HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Escape from SCI-Dallas

* * * * * * * * * * * *

House Judiciary Committee
Subcommittee on Crime and Corrections

State Correctional Institution - Dallas Follies Road Dallas, Pennsylvania

Thursday, November 4, 1999 - 9:07 a.m.

--000--

BEFORE:

Honorable Jerry Birmelin, Majority Chairperson

Honorable George C. Hasay

Honorable Harold James, Minority Chairperson

Honorable Frank Dermody

Honorable Babette Josephs

Honorable Kathy Manderino

Honorable Don Walko

ALSO PRESENT: Brian Preski Majority Chief Counsel to Judiciary Committee Beryl Kuhr Minority Counsel to Judiciary Committee
Majority Chief Counsel to Judiciary Committee Beryl Kuhr
Beryl Kuhr Minority Counsel to Judiciary Committee

CONTENTS

WITNESSES	PAGE
Honorable Martin Horn Secretary of Corrections Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	7
Ben Varner Superintendent - SCI-Dallas Department of Corrections	
Major Thomas F. Williams Area II Commander Pennsylvania State Police	64
Captain Carmen R. Altavilla Troop P Commander Pennsylvania State Police	71
Michael Fox, Council Director AFSCME, District Council 89	80
C.O. Brian Smatko, President AFSCME No. 2496	81
Joan Gauker Graterfriends, Inc.	124
Dianna Hollis, President PA CURE	137
Vince Wallace, Lay Minister SCI-Dallas	147
Angus Love, Esquire PA Institutional Law Project	153
Greg Griffin, Vice President Lawrence Ludwig, President PA State Correctional Officers Association	178

Good morning.

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

room can hear you. It may be difficult for those of you who are in the back of the room to hear the answers and the

are not an amplifier.

TROUTMAN REPORTING SERVICE

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN:

escape that occurred here this August 16th, 1999.

Representative Birmelin. I represent Wayne and Pike

the Subcommittee on Crime and Corrections.

staff and the Committee itself.

to welcome you this morning to the Pennsylvania House of

Representatives Judiciary Committee's hearing on the prison

Counties not too far from here, up in the northeast part of

the state. And with us today are various members of the

Corrections, we also invite area legislators as well as

full Committee members who may not be on this Subcommittee

but who do sit on the House Judiciary staff. There may be

one or two other Committee members who will be coming in

late. And as they do so, I'll be sure to introduce them.

are with me this morning and seated at this table to

microphones are for the Pennsylvania Cable Network.

introduce themselves. We do not have a PA system.

I chair that Subcommittee. My name is

Even though it's a Subcommittee on Crime and

For the time being, I will ask the members who

So we will ask our members here to project,

(570) 622-6850

hopefully, loud enough so that people in the back of the

testimony of those who are presenting today.

.11

"12

I apologize for that. There's nothing I can do about that at this point. However, there is copies of written testimony available. Our counsel, Brian Preski, has placed extra copies in the back. Even though they are not to be holded to reading them word for word, they oftentimes do or at least paraphrase them.

answer session unfortunately, but it will give you some indication of what their testimony is all about this morning. If, for whatever reason, you're not able to get a copy of any of the testimony, if you will contact myself or Chief Counsel Preski, give us your name and address and -- or a fax number, we'll be more than happy to see that you get a copy of anybody's testimony that you have today.

And as I've already noted, the Pennsylvania

Cable Network is taping this show. I'm not sure when

they're broadcasting it. Neither is the cameraman. But it

may be possible for you to contact them if you want a copy

of the testimony, wherein should be all of the

present -- that which is presented as well as the question

and answer sessions.

All that having been said, I'll ask the members who are seated with me at this table to introduce

1 | themselves, starting with my far left.

MS. KUHR: I'm Beryl Kuhr. I'm counsel to the

3 Democratic Chair of the Judiciary Committee, Kevin Blaum.

4 REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Don Walko, State

5 Representative from Pittsburgh.

6 MR. PRESKI: Brian Preski, Chief Counsel to 7 the Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: Representative George
Hasay, Luzerne County.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Representative Harold James, Philadelphia, and the Democratic Chair of the Subcommittee on Crime and Corrections.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: We are in
Representative Hasay's district. And of course, he has a
very strong interest in security here at the prison and has
been involved in the issues here over the years. And so
we're happy to have him with us as well.

And he will take part in the panel. Even though he's not a member of the House Judiciary Committee, we will give him that honor today of being an honorary member and all the full privileges thereto.

22 REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: Thank you, Mr.

23 | Chairman.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: He may want to leave now. It's sometimes not a privilege to be on this

Committee. It's a lot of work. Our first testimony today
will be given by Secretary Marty Horn. He's the Secretary
of Corrections for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

And he is being joined this morning with Superintendent Ben Varner, who is the Superintendent here at Dallas, also obviously with the Department of Corrections. Gentlemen, we welcome you. Thank you for coming to give your testimony. And Secretary Horn, whenever you're ready, you may begin.

SECRETARY HORN: Thank you very much, Chairman Birmelin. I've abridged my comments slightly for this morning's purposes. But I would ask the Committee's indulgence for the purposes of giving you the fullest explanation of the events of August 16th.

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to review the August 16th, 1999 escape of inmates Michael McCloskey and Anthony Yang from SCI-Dallas. The Department of Corrections takes very seriously its mission to protect public safety. I make public safety my first priority.

Our fundamental responsibility is to hold onto the inmates committed to us. While it is important to maintain the safety of all who work inside our prisons and the inmates committed to our custody, no aspect of our mission is more important than protecting our communities. _

.

__

. 11

.15

For that reason, the escape of McCloskey and Yang, following on the heels of everything we have done in the past several years to tighten security, is deeply troubling. I know it troubles the Governor, and I know it troubles you. It is not my purpose today to make excuses.

Rather, it is my purpose to lay out the facts to you as we know them, to share with you my conclusions about why this escape occurred, to outline the steps we have already taken to prevent future escapes, and to answer the questions you may have.

Prior to the escape, the Department believed that it was taking reasonable and prudent steps to upgrade the security of the perimeter at SCI-Dallas. Following his apprehension, one of the escapees, Michael McCloskey, stated to our investigator that the ongoing security enhancements at Dallas prompted him to attempt the escape.

If you'll allow me to read from his statement. Quote, They started tightening the jails up, taking away privileges, took all the street clothes, all that kind of stuff, making everything more difficult to live inside jail which is a good thing that makes people want to.

You see, you had a lot of people, as long as they are comfortable, they wasn't thinking about hitting the fence. But then they started making it a lot of uncomfortable, sectioning off the jail, you know, stuff

like that, making your levels different, taping your phone calls, of course, your different levels and everything.

.14

A lot of little stuff that means a lot, though, to prisoners, especially if you got a lot of time, right. So then they started to build in Dallas, section everything off, dig up the ground, put in electric doors, put in the cameras and they built -- to the fence, they built cameras towards the fence.

I seen them putting in the wires and stuff.

Well, they never put the wires in. But they put the tubing in and all. But it looked like they was going to put cameras around the fences and all. So I said that if I'm going to do it, then I got to do it now, which probably would have never happened if they didn't start doing what they was doing, close quote.

Michael McCloskey and Anthony Yang escaped from Dallas during the early morning hours of August 16th, 1999. Both inmates were subsequently apprehended in a wooded area of Hanover Township, Luzerne County at 6:45 p.m. on Thursday, August 19th by officers of this department and the Pennsylvania State Police.

Yang and McCloskey were cellmates since the summer of 1998. In statements from Yang and McCloskey following their apprehension, they told us they had been planning this escape for more than a year. The cell

windows in C Block, from which they escaped, have eight horizontal bars that are 5 3/16 inches apart and two vertical bars that are 8 3/4 inch apart.

.11

By cutting one of the 3/4 inch diameter horizontal bars, the inmates created a space 8 3/4 inches by 11 1/8 inch through which they escaped from their second story cell. That space is hardly bigger than the paper this testimony is printed on.

I want to share with you a picture of the window from which they escaped and the opening through which they escaped on the -- taken immediately following the escape and before it was repaired. The inmates told us that they used their wall-mounted stainless steel cell mirror as a cutting instrument.

They stated to us that they had been cutting the bar in their cell off and on since they started planning the escape. When they weren't cutting the bar, they would use a toothpaste and cigarette ash mixture to conceal the cut.

The bar was finally cut completely through on August 14th, 1999. Yang lost 25 pounds prior to the escape, and both used a cardboard cutout the same size as the window to determine if they could squeeze through it. They were unable to get any outside assistance to help with their escape. So their plan did not extend further than to

simply escape over the fences and run to freedom.

Once they decided to go, they constructed a crude rope ladder during the day of August 15th, 1999.

Yang reported that it took him only a few hours to make the ladder. The ladder was fashioned entirely from items that are permitted in inmates' cells.

It was made from torn and braided bed sheets, electrical cord, and wood that was obtained from dismantling the cell desk and bed boards. Both inmates were in their cell when the 10 -- 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. shift officers left at 10:00 p.m. on August 15th.

Shortly thereafter, they started timing the rounds of the exterior perimeter patrol vehicles. These vehicle patrols were their main concern because they knew the inside foot patrol officers did not walk very close to their planned escape route.

After timing the perimeter patrol vehicles, they decided to go. McCloskey stated that he looked at the clock, and it was 1:15 a.m. Yang was the first to try to get out of the second story window. His hips got stuck, and McCloskey pulled him back into the cell.

Yang then stripped down to his underwear and tried again immediately after the patrol went by again.

The perimeter patrol officers on duty that night claimed to have made the appropriate rounds of the facility but stated

that they saw and heard nothing unusual during their rounds.

.11

On his second attempt, with McCloskey helping him, Yang was able to get out of the second story window. McCloskey then threw Yang's clothes out the window along with the rope ladder. Yang got dressed and jumped into a nearby garbage can to conceal himself while the perimeter patrol vehicle went around again.

McCloskey then tried to get out of the window, and he also got stuck. Both inmates told us that while McCloskey's legs were sticking out the window and he was kicking and trying to get out, the perimeter patrol vehicle went around twice.

McCloskey finally had to strip to the waist and squeeze out of the window. He was able to reach back in his cell, grab his clothes, and leap to the ground. The C Block officer claims not to have seen or heard this activity as he made his rounds every half hour throughout the night.

The inmates next ran about 240 feet to the 12 foot interior perimeter fence at the corner of C Block where it intersects the interior zone fence between towers 1 and 2. Yang gave a boost to McCloskey, who was able to place the end board of the rope ladder across the corner of the fence and get on top.

McCloskey then jumped to the other side of the interior fence. They had an extension cord tied to the rope ladder, and Yang put the end of the extension cord through a nearby drainage culvert to retrieve it after he got over the interior fence.

Yang then climbed the rope ladder, got on top of the board and jumped over the interior fence. The fence alarm did not go off. The corner area is sturdier than other sections of the fence, and the inmates may have used the rope ladder more than the fence to do the actual climbing.

It is known that the Intrusion Detection

System was operational on the night of the escape since several alarms were reported and responded to. No alarms were reported the entire night in the zone breached by McCloskey and Yang.

However, an alarm was reported and cleared in that zone at 9:08 a.m. on the morning of August 16th.

Subsequent investigation has revealed that structural and environmental factors affected the performance of the Intrusion Detection System and were not corrected by facility staff.

McCloskey and Yang were now between the two perimeter fences. They retrieved their rope ladder by pulling it through the drainage culvert with the extension

cord. They then tried to climb the 14 foot exterior fence directly across from where they scaled the interior fence.

Yang again gave a boost to McCloskey, but McCloskey could not reach the top of the fence because this fence is 2 feet higher and it has more of the new style razor wire on it. McCloskey was cut by the razor wire numerous times.

He started to get tangled in it. So he came back down. Yang helped him get untangled. When they saw the perimeter patrol vehicle coming, they jumped into the drainage culvert until it passed. They were now less than 36 feet from where the patrol vehicle repeatedly passed them.

Both inmates told us that they believed they were lying in the drainage culvert a long time, perhaps up to an hour, while the patrol vehicle passed. While it may have seemed like an hour to them, it is more likely that they had been lying there a shorter time.

This would put them in the drainage culvert between the two fences close to 1:40 a.m. McCloskey then sent Yang to the corner of the facility because he remembered that a vehicle gate on that corner had a ledge they could use to help them get out.

Yang checked out the corner, saw that McCloskey recalled it accurately and ran back to McCloskey

to tell him. The inmates then waited again for the patrol vehicle to pass, dropping to the ground as the vehicle went around the corner.

Together, they ran between the two perimeter fences to the corner of the facility. Yang again helped McCloskey climb up to the support bracket on the fence's vehicle gate, and McCloskey was able to get their rope ladder around the top portion of the fence pole.

McCloskey was entangled in the razor wire as the perimeter patrol vehicle came by again. Both inmates told us they were sure they would get caught at this time; but McCloskey remained still, and Yang dropped to the ground.

