| 1 | COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| 2 | HOODE OF REFREDERING | | |
| 3 | In Re: Prostitution Related Offenses | | |
| 4 | * * * * | | |
| 5 | * * * * * * | | |
| 6 | Stenographic record of House Judiciary Committee, | | |
| 7 | Subcommittee on Crime and Corrections, hearing held in Room 205, Capitol Annex, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, | | |
| 8 | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | | |
| 9 | Thursday, April 29, 1999 | | |
| LO | 9:00 a.m. | | |
| ι1 | * * * * | | |
| L2 | | | |
| L3 | HON. JERRY BIRMELIN, CHAIRMAN | | |
| L 4 | HON. BERKI BIRMEDIN, CHAIRMAN | | |
| L5 | MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | | |
| L6 | Hon. J. Scot Chadwick Hon. Al Masland | | |
| L7 | Hon. Brett Feese Hon. Joseph Petrarca | | |
| 18 | Hon. Timothy F. Hennessey | | |
| ۱9 | | | |
| 20 | Also Present: | | |
| 21 | Hon. Stephen Stettler, Prime Sponsor James Mann, Majority Research Analyst | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY 3606 Horsham Drive | | |
| - | Mechanicsburg, PA 17055 | | |



| 1 | 717-732-5316 | |
|----------|--|------|
| 2 | INDEX TO WITNESSES | |
| 3 | <u>WITNESS</u> : | PAGE |
| 4 | Representative Stephen Stettler, Main Sponsor | 4 |
| 5 | Samantha Dorm, York resident | 10 |
| 6 | Jeffrey Miller, York resident | 17 |
| 7 8 | Herbert Grofcsik, Commissioner, York City Police Department | 30 |
| 9 | William Vangreen, Lieutenant, York City Police Department | 35 |
| 10 | Toni Smith, Councilwoman, York City Council | 33 |
| 11 | Tom Kelly, First Assistant District Attorney, York County. | 47 |
| 12 | Larry Frankel, Executive Director, ACLU | 65 |
| 13 | Travis Tu, ACLU | 59 |
| 14 15 | Sean Carr, Lieutenant, Philadelphia Police Department | 77 |
| 16 | Susan Herron, Deputy District Attorney, Philadelphia District Attorney's Office | 89 |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Good morning. I'm

Representative Jerry Birmelin. I represent Wayne and Pike

Counties, and I'm the chairman of the House Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Corrections. Today we have some

bills that we're having a public hearing on. The prime

sponsor of those bills is Representative Stephen Stettler,

who's with us to testify on them today, and we have some

other testimony that will be presented throughout the

morning.

We're going to do our very best to keep this hearing on schedule, keep moving and have everybody on time in the giving of their testimony. If you are here to testify and have with you copies of your testimony, we'd appreciate you sharing that with Mr. Mann, who is my assistant who will return here shortly and he will make sure that they are distributed to the Members that are here.

There will be Members coming and going. This is a not a Session week and so we don't expect heavy attendance, but with me to my right is Representative Al Masland. I know there are some other Members who will be with us in the morning as we go through this meeting, so I will introduce them to you and to our TV audience as they make their entrance.

To begin with, these are bills that all are

related to prostitution offenses. It is a series of bills whose prime sponsor, as I indicated earlier, is Representative Stephen Stettler, and I've asked him to sit in the chair that he is in now as a witness first and then he can join us on the panel here as we begin to hear the testimony of other people.

So Representative Stettler, if you would like to make your opening remarks, feel free to do so.

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. And I want to thank the committee for taking this time this morning to listen to the testimony of several people from the York community who have come forward to testify regarding this package of bills. I also want to apologize to the committee on one note. I have a PHEAA board meeting this morning also that I have no control over scheduling and it's important that I be at that meeting also, so I apologize for having to leave early.

I'm very proud of this legislation. This legislation represents the efforts of a team of local people. When a neighborhood in the city of York reached its limits with the side effects of prostitution, it organized. The local elected officials responded overwhelmingly to this organization on the part of the neighborhood, and a task force resulted. District

Attorney Stan Rebert, Mayor Charlie Robertson, Police
Commissioner Grofcsik, and the residents of the city
banded together, along with members of city council, to
address the issue and hopefully figure out ways to end
it. They came to me, we sat and talked and met on several
occasions, and as a result we drafted legislation that we
felt would at least deal with problems as they occur in
York, Pennsylvania.

I have to tell you upfront that a good bit of this legislation is not new. It mirrors the legislation that was drafted and passed into law in the State of Oregon, and that the State of Oregon has implemented in the areas that the local municipalities have deemed it important. The reports that we have gotten from Oregon are positive.

What this legislation does is it enables local communities to deal with the issue of prostitution and the industries that revolve around it. And I think it's important to understand that this is all "may" legislation. This legislation, if passed by the State and signed into law by the Governor, does not require any local municipalities to participate in this legislation. What this legislation does is it enables local municipalities to participate if they as a community deem it important.

And I have to say that this legislation has gotten the attention of people in York County. Just the other day I got a phone call from a resident outside of the city in the southern part of the county who took exception to the legislation, and this person's primary concern was what would happen if the john were driving his wife's car? And I had great difficulty being sympathetic to that issue in that, you know, I think the real problem is not having the car confiscated but trying to explain then to your wife what happened to her car and why. But there are options for somebody I guess in that position, and I'm not sure I'd want to have those options placed on my plate anyhow.

The supporters today who will testify represent a cross-section of York. And I'm proud of them. I mean, these people, each one of them has been involved from the beginning in drafting this legislation and dealing with the problem. And I believe what it, for somebody, a Representative who represents an urban area, what this legislation represents is that when neighborhoods work together as a group, when they organize, when they get the attention of the elected officials, when they get the attention of appointed people, they can make a difference in their communities. And so as we listen to their testimony, keep in mind that they are citizens who are

concerned about their neighborhoods.

In addition, we as a group realize that our legislation might not be perfect and that we as we sit here today look forward to hearing your input as to how we can better improve this legislation and move it on to successful action in the House and the Senate and then to the Governor's Office. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you for your opening remarks, and while you're seated there, I'll ask Representative Masland if he has any questions.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Just briefly, I want to commend you on the introduction of this legislation, and as you said, most of the people who will be testifying are from York and you designed this legislation basically to address a problem that is in York, but we don't want the folks out there to think that York is unique by any stretch of the imagination, or that York is somehow the prostitution capital of Pennsylvania. That's not the case. I know that there are cosponsors from most of the other third class cities and also from Philadelphia and from Pittsburgh, so this is something that would address their problems as well.

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: Yeah, I appreciate that, Representative Masland. It has received bipartisan support and the response has been widespread in almost all

third class cities, their Representatives have signed on to the bill. York is not unique. It is not, as you say, the prostitution capital of the world. It's just that we had a neighborhood who finally said enough is enough and we want to improve the quality of life in our neighborhood, and I think that what this legislation does, and as I emphasize it, it's "may" legislation, it allows all communities across the Commonwealth to enact this legislation. And so within that context I think that's why we've gotten bipartisan support.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Just one other point. As I was looking over the legislation on the cosponsorship memo, obviously a lot of it deals with cars, the automobiles, and at first I was thinking, well, I guess that makes sense, there is a connection there because after talking to members of your staff, Mr. Texture, he said, well, people don't just walk into the neighborhood. I don't know what the percentage is, but I guess it's close to pretty much 100 percent of these scenarios involve somebody driving up to the corner.

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: I mean, I suspected that a very, very high percentage of people travel about by car, and I'm sure that when Samantha Dorm testifies that she probably included in her remarks the impact this has on single women in the city and people driving by in

1 cars in the neighborhood and making comments to women as 2 they walk, just residents of the community out walking 3 children, they are not exempt from offers from people in 4 cars. So the emphasis is on cars. 5 The legislation is kind of silent on buses and 6 trollies and things of that nature. I don't think we need 7 to expand it to include that, but at least in the city of 8 York the emphasis is on cars. 9 REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Thank you. 10 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We've also been joined by 12 Representative Feese from Lycoming County. Representative 13 Feese, do you have anything? 14 REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: No, Mr. Chairman. 15 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I only have one question for 16 you, Representative Stettler. You said this mirrors 17 legislation in Oregon. Has the constitutionality been 18 challenged vet? 19 REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: To my knowledge, it 20 That's a question we have to pursue. I can't 21 answer that question right now. 22 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: How long has it been in 23 place in Oregon? 24 REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: It's been in place for 25 several years.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: And you're not aware of any 2 challenges that they've had in Oregon?

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: No, not right now.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Okay, I would invite you to sit up on the panel, if you would sit next to Mr. Mann, my assistant here, and participate in any questions of additional witnesses.

Next we've scheduled Samantha Dorm and Jeff Miller, if you two folks would come up and have a seat. And you both have written testimony, and I guess being a gentleman I would like the lady to go first, if that's all right with her. Maybe you could tell us a little bit about who you are. Is it Miss Dorm?

> MS. DORM: Miss.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: And before you begin to read your testimony, or if you don't want to read it, summarize it, whatever you want to do, but tell us a little bit about who you are and where you come from. And since we don't have -- these are not actually amplifying mikes. We have a rather high ceiling here, so try to project your voice as best you can.

MS. DORM: Very good. Before I get started, I will read my statement in its entirety, I just want to explain my involvement and how I kind of in some ways stumbled into this. Actually, I had lived in my house for about four months and was home one afternoon from work and received a flyer in my mail stop and looking at it was crazy enough to run out and meet Jeff Miller at that time, who did not know me as a neighbor, and asked him what this was all about.

At that point I personally was not having too many problems with this situation other than perhaps noticing from time to time that maybe a car passed one or two times, but I had been a former employee of the city of York and was at a number of community meetings where residents literally came out and yelled and fussed for hours and that there was no resolution, and it was very important for me that if we were going to have a neighborhood meeting, that we were able to come up with solutions and that we were not basically going to have some gripe sessions.

So in some ways I was serving as an event coordinator and getting people there, and then out of that what happened as the weeks went passed, I started getting a number of phone calls from residents from all over the area, not just within our little block on the square, the surrounding areas -- I did include a map there -- anywhere extending from Persing Avenue to even other sections of the city. We had phone calls from people outside of York as well due to the publicity with this, and that was

initially my impact in getting involved with this.

You have before you the written testimony. I laughed on the way up here, I did this so quickly, so please forgive my typos here.

Today you have been charged with the task of deciding whether or not it is okay to take away someone's rights because they sought sexual gratification. Simply stated like that, the obvious answer would be no. After all, we have throughout history had men and women who have frequented whorehouses, who have had extra-marital affairs, who have had sex with friends or strangers, yet these people need not fear any type of reprimand. In fact, talk shows glorify the intimate details of sexual relationships daily, bringing in millions of dollars in the process.

At no time will you hear me say things like prostitutes are terrible people or that those who patronize them should be condemned to hell. Quite frankly, I could care less what someone does in the privacy of their own home. I could care less with whom they do it with. The problem is, the activities currently taking place are in my neighborhood, and more specifically, they exist within my parking lot directly behind my home that has been deemed private parking. My child and his friends have been affected. My neighbors

and I have been affected, and today we ask for your assistance to put an end to this problem.

Most people dream of having a nice home in a safe neighborhood to raise their children. I am a single mother of an 8-year-old who excels academically as well as athletically. I volunteer my time regularly to various youth organizations, and through service with the Kiwanis Club and as a board member with the YMCA. My neighbors and I get together to decorate for the holidays, we organize neighborhood cleanups and summer picnics for families. Teachers, lawyers, nurses, city council members, general laborers, accountants, and homemakers of various ethnic and financial backgrounds blend together as a community. We have been plagued by parasites who have invaded our surroundings, yet they insist that they have the right to do so.

I would like to stop at this point and just, I'm going to set these out. I brought along some pictures from activities and just to show where our neighbors have come together. You will see us out at the neighborhood cleaning to get an idea of some of the homes. The day before Easter of this year I took it upon myself to conduct an Easter egg hunt and just put notices in everybody's mail slot and we had all the children out and the families out with video cameras. This is the type of

neighborhood that we live in and these are the type of neighbors that we have in our immediate surrounding.

I've heard a number of people express concern that if you take away someone's license or you take away their car simply because they were driving around looking for sex, that this could devastate their family. Well, who's worrying about the families who are afraid that their teenagers will be propositioned or forced into a car to perform sexual acts? Who's worrying about the women who are afraid to walk outside of their front door because cars stop by, back up down the street, flash their high beams and money, expecting that their advances will be appreciated? For some reason, we have been forced to accept the fact that a prostitute and the johns have more rights than residents or businesses. This makes no sense.

Is it not true that a woman rocking in a porch swing at her home in the suburbs can rest assured that if a man approaches asking for sex, that she can report this as a crime, perhaps even harassment? So why is it that a woman in the city, specifically in our neighborhood, where homes have been valued anywhere from \$60,000 to \$100,000, that a woman who simply wants to plant flowers in her windowsill planter can be approached by a man in a car, oftentimes a man from the suburbs, and this is dismissed

as harmless? Sorry, lady, we simply mistook you for a prostitute. Out of curiosity, how many prostitutes plant flowers or sweep the sidewalks as they are trying to pick up a client?

