think, Representative Serafini is trying to address through this legislation in the area of prisons. We're not going to go real far afield,

but I will not be opposed to people making comments or asking questions that may deal with issues other than the four bills that are before us.

Before we start, I'm going to introduce the members of the committee who are with us here this morning, and then give Representative Serafini an opportunity for some opening remarks. And to my fair right is Representative Kathy Manderino. She's from Philadelphia County. You don't have a microphone.

REPRESENATIVE MANDERINO: That's all right, I'll share.

Representative Dermody is next to her and next to me. Representative Dermody is from Allegheny County. To my immediate left is Representative Frank Serafini, the author of the legislation, that will be the basis of our discussion today. Next to him is Representative Brett Feese from Lycoming County, the city of Williamsport. Next to him is Representative Schuler who is from Lancaster County. And to the far left at the end of table is Mr. Jim Mann. Jim Mann is one

of our research directors of the House Judiciary
Committee. He has put together the hearing
today and organizing the agenda.

At this time I'm going to turn the meeting over for a few minutes to Representative Frank Serafini for some opening remarks.

Representative Serafini.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Well, I appreciate the opportunity. I didn't know whether you wanted me to testify in front or whether I could do it from here.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I prefer you did it from here, and also that you stay with us throughout the course of the hearing as best as you are able to.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Well, I appreciate that. Good morning, Chairman Brimelin, and members of the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crimes and Corrections. Welcome to Nichols Village in Clarks Summit, Pennsylvania. In my remarks, I'd like to touch on the intent of the bills under review by the subcommittee and give you a brief explanation of why, I believe, these bills are significant.

1 The four bills before you today all 2 relate to prisoners' accommodations and affect 3 persons held in state correctional institutions, county prisons or jails or any other 4 correctional facility including juvenile 5 facilities. House Bill 1168 prohibits the use 6 of free weights. House Bill 1169 prohibits the 7 sale or serving of caffeinated beverages. House 8 Bill 1170 is more narrowly tailored and only 9 prohibits the sale or serving of coffee; and 10 11 House Bill 2698 specifically addresses the access to and the use of strength and enhancing 12 equipment and prohibits offenders from 13 participating in programs which would enhance 14 their physical strength or fighting skill. 15 legislation also establishes a means by which 16 the prison facility management can dispose of 17 the equipment that would be prohibited. 18 19 This issue was brought to my 20

21

22

23

24

25

This issue was brought to my
attention some time ago while I was in Arizonia.

A local taxicab driver was describing some
recent changes in policy made by a local sheriff
in his county jail. Sheriff Joe Arpiao of
Maricopa County, Arizonia, runs a strictly no
frills facility. His offenders get nothing more

than what the United States and Arizona

Constitution requires: No weights, no coffee,

no television, no personal clothing.

Upon further investigation, I was surprised to find that the idea of a no frills prison is not a new one. The Arizona Department of Corrections has, as a matter of Department policy, removed all weight-lifting equipment from its prisons. The State of Louisiana passed the Louisiana State House Bill 226 in 1994 to prohibit inmates from possession of weight-lifting equipment. Mississippi passed similar laws the same year.

Ohio passed a Ohio State House Bill
152 in 1996. Their law is substantially similar
to the provisions contained in my House Bill
2698. Illinois and California passed bills in
1996 strictly controlling the use of weighttraining equipment, and three other states,
Kentucky, Rhode Island, and Virginia have
similar legislation pending which controls or
prohibits weight-training equipment and
eliminates programs designed to improve inmates
fighting skills.

Of course, the natural question and

the one before the subcommittee this morning recurs; is this legislation necessary? When you deliberate over the necessity of this type of legislation, I will encourage you to consider the following:

Consider the taxpayer cost of providing accommodations to criminals and juvenile delinquents which are neither guaranteed by the Constitution nor necessary for the rehabilitation of the offenders.

Consider the number of injuries that occur because of the use and misuse of weight-training equipment.

Consider the exposure to liabilities because of injuries incurred by inmates for faulty equipment or injuries incurred by persons assaulted with such equipment.

Consider the fact that drug dependent offenders use caffeine products as legal alternatives to achieve a rush similar to their former drug of choice.

And, also, consider the story of two young Ohio women savagely raped by an attacker who was recently released from an Ohio State Correctional facility. Robert Blankenship spent

the majority of his seven-year term of imprisonment for multiple rape convictions, lifting weight and building muscle mass. Within months of his release, Blankenship had broken into the apartments of Christine Long-Wagner and brutally raped her.

In her testimony before the Ohio

State House Judiciary Committee, Mrs.

Long-Wagner stated, even though he was not much
taller than me, he had complete physical control
over me and that at no time did I feel I had a
chance to make a move and try to escape.

Blankenship was not caught until three months later after three women were assaulted and yet another women, a neighbor of Mrs. Long-Wagner's, living in the same apartment complex was raped. The fingerprints found at the crime scene matched the offender's and Blankenship was finally apprehended.

In closing, we can all agree that our state, county and juvenile detention facilities are in no way club-med type institutions. It would be naive to think that these institutions are anything like country clubs. I strongly believe, however, that the

less like home we let these facilities become, the less likely it will be that offenders will return to a Pennsylvania penal institution.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee on Crime and Corrections.

I'm happy to answer any questions at this time.

Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to give my testimony.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank,

Representative Serafini. And, again, as I

mentioned earlier, you are welcome to stay here
throughout the course of this meeting. You may
participate as if you were a member.

On our schedule, we have scheduled at 9:45 several people from the Department of Corrections. But before we have them come, I'm going to give the opportunity to speak Mr. Ernie Preate, who is a former Attorney General of Pennsylvania, who, as did some others learn of this hearing through the media in the last day or so. And he just wanted to stop by and see what was going on and offer some comments. And, Ernie, I'd like to give you that opportunity and I'm gonna ask you, if you could, to try to keep your remarks to five minutes or less if you

could, please.

MR. PREATE: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman, and members of the committee: I appreciate this chance to come before you this morning. I have learned of this by reading it in the paper yesterday. As you know, I used to be Attorney General of the state and District Attorney and prosecutor and put a lot people in jail. I also went to prison for a year up in Daluff (phonetic) and had an opportunity to see from the inside just what happens to people when they go to an institution where they lose their freedom.

One of the things that I found which was extremely important was the fact that I was able to work out while I was in the prison setting. That was important to me for my own personal self-esteem and self-worth. I think that also I saw from the other prisoners, whether they were rich or poor, black or white, whoever they might be, they took advantage of those opportunities that were provided in the prison system to rehabilitate themselves in mind and body. That's important for recidivism purposes.

When you have a true rehabilitation, then you're not going to have recidivism at the other end. You are not going to have people come back to prison. You're not going to have them commit more crimes of more serious nature when they're out — once they're out of prison.

I also found talking to people in the federal prison system and the state system -- I have been to two state institutions now. In fact, I was at Coal Township just a week ago talking to the lifers. We had a banquet that was in the gymnasium, right there at Coal Township. And I tell you this, I talked to the staff there and talking to the prisoners, as I have all across the state, they see this as a management -- a very important management tool. It helps the staff of the prison manage the population, keeps down fighting, keeps down the kinds of behavior that Mr. Serafini rightfully talked about.

So, as a stress reliever it is very important. Those people that take pride in themselves and try to rehabilitate themselves in mind and body while they're in the prison system ought to be encouraged to do so.

1 is t
3 Mr.
4 out
5 this
6 prev
7 pris
8 wher
9 gets
10 seei

The second point that I want to make is that physical conditioning, as we all know,

Mr. Serafini is a great example, because I work out with Frank. I know how important he thinks this is. It is a stress reliever. It is also a preventer of illness. That when you're in a prison system where you are so close together, where, if somebody coughs on one tier, somebody gets a cold on the other tier. So, what we're seeing is, if we have an opportunity to maintain good health in the prison system you cut down on the constant going to the medical facility, the constant utilization of medicines in the facility.

I think it's a great way to keep good health in the facility. I think also we have to consider that self-esteem is important here. That is, these prisoners may have nothing to offer. They've lost their freedom. They've lost their dignity. They're dehumanized. You cannot possibly understand what it's like to be dehumanized unless you've been in prison.

You all sit here, I was there with you at one time. I went through this. I've been through the dehumanization process. It is

brutal. To have this one little chance in a day, this one hour a day basically, three days a week is what it was at Coal Township, for example, and to have that -- You don't get to be a huge weight lifter anymore like they used to have. That's a myth. That is no longer possible.

But, to have that opportunity for one hour a day, three days a week as they have in Coal Township, I think is really important for people's self-esteem. That helps them when they get out to become non-recidivist. It helps them to -- I think if they have that self-esteem they're going to be rehabilitated, and we need to do more of that.

Our recidivism rate is 33 percent.

If we had a company that was made by a product that failed 33 percent of the time, that company would not be in business very long. That's what's happening to our prison system right now.

The fastest way to reduce the crime rate is not -- to do more in the prevention side and do more on the rehabilitation side. If we can knock our recidivism rate down to 15 percent in the state, we wouldn't have many people in

prison like we have been building prisons, we've been doing it for the past 17 years, at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayers.

So, in the long run this is, I think, shortsighted. We need to have some kind of facilities for exercise and for working out.

Thank you very much. I'll be happy to answer any of your questions. I'm very open about my experience, so don't hesitate to ask me any questions.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you,
Mr. Preate. And since you are not a scheduled
testifier, I'm going to ask the members of the
panel to restrict their questions to one each.

MR. PREATE: Thank you.

to back up the program too far. But, I did want to give them an opportunity to ask a question.

So, if members of the panel have a question, I'm going to ask you to keep it to one. I know Miss Manderino is an expert at asking a question that probably has several subparts. But, I'm gonna call on her first so she doesn't have a chance to think of all of those subparts.

Representative Manderino, do you

have a question?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I'm going to surprise you and just thank Mr. Preate for coming.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I'm not surprised, I'm shocked. Mr. Dermody.

MR. DERMODY: No questions.

MR. PREATE: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Frank.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Ernie, you were a Marine. In the Marines, if I'm not mistaken, there's not a lot of weight lifting.

There's calisthenics and push-ups and pull-ups.

What do you consider that kind of exercise as opposed to the strict weight lifting and muscle enhancing?

MR. PREATE: Well, let me just say that the Marine Corps has calisthenics and it has weight training. It has both; and, of course, then you have a test on the obstacle course which is both a cardio test and a strength test. So, the Marine Corps encourages you to do both. It requires you, of course, to go through with push-ups and pull-ups which is

absolutely essential. I do push-ups and pull-ups all the time to condition myself.

That's the basic core of my physical conditioning which I have to do now, particularly because of my accident.

But, I think, that there's no question that some kind of weight training is essential for good health, for maintenance of the human body so it can resist particularly in a very close setting like you are in a military facility or in a prison facility or a ship.

There's always this encouragement of physical -- some kind of physical activity. Frankly, I'd like to see more encouragement of it in the prison system.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you. Representative Feese.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you Ernie. I have a question following up along the lines of Representative Serafini.