The patrol vehicle passed them at a distance of approximately 13 feet and, in fact, went by several more times while McCloskey was caught in the razor wire.

McCloskey finally untangled himself, worked his way through the wire and jumped to the other side.

He then ran and hid on the other side of the road. Yang climbed up the same way as McCloskey and also got caught in the razor wire. Again, the patrol vehicle passed by several times and did not see Yang. He finally worked his way through the wire, got over the fence and joined McCloskey.

They left the rope ladder hanging on the

fence. Both inmates suffered numerous cuts while climbing
through the razor wire on the fence. A significant amount
of blood found at the scene indicated that the inmates were
bleeding profusely.

.14

An inside yard patrol was conducted by a corrections officer -- by a corrections officer at 2:20 a.m. on August 16th. This officer stated to us that she walked next to the perimeter fence on the running track. This put her within 30 feet of the inside of the perimeter fence by tower 3 at approximately 2:20.

The inmates did not report seeing her walking this close to the perimeter fence, and she reported that she did not see or hear anything unusual. Thus, it is believed that McCloskey and Yang escaped over the exterior fence between 1:50 a.m. and 2:15 a.m.

Facility policy is clear in requiring that inmates be counted. Moreover, it states that the counting officer must either see the inmate standing; or during the night hours when standing counts are not required, the counting officer must see flesh or movement before counting an inmate present.

The officer on C Block during the 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. shift stated to us that he counted inmates at 10:05 p.m. and both inmates were present. He stated he definitely saw movement by the inmates and a TV was on. He

further stated that checks of all cells were done at approximately half-hour intervals through the night with no problems observed.

This would have to include the time that the inmates were struggling to get through the window, yet he did not observe this activity. He further stated that he counted these inmates as being in their cell at 5:00 a.m. on August 16th.

In their haste to escape, McCloskey and Yang had quickly rolled up sheets and towels on both bunks.

This was enough to fool the officer. He stated that he made his required rounds and earlier census checks on the block, but he obviously failed to see flesh or movement during that 5:00 a.m. count.

This officer told us that he observed the head of Yang on the top bunk and the feet of McCloskey on the lower bunk and both inmates appeared to him to be present in the cell. He stated that he believes both inmates were present at 5:00 a.m.

The officers assigned to the block between 6:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. also did not notice the inmates missing from their cell during their checks. One of the officers stated that he made a round to lock all unlocked doors and that when he checked on the cell occupied by Yang and McCloskey, quote, both beds appeared to be occupied,

close quote.

.11

No one noticed the rope ladder hanging on the exterior fence. An officer who did a walking perimeter fence check at 6:05 a.m., which brought him within a couple of feet of the rope ladder, failed to see it. The rope ladder was hanging on the exterior perimeter fence above the gate at the base of tower 3.

The yard officers opened the yard for morning recreation before 9:00 a.m. They also failed to see the rope ladder. And the 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. perimeter patrol officers during the day of August 16th failed to observe the rope ladder once daylight arrived.

Finally, prior to the yard being opened to inmates for recreation, tower 3 was manned. The officer assigned there, directly over the spot where the escape occurred and with a clear view from above, also failed to see the rope ladder hanging from the top of the fence. All of the officers who gave us statements concerning the night of the escape indicate that they observed nothing unusual that night.

Our investigation revealed that despite clear

Department policy requiring that each inmate's cell be

searched regularly and also requiring that periodic

security inspections occur, there was inadequate inspection

of the physical integrity of the cell.

Yang and McCloskey, was partially sawed for several months, this should have been detected by the block officers during their routine security inspections. The available documentation indicates that the last security inspection of their cell was made on August 11th, 1999. That it failed to detect the cut bars suggests it was performed inadequately, at best.

.11

In addition to the corrections officers assigned to the search team and the block officers responsible for conducting security inspection cell checks, the maintenance staff at Dallas are periodically assigned to conduct physical inspections of each window bar in the facility.

Known as bar bangers by the inmates, these maintenance staff are required to hit each window bar with a hammer to confirm the physical integrity of the primary security barrier. The desk lieutenant prepared lists of the areas that were to be checked.

However, it appears that maintenance staff did not always follow those lists. Facility management failed to monitor the performance of this vital activity.

McCloskey and Yang counted on the fact that the Dallas staff would not check the window bar that they were cutting and that they would not notice that they had been using

their cell mirror as a cutting instrument.

.11

Also contributing to the escape was the failure of the Intrusion System to detect the climbing of the fence. Despite numerous complaints from the Union during periodic labor management meetings, facility management continued to insist that the Intrusion System was operational and represented such to the Department.

In response to these Union concerns, the

Department gave clear direction to facility management in

1996 to regularly inspect and test the fence and further

gave authority to the shift commander to man towers when a

zone of the fence was determined to be inoperative.

The age of the fence, deterioration of the footings around the fence, poor initial installation all may have contributed to a situation that decreased the utility of the Intrusion System. For whatever reason, numerous nuisance alarms were reported.

It appears that facility maintenance staff resisted learning about the fence and failed to properly test the fence and correct for these deficiencies. An outside consultant found staff disinterested in the maintenance of the system.

Facility management did nothing to address the concerns. And top facility management continued to represent to myself and to the Union that the Intrusion

System was working properly when clearly it was not.

When the exterior fence was constructed in 1989, truck gates were built into it. And you can see those in the pictures that I've distributed to you. As part of those truck gates, protrusions designed to prevent the razor wire from interfering with the operation of the gate were added.

It was the existence of these protrusions which enabled Yang and McCloskey to obtain stability at sufficient height to get the rope ladder over the top of the 14 foot high exterior fence. We believe that absent these protrusions, this escape would not have been successful.

They have been removed. The Department had previously recognized the need for video surveillance in addition to the Intrusion System and mobile patrols on the Dallas perimeter. Plans had been made to install video surveillance equipment on the fence line during the current fiscal year.

\$180,671 worth of video equipment had been purchased prior to the escape. A video surveillance assessment was completed on March 8th in order to determine the optimum locations for the cameras. The Dallas maintenance staff had begun to install the conduit for the camera wiring.

_

1 ^

McCloskey told investigators that he observed the installation of the conduit and that he knew the camera installation was imminent. He decided to attempt the escape because he reasoned that it would be much more difficult once the surveillance system was operational.

Every facility is unique. Clearly, Dallas is not as old as Pittsburgh or Huntingdon, having been built only 40 years ago. But as you undoubtedly observed during your tour and as with many structures built during that period, it is not built with the same kinds of materials as the older facilities and certainly not nearly as well as our newer facilities.

I deeply regret that this escape occurred and apologize on behalf of my Department to the citizens of the surrounding community for the fear they experienced and the disruption to their lives caused by this escape. I realize concern has been expressed regarding notifications to the community.

Newly appointed Superintendent Varner has met with concerned citizens and elected officials to discuss those issues and make changes to the notification process. The warning sirens have been fixed and are tested every week. Superintendent Varner has met with local police and established a communication linkage that did not previously exist.

The State Police have agreed to relieve local
police at checkpoints within two hours. This escape
coccurred because of the failure of physical barriers and
lax attitudes and complacency on the part of staff
beginning well inside the perimeter.

We are taking steps to address as much of the problem as we can. We will continue to man the towers as an additional layer of redundancy over and above the Perimeter Intrusion Detection System and the mobile perimeter patrols.

The installation of video surveillance cameras will be completed by December 15th. Manning the towers 24 hours a day will add over \$1 million a year to the cost of operating Dallas and by itself will not prevent escapes. While cost should not be determinative where public safety is concerned, the total cost of operating a corrections system is a matter of concern to all of us.

We have removed the cell mirrors which have been here for 30 years. Mirrors like this had been installed in our facilities throughout the state. There are literally thousands of them that need to be replaced. We are adding new, higher quality bars to all cell windows.

We have requested sufficient funds to install an additional Perimeter Intrusion Detection System at Dallas. We have replaced the old concertina with modern

razor wire. But accomplishing all these things does not happen at the snap of a finger.

No single system is effective in guarding against escapes, and no multiple systems are entirely foolproof. The escape-proof prison has yet to be built. While we can't prevent all escapes, we are in the business of reducing the possibility that an escape will occur. And we do that by layer upon layer of redundancy.

Good prison security begins inside the facility, not at the perimeter. Indeed, the perimeter is our last line of defense. The new superintendent and deputy are proven security professionals who know the importance of regular and thorough cell searches, security inspections, bar banging, and other activities necessary to insure that our first line of defense is inside the perimeter, not at the perimeter.

They will take the requisite steps to ensure that these activities occur. At the end of the day, all of our systems are only as good as the people who observe, the people who maintain, and the people who supervise within these prisons. I believe we have a sound training program. But we have to recognize that these jobs are tedious and oftentimes unpleasant, and staff do lose their focus.

As Yang told investigators, quote, Once a prison quard does something, he does it as a routine. That

routine has a cycle, close quote. The challenge to me as
an administrator is to continually energize staff and help
them to understand the importance of what they do no matter
how trivial it may seem.

.15

I know that I enjoy the support of the vast majority of men and women who work in the Department in that effort. We have initiated discussions with AFSCME to explore ways to relieve the tedium of power and patrol vehicle posts and assure the focus of block officers.

We are together establishing facility-level security practices committees to make improvements in a collaborative instead of a contentious way. We have authorized an increase of 31 positions to the corrections officer complement at Dallas.

Throughout this past year, I have said repeatedly, including before this body, how very proud I am of the 13,000 men and women of the Department of Corrections. Most of them perform truly extraordinary tasks under very trying circumstances for very little recognition day in and day out.

Sometimes individual members of our staff let us down. That is not a reason to think ill of the rest. Rather, it shows us how sterling the performance of the many is, and it invigorates us to work towards a day when all our employees perform to that standard.

Both Superintendent Varner and I will be happy to answer any questions that you have.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: And for the benefit of the members of this Committee and for those present and witnesses, it should be noted that Superintendent Varner was not here at the time of the escape. He has been appointed since then.

I have basically one question for you,

Secretary Horn. And then I will ask members of our

Committee here if they have any questions of you as well.

I'm interested in knowing -- even though I believe as you

do, that probably 99 percent of the staff in the Department

of Corrections do their job and do it well day in and day

out, are not greatly compensated, put their lives at risk

oftentimes.

I think that's obvious when you have one officer for 70 or 80 prisoners, some of whom are convicted murderers. But it is important, I think, and not only in the sense that an escape occurred that could have endangered the public here, but also for a message to them that -- to the other employees -- that the fact that it's a boring job doesn't mean it shouldn't be done right.

I'm interested in knowing exactly what discipline took place to the COs who, in your estimation, after investigation should have done something different

and didn't do it; for instance, bed checks, et cetera. And
what discipline was taken towards those who are higher up
other than your first and second level COs who allowed a
situation in which apathy, indifference, or the mundane
allowed what happened to happen?

.15

Could you share with us specifically what discipline has taken place to both, you know, the frontline COs and those in administration since this incident occurred?

SECRETARY HORN: Yes, sir. First of all, I think that part of my responsibility to the General Assembly and the Governor is to hold everyone in the Department accountable to do their jobs. And in that respect, I believe in what I referred to as a concept of command accountability.

I don't think that the lowest guy on the totem pole should be hung out to dry, particularly when there are demonstrable leadership failures at the top level. The superintendent and the major of the guard both retired from the Department just subsequent to this escape.

I met with them and expressed to them my displeasure with their performance and their leadership.

And they chose to retire, which was an option that was available to them. The deputy for facility management was reassigned, insofar as many of the things that were

occurring here that -- or that were not occurring that
should have been occurring were in his area of
responsibility.

And so I think it's most important to hold the managers responsible for the performance of their subordinates, and we have done that. A total of five corrections officers have been disciplined with discipline ranging from reprimand to suspension. Depending upon the degree of culpability, the amount of proof, and the prior performance of the officer, all of those things influence the individual performance.

As a matter of policy, other than with terminations, the Department prefers not to reveal the individual names and disciplines attached to each officer.

But a total of five officers were disciplined. And I don't think that we are disciplining any of those officers for not specifically performing their tasks.

But I think that their tasks were not performed in as effective, in as assiduous, in as thorough a manner as we like. And they must be held accountable for that. And to their credit, I believe most, if not all, of them have accepted their responsibility and will move on and hopefully learn from that.

And the progressive discipline that the state employs is intended both to teach employees to help them to

get better at their jobs and also to let everyone else
know, as you said, that they have to be accountable and
that no matter how tedious and how mundane and how
repetitive these activities are, checking the cell at
night, driving around the perimeter, that they have to be
done thoroughly and effectively.

So we have held, as I say, five corrections officers accountable. They have received discipline ranging from reprimands to suspensions.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: And the only administrators are the two who retired, were the only ones that were -- they were not even disciplined. They would have been, perhaps, but --

SECRETARY HORN: Another management employee, as a matter of fact, did receive a reprimand.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Just for our benefit, what does a reprimand mean?