Why can't I walk two blocks to the YMCA to watch my son play soccer? Why am I expected to travel by a car to work when I have friends who walk six blocks to get from their parking spots to the government offices here in Harrisburg? Does the government offer valet parking so that these people don't have to be subjected to a form of harassment as they walk to work? Yet walking near my home is a sign of working the streets, regardless of your attire.

The person who followed me for six blocks on a Sunday morning last August had driven for more than 25 minutes from his home to my neighborhood. He went so far as to drive the wrong way down a one-way street in pursuit of me. When questioned later by police at his home in New Oxford, he stated that he was looking for directions. By that time I would have been more than happy to tell him where to go. Two other neighbors also encountered this same individual. Nothing happened. There wasn't much the police could do. He still drives around as we quickly duck into our homes.

I have learned that johns are equal opportunity

They don't distinguish between black, white, employers. big, small, short or tall, as long as the end result is The fact is that these people have a blatant the same. disregard for our property, our families, or our community at large. It's okay to do something in someone else's back yard as long as no one passes through yours. small towns, for some reason it's acceptable to pull out a shotgun if somebody crosses over your property, and people have thrown fits because a man looked at his woman the wrong way, yet near my home the people who travel from the farm to the city looking for sex walk away with a smile and a pat on the back, as I'm held hostage in my own neighborhood. If a person wants the right to drive, they must act responsibly, otherwise suffer the consequences. My safety is just as important as the person living in the The prostitutes and the johns don't own or rent homes in our neighborhood, so I ask that we change the rules of the game. This is not okay. If you're going to pay to play, the stakes have just gone up. We have a right to exist in our own neighborhood without fear.

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

In closing, I would like to point out that just this week Representative Stettler said to me that he had honked his car horn recently when he saw me walking near my home and that I failed to acknowledge him. The funny thing is in the year that I have lived in this

neighborhood, I have learned that a car horn generally is a cause for panic. If I acknowledge the driver, it may be mistaken that I'm interested in receiving their advances. The bottom line is that I would like an opportunity to turn around and acknowledge a friend when a car horn is blown. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Ms. Dorm.

At this time I would ask Mr. Miller to give his testimony, and then when he is finished I'll ask other members of the panel to ask questions.

Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: Hello. My name is Jeff Miller.

I'm a York City resident who was asked to serve on a committee formed by Representative Stettler to draft the anti-prostitution legislation that we're discussing today. Last spring and summer we experienced firsthand an upswing of prostitution activity in our southwest York neighborhood. We organized neighborhood meetings, as Sam explained, to bring attention to the problems that prostitution is causing in our neighborhoods. We realize that this is yet another in a long list of crime related problems plaguing yet another city neighborhood in our Commonwealth; however, to those of us living with it daily, it is a very real problem and a very serious concern to us.

I wish to summarize some of the problems we in southwest York have endured collectively in our neighborhoods over the past few years, especially during the spring and early summertime, so you have an understanding of what we've been enduring. We've had numerous residents verbally harassed, actually spit on, and a few were physically assaulted by prostitutes when they've been asked to move from porches and streets. We've observed public intoxication and open drug use by prostitutes and their pimps. We've experienced sexual activities on side streets, parking lots. We've had empty houses that were broken into that were set up for both sexual and drug activity. We've had condoms and drug paraphernalia littering our streets and sidewalks. had solicitations of residents at their home. In fact. one resident who was a mailman was offered half price simply because he was in uniform.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We've had solicitations in the parking lot across from William Penn Senior High School while school children are waiting to enter or leave the school. We've had prostitutes who've tried to get in the residents' vehicles when they're stopped for traffic signals. We've had johns who come into our neighborhood and solicit, actually stop and solicit female residents who are walking in the neighborhood. We've also had our streets blocked

by johns who are negotiating prices with prostitutes. Numerous incidents of loitering on the streets and actually squatting on the residents' front porches. personally have been followed to my job, which happens to be close by where I live, and in fact was confronted by one particular prostitute that was aware that I had photographed some of her activities and turned the photographs over to the police. She wanted to know if we could work something out so that she could continue to operate in our neighborhood. Subsequent to that encounter she approached me again to let me know that she had searched the neighborhood and she now knew where I lived. I took that as a not so veiled threat. Another prostitute makes the point of giving me the finger when she sees me driving by because we've had words about her activity in the neighborhood.

I'm sure I can fill most of my time here with tales of neighborhood residents' encounters and problems they've encountered with their local prostitutes.

However, venting frustrations and swapping horror stories does not move us forward to a solution. I've had to endure a lot of ribbing over the last year since this issue hit the media from friends and co-workers who live in other parts of this city and county. They don't understand why I feel this is a big deal. After all,

according to them, no one is being hurt. I usually half seriously tell them I would be happy to give the girls directions to their neighborhood and they could decide for themselves whether it's a problem or not.

It's been said that prostitution is not a victimless crime, and I contend that it's not. My contention was proved correct last summer when a 42-year-old Spring Garden man was shot and killed by a 16-year-old in an argument over prostitutes and money. This man paid the ultimate price for his association with one of our local prostitutes, and I contend this problem is of the same caliber as drugs and other violence. It all works hand-in-hand and the net effect is the degradation of our cities, as evidenced by this shooting, even though it occurred in Spring Garden Township, it was one block outside the city, there is a ripple effect into the county.

Residents of our neighborhood have suffered declining property values. After all, who would want to buy a house in an area where prostitutes are sitting on the front porch or standing on the street corners? Other illicit activities are encouraged. After all, if we don't do anything about the prostitutes, why would we do anything about the other activities? The quality of life declines in the neighborhood. We have neighbors who were

quoted in local newspapers saying they don't go outside because of criminal activity, and we've had female residents solicited by johns.

The problem is not just limited to residents' properties. It adversely affects our cities at large. It adds to the perception that our cities are totally crime ridden. It affects, in the case of York City, the redevelopment efforts planned by the city and the YMCA for the 200 and 300 blocks of West Market Street and the arrival of the York County Heritage Rail Trail. This area is planned to become a hub of a thriving downtown tourist area. I question how successful these efforts will be if we continue to allow prostitution activities and the other crime that it lures into the area.

I ask you to imagine the reaction of tourists visiting York who will be treated to the sight of prostitutes and their pimps sitting on the steps of downtown businesses drinking cheap beer who then walk down the street to pick up a john to get the money for more beer and drugs. Or a family on a Sunday outing on a York County Heritage Rail Trail who encounters prostitutes soliciting at the trail's intersection with Princess Street. Or the same family going to the York County Industrial Museum to encounter yet another prostitute stationed at the phone booth on the corner.

If female residents are uncomfortable walking our neighborhood because of johns cruising for pick-ups, just imagine what a chilling effect it would be on visiting tourists.

So how do we correct the problem? Well, we give our police officers the tools to effectively make arrests when they see prostitution offenses being committed. We need our prosecutors and magistrates to support our police officers when they do make these arrests and to use the law to its fullest extent for both the prostitute and their customers, regardless of who the customer is. We do this by enacting the legislation as proposed in these House Bills.

We elevate the penalty to be commensurate with the crime. Perpetrators who continue to engage in prostitution activities will be faced with not only risking their driver's license but also potentially the very vehicle that they commit the crime in. This sends a strong message that our communities will not tolerate prostitution activity. Laws in the past have been geared toward the prosecution of women engaged in prostitution while leaving the men basically untouched. The legislation that we proposed puts punitive sanctions on both the prostitute and their customers, where it really belongs.

1 These House Bills go to the heart of the 2 problem. If you eliminate the customer base, the 3 prostitutes go away. It's that simple. Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Mr. Miller. 5 We've been joined by Representative Hennessey 6 from Chester County, and I'll begin with him if he has any 7 questions. 8 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: No questions. 9 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Representative Masland. 10 REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Just briefly. It's not 11 a situation, we're going to hear from the York Police 12 Department next, it's not a situation that they're not 13 doing anything, it's more of a concern to give them more 14 tools, is that correct? 15 MS. DORM: That's correct. 16 REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: And the way I look at 17 this is most of our legal emphasis has been on focussing 18 on the supply of prostitutes, so to speak, and these bills 19 kind of attack the demand, and if you somehow can cut down 20 on the demand because the johns don't want to risk losing 21 their cars, then maybe that will also affect the supply, 22 is that how you approach this? 23 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir. 24 MS. DORM: We literally had people that, like I

said, I've only been there for a year, and then all of a

25

sudden, I had literally only been there for a few months, and when those phone calls started coming in, we had people on Persing Avenue and some of the surrounding areas who had lists of license plate numbers on cars and vehicles that they had been having problems with on a regular basis for months at a time. We had one lady who had moved into an apartment that apparently there used to be a prostitute that sat on her porch all the time. though this person was no longer working there, the cars still continued to come up, and here you have now a resident who is sitting at her own property that was continually being harassed by these gentlemen that were coming by looking for sex and even saying, you know, you've got the wrong person, you need to go away, but in turning in those license plates or turning in identification of that individual, there really wasn't much the police can do at this point, and we're asking that we give them the tools to be able to take care of this problem.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Is this pretty much at all times of day that you fear walking and being harassed?

MS. DORM: All times of the day. It doesn't matter, and even different parts of the year. When it's cooler we weren't out walking as much. Now as the weather

1 is getting nice and we live within two blocks, as Jeff 2 mentioned, to the Heritage Rail Trails, and when that 3 opens, and in downtown Historic York, it really doesn't 4 make much sense. 5 As I mentioned, I'm a board member of the YMCA, but to have a police officer say to me, I really don't 6 7 recommend that you walk two blocks to the YMCA, infuriated me because I'm thinking about our member base as well, not 8 9 just my own protection. How can you have a police officer 10 say, we really don't recommend you walk two blocks because 11 you're going to be mistaken for a prostitute? So I'm 12 trying to figure out who has the right to be here, me or 13 them? REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: That's probably the 14 15 best, most appropriate way to sum up your testimony, which 16 was really good. You do have the right, not them, and 17 hopefully we can help you out. Thank you. 18 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Representative Stettler. 19 REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: Thank you, Mr. 20 Chairman. 21 I have just a couple questions, and did 22 everybody get a copy of this map? 23 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I think we did.

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: If you look at the nine-block area that Jeff and Sam were talking about, I

24

25

mean, this is part, I mean, it's almost a key part of the heart of the city of York, when you talk about the activities that should occur in this area, the Rail Trail, some of the other things that are going, the Agricultural, Industrial Museum, things of that nature. Actually, when the morning I honked the horn at Sam, I was going to the market, which is right there on the corner of Market Street and Penn.

MS. DORM: One block from my home.

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: A block from her home. This is the area of the city where people on a Saturday morning people should be smiling, should be having a good time, enjoying a great day outside, and for somebody to be walking along in fear of responding to an acknowledgment like that just doesn't send the right message.

I just have one more economic question. Two economic questions. One, last year when we had the meetings in the neighborhood, the activity dissipated for a while, and now with the spring coming and the weather warming, have you seen any renewed activity in the neighborhood or has it moved, and I'm going to ask the Police Commissioner, has the activity moved to other parts of the city?

MS. DORM: I personally haven't had as many

problems, and even in talking to the neighbors now that it's getting nice, we're all coming out of hibernation and haven't had as much on the prostitution, and there are other issues that happen within our neighborhood, so I guess at least a part of that also is learning not to be out as much as I would have been a year ago.

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: Well, that's not good to hear.

MR. MILLER: I've seen a few of the girls.

There seems to be the ones we have the major problems with last year apparently have been arrested because of an ordinance the city passed, and I'll let the Police

Department discuss that, but I have seen a few new girls that have moved into that area to fill the void. They're not as blatant as they were last year. I don't know if the word is getting out that the city has this ordinance or the police are actually doing more stings. I believe they just did a sting last week. Rumor has it that that's happened.

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: I think you always want to go from the concept of rumors. You don't want to have too much personal knowledge of stings like that.

MS. DORM: If you were to ask in regards to the girls, I personally haven't seen them, but where I live my house is right on, I'm the end house of our complex, so I

probably see a little bit more than other people would, and even if I were to come out of my house, go around the corner to the market or to the corner store to get a newspaper, what happens a lot of times is I just kind of shove it off and quickly go into my house is that in broad daylight when I come back down and I'm a half a block from my house, generally there are cars that drive through because they're looking for the ladies, and why somebody needs to flash their high beams in broad daylight makes no sense. And they'll slow down, and usually once they pass once or twice they know that you're not working and most of them will go away, and there have been a few exceptions, but again, it's a nuisance because I'm at my house and many times I'm with my son, and it doesn't matter. They don't care that here you have a child with They want what they want, regardless. you.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: Just one last question, and that is on the impact on real estate and prices in neighborhoods in the city. I mean, have you, in this particular neighborhood, have you seen a dramatic impact in the ability to sell a house and the ability to sell a house at a fair price?

MS. DORM: Well, I will comment. Now some of the houses are selling, but part of that is actually that because what has happened, last year, last summer I

actually went around the one square block surrounding our house, which on your map it is Newton Square, and we took the homes within Newton Square, the 100 block of South Newberry, the 100 block of South Penn, the 300 block of Princess and King Streets, and only on one side those homes that their yards were facing us, and at one time we had as many as 26, I believe even 27, homes that went up for sale. And looking at the property values, some of those homes were assessed at \$72,000, and people were selling them anywhere from \$50,000 to \$60,000 just to get rid of them to get out of the area.