It seems to me that everything that you've talked about achieving can be achieved by calisthenics, push-ups, pull-ups without all the

muscle mass enhancing equipment that we've seen outlawed in a number of other states, because I work out also. I can do that type of strength enhancing without weights, as you testified that you are doing with your push-ups and pull-ups.

MR. PREATE: And weights.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: But, can't that be achieved without the weights equipment?

MR. PREATE: To you, I and
Representative Serafini, maybe we can do that,
but not everybody can do pull-ups and not
everybody can do push-ups. The machines kind of
help you do that.

As you know, you are in a gym situation and there's a lot of people who can't do one pull-up. But, they can go on a pull-up machine or a pulley machine and it helps them to do the pulleys, push-ups, the pull-ups, for example, or the push-up -- they can't do push-ups, but they can do one of those machines that encourages you to do a chest development. So, not everybody is as great of shape and so, you have to have at least a broad spectrum of machines that would accomplish the same goal.

There's some things that you can't

do. There's some muscle groups that you can't exercise with just by push-ups and pull-ups.

One of the things I point to is, the biggest part of your body is from your waist down. That doesn't -- push-ups and pull-ups do not work your legs. Those are the biggest muscle groups. They're the ones that burn the fat. They're the ones that determine what kind of strength you have. Just ask Mark McGwire, that's where his strength comes from the waist down.

And what we're doing in our prison systems right now, I don't know whether you realize this or not, we are reducing the ability to exercise the legs. Right now what we're doing is building dog kennels. I don't know whether you realize that, but now the new way with people are put into exercise yard is to put them in dog kennels, 10 by 15, or 10 by 20. They stash them right together. So, the only thing that the prisoner can do is walk up and down in a space no bigger than your table, and about the size of the view of the back of the wall. That is not a big facility.

What the other thing they're doing,

1	they're not giving them the kind of
2	particularly the people in S.M.U.'s and
3	restrictive housing units, they're not giving
4	them the sneakers to work out in. So, we're
5	taking a lot of things away from people already
6	in the prison system, preventing them from
7	exercise and that's going to have in the long
8	run a very debilitating effect on them and it's
9	going to have a bad effect, I think you are
10	going to see a lot more of the people concerned
11	about what's going to happen inside those
12	prisons. We need to have a little bit broader
13	spectrum than just push-ups and pull-ups.
14	That's bottom line, Mr. Feese.
15	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN:
16	Representative Schuler.
17	REPRESENTATIVE SCHULER: No. No
18	questions.
19	MR. PREATE: Thank you for your
20	indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and members of the
21	committee.
22	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you for
23	coming. Our next testifiers are from the
2 4	Department of Corrections, and there are three

gentlemen who will come in mass. They are

1 Lester Lewis, the Medical Director of the 2 Pennsylvania Department of Corrections; Mr. 3 Yancey, Harvey Yancey, who is the Major of the 4 Guard at State Correctional Institution at Rockview; Stanley Grabriel, who is the Major of 5 the Guard of the State Correctional Institution 6 at Dallas. And for members of the panel, Mr. 7 Gabriel is to your far left, and Mr. Yancey is 8 in the center and Dr. Lewis is to your far 9 10 right. I hope that is correct. So, I'm not sure which of you 11 12 gentlemen is prepared to speak first, second and third, but whichever one wants to be first, you 13 may begin. 14 DOCTOR LEWIS: I will be happy to 15 take the lead on this. 16 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: 17 Dr. Lewis, 18 would you please. DOCTOR LEWIS: Well, good morning, 19 20 Mr. Chairman, committee members: I thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. 21 am Doctor Lester Lewis. I'm the Chief Clinical 22 Services for the Department of Corrections. 23

With me today, as previously announced, are

Major Harvey Yancey and Major Stanley Grabriel.

24

Secretary Horn could not be with us today, but he's asked me to read a prepared statement. So if you would indulge me, I'll do that. We were not able to provide additional copies at this time, but they will be supplied at a later time to each of the committee members. So, I'd like to proceed.

The Department of Corrections

welcomes the opportunity to discuss the issue of

prisoner accommodations. We have reviewed the

legislation at hand and offer the following

comments:

requires a delicate balancing of public safety and security priorities against overall costs and offender rehabilitation issues.

Given the potential volatility of prison environment, prison policy and program changes are introduced maintained and discarded only after a very careful and thorough review process.

One of the factors typically considered in this process is the existence of national correctional standards. The majority of Pennsylvania state prisons are accredited by

the American Correctional Association, otherwise known as A.C.A., with the remaining prison schedule accreditation in the near future.

A.C.A.'s correctional administrators with the benchmark as to nationally recognized standards of correctional practice.

A.C.A. supports physical fitness programs appropriate for the correctional setting and that maintains and may help.

Further, A.C.A. recommends that facilities provide suitable equipment for these activities.

Specifically with respect to the proposal to eliminate various inmate programs, we offer the following comments:

Idleness remains one of the most significant issues that today's correctional administrators must address. The Department believes properly administered weight-lifting programs can provide correctional administrators with relatively low cost means by which to reduce inmate idleness and to maintain order in our prisons through structured inmate activities.

Inmates who participate in

institutional program such as weight lifting must first demonstrate acceptable institutional behavior. Use of exercise equipment is a privilege, and inmates must follow the rules in order to retain this privilege. Acceptable behavior includes compliance with their respective program plan.

rurther, in terms of rehabilitative value, exercise programs have been shown to assist inmates in developing self-esteem and other pro-social behaviors, such as learning to read and participate in conflict-resolution and other therapeutic programs. These programs also help inmates to learn positive activities that can be used to structure their leisure time upon release from incarceration.

Relative to taxpayer costs, prison weight-lifting equipment is not purchased by taxpayer money; rather, purchases were made through the Inmate General Welfare Fund. Within recent years the Department has reduced the I.G.W.F. spending on weight equipment and has instead invested those monies to institutions, chapels, visiting rooms, and libraries. In fact, spending on inmate activity, on such as

weights, has been reduced by almost 20 percent since the administration took office. At the same time, spending on libraries, chapels and visiting rooms has been increased.

Additionally, exercise programs, including weight lifting, can actually help to decrease medical costs by promoting good health and healthy living habits.

As to the other activities addressed in House Bill 2698, the Department has begun to phase out boxing activities, which have been a tradition in our older institutions. At the present time only a few institutions offer boxing as an activity. The type of boxing practiced in our institutions is similar to collegiate style boxing. In the past we have participated in boxing competitions with the Naval Academy, Lock Haven and Pennsylvania universities. Wrestling and martial arts are already prohibited in our institutions.

With respect to House Bill 1169 and 1170, please be aware that the prohibition of caffeine in our prison would be an extremely difficult task to accomplish with only a minimal benefit in return. Although some items in our

menus, such as coffee, teas, soda, chocolate products are easily distinguishable as containing caffeine, there are many other food products that contain caffeine. Caffeine can be found in everything from medications to ice cream and Hershey's candy. To remove caffeine from our prisons, the Department would have to hire an outside firm to test every product for its true contents.

The Department would not be able to handle such a complex analysis on its own. The ingredients in food products change constantly. The number of food products that would have to be tested is astronomical and the process would be continuous.

Institutional menus contain approximately 140 milligrams of caffeine per day. The American Diabetic Association suggests a daily intake of no more than 300 milligrams of caffeine. Therefore, the Department is providing less than half of this limit.

However, an inmate can purchase other items that contain caffeine such as instant coffee and chocolates, in commissaries.

The Department can only serve the

same menu to its employees that is provided to its inmates. By removing coffee and caffeine from the inmate menu, the Department would not be able to serve coffee, chocolate or other caffeine containing items to its employees.

This would be a problem that we would need to discuss with the organization's representative, our employees.

Since 1995, the Department has initiated community work programs, citizenship and parenting courses and has shifted funds into education-related equipment, furniture and libraries. We attempt to keep our institutions civil and productive, and we are not reluctant to take action when it is necessary in order to protect the safety of the public and our staff or run prisons in an orderly and appropriate fashion.

Since the Ridge Administration took office, the Department has removed civilian clothing from the institutions; implemented medical co-pay; tightened security by limiting freedom of movement, monitoring telephone calls, conducting frequent searches, and urine testing.

This concludes our remarks at this

time. If you have any questions, we are all here to answer them. And if we are not able to answer them at this time, we'll certainly assure that we will provide answers at a later time.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you,
Doctor Lewis. Major Yancey, did you have
anything you'd like to add to Dr. Lewis's
comments?

MAJOR YANCEY: Gentlemen, Ma'am: I want to thank Mr. Lewis, Mr. Preate, they pretty much covered it. And I'm sure that the topics that they spoke on is viewed by many people who are employed in the Department of Corrections.

Myself, as a manager, I believe I read in one of the memos where one of the reasons for the removal of weights was for the protection of the employees. I'm five foot eight, I weigh 135 pounds. The fact that inmates lift weights have never even been a concern of mine. In fact, the inmates that are on the weight program are our best behaved inmates, in most circumstances.

I talked to people from our Activities Department during the week who were

aware of this upcoming committee, who are also concerned with the removal of weights. At SCI-Rockview our inmate population is 2,100. I would be inclined to say that almost a thousand of them are involved in weights, in one way or another. To say that we're going to put them into some type of regimented military training program doesn't sound very feasible to me.

I have 15 years experience in the correctional system. I go in there daily. I put my life on the line like many other employees who go into the institutions. The repercussions of weight removal, I can't give you an answer of what would probably happen.

And as a manager, it's a management tool. We can only manage individually one on one to a very limited extreme. But to manage 2,100 inmates you need programs that the inmates want to be involved in.

Every inmate doesn't want to do calisthenics; every inmate doesn't want to run. A lot of them are so involved in the weight program that they don't have time to get in trouble doing other things.

If you take an inmate, you bring

them into the prison, you give them a number, he's a loser. He loses self-esteem. He loses family members. He loses friends. He loses just about everything. Weight programs have a way of building self-esteem in men, help them condition their bodies, which is the same thing that they can do on the street. I have never read any statistics where inmates set out to lift weights just so they can go out and commit crime and get away from it or beat up cops.

They can do the same thing with the calisthenics program; they can get in same physical condition.

Inmates are going to lift something. We may remove the free weights, but you can believe, inmates are so ingenious that they'll find a way to lift weights. They'll make their own; if they have to lift bunks, if they have to lift pots and pans, they'll find a way to lift weights.

But, I think, it was pretty much covered by the two gentlemen before me. And like I say, the repercussions of the removal, I have no idea what's happening across the country in weight programs that were removed.