SECRETARY HORN: Well, it is a form of discipline. It is a -- it is, under the collective bargaining agreement, in the Civil Service Rules something that remains on a person's record. It can be used against them. It's the first step in progressive discipline.

The way the State's disciplinary system works, where a person has had an otherwise satisfactory performance record, you don't fire them the first time

1 unless the violation rises to the level of a major 2 integrity violation, that sort of thing.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you very much. I have two other members who have joined us, and I want to make sure I introduce them. To the left of me, third to my left is Representative Frank Dermody from Allegheny County. And all the way to the right on the other end of the table is Representative Babette Josephs from Philadelphia.

At this point in time, I will turn the questioning over to members of the panel, starting with Representative Hasay.

12 REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: Thank you, Mr.

13 Chairman. Thank you, Secretary Horn today. I have heard

14 now two conflicting statements about Superintendent

15 | Larkins, not that he retired but he was forced to retire.

16 | So I mean, I've heard two stories now on that. And I don't

17 know who I should believe.

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm really puzzled about that fact and the deputy as well. But that's over with now. I've worked with the Citizens Committee here since it first started with Senator Frank O'Connell. This facility has been understaffed ever since that time.

Because of the escapes, what has happened now is we've gotten the attention of the Governor, we've gotten the attention to get money in this 1959 facility not just

for the -- for the staff, but the inmates as well because
the fence is 40 years old, the inner fence. And we need
infrastructure money here.

So my first question to you is, what has the Department done to improve and increase the staff facility here at this institution?

SECRETARY HORN: Well, as I indicated in my testimony, we've already authorized them to hire 31 additional corrections officers. And we are hoping that with the passage of the budget, perhaps a supplemental budget, there may be authorization for additional staff as well.

And in addition, as I also indicated, we are requesting money in a supplemental budget request to replace the interior fence. That may well be a capital project which, as you know, requires authorization by the Legislature. And the -- the procurement process and the construction process, when it's a capital project, is a more time-consuming one.

That's why I say these things can't be accomplished at the snap of a finger. And in addition, we will be installing a second Perimeter Intrusion Detection System in addition to the one that's already on the fence.

REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: How many guards have been hired here since August?

SECRETARY HORN: I don't know offhand how many have been hired since August. 2

MR. VARNER: We're in the process of --

SECRETARY HORN: We're recruiting for the 31

additional. I don't think they've actually been hired. 5

They have to be screened; they have to pass the physicals;

7 they have to be trained.

1

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I know the REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: Okav. maintenance staff has been inadequate here at this facility or those video cameras would have been installed before the escape.

> SECRETARY HORN: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: How many maintenance persons have you increased since that time, permanent maintenance people?

SECRETARY HORN: We have not hired any permanent maintenance staff. There are four temporaries that have been hired. We are hoping that the Office of the Budget will see fit to acquiesce to our request for additional maintenance staff here.

That is a very -- and you make a very important point. One of the contributing factors to this escape -- and it's very clear here. And I mentioned it in my written testimony. I didn't read it -- was the extent to which ongoing maintenance demands at this facility

contributed to allowing this escape to happen.

As you mentioned, certainly it interfered with the ability of the maintenance staff to get that video surveillance system installed. As I indicate, we recently, prior to the escape, had engaged an outside consultant to evaluate the physical plant here.

And that consultant has advised us that in order to preserve the useful life of this facility, over the next five to ten years, the Commonwealth is going to have to invest approximately \$45 million in everything from upgrading the electrical system here, which has on several occasions failed.

And what good is video surveillance or alarms and indeed what good -- you know, I'd hate to be an officer on a block when it's pitch black -- if the lights go out and the power fails? And the electrical system here is antiquated; it's deteriorating; and it needs to be replaced.

The heating system this facility utilizes was built with a very unique radiant heating system that's built into the floor that requires, any time a repair needs to be made, that literally the floors in the cellblocks need to be jackhammered to get to the pipes that run through the -- through the floors.

And so I will be the first to say that this

1 | facility is inadequately staffed with maintenance staff.

- 2 And it has always been much more difficult to obtain
- 3 | support for maintenance staff than for corrections
- 4 officers. And that is something that I am hoping that this
- 5 | year, not just here at Dallas, but at Huntingdon and other
- 6 places as well, we can make that case and that when it
- 7 reaches the Legislature, it will be approved.
- 8 REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: The Legislature, I'm
- 9 sure, in the House will address the supplemental
- 10 appropriation for this facility. How about the sirens, the
- 11 sirens that we have here? You know, they failed. They
- 12 failed. Have they been addressed?
- 13 SECRETARY HORN: Yes, they have.
- 14 | Superintendent Varner very quickly got on top of that
- 15 | issue. And as I understand it, the previous administration
- 16 was conducting silent tests of these sirens. There's a
- 17 computer that sort of indicated that if they were to run,
- 18 they would work.
- 19 But they actually never sounded them but,
- 20 perhaps, twice a year. They are now being tested weekly
- 21 | and audibly for the entire community to hear, which allows
- 22 us to know every week that they're operational. And I
- 23 believe that the one siren that was inoperative, the one
- 24 that's located on the grounds of the facility that was
- 25 | inoperative on the day of the escape, was inoperative

because a squirrel had nested in the siren.

And the Superintendent engaged an outside vendor to climb up there and remove it. Apparently, previous staff efforts to diagnose the problem had been unable to find the squirrel's nest and remove it.

REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: I am working with the Citizens Committee. And I've talked to Superintendent Varner. We will be having periodical meetings to keep a closer communication with not just the Citizens Committee but the media as well on improvements to the facility and just keeping in touch with what's happening at the facility.

I know you have -- you were concerned with the cost of the towers to be manned. That's been an issue ever since. The towers were not manned during the escape. And I don't care what the hell the cost is with the towers. I think it is important. Even if it happened, I think it's important for the security of the facility and the security of the community and residents in the community.

Perhaps if they would have been manned, there wouldn't have been an escape. Maybe Yang and McCloskey would have been seen because, you know, like you said, you go into a cycle. And sometimes, you know, you have to try to change that cycle so that the -- some of the staff don't get into a -- a particular pattern.

So I'm glad to see the towers are manned. And
I understand the cost, but sometimes the Commonwealth has
to bear the cost for security. I've also introduced a
bill when we were in session a couple weeks ago, House Bill
2014, that the House Judiciary Committee will be

6 addressing.

1.3

.14

It has to do with reimbursing the cost of local governments that had helped in the escape with the local police departments with the overtime they had to pay and the costs that they had to expend. Sometimes it's not a lot. To some of the local governments like Lehman Township and Jackson, it could be anywhere from 5- to \$8,000 a department.

But I think that the local governments need to be reimbursed for those expenses because if you have a second class township and you're running the township on maybe a budget of \$300,000 or \$200,000 a year, that 5- or \$8,000 is a lot of money to that township.

So I know that the Judiciary Committee will be exploring and reviewing that bill and having a public hearing on that bill in the future. So I thank you for coming here today and addressing the issue and monitoring this facility. I very much appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: My counterpart as the

Democrat on this Committee and the Subcommittee Chairman is
Representative Harold James from Philadelphia. And I'll
give him the opportunity to ask questions next.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. And thank you, Commissioner. And thank both of

you for being here. And thank you for the hospitality and the tour yesterday and with trying -- helping us to become more enlightened and informed as to what is happening here

and as gracious you have been throughout these tours that

10 we've had throughout the summer.

7

8

11

12

13

.14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My concern is about relationships. Has there been any determination about Johnson and these two inmates here, were there any kind of relationship or communications between them? Has that been determined yet, or is that still being investigated?

SECRETARY HORN: We've investigated that.

That was the first thing that went through our minds when the escape happened. There's absolutely no evidence that there was any relationship.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Has it been checked then to the fact that Johnson has been alleged to have been part of some hate group or gang and that these inmates might have been part of some of the same groups?

SECRETARY HORN: We looked into that. And again, there is absolutely no evidence of any such

connection.

.1.1

.15

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: And I heard you also say something about recruitment, recruitment efforts. I noticed that there were not too many African American or minority staff or officers, women -- or women. And can you tell us what's going on with that or if that's being looked into or going to be enhanced?

SECRETARY HORN: That is a continuing and very frustrating struggle for us. I perceive things the same way as you with respect to the homogeneity, if you will, of our staff. The Department is -- is sort of -- we have to live with the situation that we inherit, and that is that our facilities are located in the areas in which they are located.

Many of our facilities are located in areas where there is not a large pool of -- of local minority applicants -- although, certainly, there are women everywhere -- for many reasons. Perhaps this job has not been that attractive to women working in men's prisons.

We have done everything we can think of within the Rules of Civil Service and the merit system to increase the diversity of our work force. We have changed the way in which we do testing. Before my administration, when an individual facility needed corrections officers, the recruiting and the testing was done locally.

So all of the recruiting, say, for positions at Dallas would have been done in the Scranton/Wilkes-Barre area. We've gone through statewide recruiting and statewide testing so that an individual in Philadelphia can walk into a -- a job center or, indeed, into the office of his or her local legislator and obtain application forms and, indeed, take the test to become a corrections officer anywhere in the state, in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh and Harrisburg and Erie and wherever.

But they have to be willing to relocate when the jobs occur. It is very difficult for us to accomplish that. We have advertised in the minority newspapers, in the newspapers that are predominantly circulating in the African American community.

.15

The two newspapers in Philadelphia and the courier in Pittsburgh, we have -- we buy advertisements, I believe, once a month in those newspapers as well as in the Spanish language newspapers throughout the state recruiting for the position of corrections officer.

We have recruited at predominantly African

American -- historically African American colleges. We

have set up booths and undertaken recruiting and bought

advertisements at the NAACP statewide convention. We have

reached out to local NAACP offices, and we've reached out

to individual legislators to assist us.

The difficulty that we encounter is the
reluctance of individuals from minority groups to relocate
to the areas where our prisons are located. That is a
continuing struggle, and it is one that I intend to
continue to make. I think we've made progress. Clearly,
we've not made enough.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Well, I just want to indicate -- and I think I said this to you before -- that when we can help -- and I guess one of the things that maybe we as a legislature can do maybe in helping in terms of increasing maybe some of the benefits on the job, that may help in terms of recruitment. I guess that would help, right?

SECRETARY HORN: Absolutely. We're all in favor of that.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Without a doubt. Also, I understand, like, in the RHU Unit at Huntingdon, there seems to have been concern that either there was some relaxation or too much flexibility with corrections officers that allow incidents to happen in the RHU Unit where you had an incident, I think, a year or so ago where two white inmates were allowed to get together in the RHU Unit and stabbed an African American. Is that still being investigated?

SECRETARY HORN: No.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Oh, is that over? 1

SECRETARY HORN: That's over. The officers 2 who failed to prevent from that occurring, the officers who 3 were supposed to be supervising the inmates in that RHU exercise area and who were -- who absented themselves from their posts have been disciplined, as have commissioned 6 officers who were responsible for supervising those

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Have you had any incidents at this institution similar to what happened in the RHU Unit there?

officers.

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SECRETARY HORN: Not to my knowledge. I don't believe so. 13

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Any way that we can be of assistance in terms of that. I think we found that in some of the other incidents, there has been increase of the maintenance staff or staff of the prison and a coziness with some of the inmates.

Did you -- did you find that that happened here in this as much as it was at Pittsburgh and Huntingdon?

SECRETARY HORN: No. I don't -- I don't see anything that I've reviewed in the evidence in our investigation that suggests that. I think the issue here was one of -- of laxity. It was one of not paying close

enough attention. I don't think that these inmates had obtained any particular coziness with staff.

about this is that other inmates in the facility, nobody else knew about this, unlike at Huntingdon where there were lots of inmates who were part of this network. These two inmates kept this whole plot completely to themselves.

And so we could not find any other inmates who even had colluded with them. We couldn't believe that these two would pull it off without any assistance even from other inmates and it was just these two guys.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. So it doesn't show that they had that much influence as Johnson had with a lot of the inmates and staff?

SECRETARY HORN: No, no.

16 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Thank you.

17 | Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative Walko.

19 REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. Mr. Secretary, as you know, I represent the area wherein lies SCI-Pittsburgh. And back in 1997, we had the infamous escape. And one of the issues raised apparently has been an issue here, and that is community notification and community linkages.

And first of all, with regard to

SCI-Pittsburgh, there have been excellent linkages established even to the extent that I am on the list of notified people. This Tuesday they had a security check, and we were called.

But frankly, I'm disappointed that those linkages weren't established system-wide after SCI-Pittsburgh. And as you said in your testimony, Superintendent Warner -- Varner has met with local police and established a communication linkage that did not previously exist.

And I believe it should have been put in place at all 24 SCIs prior to this time. Can you comment on that?

SECRETARY HORN: Yes, I would like to comment on it. In fact, it was instituted system-wide. The issue here was that it was not implemented well. Every institution, every superintendent at every facility was instructed to establish those linkages.