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: That's all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to take full responsibility for the stapling job on Mr. Miller's testimony.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: For the benefit of those who don't know what the stapling job was, he put papers in the wrong order. That's a small problem in legislative services.

We want to thank you, Mr. Miller and Ms. Dorm, for your testimony. We appreciate you coming in. Thank you for spending some time with us and sharing your perspective on these problems.

Our next testifiers are from the city of York.

We have Mr. Herbert Grofcsik -- I'll just call him Herbert

1 -- Commissioner of York City Police Department; William 2 Vangreen, Lieutenant, York City Police Department; and 3 Toni Smith, Councilwoman with York City Council. If you 4 folks would come forward and give your testimony, we would 5 appreciate that. 6 REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Let me apologize in 7 advance as you're taking a seat. I have a funeral to go 8 to, so I'll be leaving probably in the middle of your 9 testimony. It's no reflection on what you're saying. 10 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I also want to introduce 11 another member of our House Judiciary Committee who has 12 joined us to the far right of my table here is 13 Representative Scot Chadwick from Bradford and Susquehanna 14 Counties. 15 And we thank you folks for coming to testify, 16 and so that we know which is which, would you gentlemen 17 introduce yourselves. 18 COMM. GROFCSIK: I'm Police Commissioner Herb 19 Grofcsik of the City of York. 20 MS. SMITH: I'm Toni Smith, City Councilwoman. 21 LT. VANGREEN: I'm Lieutenant Bill Vangreen with 22 the York City Police Department. 23 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Mr. Grofcsik, why don't you 24 give your testimony first. 25 COMM. GROFCSIK: Thank you, sir. I'm here this

morning to testify for the House Bills that you are considering this morning, Bills 212, 213, 214 and 215. The prostitution problem has been with us for a long time, but recently we're very encouraged by the tenacity and the innovation of the City of York Newton Square Neighborhood Association. The local prostitutes of the city of York are well-known business entrepreneurs who walk the streets and are well-known and recognized by our police officers. The area that is frequented by the prostitutes and known to prospective customers, the johns, was the area surrounding the U.S. Post Office. Because of their obvious presence and complaints of good, decent people, we had an intense effort to arrest and prosecute them with the help of the Pennsylvania State Police undercover Troopers. Targeted were prostitutes by male undercover vice officers. In addition, female Troopers were dressed to simulate prostitutes to target the males that solicit prostitutes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The impact of this effort, even though successful, was to relocate the business location of the prostitutes to a neighborhood of middle class residents in an area of the city called Newton Square. This activity was brazen and very upsetting with people living in the community. Not only were the prostitutes displaced from conducting business in parked cars of their clients, but

their clients are not local. Consequently, they were slowly following decent women who lived in the Newton Square area, soliciting them for sex and then making crude remarks to women who did not respond to their suggestions. The innocent women and their husbands and boyfriends became angry by the activities of these male strangers cruising their neighborhoods.

Public meetings were held with city officials invited to hear the concerns of the Newton Square Neighborhood Association. Government officials, including Representative Stettler, Mayor Robertson, City Council members, District Attorney's Office, and Police Department attended. As a result, a strengthened Loitering in Public City Ordinance was enacted targeting the street walking activities of the prostitutes, which the city police are enforcing.

Now we are here to target the customers, the people that are clients of the prostitutes who ultimately affect the quality of life of the people who live in the neighborhoods as they cruise through and disrupt with their deviant behavior. These new bills I believe discourage the customers when the first arrests are made under the authority of this legislation. The news media will publicize the fact that someone who solicited a prostitute has lost his driving privileges or his vehicle

that they were driving. They lost the vehicle because it was used as an instrument of crime and therefore was legally impounded and maybe confiscated. I think this message will be sent loud and clear and solicitation in our neighborhoods in public will be drastically curtailed.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak for the good people of the City of York.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Commissioner.

And Councilwoman Smith, could you give your
testimony at this time?

MS. SMITH: Good morning. Thank you for having us. My name is Toni Smith. I'm a member of the York City Council. I also wear a lot of hats. I've been a community activist for the last 25 years. I've been in this country since 1974. I'm a mother, I'm a grandmother, I'm a businesswoman for the last 30 years, and most of all I am a concerned citizen because what's happening should not be happening.

Now, my daughter, my granddaughter, and my son-in-law live in that neighborhood. They just bought a house, it was built in 1840. They paid over \$90,000. It's a beautiful home. But my granddaughter is only 12 years old and she's been approached by a guy, she's beautiful, but she's been approached by these middle aged

men, and I've seen it myself. So what I usually do, get their license, turn them in, and if I need to testify I will do that too.

I think it's time to make a change, it's time that they should be punished for things they do. They have no respect for the City of York. Most of those people are from out of town.

Now I went on TV and I told them, I'm trying,
Steve was going to help us to pass this law, State law,
and so what happened is a lot of the prostitutes and the
johns were meeting outside the city. I was happy. I
thought, goodness, we're getting rid of them. Now they're
not around, they're outside. But that's not what we need
to do. The problem, you just shift it from one place to
another. We should take care and not be selfish by
saying, well, good, as long as the City of York, let them
go to the Galleria, who cares? Well, I just don't feel
that way.

So I think something should be done and I feel very strongly about it because when you talk about prostitutes, they go inside their home, they come outside, they're very dirty, they use awful language, there's drugs in there, there's alcohol in there. I know because we do anti-drug marches in the City of York and I'm always part of that. We go and sit on different corners and watch the

drug dealers twice a week, watch the prostitute, turn them in. I've been doing this for 20 years. And being a city council member is not going to stop me from keeping doing it, and I'm going to keep doing it.

So I appreciate your help and I do want to thank you for listening to us. I come from Rome, Italy. I choose to live in the City of York. It's a privilege to be in this country. I have one brother and four sisters, and in Italy there they always say, well, he's a man. Anything, you know, it's okay, he's a man. There should have been all girls, no women. I come here thinking justice for all, equality. So what happened is I'm hearing the same thing: That's all right, a man is going to be a man. Well, no, because you see, it ends up the problem with the women too.

So if you take a car, I feel bad about it, but I'd rather take the car than see these men go home to his wife and end up with a disease that's going to kill her. So we have to be realistic about these things. Times are changing. Justice for all, equality for all. Thank you for listening to me.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Mrs. Smith, and next we'll hear from Bill Vangreen, Lieutenant with the York City Police Department.

LT. VANGREEN: Thank you. Good morning.

Prostitution has been an ongoing problem in our city since I began my career 26 years ago. During this time my department has received numerous prostitution related complaints from both residents and businesses. The majority of these complaints have not been regarding the act of prostitution itself but the disruption and harassment that indiscrete prostitution causes the residents in the neighborhoods where it occurs. problem is prostitutes being loud and disorderly while trying to flag down their customers, the johns, who are driving by at all hours of the day and night. The johns are often intoxicated and disorderly, often mistake the good citizens for prostitutes by offering them money for sexual favors is but another problem. With the help of citizen involvement, police have been able to move indiscrete prostitution from one neighborhood to another over the years, but it always seems to be a short-term fix to the problem.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the main reasons that I say this is that our laws and penalties in Pennsylvania as they now stand are not enough of a deterrent to adequately address this problem. The jails are too full to lock up prostitutes for any significant period of time, and I don't know that we'd ever want to do that anyway. Many of the johns who get caught patronizing a prostitute simply ignore their

citations, which eventually get lost in the many thousands of outstanding warrants in York County and many other counties around Pennsylvania.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the summer of 1998, I heard of a 10-year-old law in Portland, Oregon, where police were able to confiscate vehicles of johns who were caught committing any prostitution-related offenses. The vehicles were given back to them only after they paid \$750 in costs and storage fees. I talked to the supervisor of the Portland, Oregon, Police Department. He was a supervisor of vice and narcotics, Sergeant Lawson, who told me that they've only had to use this law a handful of times. He said that the fact that it was on the books alone has decreased their open prostitution problem tremendously over the He cited a 1-percent recidivism rate in their last years. statistical analysis study, and as I said, this law has been on their books for 10 years, since 1989.

I believe that if House Bill No. 214,
particularly the part relating to the confiscation of
vehicles of persons involved in prostitution-related
offenses, passed, law enforcement agencies throughout the
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will finally be able to make
some major progress in diminishing indiscrete
prostitution.

I would like to thank Representative Stephen

Stettler and his associates for taking the lead in this project, and also to the York City officials and police for their response to this problem. And finally to the residents who persevered this situation in their neighborhoods and who stood up and did something about it.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Again, I want to emphasize that we're not looking at prostitution the act itself, but the things that it causes in the neighborhoods, and this is only one neighborhood, the Newton Square neighborhood. Over the last 26 years, and I was involved in criminal investigations for many of those years, we have moved these prostitutes from one end of the town to the other. Some of the prostitutes that we see on the street today, a small number of them because it's such a long period of time and their life expectancy isn't that long, there's a couple of them that have been there since I started my career. So that tells you that the laws and penalties that we have now are not doing anything for those people. So I think we have to address the issue of their customers and come up with some stronger laws, and that's what's been proposed before you today.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Mr. Vangreen, and if you please remain there, there may be some questions that will be asked from members of the panel here.

And I'll turn the questioning over first to Representative Stettler.

REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just have one question regarding where the activity, where the number of johns, you know, can come from. You know, when we talk about the drug issues in the city, we often talk about the fact that purchasers of drugs, a high percentage, a very high percentage, of people who buy drugs in the city are not city residents. And I'm just wondering, there are statistics to back that up. I'm just wondering if the same can be said for the johns and whether or not we can substantiate any statistics as to where, you know, where the market is in terms of the johns. And I guess I could go to either one.

COMM. GROFCSIK: Well, Lieutenant Vangreen has the experience in the city. I've been here for about 3 years and 3 months, but from reports I have read, and I read these reports every day, the majority of the clients are from out of town, and the reason why they come in and they bother the local residents, the ladies of the neighborhoods, is because they really don't know who the prostitutes are. They're just cruising to find someone who's available, and that's the real problem. Our decent

1 citizens are being bothered. They're being talked to in a 2 demeaning manner, and it's a real problem. That's why you 3 just heard testimony from some of the people who live in 4 that Newton Square neighborhood. 5 Lieutenant Vangreen? I agree. Probably close to 6 LT. VANGREEN: 7 three-quarters of the johns that we've arrested over the 8 past many years are from not only outside York City but 9 sometimes outside of Pennsylvania. We see johns from 10 Maryland coming to patronize our prostitutes, and as I've 11 said, it's been an ongoing problem. 12 REPRESENTATIVE STETTLER: That's all I have, Mr. 13 Chairman. 14 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Representative Hennessey, do 15 you have any questions for our panel? 16 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Yes, I do. 17 Lieutenant Vangreen, the law that you cited in 18 Portland, Oregon, is that a city ordinance or is that a 19 statewide law? 20 It's a city ordinance and they go LT. VANGREEN: 21 about it, it's a civil procedure under a city ordinance. 22 That's the best I can explain it. I have a copy of the 23 Oregon law. 24 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay, perhaps you can 25 give that to the committee and it would be helpful to look

at that.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LT. VANGREEN: Okay, I can do that.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: The other question I have is with regards to the idea of enhancing these punishments to these offenses, we have the law on the books now that criminalize prostitution and engaging services of prostitution. By enhancing the punishments, once we've done that, we've done our job and at that point we have to rely on local police enforcement to actually go through with the citation. Lots of times this is just one of the laundry list of other charges that sometimes get forgotten at the time of hearing as they go through disorderly conduct or something else that carry that kind of enhanced penalty. What do you think the police reaction would be generally across the State in terms of enforcing these enhanced penalties? Do you think they will be active in it or do you think they will just trade this off as some sort of bargaining chip in the judicial process?

LT. VANGREEN: Well, I think police departments for the most part from what I know have been active in enforcing the prostitution laws. I know we work closely with the State Police to do reverse stings several times a year. As a matter of fact, we just can't do it every day because prostitution is not as high on the priority list

as other crimes.

My main issue is with the confiscation of vehicles. It's an immediate punishment, if you will, to the offender where his vehicle is actually, when he's arrested for patronizing a prostitute or for loitering where a prostitute is involved, which is also one of our city ordinances, it's an immediate consequence where his vehicle, if he used his vehicle, and most of them do because most of them come from outside the city, it's an immediate consequence where his vehicle is taken away from him.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Impounded.

LT. VANGREEN: Temporary impounding. And actually the law in Portland is they can keep the vehicle, but they choose to give the vehicle back after the first offense. And the second offense they impound the vehicle for good. So I think that this law, if it was passed, especially the part of the confiscation of vehicles, it wouldn't take long before you would see a major decrease in the patronizing of prostitutes, at least the indiscrete patronizing of prostitutes, the open solicitation on the streets where the residents also are being harassed.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Well, certainly the 1-percent recidivism rate you cited is an eye-opening example of how this thing could work. So thank you very

much for your testimony.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We have one more member who would like to ask you some questions, but I need to make a public service announcement.