1 You also have to consider the 2 population of inmates that we're talking about removing weights from. Some are smaller. 3 of our institutions have 800 or 900 inmates. 4 Some of our institutions go up to 3,500 inmates. 5 We have to consider a lot of things when we talk 6 7 about removing weights. We also have to keep in mind the safety of the employees that go in 8 there daily when we talk about what we're going 9 10 to do and what we're not going to do when it 11 concerns inmates. I think that pretty much the weight 12 13 program has been covered. 14 I would also like to speak on the 15 area -- Can I have five minutes, sir? 16 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: You have all 17 the time you need, within reason. MAJOR YANCEY: Okay. You know, when 18 we speak in terms of coffee, caffeine, you know, 19 institutions have functioned since time began on 20 the manpower of inmates. We restricted the 21 movement of inmates. We restricted the work 22 23 that they were able to do before. 24 When it comes down to preparing the

food for the inmates and the employees, the

inmates do it. So, when we go in the morning, the coffee that we drink is the same coffee that the inmates drink. So, when you talk about removing coffee from an institution, you have to consider the effects it's going to have beyond the inmates, which is the employees who work there. We eat the same food, we drink the same coffee.

I can't relate coffee to anything detrimental that I can think of, is that, it might make people nervous or make you jittery if you drink too much. But, to restrict that from inmates -- Like I say, you have to consider, when anything is done in an institution you have to consider the repercussions on the employees that work there. But, when I go to work tomorrow morning or the next morning or when I go to Retreat tomorrow, I'm going to look for a cup of coffee.

Boxing is another program that is controlled. It's controlled the same as it is in the military. We have people involved in the boxing program that are from outside of the institution. In Rockview we have Lock Haven and State College who brings their boxing into

Rockview to train with our boxers. It's a controlled situation. They have three-round fights. It's just like watching amateur boxing on TV.

It's a sport that only involves, I think in Rockview approximately 40 inmates, but it's 40 inmates who love the sport of boxing. A lot of inmates aren't dedicated to the training regiment. It's another thing that I personally, I like to go to the shows. I like to go to the weight-lifting shows. We have an inmate that I watch can bench press 950 pounds. In fact, I was walking through the yard with the same inmate the other night before I come down here.

But, you know, I can appreciate the concerns of the public. I can appreciate the concerns of the committee on reasons why you feel these things ought to be removed from the institutions. But, as the manager who goes in there every day, I live with those issues comfortably. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, Major Yancey. Major Gabriel, do you have any comments?

MAJOR GABRIEL: Okay. I certainly

echo all the comments and opinions of the people that testified before me. Let me go back a little bit here on the weights.

I started in this prison system a long time ago, 1959. I stepped in Rockview Prison, and there was weights there in 1959. Only God knows when they were introduced into the prison, probably forever. And it would be hard press for me to go in there and find all the weights removed. I would not be diametrically opposed, but you have to have something that they could replace with -- you know, think about taking the weights out. They are very, very valuable. They are a great activity.

The majority of our weight lifters are recreational weight lifters. They go to the yard whenever they get an opportunity.

Summertime they could get as much as three times a day, go to the yard. They are actively involved. When we break the doors open to the central yard, don't stand on our compound. It's like a thundering herd, buffalo steaming across that yard just to get to that weight pile.

It's a great frustration remover.

People go out there and maybe they are angry, they take frustration out on the weight bars and weights. And after a guy, inmate, lifts weights for about an hour, hour and a half, he's too tired to bother anybody. It's a great benefit.

As the doctor testified, it's great for building up health. I have seen many inmates over the years come to prison a physical wreck, strung out on alcohol, drugs, and only God knows what. And by weights and exercise they build themselves up. They became healthy individuals and build up their self-esteem.

As far as the caffeine, I don't know. Same thing as Major Yancey, I go in in the morning the first thing I look for is a cup of coffee. I scold the person who hasn't got my coffee ready yet for me. So, I actually see nothing detrimental to serving coffee or caffeine products into an institution.

So, with that I guess I'll close my comments too.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I think we are going to have to cut off the guards because they are getting hooked on this caffeine.

MAJOR GABRIEL: Yes, indeed. Get

around our coffee machine in the morning, prior to shift, you have to wait in line because everybody is there filling their cup of coffee up and taking their blood pressure pill or something.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I didn't realize the prison coffee was that good that you'd have to wait in line for it.

MAJOR YANCEY: Sir, it's not.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I have been there and had it, I would agree with you.

questions in just a minute. I first want to introduce another member of our panel who has joined us to my far left is Representative Scot Chadwick. You have some of Susquehanna County, but you're still a Bradford County boy, if I recall. They haven't thrown you out yet, anyway. But, Representative Chadwick is also a member of the Judiciary Committee. We welcome him here as well.

So, I'm gonna give you the opportunity to answer some questions, gentlemen, if you don't mind. I will begin with Representative Serafini.

1	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Well, I
2	have a few questions. Relative to the weight
3	enhancing equipment first, doctor, isn't it true
4	that a number of the injuries that you encounter
5	in the prison facility environment are the
6	result of weight lifting? A gentleman I know
7	who
8	First, maybe I should start off with
9	this. Where are you located? Out of
10	Philadelphia?
11	DOCTOR LEWIS: No, I work out of
12	Camp Hill, Central Office.
13	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Isn't the
14	prison medical care subcontracted to a medical
15	facility out of Philadelphia?
16	DOCTOR LEWIS: Well, we have three
17	contract medical providers and they're based on
18	geographic region, east, central and western.
19	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Have you
20	ever determined how many physical injuries
21	medically associated are caused by
22	weight-lifting equipment; rotator cuff problems,
23	bone problems, and joint problems?
24	DOCTOR LEWIS: No, we haven't really
25	looked at that.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: You

2 haven't.

DOCTOR LEWIS: We do look at what we consider extraordinary occurrences. Those are documented, let's say, injuries as a result of intentional acts. This is anecdotal. I can't say I can give you figures per se, but I don't recall seeing anyone actually injured with a free weight per se. But, I would say that the potential for injury is there, especially with the free weights, and that is why we are —

It's not an official policy, but we are aggressively converting to machines from free weights. That will eliminate the potential for potential assaults using equipment; also, place something between the weight and gravity other than the person who might be under that weight. So, we feel that's really a progressive use on our part to eliminating a lot of those injuries.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: It would appear to me that just as in a health club environment and any environment where free weights are associated from what I have been told, a number of the problems encountered in

1	prisons, and this was the case up in Fairview
2	years ago, they are associated with weight
3	lifting and people trying to lift more weight
4	than they are capable of, that tension reliever
5	environment.
6	What does it cost to maintain a
7	prison in a state correctional facility? Do any
8	of you know the annual costs?
9	DOCTOR LEWIS: I really don't know,
10	on an individual basis. No.
11	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Does
12	anyone know?
13	MAJOR GABRIEL: Probably over
14	\$16,000 per inmate
15	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Per inmate
16	about \$16,000.00.
17	MAJOR GABRIEL: per year. That
18	may be a low estimate.
19	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: What would
20	be offensive to the alternative of weight-
21	lifting equipment to the calisthenic kind of
22	equipment and aerobic kind of training?
23	MAJOR YANCEY: You say, what would
24	be offensive?
25	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Right.

1 What would be offensive to the prisoner 2 environment? 3 MAJOR YANCEY: Number 1 would be probably location and accommodations for the 4 How many inmates can be involved in it 5 inmates. at one time? It would restrict the number that 6 you can allow in an open yard area to lift 7 weights, if you had a controlled under-roof 8 setting. 9 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Are your 10 inmates put into a small caged in area to lift 11 12 weights where there's only three or four as 13 Ernie Preate described, space as long as this table to walk in? 14 MAJOR YANCEY: For weight lifting? 15 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: 16 Yes. 17 MAJOR YANCEY: No weights in those types of areas. That's for restrictive housing. 18 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: That's 19 restrictive housing. 20 Yes, sir. 21 MAJOR YANCEY: 22 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: 23 With regard to weight-lifting equipment, do you 24 find that it's an absolute necessity? Could you

live without that weight-lifting equipment?

1 it absolute that they need this? 2 MAJOR YANCEY: Number 1, sir --3 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: I mean, if 4 you took it away, would there be like potential 5 for rioting, et cetera? MAJOR YANCEY: Yes, I would be 6 inclined to say so. I couldn't say certainly, 7 but I would say there's a possibility. Like I 8 9 said before, I don't know the repercussions that 10 would come about with the removal of weights. 11 And going back to the injuries, I 12 think in comparison to how many inmates we have 13 involved in the weight program and how many injuries is so minusculed that I would have to 14 15 go dig out documentation to find out who was injured in the last year or six months. 16 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: What do 17 18 you find the recidivism rate is? Is it 33 percent or is it higher? I was told it was 19 higher than that in the State of Pennsylvania. 20

MAJOR GABRIEL: We, as correctional officers, we don't pay too much attention to

that. They come to us and we keep them until

24 they are time to go home.

21

22

23

25

So, recidivism is substantial from

what I understand. I see many, many inmates 1 2 over years have done life in prison on the 3 installation plan. They come to jail for four 4 years, go home for two, come back for six, go 5 home for another couple and come back for eight, and once in a while sooner or later they come 6 back and go in for life. It's there. 7 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: 8 9 there. The caffeine, is it -- Has anyone that has testified found that caffeine tends to be a 10 11 substitute for a drug addiction problem when a prisoner gets into prison, as I was told in 12 13 Arizona? MAJOR GABRIEL: I have never seen 14 anything like that. 15 MAJOR YANCEY: Never even heard of 16 17 that. 18 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Never heard of it. 19 MAJOR GABRIEL: The stuff they used 20 on the street and the stuff they try to smuggle 21 into prison is a heck of a lot stronger than 22 caffeine. 23 24 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: So, that's

not, in your opinion, ever used as an

1	alternative to just get that nervous feeling
2	that Major Yancey described?
3	MAJOR GABRIEL: Never heard of it,
4	sir.
5	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Never
6	heard of it.
7	MAJOR GABRIEL: If you remove coffee
8	from the prisons, you create another contraband
9	product, something that they are going to try to
10	smuggle in, same as they try to smuggle in
11	alcohol and drugs today.
12	MAJOR YANCEY: So, if it's removed,
13	sir, that means it's removed for us also.
14	MAJOR GABRIEL: I can live with
15	that.
16	MAJOR YANCEY: You notice I keep
17	stressing the employees.
18	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: I
19	understand. But, if it gets you nervous
20	MAJOR YANCEY: That's if you drink
21	too much of it.
22	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Okay.
23	MAJOR GABRIEL: Get the cigarettes
24	out of the prison.
25	PEDRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Well I

appreciate your testimony here very much. My problem is with the fact that just as you said, prisoners -- I mean, it's not your statement that convinces me of this. It's the fact that prisoners tend to return to prison, there's got to be a reason for that in an amount that even if Attorney General Preate's testimony is correct that it's 33 percent, it's too high.

In Arizona, this no frills prison tends to give an environment where no one would want to return to. It's my hope that creating an environment that eliminates some of the enjoyable characteristics of free life would say, you know what, prison wasn't that good.

Maybe I should go on the straight and narrow, and there are a few things in prison that, you know, that freedom allows me that I can't get in prison to maybe tend to eliminate some of this recidivism.

I don't know if free weights and caffeine are the answer, but they are a small part of what I think should be entire complex design for eliminating some of the frills that are in prison. I consider that a frill.

Caffeine is something that I don't think a

prisoner needs. Whether it's just coffee eliminated, I don't think a prisoner needs that product.