The linkage here was established with the State Police and the local 911 system. As I understand it -- and Superintendent Varner may understand it even better -- there is a unique arrangement between some of the local police departments in some of the smaller townships here such that when 911 was notified, they didn't necessarily get the notification and, also, that the actual

radio communication link between State Police and 911 and these eight, I believe, departments was an imperfect one.

And so these eight departments felt that they were left out in the cold. That was something that was very unique to this locality. It was the responsibility of local management to address it. The local managers did not address it. That was a shortcoming. It's been addressed.

So I do want to correct the misimpression. It is the expectation that we've imposed on every superintendent. But every facility and every community has its own unique arrangements, and they need to tailor it. To Superintendent Varner's credit, he very quickly came in and very creatively found a way to address it. Ben, I don't know if you want to talk about that.

MR. VARNER: We worked out an agreement with 911. The system was tested yesterday. It's installed here that if the Back Mountain Police Departments will have any type of incident, they will come. One of their individuals will be in the command post.

They have their own radio system here now to communicate, as well as the State Police. 911 has agreed that they will be our notification system. There will be a manual at their 911 center. If we tell them we have a situation, they will notify those agencies that we designate.

And that's one thing that gets away from the institution so that we can handle the emergency here.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you. Well, I would recommend, Secretary Horn, that we make sure that the management directives as you have laid them down for all 24 SCIs -- and I realize that escapes are very rare and hopefully will continue to be very rare.

But in the event one occurs, it can be devastating in a community. And I would request that there be an audit system-wide of community notification mechanisms to see that they're being implemented. And I have another question.

It seems that there are a number of but for's in my opinion. But for the de-manning of the towers in 1996, this escape might not have happened. But for the fact that there is no lighting over there at that corner or there was none at the time of this escape, but for that, perhaps they would not have been able to escape.

But I really wanted your comment on the overcrowding factor. This prison, from my understanding gleaned from yesterday's tour, is very overcrowded. Their cell was a double cell when it should have been a single cell, and the double cell bunk bed existence facilitated the escape. Is that true?

And just a follow-up. What -- system-wide,

are we overcrowded? And what would be the optimum level of cells? How many do we need in our system in Pennsylvania?

3 | SECRETARY HORN: It's a very compound

4 question.

5 REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Yeah. I'm sorry about 6 that.

SECRETARY HORN: That's okay. Let me try and answer all of your points. And if I forget them, please bring me back to them. Let me address the but for's for a moment. While there's no question but that that was a darker section of the perimeter than others, it was not completely darkened.

There is lighting throughout, but not particularly at that corner. And while it's true that the towers weren't manned, I'm not sure that if the towers were manned but you didn't have an Intrusion System and you didn't have a patrol vehicle, that you could therefore conclude that the escape would not have occurred. So I'm not prepared to concede those but for's.

Let me also say that in order for these inmates to have escaped, they had to believe, first of all, that they could saw those -- that bar and that it wouldn't be detected. In order for this escape to have occurred, these inmates had to believe that they could absent themselves from that cell for a period of time and that

their absence would not be detected.

So there are a lot of but for's that occur before they ever reach the fence. And I think that in fairness, that has to be said. With respect to overcrowding, this prison was built for about 900 to 1,000 inmates. It, on the day of the escape, housed about 1,800. It still houses about 1,800.

So it's probably got twice as many inmates as it was designed for. That has a tremendous impact. It impacts everything from maintenance to food service to our ability to keep inmates busy and occupied. It puts the work load on a corrections officer.

It makes it that much greater. Remember, on the night of the escape, there was a single officer assigned to C Block. There were 198 inmates on that block. Ideally, there should have been 100. As you correctly observed, the double-decker bed that is placed in that cell, I'm not sure that that itself -- I don't want to create the impression that it facilitated the escape.

But clearly -- and I think it was obvious to everyone who was there yesterday -- it obscures the vision of the officer, the vision that the officer has of the -- the window and the bars. And perhaps the officer would have seen the opening had there not been a double-decker bed there that night, or would have seen the

activity. So that's clearly an issue.

.14

Our department is operating today at about 145 percent of capacity. Now, the good news is that in 1996, we were over 150 percent of capacity. And so we have gradually brought the extent of overcrowding in our department down. We have opened additional capacity, and that is to the good. However, there is a long way to go.

We calculate that we have about 24,000, 25,000 cells or beds for inmates on a single-cell occupancy basis. We're housing 36,000 inmates. So one could say that in order to achieve a full single-cell or in dormitories, appropriate number of inmates in our dormitories, which are also overcrowded, we would probably need to add 12,000 cells to the system.

That's a substantial number and a substantial investment and not one that I think is likely to occur.

And I think that's just an adjustment we need to -- it's a reality we live with every day.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you, Secretary
Horn. Also, it does seem self-evident to me that we're
understaffed system-wide, one, as far as correctional
officers. And I think that the human errors involved here
might largely be due to the fact that we are understaffed.

What's your opinion on that, and how much more money do we need to adequately staff our prisons?

SECRETARY HORN: That's a very difficult
question because, again, you know, I don't think that I can
concede that an officer doing that 5:00 a.m. count when
he's supposed to see flesh or movement and didn't see flesh
or movement, that that had anything to do, you know,
whether you have -- at the end of the day, only one officer
does the count. And more staff won't change that.

I'm still dependent on a single officer.

There's still going to be one officer in a patrol vehicle.

And if that officer doesn't look up either because he hasn't been trained to look up, either because his supervisors haven't instructed him to do so as part of their supervisory responsibility, or because he's preoccupied with thoughts of what he's going to do when he gets off shift, which is, you know, just only human, I'm not sure that adding more staff solves that problem.

Having said that, one of the things that we know is that we have imposed additional responsibilities on our staff. We, I think, have in this state made a substantial investment in making our prison system drug free. And I think today we lead the nation in that respect.

But as a result, we've increased the responsibilities on our officers who previously were doing the searching. So those officers today are listening to

telephones because you gave us the authority to listen to those phone calls. They're taking urines, and we're taking statewide over 100,000 urine specimens a year.

Those are responsibilities that have never been recognized in staffing. And clearly, the number of officers on a cellblock does relate, I think, more to the issue of safety. I think that where you have a cellblock with 200 inmates on the block where there used to be 100, you have to recognize that you have to have enough officers to provide for the safety, both of the staff and of the inmates.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Yeah. Mr. Secretary, that was one of the things I was getting at. If you're preoccupied with concern about your safety, perhaps that preoccupation takes away, in many cases, from doing things like adequate security checks, flesh or -- flesh or movement checks.

SECRETARY HORN: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I was going to say flesh or bones but -- then the other -- just a final comment. Until we realize -- the public is going to have to realize we're going to have to spend a lot of money to fix these problems.

And until we do the right thing as far as intermediate punishment and creative programs to change the

nature of punishment, we're going to be paying -- paying
the freight for generations to come. Thank you, Mr.
Secretary.

SECRETARY HORN: Thank you.

.12

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: And I would just like to echo a little bit of what Representative Walko finished up with. I think this whole issue of overcrowding, the only answer cannot be simply double-deck bunks and more prisons, for a variety of reasons which I will not express today because I'd be accused of being out of my soapbox.

But we need to revisit mandatory sentencing. We need to look at alternative punishments. We need to look into diversion programs. And it's not one thing. It's a lot of things. And I will say that this Judiciary Committee has begun to do that.

That process is one that many of us here today and the rest who are not here today who serve on this Committee are concerned with. Sometimes it's because we worry about things that happened that caused us to be here today, escapes.

We're also concerned about the waste of human life. We're also concerned about the cost to the taxpayers at \$23,000 per. There's a lot of factors here. But I would say that I know the members of this Judiciary Committee are concerned that overcrowding of prisons is not

I necessarily the disease.

It's a symptom of the disease, and we need to treat the disease more than we do the symptoms. And that's been a big part of what I've been doing here on this Judiciary Committee as well as some of my members here who sit with me today.

We've also been joined by another representative. And she's to the -- she's the fourth person to my left, Representative Manderino from Philadelphia. And at this time, I'll ask Representative Dermody if he has a question?

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Just -- I'll be
13 briefer than Representative Walko.

14 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: We hope so.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Thank you, Mr.

16 Chairman. And good morning, Mr. Secretary.

17 SECRETARY HORN: Good morning.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: I'd like to thank you for your help and cooperation not only on this issue here at the prison but several others and the work we've done with the Sentencing Commission trying to reduce overcrowding. I just have a couple of questions.

You testified that you've authorized the hiring of 31 additional corrections officers for SCI-Dallas. And am I correct in assuming that yourself,

along with the administration here and staff, have decided that you need 31 additional officers, correctional

officers, to operate the facility properly?

SECRETARY HORN: Actually, I think 31 is the beginning. Let me just check.

MR. VARNER: Yeah, 31 is the number.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: How many have you

hired so far?

4

5

6

7

Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SECRETARY HORN: I don't think actually any of them have been hired. Once you make the decision to hire 31, you -- obviously, we have people on the Civil Service list. You recruit them, you bring them in for their physicals, and so on. And it takes several weeks to get them on board, and then they go to our training academy for six weeks.

What we've done, however, in the meantime is that we're using overtime to staff those posts. So we're manning the towers where -- we've increased the number of personnel assigned to the search teams. So once we've recognized that the posts need to be manned, we man them using overtime.

But overtime costs you half, again, as much, number one. And number two, it burns out your staff.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: That was my question.

It was two parts actually. How long does it take from the

time you hire a corrections officer till you get that
person on line working on a block?

MR. VARNER: They can work on a block -- as long as they're with another officer -- it's right around seven months.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: So it takes seven months from the date you hire a -- a person before they're inside the prison working?

MR. VARNER: Before they can start doing some independent working and that they take up one of your posts.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: And then my next question was, What are you doing in the meantime? And I guess --

SECRETARY HORN: We're using overtime.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: That's a costly, expensive process.

18 SECRETARY HORN: Yes.

.15

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: So it takes a while to get -- it will take a long time actually to get this person on prison staff.

SECRETARY HORN: That's right. I think the actual hiring of a corrections officer doesn't take -- the actual hiring and getting them on the payroll is probably 90 days from the time we decide.

1	MR. VARNER: Yes. As soon as we got the
2	go-ahead, right now we have 17 people in the process taking
3	physicals. We took the top 80 names on the list. Out of
4	that 80, it was like 33 people said they took the test.
5	And now we're saying, Come work for us. Are you
6	interested? And 33 showed up out of 80.
7	So we're going on further down the list to the
8	other people.
9	REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: I assume this is a
10	problem statewide, correct?
11	SECRETARY HORN: Yes. And in fact, statewide,
12	we've been given the go-ahead by the Office of the Budget
13	in anticipation of a supplemental budget request to hire a
14	total of I think it's 287 corrections officers throughout
15	the state. And so all of our facilities are in the process
16	of hiring additional staff.
17	REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Where are they
18	trained?
19	SECRETARY HORN: They're trained both on the
20	job at the facility it's a one-year training program
21	that consists of on-the-job training and six weeks at
22	our training academy.
23	REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: And where is that?
24	SECRETARY HORN: That's in Elizabethtown.

25 Five weeks. I'm sorry. Five weeks.

56 REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: What's the capacity 1 2 of the training academy? SECRETARY HORN: The training academy can 3 probably handle about 250, 300 people at a time. 4 REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: 5 Thank you. Thank 6 you, Mr. Secretary. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Counsel Preski. 7 MR. PRESKI: Just a few clarification 8 questions, Commissioner. The prisoners were noted at the 9 count, at the 10:00 a.m. count, that's when it was found 10 11 they were missing? SECRETARY HORN: Yes. 12 MR. PRESKI: And then I think you told us 13 14 yesterday during the tour, it was about 10:41 when the escape was declared? 15 SECRETARY HORN: 16 Yes. MR. PRESKI: And then, Secretary Varner, my 17 18 next question is for you. In the Secretary's testimony, he talks about you've established the communication linkage; 19 you had these discussions with the community. Do you have 20 any regular meetings set with the community? 21 I mean, are these going to be an ongoing 22 basis? Or how do you plan to handle that? 23 24 MR. VARNER: Yes. My plans are to meet with

them regularly. I've spoken to Representative Hasay.

25

We're going to set something up here in the first part of
December. And I've -- the members of the communities have
stopped in here periodically since I've been here. And,

MR. PRESKI: And then my last question is this, that yesterday during the tour, you had told us that you had just been accredited nationally.

MR. VARNER: Yes.

you know, we'll continue to do it that way.

MR. PRESKI: The discussions that we heard here about the overcrowding and the staffing, did that come up during the accreditation? Or how was that handled by them? Obviously, if you got accredited to that body, the overcrowding we've heard over the staffing was not a problem to them?

MR. VARNER: No, it's a problem to them. You have over 400 standards that you have to meet. Forty-one of them are mandatory you must meet. The nonmandatory standards, we failed those because of overcrowding, two inmates in one cell, those type things. We failed those individual standards.