I have been notified that the Main Capitol Building has received a bomb threat this morning. have evacuated the Main Capitol Building. This is not the Main Capitol Building. It's probably a hoax, it's probably nothing of substance. I intend to stay here. Ιf anybody else intends to stay with me, we'll continue with this hearing. If you wish to leave, that's your prerogative. I'm not going to try to keep you here under that mental stress perhaps. I, quite frankly, think there's probably nothing to it, and in any event, it's not this building anyway that received the bomb threat, but just for your information and just so you know that that is going on and taking place that you may wish to vacate this room and go to the outside if you would like. That includes our folks who are testifying. We don't want to keep you here as a captive audience here either.

With all that has been said, you may feel free to leave. Quite frankly, I'm not going to give in to this sort of thing. I'm going to stay here, and if I get blown to bits, that will be my own fault, but I don't think

1 there's anything to it and I think one of the reasons why 2 people do it is to make people like us give in to their scares and their tactics so they can have a good time 3 making good, decent people suffer under consequences. 4 Sounds somewhat like what we're talking about, 5 6 doesn't it? Did you have a question? I was going to say we're about to 7 MS. DORM: leave, but that's due to time constraints. 8 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: No one will accept that. 9 10 LT. VANGREEN: They are not cowards, that's for 11 sure. No one will place any 12 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: 13 connotations on your part. Representative Feese from Lycoming County has a 14 15 few questions for you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 16 REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: 17 Let me preface my remarks by stating that I 18 intend to support the bills, but I assume that one of the 19 goals is to deter other people, to seize a car, seize two 20 cars, the word gets out, and the johns will be deterred. 21 I guess my concern is part of Lieutenant Vangreen's 22 testimony he said that many of the johns are caught 23 patronizing a prostitute and they simply ignore the 24 citations and there are thousands of outstanding warrants

in York County. I was District Attorney of Lycoming

25

County for eight years and we would never put up with outstanding warrants like that. Why aren't we after these people?

LT. VANGREEN: Resources. There's no one to go after those people. Our police officers answer 62,000 calls a year, our patrol officers. They write thousands of citations per year. They have no way of going after these people unless they run across them in their normal course of duty every day. Our sheriff's department, they serve some warrants, our constables serve some warrants, but they only hit the tip of the iceberg.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Well, what can we do to correct that, because many, many police departments are like that. The City of Williamsport is like that and there is an aggressive effort to enforce those citations that are not responded to, issue warrants, and there's always an effort to do it. What--

LT. VANGREEN: That brings up another problem - magistrates. We serve a warrant, an arrest and return warrant on someone that ignored their citation, the magistrates will take them for arraignment, the officer on the car stop will take them to the magistrate's office, the magistrate will give him another 30 days to respond to that. That arrest and return warrant turns into a fine and cost warrant. Next year he'll be stopped again, an

officer will bring him in for the fine and cost warrants, and guess what happens? The prison is full, or whatever reason it is, the magistrate doesn't feel like it, more times than not that person will be released one more time, and only after that will there be a commitment for lockup. So he gets three chances.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: I understand the problems, but the argument you just made about the magistrates is a good argument against just judicial retention for magistrates, and many of them continue to be elected, so if they're not doing their job we get people who want to do their job. Thank you.

I agree with you. Forget retention. Make people run on their record. That's an editorial comment and not cogent to this particular subject at hand, but I do want to thank you folks for coming. I appreciate you remaining after my public service announcement, and I appreciate everybody else that's still remaining in the room, and thank you again for testifying. I appreciate it.

LT. VANGREEN: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: The next testifier that we have was scheduled to be Mr. Stanley Rebert, District Attorney of York County, was not able to be with us today but he did send his first assistant, Mr. Tom Kelly, who

unfortunately didn't have much notice that he was going to be here, I understand, but Mr. Kelly, I do want to thank you for coming at the last minute filling in. I know you didn't have an the opportunity to prepare written remarks. I'm sure that you're aware of the subject at hand and will be able to lend some of your expertise for members of the panel, so I would appreciate your sharing your thoughts on these bills.

MR. KELLY: Okay, good morning, gentlemen. My name is Tom Kelly, and I'm the First Assistant District Attorney of York County. I am also a City Councilman on York City Council, so I have two hats which I wear before you today.

The problem in York City is a problem which is not just contained within York City, it's a problem which every city council of at least medium size faces yearly, and it's a problem which every district attorney's office statewide deals with. And if I could boil this problem down to what I believe it to be its root beginning, which is the proliferation in prostitution from these medium size cities is directly linked to the proliferation of drugs within our society. As the drug trade has proliferated, collateral crimes associated with the drug trade have also seen a great rise. One of those crimes is the crime of prostitution and related offenses. As

addicts, especially female addicts, become addicted to drugs, they are in dire need in many instances of raising capital to purchase those drugs. The method by which they raise that capital is by selling their bodies on the streets. As the drug trade has proliferated, so too has the prostitution trade. As we see more and more addicts on the street, we're going to see more and more addicts attempting to sell their bodies to make the money sufficient to purchase those drugs.

The problem of the addiction to drugs is that it is such a desire that you and I may not ever experience in our lives to fulfill the need for drugs that people are willing to do virtually anything. And we see more and more females walking the streets who heretofore may not even have considered such a lifestyle who are now on the streets without a home willing to do anything to purchase the drugs necessary to fulfill their fix.

As we take the female addicts off the street, and I use female because that's the majority of the people who are involved in this traffic at this point, and we arrest them, the laws as they are now are not sufficient to retain them in incarceration until such time as we can either clean them of their addiction or warehouse them for a sufficient period of time that we can keep them off the street and they are forced to clean themselves of their

addiction. What they do then if they are released or cited is they go right back on the streets to attempt to make more money to fulfill their addictions.

There are many people in our society today—I shouldn't say many, but there are some people in our society today—who see these addicts, these people on the streets plying their trade, as victims, and people, these few people, feed on these victims. And what the net effect of this is is that we have had a proliferation of drugs and a proliferation of prostitution. We've also seen an equal proliferation of johns.

I live in an area right now, Newton Square, you may have heard it mentioned earlier, it's an area which had been in the past, 20 years ago, it was a red light district. It has now become a walking district for prostitutes. It is also a rehab district and I live in a rehabbed home, but because this has historically been an area where johns could come to find prostitutes, prostitutes have come to ply their trade, it has now, this rehab district which the city of York and the State of Pennsylvania has invested a great deal of money in, has now become a kind of neo-red-light district. The effect of this has been we have females walking the streets all hours of the day soliciting men. I myself have been solicited. Soliciting vehicles. We also have johns,

especially on Friday and Saturday nights, sometimes on Sunday mornings, doing a circuit around my area looking for prostitutes and soliciting anyone who doesn't have a baby carriage, any female who doesn't have a baby carriage. My wife taking a walk has been solicited.

The ripple effect on my community just in that small area has been extremely profound. People who have moved into this rehab district are now at wits' end. Their area has become just overrun by prostitutes and johns.

So, as the proliferation of drugs, the proliferation of prostitution, we now have the rippling effect in our communities. It is not something which is occurring in houses, in hotels, motels, et cetera. We, because these drug addicts have no place to go, they are street walking. The one place where they can ply their trade without possible police intervention is in a vehicle. The johns come in from outside the city in many instances, solicit the prostitutes, or the prostitutes solicit them, and the room they use is the vehicle. They then take the vehicle and park it in the darkest corner they can find and the acts are performed.

One way that we can address this present situation is by taking the vehicle, literally and figuratively, for this act and seizing the vehicle. The

ripple effect upon that will be that when this gets out, the johns, in many instance the only method by which they can get to their work, the only method by which sometimes they can make money, will be the subject of confiscation by the police. That will also have an effect upon the john and the recidivism rate. The john's wife, if he has one, will receive notice that that vehicle is the subject of seizure. The notice will contain within it, "This vehicle was used in the perpetration of an act of prostitution and its related offenses." It may not happen instantaneously; however, the rippling effect this legislation will be, and I know I've used that many times, that same term, rippling effect, because I do believe that as this law goes into effect, the community at large will feel an impact over the course of the first year or so. The recidivism rate will go down. As you take the supply, the johns, out of the equation, so too will the people that fulfill the demand be taken out of the equation. They will not be walking the streets looking and soliciting johns in their vehicles. The effect of that will be that communities such as the community that I work in can go back to a sense of what they had five or six years ago where it was a nice urban rehab district with children and professionals attempting to carve out their own little piece of the best in a city.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I really urge you all to look at this and I urge you to adopt it. It may need to be tweaked here and there; however, I think it will have a great and profound effect upon urban communities, not just Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, but even town cities like York, Lancaster, et cetera. And I thank you all for having me here. I'm open to any questions you have.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Mr. Kelly. You did quite well for not having any prepared remarks but being called in at the last minute.

MR. KELLY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I have a few quick questions for you. We heard earlier that the State of Oregon has a law similar to this. Is there any other States in the United States that you know that have it?

MR. KELLY: Not that I know of, and actually as a City Council member I was privy to that law. We were drafting and redrafting our municipal prostitution ordinance at the time and we were looking into the area of seizing vehicles and we, based upon our research that we saw that as a municipality it was something that we could not do, but it was something that we thought would be extremely persuasive to johns in not coming to the city and trying to do that. I'm certain that a good Internet search may reveal any such ordinances throughout the

United States. If Oregon has one, I'm certain that
someone else has something of a similar ilk.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: One of the earlier testifiers said that it's been in effect for about 10 years. Do you know whether or not it has sustained any constitutional challenges?

MR. KELLY: That was a question I had. I don't know whether it's withstood any constitutional challenge. I would assume that if it's been in effect, it has. I think perhaps in Pennsylvania, that statute as it's drafted may not withstand constitutional muster because they don't relate it to an actual conviction. They just seize your car and they say you can have it back if you've paid what is tantamount to a fine, \$700. They don't say that the cost of storage is \$700, they just say you can have it back for \$700.

If we had a statute and it were linked directly to the cost of storage of a vehicle, I think you'd have that sufficient constitutional nexus which it would not be looked at as a fine, it would merely be a storage cost. I don't see that necessarily in the Oregon statute, but it's something that with a little bit of work could easily be implemented and it would withstand constitutional muster.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: How large is the city of York? How many people live there?

1 MR. KELLY: I think 52,000 in the city of York. 2 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: And if you were to estimate, 3 how many prostitutes are plying their trade in the city 4 currently? MR. KELLY: Well, as I drive out of the 5 courthouse each day I see, on any given day, between three 6 7 and five just on one corner, right by the post office up 8 the street from my home. If I were to go out on Friday night -- first of all, I would not want to walk that 9 10 street on Friday night, but second of all, I would say 11 that you have anywhere up to 20 just in the area of the 12 post office and the area which is about two blocks away 13 from where I literally live on any given Friday or 14 Saturday night. 15 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Well, in quantifying this 16 for the entire city, how many would you say? 17 MR. KELLY: Coming and going within the trade, 18 kind of use that term loosely. 19 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I know we're going to take a poll on this, but--20 21 MR. KELLY: I would said upwards of 100. 22 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: And would you say that 23 that's high or low compared to other cities of your size? 24 MR. KELLY: I'd say that that's probably about 25 equal to Lancaster, perhaps even Harrisburg. Harrisburg

is a little bit bigger. I would say it's about equal.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Last question I have for you is you mentioned many of the prostitutes are drug users, addicts who are supporting their habit, supporting it by selling their bodies, and we also know that to get them out of that cycle of drug use and prostitution that supports it, some programs are even mandatorily entered into or volunteer to go into it, would you give your view on what is successful in breaking that link between drug use and prostitution? Are there any particular programs? Apparently one of our earlier testifiers said it's not how many times you get arrested, because some of them get arrested over and over again and that doesn't stop them, what do you see is the most successful way to break that drug habit that goes with prostitution?

MR. KELLY: Long-term intensive supervision by probation and parole agency that mandates drug treatment and counseling, and the best way to do that is in-patient, and it costs money. But the prostitution statutes as they are right now, it may be five, six, seven arrests before you get any term of incarceration, even in a county facility. Until you have a prostitute or a drug addict incarcerated for a long period of time you're not going to be able to subject them to the type of counseling and drug intervention necessary to clean them, to keep them off the

1 streets and keep them out of drugs. 2 There's also other intangibles. First of all, 3 the desires, but if we're speaking purely from the perspective of what is the best thing to do on the part of 4 the State, it is to get them under the State's 5 jurisdiction so that they can receive the counseling and 6 7 drug intervention necessary to clean them of their 8 addiction. 9 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Mr. Kelly. 10 turn the questioning over to other members of the panel. 11 Representative Feese. 12 REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Yes, thank you, Mr. 13 Chairman. 14 If the goal is to deter johns, do you have any 15 comments on why we should not authorize a forfeiture of 16 the vehicle on the first offense? 17 MR. KELLY: In a first offense? 18 REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: On a first offense. 19 MR. KELLY: I think it's perfectly legitimate to 20 do so on the first offense. I believe the drafters of 21 this legislation thought it -- well, I don't know what 22 they thought, but perhaps they wanted to give everyone a 23 first shot. Okay, you've got your first chance. Now next

time we're going to take your vehicle.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: The only reason I'm

24

25

thinking of that is I'm making an assumption that a fair number of the johns that are coming in from the outlying areas might have families and reputable jobs, et cetera, and it seems to me that in a number of areas, criminal laws do not deter, but drawing an analogy to the DUI laws, I think the DUI has had an impact, the 48-hour mandatory imprisonment, the mandatory license suspension. Of course ARD is available, but those penalties at least I felt have had a deterrent effect for individuals who are not individual drinkers but your average citizen. They think more about that or are more responsible, et cetera.