Free weights, there's no doubt in my mind that free weights -- As Ernie Preate said, the Marines make people take calisthenics and lift weights. They are mean, lean fighting machines and that's what comes down the street after a prisoners released. That's what we fear and that's why I don't want to see prisoners coming out of prison stronger, more capable of fighting and defending themselves than when they went in. To me that's wrong and it should not exist.

We have people on the streets who go to college, who take education to relieve their stress and tension, and learn a trade so when they come out of prison besides some self-esteem from weights that you say they get, they would have self-esteem from having a mind that's capable of giving them an opportunity to exist in society. That's far more important in my mind than free weights, caffeine or any of these products that either give a jolt or give muscle to a person those committed a crime and is sent

to prison to sacrifice where that crime was committed.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I took a short break, but I wanted -- I came back with a coffee, and I wanted Representative Serafini to know that I got a decaf.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Well, I had caffeine this morning. I needed that to.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I'm not out of control yet.

MAJOR YANCEY: Excuse me, sir. I just wanted to say one short note on the recidivism rate. The average inmate that comes back to prison comes back maybe on a technical violation. An inmate may move without reporting to his probation officer. He may go into a bar and get caught in a bar. He may have a can of beer walking down the street.

It's not that every inmate that comes back to prison has gone out and committed a rape, robbery, murder. And a lot of the technical violators that come back to prison they may come back for a year, two years.

And you have to remember also, sir, that a lot of inmates leave prison leave with

the same alcohol problem and the same drug problem that brought them to prison in the first place. We cannot accommodate every inmate with drug and alcohol problem. Although we have treatment programs and we try to do the best that we can, we're just not going to change them all. When they go out and go back to the same environment, go back to the boys on the corner, they're going to get involved into the drugs. They're going to get involved in the alcohol. They're going to get involved in the party life and they're coming back to prison. And most of them that have parole -- Parole is actually a prison on the street. So, I mean, if they're not careful, they're coming right back for the least little thing.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN:

Representative Dermody.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DERMODY: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. Doctor Lewis, you testified that some of you -- you're converting some of the institutions with free weights now to use of machines. I guess I was wondering for any of you what the reaction has been to switching from free weights to machines? I would assume they

are safer. You can probably get as many inmates using them and they're not used as weapons or using them as weapons has to be reduced. What's that reaction been and is that a reasonable alternative?

DOCTOR LEWIS: Well, first of all, it is a good alternative. You could pretty much engage in the same sort of development of muscle mass with the right training and right orientation with the machines. They are safer, in that, if you reach a point you have exceeded your ability to, let's say, get that weight back on the rack, well, if you let it go there's no harm done. So, it's also more easily graded in terms of gradually increasing the weight. We think it's just a much better alternative to that.

As far as the reaction I'll defer to my colleagues.

MAJOR GABRIEL: Up at Dallas we have both. We have free weights and we have exercise machinery such as a universal and other types of, you know, machines. The inmates actively use both. I don't think it would be a big problem, not a great reaction if you remove all

the free weights and replace it with all viable exercise equipment.

The only possible big draw back to all of the equipment is, usually only one person at a time could work on a machine; whereas, weights you have big weight lifting area, there's a lot of people get involved in it.

But, I don't think there would be any great reaction, but I would hesitate to say, take all the weights out until you have something to replace them with.

MR. DERMODY: You testified that going to the gym or lifting weights is a privilege in the institution. How do you earn the privilege? How do you lose the privilege?

MAJOR GABRIEL: To lose a privilege you gotta come into jail, the weights are available. You are out in general population you can go at certain times of the day to areas where the weights are available or the exercise machines.

If you get a misconduct, an infraction, and you go under, so to speak,

R.H.U. lockup, restricted housing units, there's no weights in there. Our weight lifters know

1 that.

As a group they are the most well-behaved inmates in the prison. They know if they get in trouble they go down to R.H.U. 30 days, 100 days, two years we've had — they just — not gonna get no weights down there. And that's the way it is. That's how to lose a privilege.

all of the benefits of all of the training they have done up until that time. And so weight training really provides its own disincentive. The purpose of doing that is to be fit and maybe develop some mass. You certainly would loose a lot of that in R.H.U. environment. It think it does have a significant impact on behavior.

MR. DERMODY: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN:

Representative Feese.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Just one question answered by any
one of you gentlemen, or Doctor Lewis. In the
prepared remarks from Commissioner Horn, I
believe you mentioned that wrestling and martial
arts are now prohibited, and except for a few

1	institutions, boxing is prohibited, and I
2	believe at Rockview you still have some boxing.
3	. Setting the boxing aside for a
4	moment, would it be a safe assumption then for
5	me to make that the Department would not object
6	to that portion of Representative Serafini's
7	bill in House Bill 2698, that portion of the
8	bill that says there will be no wrestling and
9	there will be no martial arts to make sure that
10	it is in law and just not at the discretion of
11	the Department?
12	MAJOR YANCEY: Martial arts are
13	prohibited. We don't have wrestling.
14	REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Prohibited by
15	regulation?
16	MAJOR YANCEY: Right.
17	REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Okay. But,
18	that regulation or that policy by the Department
19	could be changed.
20	MAJOR GABRIEL: That's exactly what
21	it is. It is a policy.
22	REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: It is a
23	policy.
24	DOCTOR LEWIS: That's correct.
25	MAJOR GABRIEL: It's not a law.

intent -- I've never heard of anybody's intent to introduce anything along those lines at all.

As far as the formal opinion of the Department,

I would probably defer that to the Secretary,

but I can state with a reasonable degree of certainty we have no intention at anytime in the near or distant future to introduce programs of that type.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: And a position on House Bill 2698 as far as prohibiting boxing, which is also in one of Representative Serafini's bills.

MAJOR GABRIEL: Prohibiting boxing?

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Yes.

MAJOR GABRIEL: I can live with that. I got punched in my mouth once in 39 years in the prison, and he was a professional boxer. If you want get rid of boxing, go ahead.

understand the argument with weights because there's another motivation. I'm not so sure we should be training inmates to be able to box, or -- I understand it's not a policy, but it could change, to wrestle and trained in martial

1 We're training inmates to be combatants. arts. Weight lifting there is another argument. 2 3 MAJOR YANCEY: Sir, the truth of the 4 matter is, the majority of the inmates that are involved in the boxing program already knew how 5 to box when they came to prison. Believe me, we 6 have a tremendous number of inmates that can 7 probably jump in the ring tomorrow and do very 8 well that aren't involved in the boxing program. 9 10 MAJOR GABRIEL: Boxing programs are very, very restrictive too. You have to have an 11 impeccable record before you are allowed in the 12 13 program. 14 REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: 15 MAJOR GABRIEL: Because you have to control yourself. 16 DOCTOR LEWIS: We have been looking 17 18 at that issue for some time. We are giving some consideration to maybe phasing that out as well. 19 I can't say for sure that we have determined we 20 21 would, but we recognize there are some negative aspects to that type of training and we are 22 looking at that. 23

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN:

2 Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank

you. Thank you for testifying. Are there any
physical fitness requirements to become a

correction officer, and are there any physical
fitness requirements to stay a corrections

officer?

MAJOR GABRIEL: I'll take the last part first. There's no physical requirements to stay. Once you are in, you're in. You have to pass a physical examination plus a physical running, jumping, stuff like that. Drug screening, you are tested for drugs; a blood test. And it's going. It keeps getting bigger and bigger. When I got hired they touched me on the arm and said you are warm, you're in. That's all changed now. There are certain requirements.

DOCTOR LEWIS: As a physician who has practiced in a variety of institutions, I would say, historically in the industry, there's been no -- the standards were there, but they were not really based on anything in particular.

I have been involved probably for

the last, at least, 18 months in the development of a set of standards for new correctional officers. In fact, those will be completed -- I have what I consider a nearly completed draft. This was developed in conjunction with Civil Service and we identified a set of essential tasks that every correctional officer has to perform. Then we looked at those tasks and we based it on the physical standards on the ability to perform those tasks.

I would say that, I don't believe there's any other state correctional system that has a set of standards that's based upon function.

Prior to this people mimicked military standards and just assume that they are based upon, that we are sort of paramilitary organization, but we've actually refined our evaluation process now to the point where I think it's very valid and appropriate to the specific task of a correctional officer.

Now, this only applies to applicants, new applicants. We have not given any consideration to trying to apply those standards to current employees. That is not our

intent. But, we did feel that there should be a reason for the development of those standards.

I think they're very good.

So, that project should come to completion, I would say, in the next maybe 60 days. I think it's a really -- for better of the Department of Correctional of Pennsylvania we develop this type of standards.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I asked that question not because — to suggest that I think there should be, but it seems to me that you are going to have healthy and strong people of all different ranges of health and strength both in your inmate population and in your employee population. And you are always going to have somebody in the guard population who can run faster than anyone else, and you're always going to have somebody in the inmate population who can run faster than anyone else.

So, I'm not quite sure that, and I think it was Major Yancey who said that if the weights aren't there and somebody is intent on lifting, they can lift each other; they can lift beds; they can lift chairs, or whatever. So, I'm not quite sure that the equipment matters so

much as what happens as a result.

So then, my other question to both Major Yancey and Major Gabriel, at the institutions that you have been at either Rockview and Dallas, or others that you have served at before, how many incidences within the prison have you had where the equipment, for example, free weights have been used as weapons against the staff?

MAJOR GABRIEL: Extremely little. I know nothing that ever happened at Dallas. I can only speak for Dallas. Basically, my career has all been there. My recollection, I can't recall a weight bar, a weight disk being used on staff. I have never heard of a baseball bat being used on staff; although, they use baseball bats on each other regularly; not the weights.

I don't know what the reason for it is. The weights are something like, we better not fool with these things, because if we do we're gonna lose them. I have no reason to state why they don't use the weights on each other. They're there. We have a lot of weights -- a lot of weights around. They just don't use them on each other, that is. They use

1	them to work out with.
2	MAJOR YANCEY: I can't recall any
3	instances.
4	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank
5	you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN:
7	Representative Schuler.
8	REPRESENTATIVE SCHULER: Thank you,
9	Mr. Chairman. I think, Doctor, you made
LO	reference to the fact that the inmates pay for
L 1	these weights. Was I correct in my
L 2	interpretation?
L 3	DOCTOR LEWIS: Well, it's the Inmate
L 4	General Welfare Fund that is the source of
l 5	funding.
L 6	REPRESENTATIVE SCHULER: And how is
L 7	that generated? Let's explore that a little
L 8	bit.
L 9	MAJOR GABRIEL: Sure. The Inmate
20	General Welfare Fund is built up by various
21	means, but the biggest contributor is the phone
22	system.
23	REPRESENTATIVE SCHULER: The who?
24	MAJOR GABRIEL: The phone system;
25	the telephone system. The inmates have the

1 right to call out certain times of the day to 2 family, friends, whatever. They can only do it 3 collect and in a controlled call. Phone calls 4 are being monitored as we talk here. But, every 5 time that phone call is made, the phone company 6 pays a royalty to the Inmate General Welfare 7 Fund, out of the fee of the call. Whatever the 8 call -- The more the call cost the bigger royalty will be to the funds. It generates a 9 10 lot of money. 11 REPRESENTATIVE SCHULER: How much is 12 a lot? MAJOR GABRIEL: I have no idea, sir, 13 the fiscal part of it. I know we get quite a 14 bit of mileage from that Inmate Welfare Fund. 15 Every couple of years we refinish the gymnasium 16 floor, buy furniture for the visiting areas, 17 guests house, staff dining room, inmate dining 18 19 hall. REPRESENTATIVE SCHULER: The money 20 for these exercise machines and free weights all 21 22 comes out of that fund? 23 MAJOR GABRIEL: Yes, it does.