Out of the 400 standards, we had a 96 percent that we met and 100 percent of the mandatories.

MR. PRESKI: And accreditation doesn't come easily, does it?

MR. VARNER: No, it does not.

MR. PRESKI: Do you know how many institutions

statewide or how many institutions nationwide get

accredited?

SECRETARY HORN: I don't know nationwide. All of our facilities are either -- and I think of our 24 facilities, I would say probably today 21 or 22 actually have their accreditation. And the two or three that don't are in the process, they're in the application process.

For example, the Quehanna Boot Camp is in the process and anticipating an audit. Some of our newer facilities have not yet been accredited. Chester, for example, which opened only 18 months ago, just received its accreditation last week.

So all of our facilities are either accredited or in candidacy status.

MR. PRESKI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative Josephs has asked to ask some questions, but she can't talk very well. And if she can't say it loud enough, we're going to ask Representative James to give her an assist. I know that he can speak loudly. So Representative Josephs, give it a good try and --

23 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I don't think I can.
24 I'm just hoarse.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative James

1 | will give you some assistance.

2 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr.

3 | Chairman. On behalf of Representative Babette Josephs from

4 Philadelphia, I want to ask you these questions. And of

5 | course, thank you both for testifying and for being here.

6 | The first question is about the escape at Huntingdon.

Norman Johnson was either celled with Hamm,

8 Ansel Hamm, or at least they at some time were in the cell

9 together or were both at SCI-Huntingdon. The press

10 represented that Hamm and Johnson were in the same gang

11 before incarceration.

12 Why was this allowed, one; and does the

13 Department of Corrections separate code criminals? Would

14 | you answer that for me, please?

15 SECRETARY HORN: When I became Secretary of

16 | Corrections, I instituted a policy of absolutely separating

17 | crime partners. I will tell you that prior to the escape,

18 | I had heard neither of Norman Johnson or Ansel Hamm. And

19 | it was only after the escape that I learned.

20 | I have no -- I do not believe they were ever

21 celled together; although, I don't want to say

22 unequivocally that they weren't. But I don't recall that

23 | from the investigation that they were. They were both at

24 | SCI-Huntingdon.

25 And they probably were put there years ago and

just never -- it never got changed. Today we wouldn't do

.11

.15

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Thank you. And the second question is, Could you describe the procedures that are designed to improve the communications between correctional officers and managers all the way up to you?

SECRETARY HORN: Yes. And let me first -- I

just want to respond to Mr. Preski's earlier question. The inmates were noted as missing at 10:20. And I believe that the first notification --

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: That was 10:20 in the morning?

SECRETARY HORN: 10:20 a.m. And the notification was made at about 10:40 a.m. So about 20 minutes before we confirmed that we were sure that they were noted missing by the block officer at 10:20. So it took us about 20 minutes. We do several things.

I am personally in regular communication with the state level representatives of the AFSCME, which represents the corrections officers. Each facility superintendent, first of all, is expected to manage by walking around.

And good superintendents, I think, are easily discernible from not so good superintendents because when you walk around, they know their staff. There's clearly an

easygoing relationship between them and their staff. Their
staff approach them, and they -- there's a familiarity.

And you see that, and you feel that in a well-run prison.

Secondly, all of our facility managers are expected to hold labor management meetings in a formal sense with the local collective bargaining agents, with the elected union leadership monthly. And in addition, regionally, the -- we hold regional labor management meetings on approximately a quarterly basis where our deputy secretaries will come down and meet with the superintendents and the representatives of the collective bargaining agents on a regional basis several times a year.

And then finally, on about an annual basis, we have a statewide labor management meeting.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Have you improved those communications since the escapes?

SECRETARY HORN: Well, I think we have because I think that Superintendent Varner's management style is different from that of the previous administration. And that's easily observable to anyone who has walked through this facility in the past and who walks through it now.

And, you know, you can make people meet; but not all of our managers listen as well as they need to.

And sometimes relationships become very adversarial and very contentious. And I think that's what had happened

here. And I think we had to break that Gordian knot with an ax, and that's what we've done.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Now, you had indicated earlier -- and this again on behalf of Representative

Babette Josephs -- that the escape was not discovered till about 10:20 a.m. However, in the testimony, it says something about the officers between 6:00 and 2:00 did not notice the inmates missing.

SECRETARY HORN: That's right.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: What's the -- I

11 | don't -- that's a little confusing.

SECRETARY HORN: Had they noticed the inmates

13 earlier, we would have taken note of the escape earlier.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So are they the same officers that noticed them missing at 10 o'clock?

SECRETARY HORN: On the 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

17 | shift on the 16th of August, yes.

18 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So they didn't miss

19 | them until 10:00?

3

4

5

7

8

10

14

15

20 SECRETARY HORN: That's right.

21 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: And so -- but they

22 | should have noticed them earlier?

SECRETARY HORN: That's right. Indeed, they
certainly should have been noted missing by the officer on
the earlier shift at 5:00 in the morning, which would have

given the inmates far less lead time and increased the
likelihood that we would have apprehended them -REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. She understands.

SECRETARY HORN: -- sooner. The point is that
a better count wouldn't necessarily have prevented the
escape, but it would have revealed the escape several hours
earlier which would have given us a greater opportunity to
find them while they were still on the grounds of the
facility and not out in the woods.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. The last comment Representative Josephs has is she -- and I want to know about -- she wants to thank, first, representative -- the Chairman, Jerry Birmelin, for House Bill 1724. And I believe you're supportive of that?

SECRETARY HORN: I'm not --

16 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: The community

17 | reparative board.

SECRETARY HORN: Oh, I think it's a wonderful

19 idea.

10

11

12

13

14

15

20 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: All right. Thank you,

21 Mr. Chairman.

22 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, Secretary

23 | Horn and Superintendent Varner. We appreciate your coming.

24 | Thank you very much. Our next testifiers are Major Thomas

25 | F. Williams, Area II Commander of the Pennsylvania State

Police; and Captain Carmen Altavilla, Troop P Commander,
Pennsylvania State Police. Gentlemen, if you would come

3 forward.

5

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gentlemen, we want to thank you for coming today. Thank you for your testimony. And gentlemen, would you introduce yourselves, first of all? Which one of you is Major Williams?

MAJOR WILLIAMS: Yes. I'm -- good morning.

I'm Major Thomas F. Williams, the Commander of Area II

10 Police. And directly to my right is Captain Carmen

11 Altavilla, who's the Commanding Officer of Troop P,

12 Wyoming.

13 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: We want to thank you
14 for coming. And when you're ready, you may begin your
15 testimony.

MAJOR WILLIAMS: I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to present testimony at this public hearing on the prison escape at SCI-Dallas. Pursuant to an agreement with the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, the Pennsylvania State Police is responsible for the enforcement of the laws of the Commonwealth at all state correctional facilities.

This responsibility includes responding to criminal complaints, requests for assistance, and prison escapes. On August 16th, 1999, at approximately 10:35

a.m., Troop P, Wyoming received a telephone call from personnel at the State Correctional Institution at Dallas informing the PSP that a possible escape had occurred as two inmates were unaccounted for after returning from yard out.

PSP patrol units were immediately dispatched to SCI-D. Approximately five minutes later, PSP telephoned SCI-D for further information. SCI-D personnel related that they had not accounted for two inmates and had found a makeshift ladder which breached the outer perimeter fence.

SCI-D was treating this incident as an escape and had activated their emergency escape plan. Additional troopers from Troop P were dispatched to SCI-D. A command post was established at approximately 11:45 a.m. staffed by myself; Captain Carmen Altavilla, Commander Troop P; and other Troop P command staff personnel.

I might add that that command post was established in the administration building here on the grounds of SCI-Dallas. Assistance was requested from the PSP Bureau of Emergency and Special Operations Aviation Division as well as canine tracking dogs from the Luzerne County Sheriff's Department.

Pursuant to a previously agreed-to Escape

Action Plan, area municipal police departments in

conjunction with State Police patrols had set up

checkpoints at preestablished intersections around SCI-D.
Additional troopers were also obtained from PSP Troop F,

3 | Montoursville; Troop N, Hazleton; and Troop R, Dunmore.

Upon arrival, the first canine unit was immediately directed to the apparent area where the escapees had breached the outer perimeter fence. SCI-D personnel began to duplicate photos and information on the escapees from their respective escape packets.

Once received, the information and photos were immediately disseminated to checkpoints and roving patrols. Photos were also disseminated to local residents for their information and safety. Area residents reported numerous sightings to the command post.

These leads were responded to but were met with negative results. Intelligence information on both escapees began developing, indicating a list of family and friends of both escapees. As the search progressed, additional canine units were dispatched from the Department of Veteran's Affairs Police, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Bureau of State Parks from Sullivan County, as well as private tracking dogs from Bradford and Schuylkill Counties joined in the search.

In addition, PSP troopers and municipal police checked residences surrounding the institution for any signs of forced entry. As darkness approached, a PSP

helicopter with forward looking infrared, which is FLIR for short, was utilized to search for the escapees with negative results.

The command post at SCI-D transferred to Troop

P headquarters at approximately 11:00 p.m. The command

post then resumed operation on site at SCI-D at 9:00 a.m.

on Tuesday. The following day, August 17th, 1999, the PSP

began using intelligence information obtained on the

escapees.

Contact was made with the PSP BCI Fugitive
Unit; Troop K, Philadelphia; and Troop M, Bethlehem.
Additionally, the FBI field offices in Philadelphia and
Atlantic City as well as the Philadelphia Police Department
and the US Marshall field offices in Philadelphia and
Scranton were notified.

On August 19th at 2:10 p.m. hours, the PSP in Wyoming received information from the US Marshall's Service in Scranton that information was received from their Philadelphia office regarding phone calls received at an acquaintance of the escapees.

The calls originated at a pay phone in Hanover Township, Luzerne County. At approximately the same time, an attempted robbery/assault occurred at this location by an individual who attempted to steal the victim's vehicle.

PSP units proceeded to the scene and were met by municipal

police and the US Marshalls.

A command post was established at the rear of a shopping center in Hanover Township, Luzerne County where the pay phone and attempted robbery/assault occurred. PSP units began responding to the scene, and a perimeter was established.

The Luzerne County Communications was notified, and assistance from additional municipal police departments was obtained. Canine tracking dogs were once again requested from the Luzerne County Sheriff's Department and responded to the scene.

A contingent of Department of Corrections
personnel was also dispatched from several state
correctional facilities in the area. As the tracking dogs
began their search, a hot trail was discovered and pursued.
Positive identification of one of the escapees was
established through latent fingerprints which were
processed by the PSP Records and Identification Unit
located in Troop P, Wyoming.

These fingerprints were found on items processed from the victim of the attempted robbery/assault. As the search progressed, the news media began broadcasting information on the search. Two area residents telephoned the PSP after seeing whom they believed were the escapees crossing a roadway.

Additional PSP ground units supplemented by corrections officers from SCI-D, SCI-Retreat, and SCI-Waymart were directed to this area. PSP helicopter units, which had been present for the search, were also directed to this area.

Shortly thereafter, a PSP helicopter located both escapees wading in the Susquehanna River. PSP and Department of Corrections ground units were directed to this area and apprehended the escapees without incident at approximately 7:20 p.m.

This concludes my testimony regarding the SCI-Dallas escapees. On behalf of the PSP, I would like to take this opportunity to thank personnel from the various municipal police agencies, the US Marshall's Service, and the Luzerne County Sheriff's Office for their assistance with the capture of the two escapees.

I would also like to thank the local citizenry and the news media for helping to bring this incident to a successful conclusion. In addition, I would like to give an extra special thanks to the cooperation provided by the Department of Corrections, not only during this instance, but also in the past.

The Department of Corrections has been instrumental in helping us formulate Pennsylvania State Police emergency plans for state correctional institutions.

We have met on September 13, 1999 with SCI-Dallas
supervisory staff to exchange ideas and information for
refining our plan.

Furthermore, on October 13th, 1999, we met with the new superintendent, Mr. Ben Varner, and his staff to update our emergency plans for state correctional institutions. Several additions and changes have been made to encourage a smooth flow of operations between the State Police, Department of Corrections, and local police agencies.

Once again, thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee for the opportunity to present testimony on this incident. Captain Altavilla and I will now be happy to answer any questions you or members of the Committee may have regarding this testimony.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you very much, sir. I had one question. I'm trying to find the page on which to reference that question. But somewhere in your testimony, you indicated that someone locally said they thought they saw the two escapees.

MAJOR WILLIAMS: That's correct, sir.

22 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: On what basis did they 23 think that they were the escapees?

MAJOR WILLIAMS: Based on the news media broadcasts and descriptions that were put out as to what

these people may have looked like and what they may have
been wearing.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: What were they wearing?

MAJOR WILLIAMS: They were wearing -- I'm

looking -- khaki?

CAPTAIN ALTAVILLA: Maroon. Maroon prison garb. I think the one you're referring to is the incident that occurred at the shopping center. With that incident, we had a description of an individual with a white T-shirt with maroon pants and wearing a hat.