MR. KELLY: Agreed.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: I'm just thinking if we really want to have an impact, we really want to deter people, why not do it the first time?

MR. KELLY: Is that a rhetorical question?
REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: It is. It is.

MR. KELLY: And I agree with you and I also agree with the fact that the DUI laws have had a profound impact upon people who go out and drink, and I mean, in discussions that are had nowadays at parties are: Are you okay to drive? It's something that was never discussed 15 years ago, you know, or my parents never discussed, and certainly also owners of bars, they are much more cognizant of the effect of giving another drink to

someone. And I think you're correct.

I can only theorize that perhaps the thought was, well, we'll give everyone one shot at this.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: I'm not so sure that people in your neighborhoods who are suffering like we heard should have to wait long for that, but hopefully if the prime sponsor, Representative Stettler, is really interested in going after this problem, I'll certainly support an amendment to make it a first-time offense that we're taking if he wishes to do that. Maybe you should talk to him.

MR. KELLY: Okay, I will.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: Thank you for having me testify.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Our next testifier is Larry Frankel from the American Civil Liberties Union, who is not in the room. I understand Mr. Sean Carr of the Philadelphia Police Department is here. He stepped out for a break, so we will suspend this hearing for a few minutes until Mr. Carr returns. So stretch your legs and take a short break.

(Whereupon, the proceedings were recessed at 10:18 a.m., and were reconvened at 10:30 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Well, most of the panel that was here I guess couldn't resist the temptation to go out on the lawn like the rest of the people and enjoy the good weather. Representative Hennessey is back to join us and some of the other members had other meetings to go to.

We'll pick up on our agenda with the scheduled testifier for 10:45 is Larry Frankel, the Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania. He also has with him an assistant by the name of Travis Tu, and I understand, Mr. Tu, you're going to be giving the testimony today.

MR. FRANKEL: Well, he's going to start and I'll add some comments.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Okay, Mr. Tu, if you want to begin.

MR. TU: Good morning, my name is Travis Tu and I'm here today on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania. My thanks to the Judiciary Committee for allowing me the opportunity to present testimony today. My comments will be limited to House Bill No. 213, a bill that would authorize the seizure and forfeiture of vehicles used in the commission of criminal offenses related to prostitution. The ACLU believes that the existing forfeiture schemes are flawed, and we support efforts to reform existing forfeiture laws. We appreciate

this opportunity to raise concerns over the protection of civil liberties in the authorization of new forfeiture statutes.

Let me begin by stating that the ACLU recognizes this Commonwealth's legitimate interest in deterring criminal activity and disabling repeat offenders. We have, however, serious reservations about the means this bill uses to reach that objective. Broadening the civil forfeiture laws threatens Pennsylvanians' rights to be free from punishment that is disproportionate to the offense, and this bill also raises questions about the potential for double jeopardy.

Since the mid-1980s, our country has seen a dramatic rise in law enforcement's use of civil forfeiture. It has been seen as an ultimate weapon in the war on drugs. The ability to seize for forfeiture the assets of those making tremendous profit from drug trafficking has been thought of as some form of poetic justice. As law enforcement began to realize the relative ease by which forfeitures could be secured, the opportunity for forfeitures to become a lucrative source of supplemental revenue made forfeiture statutes open to excessive use and abuse. In keeping with the saying that politics makes for strange bedfellows, the ACLU has taken guidance on this issue from Henry Hyde,

Republican Chair of the U.S. House Judiciary Committee, who has tried in numerous sections to pass reforms of this nation's two centuries' old civil asset forfeiture laws.

In a letter to his House colleagues last year, co-signed by Representative Bob Barr of Georgia, Chairman Hyde noted that, quote, "it has become all too apparent in recent years that these civil asset forfeiture laws are sometimes being used in terribly unjust ways."

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Heightened awareness of States' uses of forfeiture statutes has caused the public and the courts to consider the question of whether these punishments fit The question becomes even more appropriate as the crimes. legislators consider expanding forfeiture laws to address a wider variety of crimes, in this case to offenses related to prostitution. Therefore, it would seem relevant as you consider this bill to ask whether the seizing and forfeiture of a person's automobile suits the crime of a second or subsequent conviction for an offense related to prostitution. Are the conviction and resulting penalties related to these offenses no longer adequate, or should the government now authorize law enforcement to take possession of the offender's car, sell it to the highest bidder and pocket the profits?

The U.S. Supreme Court, in <u>Austin vs. The United</u>
<u>States</u>, ruled that forfeiture could, in certain instances,

be considered punishment and would in such cases be regulated by the Excessive Fines Clause of the Eighth Amendment. Just last week, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in Commonwealth vs. 5043 Anderson Road, curtailed what law enforcement could legally seize for forfeiture.

In that case, law enforcement found that the owner of the 24-acre property was conducting a lucrative business selling marijuana from his family's house and adjacent garage. Pursuant to the Controlled Substances Forfeiture Act, the Commonwealth filed a forfeiture petition for the entire property. The Supreme Court agreed with a lower court decision that limited the forfeiture to the house and the garage and excluded 22 acres deemed unrelated to the criminal activity.

The Justices commented that using the district attorney's argument justifying law enforcement's excessive forfeiture of the entire property would produce absurd results and would defy what the Justices called a common sense approach to forfeiture. This case demonstrates the growing need for the courts to remedy the excessive punishments inflicted by law enforcement's use of broad forfeiture statutes.

House Bill No. 213 also raises concerns over the potential for double jeopardy. In the case of

Commonwealth vs. Wingait Farms, law enforcement seized a horse form, horses, and other property under the Controlled Substances Forfeiture Act after findings that the property was used to facilitate drug violations in delivery of marijuana worth nearly half a million dollars. After pleading guilty to various drug charges, the owner of the property claimed that the forfeiture of her property was a violation of the double jeopardy clause of the U.S. and Pennsylvania Constitutions.

The court ruled that the forfeitures in the case could not be considered double jeopardy, because, quote, the forfeiture statute serves the purpose of depriving the defendant of the means to commit additional offenses and also helps the State defray the costs of investigation and prosecution. Thus, the claim of double jeopardy was thrown out because the forfeiture was seen as remedial rather than punitive.

Here is where the use of forfeiture in drug-related offenses might differ from the use of forfeiture in offenses related to prostitution. The use of forfeiture to seize the property of drug offenders is meant to deprive the offender of the means to commit additional offenses. House Bill No. 213 does not deprive offenders of the means to commit repeat offenses. A person could violate these crimes related to prostitution

using someone else's vehicle, a rented vehicle, or even perhaps a bicycle. Therefore, the use of forfeiture in these offenses could more easily be seen as further punishment and may therefore open the law to double jeopardy challenges.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

While the bill makes clear the intent to use forfeiture against habitual offenders, it may be worthwhile to consider who besides the offender may be unduly burdened by the forfeiture of a car. Consider for a moment a one-car family where the mother works and the father either stays at home to take care of the children, works nights, or is currently unemployed. After Mom returns from work, Dad drives down and solicits a prostitute. After being convicted of his second offense, the family loses the car unless Mom can show that she is the rightful owner of the car and that the acts were committed without her knowledge. The bill does not even make clear what would happen if both Mom and Dad were listed as owners of the vehicle. But clearly, if the title were in Dad's name alone, this one-car family would now be a no-car family.

We suggest that the committee consider adopting language similar to that proposed in House Bill No. 263, referred to this committee on February 1, 1999. Section 6801(1) of this bill would provide a hardship exception in

vehicle forfeiture cases related to drug offenses. This section reads:

"No vehicle shall be subject to forfeiture...
where forfeiture will impose a substantial hardship
upon the family of the owner of the vehicle. For the
purposes of determining whether a substantial hardship
exists, the court shall consider whether the vehicle
is the family's only source of transportation, public
or private, whether the vehicle is the family's only
means of obtaining food and other necessities, whether
the vehicle is the family's only means of
transportation to educational facilities or whether
the vehicle is the family's only means of
transportation to places of employment."

The ACLU does not support expanding the use of forfeiture in Pennsylvania to offenses related to prostitution. To that end, we urge the committee to look closely at ways to diminish the potential for inflicting disproportionate punishment contained in House Bill No. 213.

Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Mr. Frankel.

MR. FRANKEL: Thank you. Good morning,
Representative Birmelin and Representative Hennessey, and
I commend you for your remaining in the building. I think

it's admirable and I'm glad we're able to proceed today.

I would like to add a few brief comments with respect to Bills 212 and 215. House Bill No. 212 would mandate the suspension of operating privileges for any person convicted of patronizing a prostitute or any municipal ordinance relating to prostitution offenses. In our mind, the legislation raises several concerns. First, there's no requirement that the defendant had been using a vehicle at the time he committed the offense. There's not any clear nexus between the crime in that instance and the penalty that's being imposed.

Second, the legislation raises the problem of proportionate punishment, although it is somewhat tempered by the possibility that an offender may qualify for an occupational limited license or reduce the period of suspension through community service.

Third, the provision regarding revocation of a habitual offender's license appears to permit the revocation of a license of an individual whose driving behavior does not pose a danger to other drivers. Again, this raises a question of proportionality. In fact, when we were coming up in the car today, Representative Birmelin, I was remembering comments I believe you made last week on the floor with regard to an amendment to Ben Ramos's bill that would have been suspending a driver's

license for graffiti or vandalism and expressed some
concern--

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: And I recall the amendment passed.

MR. FRANKEL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Partially due to my persuasive powers, I believe.

MR. FRANKEL: I think solely due to your persuasive powers.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I understand. That is the one I was making on the House Bill.

MR. FRANKEL: House Bill No. 215 provides for suspension of the vehicle registration when the vehicle has been used by the owner or some other person in violation of the anti-prostitution laws. Suspension is automatic upon conviction of the criminal offense. There is no provision for a hearing in that bill. There is no exception for a co-owner or innocent owner of the vehicle in that bill. The ACLU believes that due process requires that the owner or co-owner of the vehicle be given an opportunity to present evidence that the unlawful use of the vehicle was without his or her knowledge or consent. Cracking down on those who patronize prostitutes should not be accomplished at the expense of innocent individuals.

Thank you again for allowing us to present our views today, and we'd be happy to try to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Representative Hennessey.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Frankel, and thank you, Mr. Tu. Well, there's been just a little bit of comment on House Bill No. 214, that's the question on issue of impoundment of the vehicles upon the arrest. And I noticed from looking at your comments, Mr. Tu, you were talking about just House Bill No. 213, and I think, Larry, you talked about 212, and 215, so I don't want to ask you questions about it if you've not reviewed--

MR. FRANKEL: I have reviewed the bills.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I thought, frankly, the concern that you had dealt with the immediate impoundment upon the arrest of someone and a charge of prostitution or soliciting a prostitute and the fact that it was going to cost up to \$1,000 to get the car back at a time when unless there's an immediate guilty plea I believe the constitutional provision for the presumption of innocence would apply. I'm a little surprised that neither of you had talked about that, but it seems to me that if we authorize up to \$1,000, and it almost becomes a

form of lancing to get cars back before there's ever been a conviction, that may very well have serious constitutional ramifications. With respect to your comments, I'm not so certain that we don't have relationships here between cars and drivers who are soliciting the prostitutes. The testimony of the earlier witnesses indicated that on many occasions people cruising, johns cruising up and down the street making advances toward people out car windows or calling to women working on the sidewalk, flashing money or even making suggestions that are inappropriate, and it would seem to me that there is as much of a causal relationship in those situations to the driver and user of the car as there are in situations in which the court has said that if you use a car or a house or a building to facilitate drug trafficking, then that building or house or car is subject to seizure. But that of course is not an immediate impoundment situation, and that's why there is a process to have due procedure safeguards.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With regard to the question of double jeopardy, it seems to me that we have license suspensions for driving under the influence in addition to incarceration. So it seems to me that going after someone's license doesn't raise the kind of double jeopardy concerns that -- doesn't violate the double jeopardy clause. I understand

your concerns for them and I think it's wise to hear about those, but I wouldn't think they would run afoul with the double jeopardy clause because we've done it in other cases and other cases have been upheld because of the causal relationships that have been shown.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't know if there's a question, but I'll hear your comments.

MR. FRANKEL: Actually, there are three questions there. I'll deal at least with the first one because it was about the bill we didn't address. It does raise concerns as well. I quess partly my judgment is clouded by having had my car towed in New York City recently just for merely parking in the wrong place. mean, that is one of the hazards, I think, of driving these days. I'm not trying to dismiss your concerns. Impoundment is serious, but at least you can get your car back. Under some of the other bills, there isn't even a remedy necessarily to -- certainly if your car is forfeited you're not going to get it back. It wasn't clear to me if your registration is suspended how you get the registration back. That bill doesn't say anything. So I think it was a matter of prioritizing what we were concerned with rather than necessarily addressing each and every problem in the bills.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Fair enough.

MR. FRANKEL: The second question was--

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Before you leave that, I mean, the concern that I would have is the impoundment at a time when the presumption of innocence under our Constitution applies and the fact that you can avoid that impoundment but only if you come up with \$750 or \$1,000, it's hard for people to do that. Not a lot of people have that kind of ready cash, or I should say there are a lot of people who don't have that kind of ready cash, so if you want to submit anything further to the committee with regard to that specifically, I think it's House Bill No. 214.