DOCTOR LEWIS:

That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHULER: My other

24

1 question is, has there ever been any liability 2 filed against the state over these things; these 3 free weights? 4 DOCTOR LEWIS: You mean because somebody got hurt? 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE SCHULER: Some of 7 these prisoners or inmates have come up with some of these fantastic lawsuits. Have we had 8 any of that in regards to weights? 9 10 DOCTOR LEWIS: I have not seen one. Again, that's based on my personal experience. 11 I have never seen one in any institution that I 12 have worked in where it was generated from the 13 14 weights per se. They generally complain about access to healthcare, that sort of focus. But, 15 I've never seen it generated specifically from 16 use of weights. 17 REPRESENTATIVE SCHULER: That's all 18 19 I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: 20 21 Representative Chadwick. 22 REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: Thank you, I just have a short statement to 23 Mr. Chairman. I was struck by something that Major 24

Gabriel said, and I thought it was worthy of

comment.

Like most of us, I have a family at home. I think a lot of people in Pennsylvania share my concern that we're not particularly comforted by the thought that someone who was sent to prison for five years for aggravated assault and who goes in looking like Pee Wee Herman is going to be turned loose five years later looking like Arnold Schwarzenegger. Also, I don't think they're comforted by the thought that by taking advantage of the boxing program the neighborhood bully can be turned into Mike Tyson.

Now, Major Gabriel said he wasn't unequivocally opposed to removing the weights and boxing from the prisons as long as we had something to replace it with. And I think that's the key. I just think our challenge is going to be to find something satisfactory to replace it with. I'm not naive. I don't think spelling bees and quilting contests are going to replace weight lifting. We are going to have to find something that works. I think that's our challenge. But, I do think we ought to seriously look at ways to replace this

equipment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I just have one quick question. Either of the Majors can answer this. When we invited Mr. Preate to give his testimony, he talked about the tendency in most prisons now to go to these dog kennels. I have seen some of these dog kennels. It was my understanding, and maybe wrongly so, that these were not your average prisons. These were probably Level 4 people who you couldn't trust to be —— or Level 5, couldn't trust to be with the general prison population. Is that a correct assumption?

MAJOR YANCEY: The inmates that use the so-called dog kennels for recreation, these yard areas are connected to the restrictive housing units that they're housed in. They are in there for disciplinary reasons, administrative reasons, or reasons that they can't be in general population. And that's the only inmates that use the restricted dog kennel type.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: And that would tend to be a rather small percentage of most prison populations?

1	MAJOR YANCEY: Yes, sir.
2	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: It would
3	vary, of course, from prison to prison since
4	some of you have more Level 4's and 5's than
5	anyone else.
6	MAJOR YANCEY: Right.
7	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Well, we want
8	to thank you gentlemen. I appreciate the time
9	that you have given us. Just a moment, please.
10	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Mr.
11	Chairman, I apologize. One quick question based
12	on what you just said. If you are on death row,
13	you're automatically in that restricted area?
14	MAJOR YANCEY: Automatically,
15	separated from general population.
16	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So,
17	somebody who is on death row would be in that
18	kind of situation?
19	MAJOR YANCEY: Yes, ma'am.
20	MAJOR GABRIEL: They are even
21	separated farther beyond what Major Yancey
22	described. They are separated farther away.
23	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: But, if
24	you're a general lifer, but not necessarily on
25	death row, you could be in the general

1 population. 2 MAJOR GABRIEL: Oh, yes. 3 MAJOR YANCEY: The majority of the 4 lifers are in general population. 5 MAJOR GABRIEL: The vast majority of 6 the general population. 7 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, 8 gentlemen. We appreciate your testimony and thank you for sharing that with us. 9 DOCTOR LEWIS: Well, on behalf of 10 11 the Secretary and the staff of the Department of Corrections, thank you very much for your time. 12 Hopefully, we contributed to your understanding 13 of how we operate. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, gentlemen. We appreciate that. 16 17 MAJOR GABRIEL: Thank you, 18 Representatives. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Our next 19 testifier is Edward Sweeney. He is the Warden 20 21 of the Lehigh County Prison. Mr. Sweeney, if you would come forward. Adjust that microphone 22 23 so that it's right in front of you. And when you're prepared to begin your testimony you may 24

25

do so.

MR. SWEENEY: Good morning. My name is Edward Sweeney. I'm Warden of Lehigh County Prison. I'm here this morning not as a representative of Lehigh County, but rather as spokesman for the Pennsylvania Prison Warden's Association. The Pennsylvania Prison Warden's Association is an organization that's composed of chief administrators and wardens for county, state and federal prison facilities across Pennsylvania. On behalf of the Warden's Association, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to give this testimony this morning.

My comments are going to be brief.

First of all, I would like to recognize that
there are many distinct different points of view
and opinions regarding the issues that are on
the table today on all four of the bills. Not
only is there a great deal of debate among
citizens, legislators, county and local
officials regarding these topics, but also there
is disagreement and debate among corrections
professionals, passed to all new topics which
are being discussed. There does not appear to
be any one definitive right or wrong answer. As
I said, there is much discussion and debate.

Our organization, however, does have a clear position regarding legislative mandates which dictate blanket regulations, restricting the operation of prison facilities. The operational philosophy of running prison facility at either county or state level is best left to the discretion of the appointed or elected county or official who is charged with managing that entity.

Existing law clearly empowers

government officials as the exclusive authority

to promulgate rules and regulations for the

proper operation of the county prison

facilities. It doesn't serve anyone's best

interest to limit the individual discretion of

prison boards who are faced with very unique

geographic, budgetary and physical plant

facilities.

Additionally, the State Department of Corrections is vested with the authority to manage the control over state prisons facilities across the state. The Secretary of Corrections, as a member of the Governor's Cabinet, is responsible for establishment of operational philosophy and policy in accordance with the

tempo established by the elected governor. The imposition of reactionary laws, which unilaterally limit the discretion of current and future state officials, could be considered shortsighted and ill-advised.

In the 1970's, the correction system across the country was very much in favor of rehabilitation. It was expending a great deal of monies at all levels, county, state and federal in order to educate and rehabilitate prison offenders. Inmates were obtaining college degrees in prison facilities.

today, but it was the climate in the 1970's. I am happy that the legislators of the 1970's were not successful or did not try to impose legislation which would have carried that philosophy into the future because, as the pendulum swings and citizenry changes, so does operational philosophies of prisons.

Lastly, I would like to bring to everyone's attention Governor Ridge's Executive Order 1996-1. This executive order calls for the review of all existing regulations in an effort to reduce the regulatory burden they

impose. It is the position of the Pennsylvania Prison Warden's Association that this type of legislation, which restricts operational discretion of county facilities, is in conflict with the 1996 executive order; and furthermore, it erodes the premise of local rule.

That's it. My testimony is very brief.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you,
Mr. Sweeney. For the benefit of the members of
the committee, Mr. Sweeney was not able to
provide copies of his testimony for each of the
members, but we'll see that you get it in
writing at a later time.

I want to give you the opportunity, if you would, to answer some questions that members of our panel may have, and I'll begin with Representative Serafini.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Well, briefly, the same basic questions I asked before. If a prisoner creates an infraction into the prison system and he's put into a separate environment, from what I understand his weight training would be curtailed as a punishment. Yet, when a person committees a

crime against society, he goes to prison and he's got weight training.

I mean, why wouldn't the punishment be the greatest when he commits a crime against society as opposed to the punishment being more severe if he commits the crime in prison? I mean, it seems like a contradiction to me to take weight training away from a person that's bad in prison, and yet, give it to them when they're committing a crime against society. How do you justify that?

MR. SWEENEY: Well, I think that's a multiple part answer. Specifically for Lehigh County it's a very easy answer. We have chosen Lehigh County to be very restrictive. We do not have weight equipment. We don't have contact visits. We don't have a lot of things in place that a lot of other facilities do have.

However, I go back to my original premise as I talked -- as I spoke to, and that is left to the discretion of the local authorities who manage those settings. It's contingent upon having the proper plant facility in order to carry out those type of initiatives.

I would certainly agree with you

that at face value just with asking the simple question that there appears to be no real logic for the offender who clearly has demonstrated a violent crime to come into the institution where they can make themselves stronger.

At the same time, though, I would come back with an argument especially at the county level in most institutions over 60 percent of the offenders that are incarcerated have not been found guilty of any crime. They are merely being held because they are unable to make bail, or they have different stipulations or restrictions that are requiring them to be held in that facility.

In addition to that, the county resources of a lot of the smaller counties, particularly, are extremely limited. They do not have the funds in order to pay for a full-time education coordinators, treatment programs to come in and help fill those days, especially at some of those smaller counties. And they look for any programming opportunity that will fight the worst enemy that correction official has, which is, ideal time on the part of the inmate.

So, for many institutions a one-time

purchase of weight equipment could buy them

years and years of a program activity which

fiscally ends up making a lot of sense.

ever found a prisoner who has a drug addiction using caffeine or those kinds of products, or even cigarettes, to effectively substantiate -- as a substitute for that addiction, like they drink ten cups of coffee in an hour or so and give themselves that nervous high? I have been told that happens.

MR. SWEENEY: It could happen perhaps in a kitchen area. And, again, every facility is different. In our setting they may only have the opportunity for one cup of coffee a day because it's delivered to them in that fashion. An inmate who works in the kitchen, however, could certainly give themselves an artificial buzz, so to say, by sitting by the coffee pot and drinking 20 cups a day.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Thank you very much.

MR. SWEENEY: I would expand upon that, just to say, it certainly does perpetuate

1 a behavior, perhaps, in that, I'll use tobacco as an example. We are a no-smoking facility. 2 Inmates are not allowed to have tobacco 3 4 products. However, the same type of inmates that typically were involved in drug activity on 5 the streets are the same type of inmates who we 6 7 typically have misconducts against institutionally for trying to smuggle tobacco 8 9 into the institution. So, one does substitute for the other in some ways. 10 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: 11 Thank you 12 very much. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, 13 14 Mr. Sweeney. None of the other members have 15 questions for you and I appreciate your coming. Thank you for making the trip up here and 16 sharing your testimony. As I indicated earlier, 17 to the members, I will provide written 18 transcript of your testimony that they'll all 19 have as well as the members who are not able to 20 21 be here today. 22 MR. SWEENEY: Okay. Thank you. 23 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you

Our next testifier was scheduled to

very much for coming.

24

be Joseph Rowe from AFSCME, District Council
Number 87. I understand he has a replacement
here, Mr. Ed Harry. Mr. Harry, are you also
from AFSCME District Council Number 87?