That fit into the description of what we knew the escapees to be wearing at the time when they left. But also, the conclusive evidence, there was a Penn Register, information that we had received from the US Marshall Service that at least one of the individuals had been using a telephone at that location.

And secondly, one of our Records and Identification people had taken a fingerprint off the eyeglasses of the woman who they attempted to steal the vehicle. And we were able to, on scene, positively determine that it was Yang.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: You're calling the color maroon. And I'm thinking of, you know -- when I go through the prisons and I see all the prisoners, they're wearing brown.

CAPTAIN ALTAVILLA: They're referred to as prison browns, right.

1.3

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: We're talking about the same color?

CAPTAIN ALTAVILLA: Yes, we are.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Maroon and brown are different to me so -- and the reason why I ask that question is because as a matter of law, but also as a matter of policy before it became law, the DOC was changed and no longer allowed prisoners to wear civilian clothing, which I'm not sure if you're familiar with that --

CAPTAIN ALTAVILLA: Yes, I am. Yes.

not. But that was one of the changes that was made after the escape that occurred a few years ago, approximately two and a half years ago at SCI-Pittsburgh where we had a public hearing. And that was one of the outcomes of that hearing, was the fact that we passed legislation that required that they not wear civilian clothing, that they had to wear certain clothing.

Now, it may not have made any difference in the SCI escape but apparently made a difference here in that they were identified because of that clothing. Would you indicate that that was a help to you as the State Police in trying to track down these guys to know that they

were wearing a distinguishing type of clothing?

.14

CAPTAIN ALTAVILLA: It was. Although, I have to add that we do know that during the course of the time from the escape until they were caught, that they had taken some clothes off a -- off a clothesline at a Plymouth Township residence.

And that's why the one T-shirt that was actually being worn by Yang at the time was not the shirt that he had left the institution with, but that is very true.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Okay. What that tells me is that I think it was a good thing that they're required to wear the browns because either they were -- in the early moments of an escape, they would be wearing those clothing.

But they would recognize that they shouldn't be wearing that clothing and you would have to steal clothing, which would also give an indication of where they were. So I think that you would agree with me then that the mandate that they not wear civilian clothing is a good thing, at least as far as you're concerned.

MAJOR WILLIAMS: There's no question. As far as we're concerned, that is a good thing.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you very much.

Representative Hasay.

74 1 REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: Thank you, Mr. 2 Chairman. I would first of all like to thank Major Williams and Captain Altavilla for all of your assistance through this August situation that we had this year. I 5 noticed in your statement the State Police Records and ID Unit helped in the processing and investigation for the fingerprints? 7 MAJOR WILLIAMS: That's correct. 8 REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: I take it that was the 9 10 lab? MAJOR WILLIAMS: No, it was not. That's a 11 special unit which is assigned to each troop headquarters. 12 13 We use those people to go out and assist our crime scenes, to assist at our crime scenes by collecting the evidence 14 and taking fingerprints. 15 We also assist many municipal police agencies 16 in doing that. These are people that are specially trained 17 to do this type of work, and they are at each troop 18 19 headquarters. So it was our own people. REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: 20 That's a great job, 21 what you've done. How long has that been in existence at 22 the station, at the barracks? 23 MAJOR WILLIAMS: Oh, it's -- they've been 24 around since I've been on the job. And that's 30-plus

25

years so --

1 REPRESENTATIVE HASAY: Okay. Thank you, Mr.

2 | Chairman. Thank you, Captain. And thank you, Major.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: The tag team of Josephs and James will now be asking you some questions. And I'm really not sure whose questions are whose, but I'm sure that Representative James will be asking all of them.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. This is going to be Representative Harold James' questions first. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you both for testifying. I just want to commend the State Police, the correctional officers, and the law enforcement agency for working good together on this escape, the Johnson escape.

I think it was just an outstanding job in cooperation and helping the community and working with the community and doing what you do. I'd just like to ask, I heard you say that you're meeting with the corrections officials. And Representative Hasay said that he's having community meetings. Do you meet with the community also?

MAJOR WILLIAMS: No, sir. We -- the Captain and I discussed that just briefly this morning. We have not participated in those community meetings, but I would certainly like to see us participate in those meetings because we have a community relations person assigned to the barracks here.

And I see no reason why he shouldn't be at

those meetings to provide guidance or expertise concerning
police matters.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Right. I think -- I think it would be -- and I'm glad to hear you say that because I think that's important that you do be included or that you participate with the community and with all the other officials in the meeting because then we got everybody at the table.

And they don't have to -- okay. That's it for my questions, Mr. Chairman. And on behalf of -- is it okay for Representative Josephs? -- Representative Babette Josephs, how much has this escape cost the State Police? And if you don't know that now, you can send that into us.

MAJOR WILLIAMS: No. We do know that now.

And I'll defer that to Captain Altavilla because he has
those figures.

CAPTAIN ALTAVILLA: Sir, the actual escape, the four days from the 16th to the 19th actually cost the State Police in overtime \$21,319.58. And we also have that broken down by troop. But that's -- that's the total.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Do you also have how much it cost local law enforcement?

CAPTAIN ALTAVILLA: No. What they did is they attended to their own matters as far as the finances. And I know at the Senate hearings, they did present the amount

1 | that they had approved. But we do not have that.

2 MAJOR WILLIAMS: I can tell you it was nowhere 3 near what it cost the State Police, though.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: If it's possible -- the document that you were just reading, Captain, is it possible to forward that to our Chairman so we can get

8 MAJOR WILLIAMS: Yes, it is.

copies?

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CAPTAIN ALTAVILLA: Certainly.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: And -- because I think what she's trying to determine, if we can get a cost, you know, local law enforcement costs, your costs, the corrections department cost, and just tie it in all to the escape, if that's possible, Mr. Chairman.

MAJOR WILLIAMS: It's not a problem. You'll receive it.

17 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: All right. Thank you.

18 Okay. Representative Babette Josephs thanks you.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I received information, gentlemen, that I'm sure you'll be interested in knowing.

And that is that the State Police will be invited to any future meetings with the community groups. That comes from Superintendent Varner so --

MAJOR WILLIAMS: Very good. We'll make sure that we have a representative there.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Yeah. I'm not sure
where he is. I know he's around here somewhere. He's in
the building here somewhere. But you may want to confirm
with him when the next meeting is --

CAPTAIN ALTAVILLA: We'll do that.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: -- and make sure that you're on the list of invitees. Counsel Preski.

MR. PRESKI: One question, Troopers. It says in your testimony, Several additions and changes have been made to encourage the smooth flow of operations between State Police, DOC, and the local police agencies. Could you just expand on that a little?

MAJOR WILLIAMS: Sure. One of the real serious problems was a communications problem between the State Police and between the local police, the municipal police departments because we're on entirely different frequencies, different channels.

We don't have enough portable radios to put out and issue them to each and every individual municipal police officer. So what we were doing, we were putting -- in addition to the municipal police officers, we would make sure we had a trooper at the scene which would give us access to that -- to that scene, to that location.

What we have done now, we have been in contact with the supervisor at the local 911 emergency radio. And

1 | we are now going to have them install an actual radio for

2 | the municipal police departments right at our command post.

And that radio will be manned by a local officer who will

ensure that the municipal police agencies involved get all

5 | the information that we give out to the State Police.

The other situation was sometimes the municipal police officers would be tied up at the scene of an intersection, a checkpoint for hours and hours and hours, sometimes four, five, six hours. They felt that that was taking them away from their local municipality.

And indeed, it was. So what we have determined in the future, at any future incident such as this, we will have Pennsylvania State Troopers relieve them within a two-hour period so that they may go back to their municipalities.

MR. PRESKI: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Gentlemen, that's all the questions our Committee has for you. And we want to thank you very much, number one, for capturing those two gentlemen. Maybe I'm using the word loosely, gentlemen. We want to thank you for your efforts and for your coordination and for your efforts to make sure that you are coordinating your efforts with local police better in the future.

I think -- we didn't want an escape to happen.

1 But hopefully, the things that have occurred since then and

- 2 | the changes that we've made in policy will help to prevent
- 3 them from happening in the future or if it does happen,
- 4 | capturing those who escape as quickly as possible. We want
- 5 | to thank you for your good work and for testifying today.
- 6 Thank you very much.
- 7 MAJOR WILLIAMS: Thank you.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Our next testifiers are
- 9 Michael Fox. He's the Council Director for AFSCME,
- 10 District Council No. 89. And Corrections Officer Brian
- 11 | Smatko, who's the local AFSCME President here at the Dallas
- 12 | SCI. Gentlemen, thank you for coming. And please be
- 13 | seated at the table.
- It's my understanding, Mr. Fox, that you don't
- 15 | have written testimony today?
- 16 MR. FOX: Yeah. The -- I submitted testimony
- 17 to you at the Huntingdon hearing. And that testimony would
- 18 be presented today. Now, if you want me to go through it
- 19 again, I'd be happy to. But I don't think that would be
- 20 | necessary. However, there are a few points that I'll be
- 21 adding on to that testimony verbally.
- 22 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Okay. Well, it
- 23 probably wouldn't be necessary for you to repeat it. And
- 24 | I'm not sure that all of our members were at the Huntingdon
- 25 hearing. Although, all that information was sent to them

1 | in their offices so --

MR. FOX: I'm prepared to do so, Mr. Chairman, if you want.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Well, why don't we distribute it from the last hearing to the members. And then Brian Smatko, your local president here, does have his in writing. And we will ask him to present his. And then as questions are asked of either of you, then maybe you can fill in some gaps that you think need to be filled in.

MR. FOX: Some of the information I was going to present to you was going to be in response to some questions that was asked of me at the last hearing that I didn't have answers to.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: That would be fine. Why don't we give Mr. Smatko first run at this. Welcome, gentlemen. Mr. Smatko, you may give your testimony when you're prepared to do so.

MR. SMATKO: Thank you, sir. Good morning.

My name is Brian Smatko. I'm the President of American

Federation of State, County, Municipal Employees Local

2496, representing 450 employees at the State Correctional

Institution at Dallas.

I've been employed at SCI-Dallas for over seven years. And I currently work the 06 to 1400 hour shift as a housing unit officer. I'd like to start off

today by saying that mistakes were made, mistakes that if not coupled together would not have resulted in an escape. Unfortunately, they did.

A few corrections officers made mistakes.

Errors in judgment were made, and appropriate disciplinary action was taken against them. The officers served their discipline. And I have encouraged them and all corrections officers that we all recommit ourselves to our jobs.

However, mistakes, some serious, were committed by employees outside the Union at a much higher level. And it wasn't until the second escape that the Department finally realized that some of their decisions were detrimental to the overall security of the institution.

I would like to begin to put a lot of troubles here behind us. With the new Superintendent Ben Varner and Deputy Tom Lavan and a renewed commitment to a healthy labor/management relationship, things are improving. They have to. The public expects to be protected and not to have to worry about a murderer running around in their backyard. This cannot happen again.

The Department of Corrections conducted manpower surveys in 1990, 1993, and 1998. And every time, the numbers rose. Forty, 50, over 60 officers needed in 1998, not including the tower officers. And that number is

expected to grow over 70 in the upcoming Manpower survey scheduled for November 8th and 9th of this year.

And yet the Department never acted on any of their own surveys done by their own security people.

Instead, the Department incorporated new programs such as unit management that cost millions and, in the opinion of most 450 of my Local, is a failing program.

It just diverted money, money that could possibly have been used to hire additional corrections officers. Posts that have been identified for almost ten years still go unfilled. Just one example was additional search team officers, positions that have just recently been added following the second escape, now enables us to search every jail cell almost once a month. Where before, we were lucky to be getting it done once every six months.

It takes over 140 officers to staff the population blocks at SCI-Dallas. That's not including the restricted housing units. Then you have the exercise crews necessary to run the restricted housing units. You have tower officers, special post officers, search teams, hospital officers, transport officers, gate officers, yard officers, patrol officers, security and security-related officers, and many more.

And yet for the first time in years, a few positions have finally been added. And yet millions and

millions of dollars have been poured into treatment and treatment-related programs. It is my belief that security at a penal institution should be our first and foremost responsibility.

It is also my belief that when you neglect something long enough, it takes a lot to restore it to the condition that it should have been in all along. I'm sure that the numbers are staggering at what it cost to recapture McCloskey and Yang.

And yet it leaves me to wonder if the money saved by ignoring their own reports on staffing, the Union constantly pointing out problems about the Perimeter Intrusion Detection System, and the need for the towers over the years was enough to cover the cost of what it will take to rebuild not only Dallas's but several other institutions' complement of officers to ensure that the safety of the taxpayers is never again jeopardized.

I would like to give the facts to the Committee of the escape according to the documentation inside the prison that was available to me. Yang and McCloskey were celled together for 23 days prior to the escape. McCloskey was confined to the restricted housing unit K-A from May 19th of '99 to July 19th of '99.