MR. FRANKEL: I will take you up on your suggestion.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: And also before you leave, you mentioned that House Bill No. 212 didn't indicate how to get your operating privileges back, but if you look at page 3, line 5, it does tell you there is already in law a process for that.

MR. FRANKEL: I may have misspoken. I indicated that House Bill No. 213, the car gets forfeited, and under 215 your registration gets suspended. I did not mention--

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I thought you meant driving license.

MR. FRANKEL: No. I know you can get your driving license back under the bill, but it's the suspension bill that doesn't indicate at all--

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

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: The suspension of the registration of the car, not of the driver's license?

MR. FRANKEL: Not of the driver's license, of the car. I'm sorry if I misspoke. But we will provide further comments on the one bill we didn't specifically address.

I know one of your other questions was about double jeopardy. I guess I'll address that issue. think the issue becomes whether the second penalty is deemed remedial or punitive. And the question that seems to be raised here, at least with the drug forfeiture they're seizing the assets that have been obtained through the drug trade. So in a sense it's a civil remedy to make somebody whole, in this case the government whole, from the illegal activity. With regard to seizing the car, other than it deprives that person until they go get another vehicle from being able to potentially solicit a prostitute, it is taking an asset for punitive purposes solely, which I think does raise different issues under the double jeopardy clause than are raised by the drug forfeiture statutes. At least the way the court has indicated when it upheld the drug forfeiture law, and as

we see more recently with a decision just last week, even with regard to drug forfeiture the court is beginning to say there are limits of what can be done.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Is it your feeling that the courts have said that the only forfeitures which are allowed are those where the government can show that the assets were actually procured, the assets that were sought to be forfeited, the building, in that case, I think it was the farmhouse, or the car were procured as a result of profits made from other drug activity? It just seemed to me that if it was used in the distribution chain at some point, that at that point it became subject to forfeiture, not that you had to show that this was the result of prior drug activity or illegal activity that caused profits that allowed you to purchase that.

MR. FRANKEL: I don't think the case law has been fully developed in this area because the challenges are relatively recent, but--

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I'm sorry.

MR. FRANKEL: The challenges on forfeiture laws are relatively recent, but they've always emphasized looking at how punitive it is in determining whether double jeopardy applies. And that's the crux of any double jeopardy argument: Is this additional punishment after they've already been convicted, or is it more in the

nature of a civil remedy, which has always been. You know, a person can sue civilly after the criminal case to be compensated for the losses that happen in this case. It's the government that is doing the civil action. So I don't think we know definitively where all of this goes, and I think the testimony indicates that it raises the question. I don't think we know the answer yet, but it's distinguished and I don't think the courts are necessarily going to say, well, because we allowed the drug-related offenses we're going to allow it somewhere else.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: You might just want to take a look at the written testimony of previous witnesses. It sort of might enhance your views in terms of how cars and the prostitution and solicitation of prostitution might be related from their actual on-the-street experience that some of the people have testified to. It might be helpful to you.

MR. FRANKEL: I have no doubt that there is a relationship between using cars and people driving around to solicit prostitutes and probably sometimes soliciting nonprostitutes in mistake. Not doubt that that occurs, but I think the question to the court will also be: Is it deemed to be punishment or is it deemed to be something that falls outside the double jeopardy clause?

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Just as a footnote to all of

this, one of our previous testifiers gave me a copy of the law in Portland, after which some of these bills were modeled, and it indicates there that the forfeiture or the seizures of the vehicle is done as a civil procedure not as a criminal procedure, but from the criminal procedure of soliciting. I don't think that's what's happening in these bills here, but that may be a model that they've found to be successful.

And let me ask you this question I've asked of other witnesses: Has that Portland legislation been tested for constitutionality in court that you know of, either in Oregon State court or the U.S. Supreme Court?

MR. FRANKEL: I don't know the answer. I don't know of any challenge to it. These bills imply a civil action as well. Everything is civil forfeiture, but I don't know, again, I don't know that it's been challenged. It may not have been challenged. I don't know that these bills, if they are enacted, will be challenged. It may depend on how they're enforced, but what we did see for the first time just last week is the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, although it was upholding a lower court, did find that there are limitations on how far they will let forfeiture proceedings go, which is a new development.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: It just seems odd to me that

Oregon has had this law in effect for at least 10 years and none of the testifiers prior to you have any knowledge of any other State that has had it or whether or not they were going to challenge it constitutionally.

MR. FRANKEL: I know that the State of
California has a similar statute and that the city of
Oakland has passed laws that go further than the
California law that was passed, and the ACLU of Northern
California is challenging the Oakland statute, partly
because their State law that seems to preempt the field.
But there may also, and I'll have to check and we will
check to see whether these are entirely consistent as
well.

And some of the concerns that we have are whether this license you can obtain, the hardship license you can obtain, I don't know whether that exists in Oregon or not. That would certainly affect, one, anybody's interest in challenging; and two, how the court might dispose of it. But we'll look into that as well.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: My administrative assistant, Mr. Mann, has a question for you.

MR. MANN: Just a really quick question. Mr. Frankel, in the recent Pennsylvania Supreme Court case that will limit the asset forfeiture on a 24-acre piece of property, I haven't read the case yet but could you tell

1 me whether the criminal activity involved was limited to 2 the house and the garage and the privilege around, or was 3 the other 22 acres of the property in any way involved in the criminal activity? 5 It was my understanding in the reading MR. TU: of the case that the reason the court decided that the 22 6 7 acres would be partitioned would be because there was no 8 direct nexus between those acres and the activities. 9 MR. MANN: So they weren't growing marijuana in 10 the fields, but if they had been, chances are the case 11 would have turned a little bit differently? 12 MR. TU: Perhaps. 13 MR. MANN: Okay, thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Mr. Frankel and 15 We appreciate your coming here and giving your Mr. Tu. 16 testimony today. 17 MR. FRANKEL: Thank you. 18 MR. TU: Thank you. 19 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Our next testimony is Sean 20 Carr, Lieutenant of the Philadelphia Police Department. 21 Welcome to our committee meeting. When you're settled in 22 and ready, you may begin your testimony. 23 MR. CARR: Hello. Thank you for having us 24 My name is Sean Carr. I'm a Lieutenant with the

Philadelphia Police Department. My current assignment is

25

as the lead officer of the Citywide Vice Enforcement Unit.

The Philadelphia Police Department Citywide Vice Enforcement unit has identified 66 prostitution corridors within the city limits. The Prostitution Control Squad of this unit makes between 6 and 20 prostitution arrests each night that they work. In calendar year 1998, a total of 1,935 prostitution arrests were made by the squad. The Prostitution Control Squad so far this year has made 556 prostitution arrests. That's just for the first three months of this year.

As the Commanding Officer of the Citywide vice enforcement unit I attend neighborhood meetings and listen to law-abiding, good living members of the community complain about the problems associated with prostitution. I hear people complaining about how the street prostitutes tie up traffic, causing unsafe conditions for their children on neighborhood streets, how they taunt and scream at citizens who try to chase them. I listen as mothers and fathers tell horror stories on how their children got swept into the sex business with promises of glamorous modeling careers, and or because their peers, and therefore they, see it as fast, easy cash.

I listen when grandparents speak of the times they take their young grandchildren out for a walk in the

park or in the neighborhood, only to have that child pick up a used discarded condom thinking it was a balloon. hear patrons complain about the dirty hooker who gave me this disease, or they just say thank goodness it's not AIDS, it's only gonorrhea, syphilis, or herpes. I listen to the spouses of patrons complain in bewilderment about infections or diseases they mysteriously contracted. Other spouses of patrons who are lucky enough not to suffer from these diseases can't understand what is happening to money that is desperately needed in the family budget. I watch television and movies and see glamorous portrayals of prostitutes' lives and experiences that don't contain even the most remotest degree of truth I know because I've witnessed how they really or realism. receive. Do most people understand what the life of an average prostitute is really like, or are they naive enough to believe the lifestyle portrayed by Hollywood? When I participate and counter-prostitution street operations and see firsthand the desperation in the prostitute's lives, I can't help but wonder how anyone can let their self-esteem get so low that they will sell the only thing they have left, their body. All of these people that I have just mentioned are victims. They're victims of a so-called victimless crime. Prostitution is a crime of victims. There are only two people involved in

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

this crime that are not victims - drug dealers and pimps because - because they are the only two people who really profit.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Having explained how virtually everyone involved in the prostitution business is a victim, outside of the promoter or the drug dealer, you're probably wondering why these bills are so important to battle these problems. Law enforcement needs as many arrows in its quiver as it can obtain to effectively combat the prostitution Taking away people's driving privileges, problem. impounding and/or seizing their vehicles or suspending the registration of their vehicles, as described in House Bills 212 through 215, has been an extremely successful deterrent when used in drug enforcement. this Commander's belief that if these acts are made into law and announced in a widely publicized ad campaign it will in itself act as a deterrent to many patrons or potential patrons of prostitutes. For those who are not deterred by the ad campaign, vigorous enforcement and strict judicial interpretation of these laws will cut deeply into the demand for the services of prostitutes.

The enactment of these laws should have a profound impact on potential patrons of prostitutes.

Patrons will realize for the first time that being charged with patronizing a prostitute will no longer result in

just the minor inconvenience of appearing in court to get this thing over with. They will understand the seriousness of this crime by the severity of the penalty each time they are inconvenienced by not being able to drive.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The one portion of Bill 213 that is difficult to understand is why does it state it is all right to promote or patronize prostitutes until after you get caught for the first time? Is the Commonwealth condoning this behavior? Why does someone have to be convicted twice in a period of five years before their vehicle can be seized? Save the victims of these crimes from themselves by making the penalties a real deterrence. Let patrons worry about losing their vehicles the first time they indulge in this behavior. Save their spouses and families from the hardships they suffer, from the diseases associated with this behavior or the loss of family Give this arrow real penetrating power to cut into funds. the demand side of this economic equation of the prostitution business. Prostitution patrons know what they are doing is wrong; show them the legislature also knows this behavior is wrong.

The Philadelphia Police Department is aware of all the problems associated with prostitution. This department has dedicated a squad of the Citywide Vice

Enforcement Unit to address the street prostitution problem in Philadelphia. 1,935 arrests were made in 1998. This unit has made 556 prostitution arrests the first three months of 1999, over 100 more than the same time period of 1998. These statistics indicate the size of the prostitution problem in Philadelphia. District and Divisional commanders are having several officers trained to conduct their own counter-prostitution enforcement efforts in addition to the Citywide Vice Enforcement Unit's efforts because they realize the magnitude of this problem.

The Philadelphia Police Department realizes
there's a link between prostitution, illegal drugs, and
other crimes which cause the deterioration of
neighborhoods. These conditions have to be attacked on
all fronts. The passing of Bills 212, 213, 214 and 215
would help police officers and members of the community in
their efforts to rid their neighborhoods of street
prostitution. Please remember that most people don't
recognize street prostitution as a problem until a hooker
starts practicing her trade in front of their family's
home.

Years ago some success was made in the battle against prostitution by having the names of people convicted of patronizing prostitutes published in local

newspapers. This idea was rendered ineffective by not publishing names of people who would enter a guilty plea, and by waiting as long as six months to have the list of names of people found guilty of patronizing prostitutes appear in some nondescript section of the newspaper.

Don't allow House Bills 212, 213, 214 and 215 to be rendered ineffective by compromise. Give law enforcement a strong, effective weapon to help rid communities of prostitution-related crimes.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you, Mr. Carr.

Representative Hennessey.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Nothing right now, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: I have a few questions for you.

You stated I think twice that your rate of arrest for prostitution in Philadelphia has increased over last year. Is that a result of just more aggressively enforcing the law, or has more prostitution taken place?

LT. CARR: I'm trying to indicate the size of the prostitution problem. I have one squad of people who address it. They can only go to one of the 66 corridors that I mentioned. Any one of those corridors will make between 6 and 20 prostitution arrests each night when they work.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: What's the definition of a prostitution corridor?

when they are solicited -- all the arrests under Crimes Code 5902. If they are solicited by a prostitute and the police officer working as a decoy officer receives a solicitation of sex for money. It's also when we have women police officers who pose as prostitutes and patrons approach them and offer the woman police officers a deal, so much money if the woman police officer will perform a sex act. That's the type of arrests that I'm talking about, and obstructing a highway arrest where prostitutes who are known by police or who have been chased several times for flagging down single males in vehicles in order to try to make a deal with them, they will be arrested under 2903 for obstructing the highway.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: What constitutes a prostitution corridor?

LT. CARR: Prostitution corridor usually is one street where prostitution is rampant. We call it a corridor because we expand our control two or three blocks to either side of that street. For instance, South Broad Street and south of the south section of Philadelphia, there's a corridor that runs from 13th Street, Broad Street is the equivalent of 14th Street, and up to 17th

Street. That would be one corridor. One area where our squad would go out and patrol and do a prostitution sweep and get between 6 and 20 prostitutes, arrest between 6 and 20 prostitutes.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: In the end of your testimony, you indicated you felt it was not an effective means any longer of dealing with johns and that is by the fact that publishing the names of people who enter a guilty plea is no longer done. Is that just recent?