MR. HARRY: Yes, I am.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Okay. We thank you for coming here. When you are ready you may begin with your testimony.

MR. HARRY: I'm not going to be repetitive on the other examiner's testimony. Although real guick as far as the caffeine and the coffee part, the membership I represent would be upset because they can't have a soda or a coffee at work. People who do work overtime and there is a lot of overtime that is done. you can't go between shifts or a break because you don't get a regular lunch, if you're there eight hours you work eight hours. You get a chance and you fly to get something to eat or If you are going to do it, then you have drink. to consider that aspect of it. You have got people who are putting in long hours, and I think they need that. So, other considerations should be given.

The free weights, probably with my

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

membership—I have two institutions locally that
I represent—it's split. I have C.O.'s that
probably don't want inmates to have anything,
one extreme, and another segment that don't have
any problems with the way things are. Are quite
happy with some of the stuff that just took
place that Doctor Lewis mentioned, about co-pays
for physician because everything was free.
There should be, was always felt by the
membership that inmates should have to pay for
services they do get. However little it is, if
you are going to rehab somebody, then let's make
it legitimate.

The aspect that I have got to deal with as far as the free weights go, and Major Gabriel spoke to a little bit, there's got to be alternatives. I'm not going to name the institution, but I oftentimes when I talk to people, my friends in the public, one institution right now has 1,900 inmates. They have got lifers, and it's a bad insti-- You've got some bad inmates there.

Right now you have on duty less than a hundred C.O.'s taking care of that institution. People never equate those numbers.

Weights and any other programs that the institutions have, allow those inmates time to do activities other than just hanging around on the corner.

Problems we have, and we hear at least, I live in Plymouth, Pennsylvania, small town. I have a nephew and niece nothing to do. They hang out. You hang out normally, you find a way to get in trouble.

I'm afraid that unless there's some thought given to eliminate another item from those inmates, that the people who deal upfront with upstate inmates are the people that I represent. They're the people that are there that have to break up the fights, with the bat spats that are being swung at each other. Guess what? They get hit trying to break those fights up. They get hit trying to break up a fistfight. It's nice that the people who have programs, the inmates, they know where they are at; they're busy; they're being occupied.

To come in now -- And again, I'm not saying one way or the other. I think there's got to be some alternatives for the free weight program. I like the machines, but -- I've been

dealing with representing my two institutions, anyway, nine years. I haven't heard of one of my members getting hurt by any inmate using any of the equipment against them. Obviously, the Major hasn't heard of any in his 39 years or 50 years, or whatever, that he's been there.

That's a private joke between him and I.

But, I think you folks have to understand something that all the legislation that you pass, it's meaningful as it may or may not be, and the way you feel about it impacts on the people on the front lines. The second you start removing stuff -- It's a bad enough environment anyway.

The nicest thing, for me I should have went to -- had a tour of the prison when I was 16 years old, because once those gates closed and you heard those, it's terrible. I would never do anything in my life to ever live in that environment. I think the more activities that inmates have, the less likely they are to get in trouble.

You have got bad people to begin with who are in there. To upset those people even more than what they are to be there to

begin with, I think some consideration should be given to either modify or make damn sure that we have some alternatives there to occupy those people. And the testimony by the three representatives from Corrections all say that those — almost no problems from those people. They're sort of — It's sacred ground. They do what — They intend to be the best inmates.

The privileges, I don't work there,
but my membership relates to me all the time,
privileges is the most important thing. Once
you start losing privileges as an inmate, your
life becomes harder, and it should be harder.
You earn by being good the ability to do those
things; have those extra special privileges that
you're given.

To rehab people, I think, it's nicer to have people going out happy than it is to be miserable their whole life and getting in trouble and they, you know, ultimately their sentence is going to be over whether it's for armed robbery or whatever, they're going to go out. And if they've lived in a hole or had trouble the whole time out, you gotta have to leave them out anyway.

1	I have no documentation, but people
2	who don't want to go back there again make sure
3	they do things the right way so their time there
4	isn't as long as it would be if they have no
5	other alternatives. I think that's the part
6	that wasn't touched on that I'm most concerned
7	about is the alternatives for the safety of the
8	people that I represent. Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you,
10	Mr. Harry. We'll start our questioning with
11	Representative Serafini.
12	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Well, I
13	appreciate your testimony. Relative to the
14	caffeine problem, so you would be agreeable with
15	this legislation if it didn't apply to the
16	personnel?
17	MR. HARRY: Again, understand you've
18	got
19	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Which was
20	the intention of the bill; not the
21	MR. HARRY: Well, but it doesn't say
22	that
23	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: To take
24	caffeine away from the employee. In other

words, this is to punish the prisoner; not to

1 punish the employee. 2 MR. HARRY: The only problem I have with that is, if you punish the prisoner who's 3 the person they're going to punish to get back 4 5 at you? He's going to punish the person I 6 represent who's waiting in the cell block with him. 7 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: But, it 8 9 sounds to me like you want to make prison as nice as it can possibly be. 10 MR. HARRY: Believer me --11 12 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: In other words, if we just gave them little condominiums 13 14 and --HARRY: No, believe me. 15 MR. don't mean that. That's a stretch of your 16 imagination. 17 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Just don't 18 pick on me. If you come back, 33 percent of you 19 20 come back here you're going to end up in a 21 smaller condominium. This is also getting --22

MR. HARRY: If my testimony sounded like that, believe me, I screwed up in my testimony. That's no intent of my perspective to even hint at that. My only concern is, a lot

23

24

of times people who aren't there lose sight of
what goes on in those places. They are not nice
places.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: No. I know

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: No, I know that.

MR. HARRY: They are not nice places.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: But, some of them are not nice, but they're nicer than they have to be. That's all I'm trying to say.

MR. HARRY: Well, again, that's not within my realm to make that decision. You gentlemen would make that decision, along with the Department. My only concern is the people who enforce the laws and the policies that people make are the people that I represent. They're the ones who are the first ones that get struck out towards, or struck out at. It's those people who are there day in and day out, three shifts, 24 hours a day. They get nailed.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Well, I'm not going to perpetuate this any longer. But, it would appear to me, the people that you represent would rather be struck by a person who is a little weaker than that weight lifter who

bench presses 900 pounds than for their own self-protection. I mean, if we're bulking up these people, that punch is going to hurt a little bit more.

And it would appear to me that a person who is a little bit high on caffeine would be more susceptible to losing their temper than a person who is calmer and more in control of their emotions. And, a person who is high on caffeine who wants to be up that night or has that caffeine high to keep awake is going to be a little harder to control than the person who is essentially caffeine free.

That's the purpose behind what

Arizona did and in part of what Ohio did and

Louisiana. That's the approach I'm trying to

take to this prison reform, as small as it might

be. Not to affect in any detrimental way the

personnel that you are discussing. It's sad

that that would have to be like that, but --

MR. HARRY: That's the real world in prison. I mean, they are the people that are struck at first.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Right.

Well, the person they struck at first was the

1	guy on the street. They're the second person.
2	MR. HARRY: Well, I understand that.
3	I understand that.
4	REPRESENATIVE SERAFINI: Thank you
5	very much.
6	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN:
7	Representative Feese.
8	REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Thank you,
9	Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your testimony, Mr.
10	Harry. Just one question. Do you believe that
11	your membership that you represent would oppose
12	legislation that, one, prohibited boxing; and
13	two, codified the existing Department policy of
14	prohibiting wrestling and martial arts?
15	MR. HARRY: I don't think there
16	would be any disagreement with my membership on
17	those things, no.
18	REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Thank you.
19	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN:
20	Representative Manderino.
21	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank
22	you. I'm assuming it is departmental policy,
23	we've heard from numerous folks, including
24	yourself, that what applies to the inmates
25	applies to the staff, at least, with regard to

food service and what's in the prison.

Do you have any opinion or comment about the effectiveness of that policy? And if we made a policy that was different, meaning, staff and employees can have caffeine and prisoners can't, what impact, if any, would that have in the work setting?

MR. HARRY: There was a -- This past Thursday on, I guess <u>Dateline</u>, there was a show on all of the products that now have caffeine, and coffee mixed in with whatever they end up being. My question -- The first thing that would cross my mind, is number 1, how you would enforce it? Not only that, but then that just complicates the contraband issue that the C.O.'s and the management of every institution deal with daily, is the smuggling of contraband into the institution.

When you are dealing with caffeine -- Peanut butter, there's caffeine in peanut butter. Does that mean you can't have peanut butter? And I'm not trying to be smart. Soda, unless it's a 7-Up, every soda that I drink unless it's specifically noncaffeinated, I mean, that becomes contraband at that point in

time. People get in trouble.

I don't know what the ramifications would be. It would be more work for the C.O.'s, obviously, and the administration. Again, for the life of me, I drank -- I used to drink a lot of soda and I never got strung out on it from a lot of caffeine. It's not healthy, I know that. I have cut down considerably, because I take my walks every now and then.

But, again, I don't know if it's caffeine in and of itself is that big of a problem in the institution to where inmates shouldn't have that stuff. Again, I can't sit here and say it is or it isn't, obviously. I hope I answered your question.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Let me try again. What I'm trying to -- It's clear to me from testimony that we have a current policy operating that says, whatever -- from food stuff point of view, I guess, whatever applies to the inmates apply to the staff, that's I guess a departmental policy.

MR. HARRY: I think the Major said that the food that the inmates eat for lunch or whatever is available to the staff that works

there also.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: When we visit prisons we have prison food.

MR. HARRY: We have got wonderful food. Yes, it's great.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And others have suggested, well, maybe a way we can accommodate — this concern is, we say staff can have coffee; prisoners can't. What I was trying to get to is, I'm not suggesting that we adopt that policy. That's not my position. But, if we were to adopt that policy, what impact, if any, would you perceive that would have inside the institutions that may or may not affect the ability of your members to do their job? Again, I'm not suggesting it will. I'm asking, will it —

MR. HARRY: I could just -- Just by any one of us, if you can do something that I can't, we're in the same place together, obviously, I'm going to take offense to it. And there's going to be, I would think, that segment of the inmate population who are going to be upset if they can't do it and you are able to do it.

And if I'm at a work site, or I'm walking, obviously, inmates are all over us. So, if they see me having coffee and they can't have it, some may -- And like I said before, they're not all nice people to begin with or they wouldn't be there. How they act when something like that is taken away and they're put in that situation, I don't know. I would hope the fear that they have for the ramification of an action they'd take would prohibit them from doing that. But, there's laws on the book that they violated to get in So, I don't know. there.