Prior to that, they were celled together from July of '98 to April of '98 -- or April of '99 -- I'm

sorry -- in 10 cell. Yang arrived on C Block May of 1998
and was lodged in cell 87. Approximately 60 days later,
management approved a transfer of Yang to 10 cell to house
with McCloskey.

According to McCloskey, a convicted murderer, they were cutting the bars for several months, as you heard in previous testimony, when this -- we know from the records -- is a lie. In fact, a lot of what McCloskey and Yang have said were lies.

And yet the Department took some of the things they said at face value and were used by the Department in previous testimony and testimony including today.

Concerning the Department's recognized need for video surveillance, according to the records at SCI-Dallas, the cameras that are now being installed have been in the warehouse for over two years prior to the escape and long enough for the warranties to expire even before they were taken out of the box.

The concertina wire installed after the escapes had been at the institution for over a year prior to the escapes. Someone a year ago recognized the need to replace the old withered and, in some cases, brittle wire that was at that time on the fence. Yet it sat unutilized because the manpower was never available to install it.

The method that was referred to previously on

how the bars are tested is inadequate at best. The method known as bar banging has been tested by Joint Committee including members of SCI-Dallas's upper management team and Union officials, and it was concluded that a bar that has been compromised will produce no different sound until the bar is cut totally through.

.12

A more thorough test must be implemented to ensure the integrity of the bars at our institution. You must not rely on a procedure and hold people accountable to that procedure when the procedure itself cannot produce its expected result.

The employees were told time and time again that the Perimeter Intrusion Detection System doesn't blink. Over and over, repeated complaints were ignored being told that the system doesn't blink. We were told to rely on the Perimeter Intrusion Detection System. So we did. And in that respect, we became complacent. But at the same time, that's what management wanted.

Then the system blinked, and the corrections community was awoken from their closed-eye approach towards the possibility of a perimeter breach. Unfortunately, we compromised the security and safety of those who live around our institution. For that, I would like to apologize and pledge that myself and the people that I represent will never allow such egregious actions to be

taken again.

Since the dismissal of Superintendent Larkins and the inception of Ben Varner, there have been marked improvements. Improvements that have been needed for a long time are finally coming to fruitation. Ideas on how to better improve security and to address security concerns more quickly are now being sought.

For the first time in many years, it seems that management is now listening with an open ear to some of the concerns brought forth by the Local, the citizens advisory group, and other security-minded groups, realizing that those who work in the thick of things sometimes have the best perception of some of the problems.

As the president of this Local and living on the brink of the 21st Century, I realize that we will never get everything that we as a Local want; and that is fiscally understandable. However, security should always remain at the forefront. And in doing that, we at Dallas expect to go another 20 years escape-free and once again become the crown jewel of the Pennsylvania prison system.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Committee and its distinguished members for this opportunity to present my testimony. I sincerely hope that through these hearings, we can achieve the goals commonly sought by all in this room. I would like to welcome any

1 | questions you may have. And once again, thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Before we do that, Mr.

3 Smatko, Mr. Fox, why don't you present your answers to

4 | questions that we had previously.

MR. FOX: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the last hearing, I think it was Representative Walko may have asked me a question with regard to a portion of my testimony where I was dealing with the inmate to staff ratio and the fact that Pennsylvania ranked 25th at a 5.3 to 1 ratio.

And I think Representative Walko's question was, Well, what was the worst in the country; and what is the best? And at the time, I didn't know. And now I do. The worst is 12.3 to 1, and the best is 3.2 to 1. Now, in addition, as I said that day, that's -- that's a -- a misleading ratio in that -- that's overall.

That's a total number of corrections officers divided into the total number of inmates at an institution. And that's not a true picture of what it's like in the institution. For example, at Camp Hill, SCI-Camp Hill, there are 3,275 inmates.

On the 6:00 to 2:00, 8:00 to 4:00 shift combined, that ratio is 19 to 1. And that's the shift that has the highest number of staff. That goes down. When you get to the 2:00 to 10:00 shift, it goes to 26 to 1. Then

at the 10:00 to 6:00 shift, it goes to 46 to 1.

Mahanoy, one of the newer institutions -- and I think a question was asked of me last time also is should the -- or is the staffing the same at a prototypical as it is at an older institution? And I said that it was not, and it should not be.

The ratio on the 6:00 to 2:00, 8:00 to 4:00 shift at Mahanoy is 23 to 1. On the 2:00 to 10:00, it's 31 to 1. And on the 10:00 to 6:00, it's 55 to 1. And those ratios are fairly consistent no matter which institution that you -- that you look at.

And I was glad to hear the questioning of Secretary Horn this morning with regard to staffing and understaffing and overcrowding because that is a serious problem. We've spent the last a little over a month -- this is the third hearing I've been to.

The first was the Senate hearing, the second was this Committee's hearing at Huntingdon, and now this one. And during that period of time, something was transpiring in one of our State Correctional Institutions that didn't get the kind of press across the state that a -- that an event like an escape gets, that an event like a riot gets because, unfortunately, it's something that occurs day in and day out.

But I'm going to bring it to your attention

1 | because I hope that this Committee in its deliberations

2 will begin to tackle the understaffing issue in the State

3 | Correctional Institutions. At the State Correctional

4 Institution at Houtzdale, again, one of the newer

5 institutions, one of the prototypicals, in a two-week

6 period of time, beginning on October the 8th, 1999, on

7 October the 8th, 1999, a CO working in the RHU was kicked

8 | in the neck by an inmate.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On October the 12th, 1999, a CO on the 6:00 to 2:00 shift working alone in a pod with 124 inmates was assaulted. That CO ended up with a broken nose and had to have his eyelid re-attached, that the assault was so serious. A second corrections officer in an adjoining pod coming to that officer's assistance was also assaulted seriously, suffered a broken nose and will have to have a plate put into his cheek.

In fact, one of these officers stopped breathing three times because of the blood pouring down the back of his neck. Eight days later, on October 20th, 1999, another corrections officer working alone in a pod assaulted seriously. On October 22nd -- oh, let me say something here.

Following the October 20th assault, I had conversations with Secretary Horn and Executive Deputy Secretary Beard, following which a lock down and shakedown

of the entire institution of Houtzdale took place on October the 21st.

Now, just to show you the ingenuity of inmates, one inmate somehow was successful in their speculation because he had a broken leg. He may have had it hidden in his cast. It may have been screwed into his crutches. But one inmate was successful in hiding a shank, a homemade weapon.

And on October the 22nd, the day after the institution-wide lock down and shakedown, a corrections officer again working alone in a pod was stabbed five times. That corrections officer, fortunately, did not have any vital organs pierced and was in the hospital for four and a half days. He's home now, and he's okay.

This was occurring as we're focused on

the -- the issues at Huntingdon and Dallas, as we should

be. But we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that there are

22 other correctional institutions out there with similar

problems that should and need to be addressed before an

escape occurs.

I heard the comment a little bit ago
about -- and it may have been Representative Hasay
commented about how, you know, we respond to these things
now that an escape has occurred. Unfortunately -- and as I
said before, I've been working with the Department of

Corrections for over 17 years.

And that seems to be the pattern. We had understaffing and overcrowding before the riots at Camp Hill. The riots at Camp Hill occurred, attention gets focused, and a commitment to staff at 100 percent's made. And that occurs. Since then, we have a slide.

We now have escapes, brings attention to the system. Now, hopefully, we'll have the same type of progress. But I hope -- and I'm confident with your leadership, Mr. Chairman -- that the Legislature will not allow for complacency to set in among us all when we're dealing with the Department of Corrections so that we're addressing these problems, these serious conditions before -- before the serious assaults, the serious escapes, the serious riots occur.

The other thing that I -- that I feel compelled to comment on, during the course of the hearings, following the hearings, primarily in the press reports, there seems to have been a -- an impression built that, you know, that staff in correctional institutions, corrections officers in particular become complacent, become lax because of -- because of the tediousness and the repetitiveness of their job.

I talk to corrections officers every day. And that is the one thing that they've read about. In fact,

walking in here this morning, a corrections officer saw my bag, recognized me and said, Mr. Fox, don't let them keep blaming us. We do our job, and we do it well. And he's right.

I've received many calls about that point.

And I think what you had, you had -- Officer Smatko is correct. Mistakes were made. But corrections officers are not unlike you or I. There are times when you lose focus on your job and a mistake's made.

That doesn't mean and it should not mean and it should not be interpreted as a system-wide complacency that has set in among corrections officers. I've told you what happened at Houtzdale over the past month. In the Department of Corrections, there averages one assault on a corrections officer every day.

Corrections officers know that their lives, lives of their brothers and sisters are in danger every day. When you work in those kind of conditions, you don't become lax. You don't become complacent. You are always on guard. But again, there are times when focus is lost.

In fact, I hope you don't take this personal; but I've watched PCN quite a bit. And I've seen a few times when members of our General Assembly have said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to correct my vote. I hit the wrong button. Sometimes we lose focus. They're only human. We

all do that.

But please -- and I would -- and I would ask
the press that are here, please do not continue to paint
the corrections officers and the employees of the
Department of Corrections with one broad brush that they're
all complacent, they're all lax because they are not.

There was a question asked about, you know, our relationship, the Department and the Union and its employees -- and I appreciate that question because that's important -- and have there been any improvements made. Secretary Horn mentioned something kind of in passing that I'd like to elaborate on because I think it is important for us all to understand.

As I've said in my previous testimony, we have brought security issues to the labor management table.

Oftentimes, they get lost in the shuffle; and they become part of what was described as a very contentious sometimes relationship, particularly here at Dallas.

Secretary Horn and I have met, and we have agreed to set up a joint committee of corrections officers and the management at an institution. We're going to try it at three institutions, one of which is going to be here at Dallas, where, on at least a monthly basis, the management of the institution will meet with representatives of the corrections officers and talk about

one thing and one thing only, security.

They will get the recommendations from the employees. The employees will have an opportunity to discuss what management plans on doing. Then at -- and again, at least quarterly, that meeting will definitely include the superintendent of the institution.

And I think what's critical in this process is that the recommendations of that -- of either party in that meeting, whether it's the Union or management, all those recommendations, whether accepted or rejected, get submitted to Harrisburg.

They go to the appropriate Deputy Secretary and then ultimately to the Secretary so that everyone from the institution to the Department level will know what recommendations are being made because maybe an idea that locally they don't think is a good idea to implement, maybe someone in Harrisburg might think it's a good idea.

hopefully the input of the corrections officers and the staff of these institutions will be listened to and taken more seriously than they have in the past. And the other thing that I want to echo -- and it was a point made by Officer Smatko -- and that is that a lot of what you heard and what the opinions have been developed on that the staff were complacent and were lax is based upon only one thing:

The statement of the inmates.

It was the inmates who said they hung out a window for, I don't know, 15 or 20 minutes. I don't know if that's true. It was the inmates who said they hung on the fence for 15 or 20 minutes while the corrections officer was parked underneath. I don't know if that's true.

And, you know, so again, you know, I would ask you on behalf of the corrections officers, don't paint with a broad brush the assertions that somehow because of the job they do, they've become complacent or lax because I think quite the opposite is the case.

Because of the job they do, they are on their toes almost constantly. No one's perfect. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony. I want to extend an apology on Representative Hasay's part. He had another commitment that he had to be at, and that's why he had to leave earlier than the conclusion of these meetings.

I'm going to turn this over to my counterpart,
Representative James, for a few minutes to run the meeting.
And he'll give members the opportunity to ask questions.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. Thank you both for testifying. Just briefly, I

don't -- and this is not to be argumentative. And I

appreciate and understand with respect to where you're coming from. But I don't remember hearing no members painting the correction officers with a broad brush.

I don't remember anybody -- I don't remember no members on the Judiciary Committee doing that. Now, whether it may be news media, I don't know. But I do know and from what I've heard since I've been here is that most people do their job and do it well and that in every profession we have people that don't do it well.

And the concern is that sometimes people
don't -- in leadership don't want to recognize that or
don't want to admit that. And when they do, they find out
that it's better. I guess the question that I have is to
Brian --

MR. SMATKO: Smatko, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Yeah. I think you have a tough job as being president and -- and having to work also. Now, I've heard consistently a couple times that a CO was working alone and there had been like 100 people in a certain area. Did that take place at Dallas?

MR. SMATKO: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Has that been changed since the escape, or do you still have occasions where one CO works where there may be 100 inmates?