LT. CARR: The reason I say that, quite frankly, prostitution is not considered a serious crime by many people. Until a prostitute sets up on your mother's front door, most people don't want to hear about it. They don't want to believe that it exists. I have to go to into all the neighborhoods, speak to all the people where the prostitution problems exist. I have to listen to the grandparents who have grandchildren pick up condoms thinking they're balloons. It's really a problem in some neighborhoods. This is one, if this bill is not watered down and if it is put forth and given some meat, it will show that the State is starting to take this particular crime seriously.

The other reason I put that in there, again, to emphasize the seriousness of the crime, if you have a drug problem, you're going to have street prostitution follow

it. There's no if's, and's, or but's about it. Most of street prostitutes are people trying to get drugs. don't think there's a major community in the State that doesn't have some sort of drug problem. There are probably a degree of that drug problem in each community that will determine whether or not prostitution will follow. We found in one of our corridors, the 13th Street corridor in central city, that when we enforced prostitution very strongly and very heavily, that robberies went down 20 percent. When we laid off that enforcement effort, robberies went back up again. there's a lot of related crimes to prostitution that weren't mentioned. Things like johns getting robbed, things being set up, being taken places. These things don't get addressed, and when we take our cases to the courts it's definitely an attitude of let's get this thing over with. I would like to see that changed.

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

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: And the drug problem really is the beginning. As you said, these are drug-related.

LT. CARR: For street prostitution, yes. Indoor prostitution is a different matter, but for street prostitution, drugs are the major reason why people prostitute themselves. And I say people, because most quite frankly, people look at this as a crime of females prostituting themselves. In some sections of Philadelphia

we have males that prostitute themselves, and it's a crime concerning both sexes.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Earlier I had asked one of the Assistant District Attorneys of York County how many prostitutes he felt were operating in the city of York. How many do you feel are operating in the city of Philadelphia?

LT. CARR: How many prostitutes? I couldn't even make an estimate. A lot. Each one of these areas, these are not all repeat arrests. It's not always the same people. There's a lot. And again, it would be, we're a city of a million and a half people, so to venture a guess would be inappropriate.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: What would you guess to be the recidivism rate for prostitutes being arrested? How many times have you arrested the same people, on average?

LT. CARR: We do arrest several, as stated earlier, we do make a lot that are repeat offenders, but we also make a lot of arrests that are so-called first-time offenders, and a lot of people just don't get caught, which is most, like I said, we have 66 corridors. We can only work one of those corridors a night. That means there's 65 corridors working with people not getting caught.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Is it safe to say you're

1 only getting a very small percentage of the activity? 2 You're only arresting a small percentage of the 3 participants? LT. CARR: I'm sorry? 5 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: You're only arresting a 6 small percentage of prostitutes? 7 LT. CARR: I believe so, yes. 8 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: We've been joined by 9 Representative Petrarca as well. Did you have any 10 questions? 11 REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: No. 12 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Representative Hennessey? 13 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: No questions. 14 LT. CARR: If I could make one comment. I think 15 this will be more effective than arresting prostitutes 16 because the patrons are not always people with drug 17 problems. They could be normally law-abiding people who 18 are out looking for sex for money. The patrons, if you 19 take the demand side away from the prostitutes, it will 20 reduce the business out there and will reduce the number 21 of prostitutes. It's simple economics. And I think 22 enforcement efforts against the demand side will be more 23 successful than enforcement efforts against the supply 24 side. 25 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Well, we want to thank you

very much for your testimony. We appreciate you coming. 1 And our last testifier, who has just made it in 2 3 here, is Deputy District Attorney Susan Herron. you were probably out there on the lawn somewhere. 4 5 MS. HERRON: I just got here. I was nowhere. Ι didn't know anything about the bomb scare. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Well, let me tell you all about it. 8 9 MS. HERRON: Well, it doesn't surprise me. 10 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: The main Capitol building, 11 about an hour and a half ago, two hours ago, received a 12 bomb scare, however we don't scare easily here and we're 13 not actually in the main Capitol building, this is the 14 annex building, we gave the members of the committee and 15 those in attendance the opportunity to leave. Most 16 stayed, and those who did leave I think left for reasons 17 other than the bomb scare. We're tough to scare. So we 18 kept on moving with the hearing, and we're glad that 19 you're here and you're the last testifier. 20 MS. HERRON: Well, my timing was perfect, I 21 quess. It's usually not that good. 22 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Absolutely. Whenever you're 23 ready, you may begin. 24 MS. HERRON: Well, I didn't even get a chance to 25 read over what I was going to say, so I'll probably end up

reading it.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: That's fine.

MS. HERRON: Well, good morning. You know who I am, and I'm here on behalf of Lynne Abraham, who as you know is the DA of Philadelphia. Prostitution problems come up at every community meeting the DA goes to.

Particularly Fishtown, Kensington Avenue corridor.

There's a huge prostitution problem around there. The neighbors are so upset about it, and understandably so.

It diminishes the quality of life for everyone unfortunate to be confronted about it, and you know it brings with it drugs, alcohol, open lewdness, sexual behavior, criminal behavior of every kind, and it drags down the neighborhoods in every way possible.

We're not naive enough to think that we can eliminate prostitution, and I'm not here, unfortunately, to offer a quick-fix. It will always be with us. I think, as the DA A agrees, that in order to change the nature of it or change prostitution, there are some basic premises we need to come to grips with and some proactive things that we want to do. But before I get into that I just want to say that we're not opposed to these bills at all. I agree with the last speaker who feels that anything you can do to attack the demand side is a step in the right direction. So some of the stuff I'm going to

say in the beginning might sound like we're opposed to the bills, but we're not at all opposed to them.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We're concerned about all hookers: so-called high-class women who turned tricks for the Mayflower madam in New York, or Heidi Fleiss in Los Angeles; the baby strollers - the 12-, 13-, 14-year-old girls and boys who hook on the streets and who, in a matter of years, will probably die from drugs, AIDS, malnutrition, or from beatings at the hands of their pimps; and those who might fall prey to the mass murderers who have traditionally picked on prostitutes. Jack the Ripper wasn't the first serial killer to target prostitutes; and Gary Heidnick and John Wayne Gacy wouldn't be the last. I just heard that Gary Heidnick, on the trip up here, is apparently trying to stop the appeal so his execution can move forward. But it was a long time, are you familiar with who Gary Heidnick is? CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: He's supposed to be executed

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: He's supposed to be executed next week. There's an execution scheduled for Tuesday of next week.

MS. HERRON: It could possibly be him.

Apparently his daughter, who he never knew and had any contact with, is trying to seek the stay, and he has indicated he's not interested in it.

But in any event, I've spent a great deal of

time reading and speaking with people about prostitution. What I learned didn't surprise me and shouldn't surprise you, but I would like to share it with you. I spoke with a number of people, World Health Organizations, CDC, social service professionals, ex-hookers, law enforcement personnel, and a number of others, and what I learned is this:

Prostitution is not a victimless crime. The real victims are the prostitutes themselves.

The legal system's efforts to combat prostitution have been futile at best and counterproductive at worst.

Almost all young prostitutes have run away from sexual and physical abuse in their homes. Upon apprehension, they are returned to these homes by courts which are often oblivious to the causal link between sexual abuse in the home, runaway teenagers, and prostitution.

Runaway teenagers often engage in prostitution.

When they are picked up by law enforcement, they are identified as status offenders and not identified or treated as having been involved in prostitution. Upon arrest and conviction after the age of 18, they of course are categorized and criminalized as prostitutes by the legal system.

Prostitutes are most often the victims of coercion. Most women do not choose freely to prostitute themselves. It's an attempt to survive.

Ninety percent of street prostitution is controlled by pimps who use a variety of coercive methods to control the prostitute. The stories are all too familiar: girls held in virtual slavery by men who appropriate their money and dole them piecemeal the food they need to survive and the drugs to which they have become addicted.

Prosecutions for male clients and pimps are nearly nonexistent. The male client generally is thought to be less culpable than the prostitute. In actuality, they are more culpable as they are the ones who organize, maintain and pay for the institution of prostitution.

Prostitutes receive more severe treatment in the courts, the jails and at bail hearings than do their clients.

Prostitution cases rarely go to trial. The prostitute usually waives the right to trial and to counsel in exchange for a sentence of time served.

Rape of a prostitute is rarely reported, investigated, prosecuted or even taken seriously.

And the criminal justice system is spending

enormous amounts of money on sanctions that fail to significantly deter prostitution.

prostitutes, rehabilitative efforts and therapeutic options are critical. Effective treatment programs must be established which offer prostitutes realistic alternatives to prostitution. Training must be provided to social service workers who deal with young runaways with the goal of identifying those who are at risk of becoming prostitutes and offering them realistic alternatives to street prostitution. Judges need to be informed and sensitized about the true nature of prostitution and the causal link between juvenile and adult prostitution. Substance abuse treatment for prostitutes is perhaps the most critical component of all.

We also need to address the public health issues because, as we all know, there is a clear connection between prostitution, sexually transmitted diseases, STDs and AIDS. And common knowledge suggests that prostitutes spread AIDS, but the I am told that in reality, the incidence of female to male transmission through sexual contact is fairly minimal, and the greatest risk of AIDS is to the prostitute, who is more likely to become infected by her client and then may infect her later-born

children.

San Francisco has taken an innovative, holistic approach in dealing with the problem of street prostitution by drawing together the resources of law enforcement, public health and various private agencies to address the root of the problem, which is sexual exploitation, abuse, addiction, illness and violence. The First Offender Prostitution Program, or FOPP as they call it, is comprised of three primary components: Educating customers, providing services to girls, young women and adult women in and out of custody, and system reform. It represents a paradigm shift from solely criminal prosecution to prevention, early intervention and rehabilitation of both customers and prostitutes.

It is, of course, too early to measure the success of San Francisco's project, but the likelihood of its success is greater than that of a much-touted Portland, Oregon, program, although I did read just recently that they say that they only have with the male clients -- not clients, male customers, the johns, they say they have a 5-percent recidivism rate. But I don't know over what period of time that is.

In the early part of this decade, Portland aggressively impounded and forfeited john's vehicles. While the targeted areas were indeed cleared of

prostitutes, the sheriff who is in charge of the program candidly admitted to me that they had merely succeeded in displacing the problem. What we would suggest and hope that perhaps you might be interested in is forming a multi-disciplinary task force to examine the societal and personal problems posed by prostitution in Pennsylvania, its relationship with substance abuse and the spread of AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. The task force could include psychologists, psychiatrists, law enforcement, public health officials, academics, social workers, and ex-prostitutes. It can't hurt, and such an effort could lead to measures that would go a long way toward significantly changing the lives of many people the prostitutes, their children, the johns, and certainly, the people who live in the neighborhoods where prostitutes ply their trade.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That said, I can briefly comment on the bills before the committee. The DA has in the past supported a lot of legislation, both city and State, dealing with prostitution, and as I indicated before, indeed supports these bills. We do believe that something akin to the San Francisco program is perhaps the best way to go, but until that happens, we have no issue at all with targeting johns, as these bills do. Targeting johns focuses on the simple economic principle of supply and demand: where

there's no demand, there's no reason for supply.

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

House Bill No. 212 is the suspension of operating privileges upon conviction. It's a good idea, but the conviction is for patronizing a prostitute, and we don't see a lot of arrests for patronizing a prostitute for the simple reason that it's really, really difficult to prosecute. We never have a prostitute available to offer testimony that the johns solicited sex, so arrest and prosecution generally only occurs when the vice squad is involved and, for example, an undercover cop poses as a prostitute. And as I understand it from the people who prosecute the prostitution cases in our office, is there aren't that many vice squad officers in Philadelphia, so it's very difficult to do an undercover operation. And of course the reality of it is even when we do get a conviction for patronizing prostitution in Philadelphia, the people will drive with a suspended license anyway. So although it might work better in other jurisdictions and if it would help other jurisdictions, we would certainly support it.

House Bill No. 214 permits impoundment of the vehicle used in prostitution. We like impounding the cars, but there are some issues that need to be thought through. Impoundment puts a minimum of two police offers out of action - one to arrest the driver, and the other to

stay with the car until the tow squad comes. In addition, the car would have to be stored in a secure lot, the contents inventoried, and the condition noted. And I can assure you that every car impounded will, according to the driver, be dent free and have a Monet and a fur coat in the trunk.

But second, Philadelphia enacted a similar ordinance in 1992, it's not enforced because the City Solicitor issued an opinion stating that the ordinance was legally deficient in three ways: It failed to provide for a prompt hearing; it required payment of a fine prior to releasing the car, in effect requiring an unconvicted offender to post his vehicle as security for payment of a fine he might not be required to pay should he be found not guilty of the underlying offense; and there was no State enabling legislation at the time. Well, of course House Bill No. 214 would obviate the third concern, but to address the other two concerns I think that if the legislature is going to go forward with the bills, that we should probably rewrite them a little bit to include those provisions so that there isn't any problem with it.