And again, my concern is, do we really have to put the front line troops in that situation where they have to look over their back because of something like that? That's my concern. I'm very concerned about the security of the people that I represent.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Let me ask you one other thing. The Warden from Lehigh County testified that his county prison is a smoke-free environment. I didn't think to ask him at the time, but I assume that that means not only can prisoners not smoke in the

institution, but neither can any staff. 1 2 MR. HARRY: I don't know. 3 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: He's shaking 4 his head no. 5 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I don't want to have him testify from afar. Let me ask 6 7 you, I don't believe we have a similar policy in the state corrections institution; meaning, in 8 the state correctional institute we allow 9 smoking; is that correct? 10 11 MR. HARRY: There's some 12 institutions now, at least the Commonwealth is 13 in the process, and these gentlemen could correct me. I don't know if it's carte blanche 14 that it's smoke free in every institution, but I 15 know one by one it's getting to that point. 16 That's under the direction of the Department. 17 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Do you 18 19 know, Representative Birmelin just told me our newest prison on-line is Chester is smoke free. 20 Does that mean it's smoke free for everyone, or 21 do we have a policy that state prisoners can't 22 smoke, but the staff can smoke? 23 MR. HARRY: I don't know. 24 MAJOR YANCEY: That means everyone,

1 ma'am. Smoke free means smoke free, right. 2 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okav. Thank you. I have enough information to make my 3 4 decision. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I just have a 5 6 little P.S. to one of the questions that you 7 responded to from Representative Manderino when 8 she talked about removing caffeine, whether or not if you allowed the employees to have it and 9 10 prisoners didn't that might create a problem. 11 see the bigger problem is that the staff is 12 allowed to leave at the end of the day and prisoners necessarily aren't. 13 MR. HARRY: Well, they accept that, 14 15 though. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: That being 16 the paramount consideration, I just wouldn't get 17 18 too upset if the prisoners saw the corrections 19 officer having a Coke-Cola and they had to have 20 a decaf cola. I mean, you loose a lot of other 21 things, but freedom is paramount --22 MR. HARRY: I understand that, and some of them get crazy and that punch gets 23 24 thrown.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN:

25

I would

1 assume that if we were to do something like that 2 it might be wise to phase it in, rather than 3 just, today you can have it and tomorrow can't. 4 MR. HARRY: They have done that with 5 clothing and all the other changes that have been made. 6 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: And they were 7 8 quite upset over that. MR. HARRY: There was a lot of 9 concerns from the administration as well as the 10 staff, the people that I represent, on just how 11 that would go as far as inmates go. It's 1,900 12 13 versus a hundred people or 200 people carrying everybody else aren't any good odds when you 14 15 don't have the weapons. 16 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Well, we appreciate your testimony, Mr. Harry, and thank 17 18 you for coming in place of Mr. Rowe. 19 MR. HARRY: Thank you. 20 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I'm going to ask our next testifier, Angus Love, if he would 21 come forward. He's the Executive Director of 22 Pennsylvania Institutional Law Clinic. While 23

he's getting comfortable, let me -- for the

benefit of the committee mention three things

24

for you're edification.

First of all, we will be adding one more testifier after Mr. Love is done, the gentleman who has asked at the last moment to be added. I'm trying to accommodate him and give him a few minutes to do so. Don't be in a hurry to leave when Mr. Love is done.

Secondly, we have a letter that was sent to Representative Serafini but they copied me and Chairman Mr. Gannon. I'm going to ask our stenographer if she would enter it into the record. It's a letter from Pennsylvania Soft Drink Association. It deals with essentially the statistics as they viewed them dealing with what is acceptable levels of caffeine in soft drinks. If any of the members of the committee would like to see that, I'll be more than happy to share it with them. But, if the stenographer would make sure that that's entered into the record I'd appreciate that.

(Whereupon Pennsylvania Soft Drink Association letter is contained herein as follows):

"Dear Representative Serafini: On behalf of the Pennsylvania Soft Drink Association, I am writing to you to express the Association's opposition to House Bill 1170, prohibiting the sale or serving of any beverage containing caffeine to prisoners.

"Caffeine is a safe food ingredient found naturally in tea, coffee, cocoa and other foods and has been part of the human diet for centuries.

"Caffeine is one of the most
thoroughly studied ingredients in the food
supply and is approved by the United States Food
& Drug Administration (FDA). Caffeine is
generally regarded as a mild stimulant, but the
degree of effect is variable and highly
dependent on individual sensitivity and the
amount consumed. Comprehensive evaluations of
all the available research on caffeine have led
the National Academy of Sciences, the United
States Surgeon General and FDA to conclude that
normal caffeine consumption is not associated
with any health risks.

"Currently, the United States Food & Drug Administration (FDA) regulates caffeine, allowing six milligrams per fluid ounce. Most soft drinks are well below that limit, at

approximately three milligrams per ounce, or 18 milligrams per six-ounce serving. Caffeine is added in small amounts to colas and some other soft drinks due to its unique flavor. Flavor experts recognize caffeine as a valuable ingredient because it adds a unique bitter taste that blends well with, and complements other flavors and sweetners.

1.5

Most major health authorities agree that caffeine is not addictive. Unlike addictive substances, caffeine is not associated with any chronic health problems. The consumption of caffeine does not result in steadily increased use, and it is not difficult to decrease or stop consumption of caffeine.

For the foregoing reasons, the PSDA respectfully opposes any and all bans on caffeine. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your consideration. Very truly yours, Anthony L. Crisci, Legislative Counsel."

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: And thirdly,

I want to remind you that tomorrow we have

scheduled a tour of Retreat Prison. The Retreat

Prison is down in the lower Wilkes-Barre region,

valley, and is scheduled to start at 10 o'clock tomorrow and that means we will meet at the prison, front gate, assuming they'll let us in, approximately 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. So, if you're able and willing to go to take a look at Retreat Prison tomorrow, please plan on being there at 10 a.m. If you don't know how to get there, I'll do my best to try to help you find it.

Mr. Love, you have been before this subcommittee and the full committee before. We appreciate your willingness to come again. You have testimony prepared for us that we have copies of. If you are prepared to do so, present that at this time.

MR. LOVE: Good morning, Chairman
Birmelin, and good morning members of the
Judiciary Committee. I thank you for the
opportunity to testify today on behalf of the
Pennsylvania Prison Society. I'm the Policy
Director of the Society. We're in opposition to
House Bills 1168 1169, 1170 and 2698.

Pennsylvania Prison Society was founded in 1787--I'm sorry about that typo in the prepared remarks--by Doctor Benjamin Rush

and Benjamin Franklin and several other dignitaries of the Philadelphia community at that time, many of whom are also signatories to the Declaration of Independence. The Prison Society is the nation's oldest prison reform organization and we are empowered with the official visitor status by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

We oppose the bills before the committee despite their good intentions because, in our opinion, they will create more problems than they will solve. We are very aware of the public's legitimate concerns regarding the eradication of the crime and we share this important goal.

We are also aware of the strategy to make prison life a no frills experience so that its deterrent effect will be maximized. There is considerable debate within the corrections community about the current state of affairs in prisons and jails and whether there is any need for additional need to make the prison experience less palatable.

The Pennsylvania Prison Society was originally named the Society to Alleviate the

Misery of Prisoners, and we believe that the current conditions are sufficiently harsh to achieve the desired deterrent effect. We are of the opinion that the current climate could be enhanced by a rededication to rehabilitation through educational and vocational opportunities together with treatment for problems such as drugs and alcohol that led to an individual's incarceration.

We further believe that legislative efforts such as these attempts to capitalize on the legitimate public fears of crime and their well meaning attempts to reduce the impact of crime on our society. If this were a football game and we were the referees, a flag would be thrown and a penalty would be assessed for unnecessary roughness or piling on.

These bills are part of the so-called creature comfort movement that is based on the false premise that our prisons are more akin to a country club than an institution suitable for those who have violated the public's trust. I do not believe that it is mere coincidence that these type of bills often come before the public as Election Day nears.

2.5

With respect to 1168 and 2698, the benefits, as well as the costs, should be considered. I assume the perceived benefit from removal of exercise equipment is to reduce an inmate's strength and ability to overpower citizens and law enforcement personnel. My common sense tells me that physical fitness is not dependent on access to such equipment. Sit-ups, push-ups, pull-ups and isometric exercise can all achieve the same purpose if an individual is dedicated enough.

On the other side, we deprive prison administrators of a program that keeps inmates occupied. I have discussed this topic with many wardens and superintendents and have found little support for the elimination of free weights and related equipment. Many believe that it is wise to keep inmates busy and to allow them to engage in draining aggressively physical exercise as opposed to more unproductive pursuits. As jobs have failed to keep pace with the rapidly expanding prison population, administrators are anxious to keep inmates busy.

The elimination of free weights runs

contrary to two other important public policy considerations. The medical community has recognized the importance of exercise in reducing health care costs. Health insurers offer rebates to those who are actively enrolled in health clubs. Such activities tend to lower the costs of health care. Thus, this bill may save a few dollars, but may ultimately cost our taxpayers more money due to increased health care costs. The bill also runs contrary to the current trend of allowing greater local autonomy. The bills impose a mandate on our county jails and provide penalties for those who refuse to comply.

The recent revisions of Title 37 of the Pennsylvania Code regarding county jail standards has a consistent theme of reducing state-imposed mandates and giving county prison administrators greater autonomy in running their own jails. It was also mentioned by Mr.

Sweeney, the 1996 Executive Order of Governor Ridge, is consistent with that philosophy. Is this measure worth going against this trend?

The bills aimed at elimination of coffee and/or caffeine serve little purpose.

The potential problems far outweigh any possible gain. Caffeine is contained in many products, such as soda, and as previously just mentioned peanut butter, ice tea and many other items.

Is it worth regulating to such a minuscule degree? The bill eliminating coffee fails to address the increasingly popular decaffeinated coffee.

We fear that elimination would overburden the already burdened correctional officers with one more item of contraband.

There is no doubt it will create a black market for the banned items, giving guards another issue that must be dealt with.

I thank you, the Chairman, and the committee members for this opportunity to discuss the state of affairs in our prisons and jails. These are serious topics and any discussions are most welcomed.

Although we oppose these bills, we would like to end on a positive note. We urge the committee members to examine the need for rehabilitation in prisons. Such efforts would serve many of the same goals these bills mistakenly seek to address. These include

1 keeping inmates busy in productive activities, 2 lessening the burden on taxpayers by teaching 3 them skills necessary to break the cycle of recidivism, and helping the offender become a responsible member of society. 5 Programs that enhance both 6 7 vocational education opportunities as well as 8 treatment for substance abuse would further these goals. H.B. 1933, which is also before 9 10 this committee, in which we support it in 11 testimony -- or excuse me, not in testimony, but in letters, would enhance literacy and yield far 12 greater results for all concerned. Thank you 13 14 for your time. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, 15 Mr. Love. We'll ask Representative Serafini to 16 17 begin the questioning. REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: 18 19 mentioned recidivism. What is the rate in your

opinion? Do you have --

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LOVE: About 60 percent, depending on what jurisdiction. Nationally, I think it's about 60 percent would be my guess.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: percent of the prisoners released end up back in

Ι

1 prison. What do you think about that? 2 MR. LOVE: I think it's terrible. think it's a tremendous cost. Unfortunately, 3 4 it's a lot of the same folks going through the 5 cycle over and over again. If there's a way 6 that we can break that cycle, I think it's high time to do it. 7 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Do you 8 9 think that shows -- that that indicates the fear 10 of prison? MR. LOVE: There's a certain amount 11 of that, yes. But, obviously, there's other 12 factors that outweigh that to cause them to go 13 back. I think a lot of that is inability to 14 gain a foothold in society and pursue some 15 productive activity, a job, something of that 16 nature is illusive, and then they fall back 17 under the old ways that led them to prison in 18 19 the first place. 20 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: don't think free weights in any way are 21 effective with regard to recidivism? 22

> MR. LOVE: I don't see how one way or the other --

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI:

1 nothing to with --2 MR. LOVE: No, I really don't. REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: So, by 3 4 eliminating them, really just eliminates the 5 potential for the person to increase his bulk and size. Is that what you're saying? 6 7 MR. LOVE: Again, I try to exercise regularly. I don't lift weights. I don't 8 consider myself a physical specimen either. 9 10 But, I think if you are dedicated to maintaining 11 yourself in good condition, you can do with or without weights. 12 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: So, you 13 would not really have offense to eliminating 14 free weights? 15 MR. LOVE: I just don't know. 16 17 What's the point of eliminating them? REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: In my 18 opinion it tends to create a more muscular 19 stronger person. Exercising for cardiovascular 20 effectiveness, as you said, in your testimony 21 22 which is recommended by doctors, tends to be

23

24

25

goes.