213, which is the forfeiture bill, was reviewed by the Chief of our Forfeiture Unit, Matt Hurks, and he is concerned that forfeiture of a vehicle upon conviction of patronizing prostitution would be found by our Supreme

Court to be an excessive fine. I'm sure you're aware that over time the courts have slowly been restricting the ability of the Commonwealth to forfeit property. A very recent decision, just April 20, a little over a week ago in a drug forfeiture case, our Supreme Court held that forfeiture of a 24-acre parcel described in a single recorded deed was excessive when drugs were found only in the house and the detached garage. Again, if the committee decides to go forward with these bills, particularly the forfeiture bill, we recommend that it more closely track the drug forfeiture law found in Title 42, Chapter 68. Chapter 68 has been on the books since 1988 and a body of case law interpreting its various provisions already exists. And we of course would be happy to work with the legislature if you choose to have it redrafted.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on this issue, and Ms. Abraham stands ready, as I said, to offer whatever assistance we can in helping the legislature work on this very difficult problem in Philadelphia and throughout the Commonwealth.

CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Thank you Ms. Herron.

Representative Petrarca.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRONE: Ms. Herron, one question. You said that there aren't that many female

| 1 | police officers undercover working? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MS. HERRON: That's what I'm told. |
| 3 | LT. CARR: That's correct. We don't have that |
| 4 | many. |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE PETRONE: Is that just a problem |
| 6 | with manpower, so to speak, or where you're allocating |
| 7 | resources? |
| 8 | MS. HERRON: Person power. |
| 9 | LT. CARR: Well, I can tell you we have four |
| 10 | woman police officers that address and decoy as |
| 11 | prostitutes. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Lieutenant Carr is head of |
| 13 | Vice Squad in the Philadelphia Police Department. |
| 14 | MS. HERRON: Hi. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Lieutenant Carr, for the |
| 16 | sake of the use of microphone, would you join Ms. Herron? |
| 17 | I'm sure she wouldn't mind. |
| 18 | And I would like to ask Representative Petrarca |
| 19 | if he would reask that question so that we could have that |
| 20 | recorded. |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE PETRONE: Again, the question is, |
| 22 | how many officers are working? |
| 23 | LT. CARR: We have 10 police officers and 1 |
| 24 | sergeant dedicated to just the prostitution, okay. They |
| 25 | work, and they are the people as I testified earlier make |

between 6 and 20 arrests each night that they work. also, the city is divided into several districts, police districts. Many of the District Commanders are putting together their own street prostitution enforcement squads to supplement our effort. This is a problem in Philadelphia. REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: Are you overwhelmed with that few officers working on this problem?

LT. CARR: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: How many officers do you think you need to have a substantial presence in the city?

LT. CARR: I would like to have, well, to make a substantial cut in the prostitution problem, I would like to have at least two squads of 12 officers with a complement of supervisors.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRONE: In the testimony, Ms.

Herron, you mentioned sanctions that fail to significantly deter prostitution. Can you tell me generally what those are?

MS. HERRON: Well, I don't certainly know how much money is involved in it. What happens is that they get arrested, and that of course costs something, and they revolve through the door of the Justice Center, they come out, they don't show up for court, bench warrants are

issued, they are picked up again and, you know, revolve through. I do know that one of the things we're doing in Philadelphia, and this is thanks to the legislature with the RFD treatment, we are sometimes referring appropriate cases when we can those prostitutes who actually do come through the courts through the RFD, restorative intermediate punishment drug treatment, and I'm sure that is helping to an extent. But again, all the prostitutes that come through the system, they are either not identified, if they are juveniles, as being prostitutes or not dealt with that way, and as adults they just revolve through, they get arrested, they come out, they can't be held because of prison overcrowding. And I don't see a lot of things, you know, I don't see any programs that the people who are involved in this sex trade, not necessarily the sellers and the buyers, but the professionals who are involved in it, they are the ones who say that that's needed. And so if the money could sort of be diverted in some way, although I don't have a quick-fix and I don't know how to do that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LT. CARR: There is no quick-fix to this problem. Prostitution has been around forever. It's in the Bible. There is no quick-fix. All you can hope to do is make it so that it's not so public

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: And that's what I was

going to ask. Outside of these pieces of legislation, do
either of you have any comments what we could do to help
with the problem or to curb demand?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LT. CARR: If you don't mind, yes, as a matter of fact there's something I have been working on. I've compared notes with some other jurisdictions such as Baltimore, San Diego and Las Vegas. Baltimore and Las Vegas have had a lot of luck with in-border out program. They had it somehow making a legislation to become a condition of probation. I don't know how they did it, but what happens is if someone is convicted of street prostitution, as a term of their probation they are ordered out of those so-called corridors that I mentioned earlier are heavy prostitution areas, and if they are caught within those areas, that only a few exceptions going to church, if they have a legitimate job and can show a legitimate job in that area or to see a doctor in that area, they are considered in violation of their probation and sentenced to go to jail. Baltimore claims that it has been very effective for them. Las Vegas claims that it has been very effective to them.

San Diego went the civil route by having people in the neighborhood call a police officer to keep anyone who was convicted of prostitution out of their neighborhood.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: How about the demand side?

LT. CARR: The demand side, the demand side everybody is reluctant to address. Quite frankly, the demand side most people, including legislators, including some police, including some judges, everybody, look at it as just some guy who is going to get good sex for money, and that's a blunt way of putting it, but that's pretty much all. You should not crucify a guy because he's getting good sex for money. And I think that's to some extent what these bills are trying to do, or aiming at.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: Ms. Herron, do you have any thoughts about curbing the demand side?.

MS. HERRON: Well, curbing the demand, or the thoughts I have on it, the things that are done in the San Francisco program where they have an educational component for johns, I have the details if you want me to get it. It's in my folder, but basically I think there's a sliding scale of a fine, and that pays for the education that they provide for the johns and they teach them about things like sexually transmitted diseases, AIDS, and all sorts of things, and the courses are taught by and a curriculum that is written by those who would know best how to address these issues, and I don't know how to do those but that, according to San Francisco, has been reasonably

successful in decreasing the demand in the sense that only 5 percent of those, there's only 5 percent recidivism rate.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With regard to House Bill No. 214, the impoundment, I have a question. Do you have any thoughts with regard to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of immediate seizure of a vehicle and the requirement that someone pay up to \$1,000 to get it back before there's any kind of conviction or any legal process? How does the DA's office feel about that?

MS. HERRON: Well, our position is, first of all, I'm not a constitutional scholar, but from what I've read about that, that would be problematic. There should be, and that's what the City Solicitor indicated in her opinion when she was addressing that same issue in the Philadelphia ordinance. It's basically a taking without any due process.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: It would seem to me that, and we had the ACLU here a little bit ago and they didn't specifically address that, although they may be sending further information to the committee, but it did seem to me that the problem had some ramifications that could be read side by side with the presumption of

1 innocence. 2 MS. HERRON: Yeah. Yeah. 3 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: And certainly the 4 fact that some people have \$1,000 to get the car back, some people don't. 5 MS. HERRON: Right. And also, the person may not be convicted. 7 8 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I'm sorry? 9 The person may not be convicted. MS. HERRON: 10 The person whose car we took may not ultimately be 11 convicted and --12 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: At that point the bill says the money should be returned. But up until that 13 14 point of conviction or acquittal it's held in escrow by 15 the city. 16 MS. HERRON: But of course then the person who 17 is not quilty who is presumed innocent is without his or 18 her car, his property. 19 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Well, actually, the impoundment was a temporary measure. The confiscation was 20 21 permanent. Unless I'm not understanding it correctly. 22 MS. HERRON: But still he'd have to pay a huge 23 fine to get the car back. It's holding a car hostage for 24 payment of a fine without any kind of a hearing, and I 25 think it could be remedied, that part of the bill could be

1 remedied by just providing for some kind of a prompt 2 hearing for at least finding probable cause. 3 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I would think the threat of confiscation ultimately, six months or a year 5 down the road, would be enough so that you have might not 6 need the immediate impoundment of a car, or do you think 7 that's an important cog in the wheel? 8 MS. HERRON: Well, I quess the only problem with 9 that would be the likelihood of then finding the car. 10 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: The what? 11 MS. HERRON: The likelihood of finding the car 12 down the line might diminish--13 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Yeah, but if I, well, 14 hopefully it's not me, but if somebody puts up \$1,000 and 15 gets the car back, the car could be damaged or disappear 16 or traded in or whatever in the meantime, unless there's 17 some sort of a legal mark put on the title. So, I mean--18 MS. HERRON: You know, that sounds good. 19 LT. CARR: Excuse me, there is something else 20 that should be addressed at this point. Often car sales 21 are done without transfer of title. Okay. You're talking 22 about people, I know--23 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Often car sales are 24 done without transfer? 25 LT. CARR: Car sales are done in some sections

of our city without transfer of title. A police officer stops a vehicle and cannot determine who the owner of the vehicle is. These are the people that are probably the best patrons of prostitutes. This type of law doesn't affect them a whole lot. Taking a car, even if it's a \$100 junker, hurts them a little bit. That's something they'll understand because they just stopped someone and it was Uncle Joe's car, well, I got it from and Sally who got it from some guy named Jose, who got it from some guy named Vincent, and there's no legal series of paperwork to follow.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: That's confiscation, and as much as it might help the committee, I don't know that we want to just say that regardless of how fair or unfair of these to allow you to seize the car, if it was used in a crime, if the real victim here becomes the person who loses the car and had no idea or connection with the solicitation at all. But I guess I'm trying to get to the question of do we need an immediate impoundment of the car, especially from--

LT. CARR: From a police perspective, I would said yes.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: If someone comes in with the money to get the car back and the police don't have it in custody, there's no guarantee that it will be

there six months or a year from now, or it could be in an accident from that period of time.

LT. CARR: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: So I'll ask the lawyer, if we allow confiscation, I'm not sure if we pass that bill, do we really need the impoundment, in your view? Does it serve any real--

LT. CARR: I think you have to get custody of the car immediately. We have enough problems getting people to appear in court let alone to get the vehicles and do any positions.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: But a drug dealer or someone is going to have \$1,000 and he can post that money and get the car back immediately anyway. So at that point you've lost the car, you have \$1,000 which may, if you're talking about '99 Mercedes, is not really, there's no equivalency there.

MS. HERRON: And the thousand dollars might be all we're going to get anyway, because under the current case law it's not likely that we would even get a forfeiture of the entire car for patronizing a prostitute.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: That's the next question I wanted to ask you. I don't understand the case law that way. I thought that the connection that the courts have made is if the car or the house or the

1 building is involved in the activity that's illegal and 2 somehow is used in promoting that activity, then it could 3 be seized, and I don't know, perhaps you can tell me something I don't know about the law. 4 5 MS. HERRON: Probably not. 6 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: But I didn't think 7 the courts were saying if it's a \$50,000 house it can be 8 seized, if it's a \$200,000 house it can't be. MS. HERRON: No, you're right. They're not 9 10 saying that. 11 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: So if it were a '99 12 Mercedes or a 1979 Chevy, it can be seized if it was used 13 regardless? 14 MS. HERRON: It's going to hinge on used in the 15 crime, used in prostitution, and how that's going to be 16 determined, we of course can't project into the future, 17 but the feeling that it would be declared an excessive 18 fine is just based on how far we've seen the case law 19 going over the years. 20 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: That's what I'm 21 asking. 22 MS. HERRON: I can't give you any specific 23 cases, but since I think 1988 was when the forfeiture bill 24 was passed, everything was forfeited. All we had to do

was put a petition in court and yeah, it's yours, take

25

it. And we've seen, which is not, you know, I'm not saying that that was the right thing, but we've seen a gradual erosion of that and we expect that it's going to continue to erode, and it seems that where the courts can say that something might be an excessive fine, like for a '99 Mercedes it could be excessive, the fine might then be what, \$50,000 for patronizing a prostitute, which is a misdemeanor of the third degree. When they weigh those things--

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Well, if you have any case law to submit to the committee to highlight that particular aspect of the law, that decision of the law, I would appreciate that.

MS. HERRON: I will.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Because I thought that the connection has always been if it's been used in the crime, then it's subject to seizure and forfeiture, and if it wasn't used in the crime, well, I'm actually the owner and I had no idea that it was being used, but you would allow that not to be seized because we don't want to harm people who are truly innocent.

MS. HERRON: No, it's an innocent owner defense, and there should be an innocent owner defense in every forfeiture provision. But I will talk to Mr. Hurks, who is head of our forfeiture division. Perhaps you'd like to

1 talk to him? Do you want me to get you two on the phone 2 together? 3 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: That would be fine, 4 sure. 5 MS. HERRON: Okay, I'll do that. REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay, then I'll ask 6 7 him if he could submit that to the committee just so we 8 I just was unaware that the courts have been going 9 in that direction saying that even though there is a 10 direct and obvious connection with a crime, the fact that 11 you've chosen to drive something which is expensive might 12 render the forfeiture inoperative, when if somebody was 13 driving that car, I mean, I don't think the courts have 14 ruled that way, but I'm always being educated on that. 15 Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN BIRMELIN: Well, we want to thank Ms. 17 Herron and Lieutenant Carr for their testimony and for 18 being with us. We appreciate your effort and travels that 19 you made to be here. And with that, we conclude this 20 meeting today and we are adjourned. 21 MS. HERRON: Thank you. 22 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at. 23 12:40 p.m.) 24

25

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me during the hearing of the within cause, and that this is a true and correct transcript of the same. ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR SUPERVISION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER. Ann-Marie P. Sweeney 3606 Horsham Drive Mechanicsburg, PA 17055 717-732-5316