Free weights -- I mean, I don't know

inadequate effort as far as physical fitness

a lot of doctors that recommend that, free weights. The insurance companies, they give you a deduction in their rate because you are a weight lifter.

And as far as the medical care goes, do you have statistics that show anything that about the effects of weight lifting on prisoners medical --

MR. LOVE: Well, I was talking to a friend recently and told me he was a member of Bellview Health Club in Philadelphia. This is a very expensive club. I said, how can you possibly afford, knowing his income, to be a member of that? He says, because my health insurance gives me \$300 a year, if I agree to go there three times a week and work out. I assumed that the health insurers have made a study and found that individuals who work out have significantly less health costs down the road. I think it makes sense. I think it's a more modern trend. I think it's valid concern.

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Are you aware of what kinds of medical problems are created by weight lifting, rotator cuff problems, joint problems?

1 MR. LOVE: Oh, sure. If you overdo 2 anything, if you run marathons two or three 3 times a year you will have knee problems, ankle 4 problems, hip problems or -- Anything to excess 5 will cause problems. I respect your opinion. But, just I think we are getting, unfortunately, 6 into the same area we have criticized the courts 7 for; that is, micromanaging our prisons. 8 9 think these matters should be left to the correctional community. 10 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Do you 11 know what it cost to maintain a prisoner 12 13 annually? 14 MR. LOVE: Twenty to thirty thousand. 15 16 REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Twenty to 17 thirty thousand. Are you against the elimination of smoking in prisons? 18 19 MR. LOVE: I think that smoking 20 again has -- The reduction of smoking has proven 21 to be a benefit for health care. As such, consistent with my earlier testimony, I think if 22 23 you eliminated smoking you would reduce your health care costs. 24

REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: But, you

1 don't feel the same way about caffeine? MR. LOVE: I admit, I had a cup of 2 3 coffee just before this hearing. But, I just, 4 again, I think it's micromanaging of a prison. REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Thank you 5 6 very much for your testimony. 7 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: 8 Representative Chadwick. 9 REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: Thank you, 10 Mr. Chairman. Depending on the response I get, 11 I may only have one question. Mr. Love, I sat 12 here this morning and listened to pretty much all of the witnesses, although I was a little 13 late and missed the first one. Particularly, I 14 listened to all wardens who spoke at the state 15 and the county level. 16 First, I want to say I have 17 18 tremendous respect for the job they're doing. It must be enormously difficult under the 19 conditions that they have to manage those prison 20 populations. And, I think they're doing a 21 terrific job. 22 23 Yet, at the same time, what I've

heard from all of them was that they're

supportive of weights because they're a good

24

management tool, and only because they're a good management tool. I didn't hear anything from any of our witnesses that they support weights because they in any way aid in prisoner rehabilitation or have any benefit to society as a whole.

Indeed, in view of your testimony that we have a recidivism rate of 60 percent, all we're really doing is turning small weak criminals into large strong criminals because they are going back out on the street and committing additional crimes.

Given all of that, my question to you is, and I would be grasping for management tools, too, if I was in their position because they have a very difficult job to do. If we can come up with alternative management tools that don't turn small weak criminals into large strong criminals, that perhaps, do aid in rehabilitation and/or are beneficial to society, would you be opposed to an alternative to weights?

MR. LOVE: Not necessarily, because those universal gym sets that are adequate as opposed to free weights. I don't think anybody

would dispute that. I don't agree with your premise that we are turning small weak criminals into big, large powerful criminals. I haven't noticed that. I haven't noticed anybody --

I have been in jails close to 20 years that I knew went in a weakling and came out, you know, Charles Atlas. Most of those folks you see coming out like Charles Atlas went in like Charles Atlas.

REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: Well, granted I may have exaggerated a little bit to make a point. But, nevertheless, the point is, that weight lifting does increase strength and power, does it not?

MR. LOVE: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: And someone who goes into prison and engages in weight lifting is likely to come out stronger than they went in; are they not?

MR. LOVE: I think a lot of those folks, as I say, I don't think they -- I don't think they are any stronger when they go out than when they come in, I really don't. There are a lot of issues here, criminals, I guess, don't tend to work like the rest of us.

people. Maybe that's why they went into a life of crime. I have no idea. They couldn't do anything else and they were physically strong and they felt, you know, maybe that was a plus in criminal activity. I have no idea, but I just haven't noticed folks coming in and dedicating themselves to become big, powerful and strong people. I just haven't seen it.

REPRESENTATIVE CHADWICK: Mr.

Chairman, I don't see any point of pursuing that line of questioning any further. Thank you.

And thank you, Mr. Love.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: The question you didn't ask, Mr. Chadwick, that I would have asked, is that, is there any correlation between criminals who did involve themselves in a weight-lifting program in their recidivism rate when they came out? I think that would be a telling statistic.

And maybe even with other
activities, you know, what is that we involve a
prisoner in when he's in prison, and we also
have a lot of other programs; some of them are
carpentry and some are woodworking and shoe

repair. All these others that different prisons offer here and there.

Wonder what the recidivism rate of those who were actively involved in something in prison as opposed to the general population?

I'm not asking you to answer that question, but if you have an answer I would be more than happy to listen to it.

MR. LOVE: I have a couple comments. We have a print shop in Huntingdon. We teach people how to print. There could be someone who goes out and becomes a forger, does that mean we should eliminate the print shop? I really don't think so. I think there's different types of criminals, different types of crimes. You are just focusing on one aspect.

I mean, how many -- Most of the offenders in jail are not in for violent offenses. I think it's only 30 percent are in for violent offenses; 70 percent are drug or nonviolent offenses. So you're only having 30 percent that were even involved in that type of activity. I think it's more important to look at the big picture, get the drug treatment, get the literacy training, get some vocational

1 opportunities, and we all know that it's not 2 going to work with most, but the more it works with, the better off we all are. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Well, thank 5 you very much, Mr. Love. We appreciate you 6 coming and giving your testimony. 7 Our last testifier is a gentleman 8 from the Scranton area who has asked to come 9 similar to the manner in which Mr. Preate came; 10 that he saw it in the news last night or yesterday somewhere and decided that he'd like 11 12 to come and give his testimony. We would 13 welcome to the table Mr. Patrick O'Malley who is 14 a Scranton School Board Director and also a resident of the City of Scranton. 15 Mr. O'Malley, since you are the last 16 one to testify, we didn't have you on schedule, 17 I don't want to keep our members too much 18 longer, I'll ask you to give your testimony as 19 20 briefly as possible. Thank you. 21 MR. O'MALLEY: Thank you, Mr. 22 Chairman, for giving me the opportunity to 23 speak. Could you spell 24 THE COURT REPORTER:

25

your last name?

I'm

.

MR. O'MALLEY: O'-M-A-L-L-E-Y.

a corrections officer of a local prison.

heard the testimony of some of our state

4 corrections officers who got up and spoke before

5 me, wardens from various county facilities and

6 state facilities.

In my eight and a half years
experience as a corrections officer, I have seen
people come into the prison system 130, 140
pounds, heroin addicts, crack addicts, cocaine
addicts.

I've seen in a matter of six to eight months these people put on incredible amounts of muscle mass, 30, 40 pounds of muscle mass. I'm in a situation daily that we have to deal with these individuals.

The caffeine does have some play into that too because the same individuals that are in here, that are in the prisons for drugs and everything else, this is an alternative way for them to get high by large amounts of caffeine and nicotine. What I see is this.

As a corrections officer it takes a minimum of four corrections officers to take one of these individuals down. The prison that I

work at at this time, we just refurbished and tore down the old prison and we're in a situation where our weight room has been gone for the last eight and a half months. And what I've seen is, some of our more violent inmates that are inside our prison have gotten smaller and they're not in the situation where they want to go out and fight as much. That's what I've seen.

They were just talking about another individual who could lift 950 pounds. How would you like it if this person got out of prison and you and your wife were going into a restaurant and he mugged you? I would say someone who could lift 950 pounds could kill you and your wife in a matter of seconds, breaking your neck, breaking some vital part of your body.

I am totally for this bill. I have a sister who was killed by her husband who is in a state facility, I know for a fact is lifting weights, and I don't think he should be allowed to lift the weights because my sister is six feet under now.

Thank you for your time. If you have any questions, I'm prepared to answer them.

1	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Repre-
2	sentative Serafini.
3	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: You
4	personally noticed there have been a number of
5	people who are in a prison and used the weights
6	to bulk up. Do you find the recidivism rate
7	among those prisoners when they get out of
8	prison, do you find that they have a tendency to
9	return move often, or are there no statistics on
10	it?
11	MR. O'MALLEY: Usually, the
12	prisoners that I have dealt with, they lift the
13	weights, it was more of a chance of them coming
14	back. A lot of them were bulking up to go back
15	on the streets to take care of a problem they
16	wanted to take care of, like someone, something
17	that got them into the situation that they're
18	in.
19	REPRESENTATIVE SERAFINI: Thank you
20	for your testimony.
21	MR. O'MALLEY: Thank you very much.
22	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you for
23	your testimony, Mr. O'Malley.
24	This concludes our public hearing,
25	and this meeting is adjourned.

	11
1	(At or about 11:30 a.m. the hearing
2	concluded)
3	* * *
4	
5	CERTIFICATE
6	
7	I, Karen J. Meister, Reporter, Notary
8	Public, duly commissioned and qualified in and
9	for the County of York, Commonwealth of
LO	Pennsylvania, hereby certify that the foregoing
11	is a true and accurate transcript of my
L 2	stenotype notes taken by me and subsequently
L 3	reduced to computer printout under my
L 4	supervision, and that this copy is a correct
L 5	record of the same.
L 6	This certification does not apply to
L 7	any reproduction of the same by any means unless
18	under my direct control and/or supervision.
19	Dated this 11th day of October, 1998.
20	
21	Karen J. Merster (JB)
22	Karen J. Meister - Reporter Notary Public