MR. SMATKO: We still have occasions where

98 there are two officers where 200 inmates are present. 2 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. So what about the one officer? 3 MR. SMATKO: We have housing units that have 4 5 one officer with 100 inmates that are present. When we run yard, you could have up to 1,000 inmates in the yard; and we have six officers. So there are a lot of instances -- I 7 work on a population block. 8 There's three assigned, but only two at one 9 time are ever there. We're in charge of 160 inmates. 10 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Where's the third one? 11 MR. SMATKO: The third one is used 12 primarily -- the third one would seat them in the dining 13 hall. He'll go to the yard with them; he'll do reliefs on 14 other blocks; he'll do reliefs for other jobs. 15 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Is that one of the 16 concerns that you express as a security concern with the 17 18 management or administration? 19 MR. SMATKO: Yes, it is. REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: And did you ask that 20 that be increased? 21 MR. SMATKO: Yes, I did. 22 23 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: To how many? 24 MR. SMATKO: To keep -- on a two-man block,

two officers is sufficient to maintain. On a 200-inmate

25

population block, you need at least three officers because somebody has to watch the inmates and somebody has to watch you.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So you -- I guess that would be one of your discussions with management --

MR. SMATKO: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: -- until that is addressed. And that's because it hasn't been --

MR. SMATKO: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: -- to your

11 | satisfaction.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SMATKO: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. You also said something about -- I like the way you say in your testimony that you -- under the new leadership, you want to put trouble behind you and work with the new superintendent to try to enhance and improve things. I think that's good as a leader.

Then you go to a part where you say that for the first time in years, a few positions have finally been added and that there have been money poured into treatment and treatment-related programs. How long have you been in corrections?

MR. SMATKO: Eight years, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: You do not see a need

for treatment and treatment programs?

MR. SMATKO: I didn't say that, sir. What I said was -- I see that the amount of money spent on treatment programs is far surpassing the amount of money spent on staffing the prisons. What I meant by a few positions over the last few years, prisons always do hiring.

Most of the hiring are for people that retired, transferred, so on and so forth. The new positions are positions that were -- increased our complement, new posts, not just people, but new posts, the additional search team officers.

Up until prior to the escape, we had a search team of four members. They were responsible for doing all the urines, all the phone monitoring, all the ion scanning.

Plus, they were also tasked with searching cells, conducting investigations, gang-related materials and information.

And it wasn't until after the escape when the Department added search teams to each shift of the daylight hours, the 06 to 1400 and the 1400 to 2200, exclusive of the search team that was already in place.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Now, my question to you is that do you see treatment and treatment programs helping to improve conditions in the institution?

MR. SMATKO: I see treatment programs

improving the conditions in inmate lives. I don't view

them in some respect as increasing the enhancement of the

security. We have a program now under unit management

where -- unit management is a program where someone is the

middleman between the counselors and the corrections

officers.

They're nothing more than, in my opinion, an overpaid go-between person. They are there to satisfy the inmates' needs as far as treatment, and yet they are also the ones that we have to send these inmates to when we have disciplinary problems.

I find it very difficult and troubling for someone in the treatment field to also wear the hat of disciplinarian.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. You also said that -- that you may not believe that they were cutting the bars for several months?

MR. SMATKO: That's correct, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Do you have any idea, based on your experience, how long you think they may have been doing it? How long --

MR. SMATKO: I believe that they started after McCloskey was released from the RHU, and it was done within two weeks prior to the escape.

_	102
1	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So you think that that
2	tool could have done that within that short period of time?
3	MR. SMATKO: No doubt about it, sir.
4	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Did you express that to
5	management or the administration or know if they tried it
6	to see if it worked?
7	MR. SMATKO: It has been tried, and it does
8	work.
9	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Within the time frame
10	you spoke about?
11	MR. SMATKO: That's correct, sir. Hours and
12	not days.
13	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: In your position as
14	president of the Union, do you see a need for more
15	diversity among correction officers?
16	MR. SMATKO: Yes.
17	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Do you see problems
18	with racism here?
19	MR. SMATKO: Isolated instances, yes, sir.
20	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: What do you do about
21	them?
22	MR. SMATKO: Most of the problems that I see
23	about racism, sir, actually come from the inmates. Because
24	I work on a housing unit, I have 160 inmates. I know 150

25 of them. I've been there a few years now. I know a few of

them well. We received an inmate from the restricted
housing unit a few years back that was labeled an extreme
racist.

In the two years that we've had him on our block, he is now one of our janitors, works directly for me. And we have a wonderful rapport. I think part of the problem is there's not enough officers to get involved and to deal with inmates on a one-to-one basis.

Most officers that do, such as myself, go out of their way to make sure that some of the inmates are at least content with what's going on or at least knowledgeable and informed about some of the decisions that are made.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: As a union, do you try to deal with, you know -- there's been alleged rumors that there are correction officers and that some -- not only correction officers but inmates belonging to hate groups or racist groups. And how do you deal with that as a union, or do you disregard it, or do you report it?

MR. SMATKO: As a union, we do here at the institution have a Union member -- several Union members as a matter of fact that belong to a gang task force inside the institution. As a union, because most officers -- and those that are in my Local aren't all corrections officers. It's very difficult to address the concern about gangs at,

say, a union meeting.

However, we do make sure, as a union, that we are increasing our gang activities members. And we do keep updated lists, and we do encourage members to report things that they may otherwise consider maybe out of the ordinary but not necessarily meeting the guidelines of, say, a misconduct.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. All right.

9 Thank you. Don Walko.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. For either Mr. Fox or Smatko, one of the things that we're charged with is analyzing how central administration is responding to problem -- problem identification, what corrective actions they're taking.

What I've heard from Mr. Smatko was until very recently, much of what you were saying has been ignored. And what I was -- and also, back in the case of SCI-Pittsburgh again, one of the things that came as a result of the meet-and-discusses that the AFSCME Union held were recommendations to central management regarding tool control, key control, access of correctional officers to maintenance areas.

And what I'm wondering is, on a -- on a system-wide level, are these concerns being addressed? I think you mentioned three SCIs are now entering some kind

of a phase of management/labor communication to the central administration. Is that enough? And what has been done?

MR. FOX: Okay. That -- let me answer it a couple of ways, Representative Walko. First, the -- the issue of local communications, you know, has in the past, particularly here at Dallas, been of a major concern. At the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, ex-Superintendent Larkins testified.

And as I recall his testimony, he said that he viewed his relationship with the local union as good.

Well, I think that was indicative of what the problem was here. You know, when I testified, I indicated to the Committee at that time that if there was one institution that I was getting calls with regard to the security issues on a regular basis, it was Dallas because Superintendent Larkins was more of a treatment-oriented philosophy than a security-oriented philosophy.

about the clothing of the inmates. When the Department changed the policy on the clothing of inmates, one of the first places I got a call from after that policy was instituted was here at Dallas because Superintendent Larkins took it upon himself to give exceptions to that policy.

You know, so the -- the relationship up here

with Superintendent Larkins was not good, was bad. It was
terrible for security. It doesn't surprise me that -- that
something like this happened at Dallas given that attitude
from Superintendent Larkins' perspective.

We had a similar problem in Pittsburgh where issues -- where issues were being brought forth but being ignored. System-wide, I would say that they're still not as good as I think they should be. Response needs to -- needs to occur quicker with regard to issues.

For example, again, I'll mention Houtzdale.

You heard testimony from Secretary Horn that he instituted
a new policy requiring regular standing counts where the
inmates actually have to be rousted out of bed, standing
up, seen and counted.

Well, on October the 20th, I believe the date was, the superintendent at Houtzdale issued a policy making an exemption for certain inmate workers from the noon count. Now, you know, the question -- the question arises, you know, What do you do?

If you don't see skin and movement, you have a policy from your superintendent making an exemption, what does the CO do? I called the -- I called the deputy secretary in charge of that region, expressed my concern about that, expressed my view that that should be rescinded.

1 |

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 That call took place on Monday. I haven't gotten a

3 response yet. When I get back to Harrisburg, I'm going to

Now, that call occurred -- today's Thursday.

4 | follow up on it. So I mean, we need improvement. But I

5 | said in my original testimony, of all of the -- all of the

6 | secretaries that I've dealt with over the past 17 years,

7 | Secretary Horn has probably been one of the more accessible

8 to us and one of the more responsive.

But again, we need to make improvement. Are three institutions enough? No, sir. I don't think they are. But there, you know, there's -- there's a concern about -- what we want to do is we want to make sure it works. We want to -- we want to -- once we get this all talked out, then we want to bring in representatives from our local unions who will participate on the committees, bring in the management people, and essentially have a training session on how to work together cooperatively so that -- so that this thing, when we put it in place, it will work.

And what we thought was if we tried too many institutions at one time, it could become too unwieldy; and it may be doomed for failure. So we wanted to see what problems we experienced, fix those problems, then put it out system-wide. So it's not enough, sir. And we're hoping in a short period of time to make sure it's in all

institutions.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: And one final thing.

The Governor retained the American Correctional Association and their so-called Blue Ribbon Committee to come in and review the entire system. And I was wondering -- first of all, I don't recall where they are in the stage of that review.

And I don't even recall how much they're being paid for it or anything like that. But I was wondering, have you had any interaction, Mr. Smatko or Mr. Fox, with this Blue Ribbon Committee that's overseeing -- evaluating what's going on in our correctional institutions?

MR. FOX: I was invited -- when the panel was put together and was meeting with Secretary Horn and Secretary Horn's deputies, Secretary Horn invited me to that briefing so that I would be aware of exactly what that panel was being instructed to do and what they're being charged to do.

And then I was given an opportunity to -- to address them and give them the concerns. And it was at that time that I requested that when they visited institutions -- and at that time, I thought they were going to visit them all -- when they visited institutions, to make sure that they visited and spent time with our local union leadership. And they agreed to do that. Now --

1	109 MR. SMATKO: I have met with the Blue Ribbon		
2	Panel. They were here I can't give you an exact date.		
3	But it was in the month of October. And we did have a		
4	chance to sit down with them for a good 45 minutes and		
5	discuss openly the concerns of our local, and not just the		
6	local, but the people that everyone here at the		
7	institution, about what we perceive as some of the security		
8	lapses that may have taken place and so on.		
9	MR. FOX: And they're still visiting		
10	institutions. That's their I think their visits may		
11	be done by the end of November.		
12	REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you. Thank you		
13	very much.		
14	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Representative		
15	Manderino.		
16	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you for your		
17	testimony, and good morning. I have a couple questions for		
18	Corrections Officer Smatko. You told us in your testimony		
19	that the practice of shaking or banging on the bars that		
20	you were taught in order to secure in order to assure		
21	the security of the bars on the windows doesn't work.		
22	And I'd like to ask you to elaborate on why		
23	that doesn't work		
24	MR. SMATKO: There was a joint test		
25	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: why you came to		

1 that conclusion.

2 MR. SMATKO: There was a joint test done after 3 the escapes when the question of bar banqing arose.

4 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Describe bar

5 | banging.

6

7

8

MR. SMATKO: Bar banging, although you can't see any bars in here, what you do is you take a ball-peen hammer and you bang the bar.

9 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You don't

10 | physically shake it as well?

11 | MR. SMATKO: No, ma'am.

12 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You were never

13 | taught to physically shake it?

MR. SMATKO: No, ma'am.

15 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So you never

16 | physically shaked it? That wasn't the practice?

MR. SMATKO: That was the reason why we

18 attacked the bar banging, because the policy was -- people

19 were getting used to the idea of banging a bar. They were

20 being told that should the bar be compromised, that it

21 | would create -- and in Secretary's own words -- a quite

22 distinguishable sound.

When we took it and we made a display and cut

24 bars to various degrees, the only bar that was

25 distinguishable was the bar that was cut straight through.

So in essence, everything that we were told really held no relevance.

.12

And by using a system and a procedure that doesn't produce the effect but yet telling them that it does, you sort of take your mind off of touching the bar, looking at the bar because, basically, you have the hammer, you bang it, you hear nothing different, and you leave.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So are you saying to me that a human being checking the bar is not an adequate procedure, or are you just saying --

MR. SMATKO: I'm saying the bar banging itself is not an adequate procedure.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And in your manuals and in your training, the notion of physically touching and shaking the bar like this, which I saw demonstrated on a million tours that I went on this summer, et cetera, that's not what you were taught to do?

MR. SMATKO: No.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. How about the flesh and movement policy? There's a flesh and movement policy for observing inmates during the evening rounds while they're sleeping, naturally not wanting to arouse them physically, but needing to see flesh and movement.

I think it's fair to say no matter whose

version of the facts you believe in terms of when people
attempted the escape, we at least know what time you
discovered they weren't there any longer.

MR. SMATKO: Correct.

.....

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So there were at least some rounds where flesh and movement was not being seen.

MR. SMATKO: Okay. The flesh and movement -REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Now, explain that
from a human perspective. And is that a good policy, or is
that a policy we should no longer rely on?

MR. SMATKO: The policy -- the flesh and movement refers to when count is being taken. Prior to the escape, our institution didn't have a count until 11:30 in the morning. Meaning when I came on shift, the officer that I relieved, the midnight man, would tell me my count is 156 with 4 inmates out.

You would not make a physical count of those inmates until 11:30.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And that was because of practice, or that was how your policy manuals here at the institution were written?

MR. SMATKO: That was past practice. And the post orders indicated that that's the time that count was taken. Now, since the escape, we have changed that

dramatically. We now take a 0620 count, and it's a
standing count. Meaning that at 0620, 20 minutes after I'm
in the institution, I have a list of inmates I know that
went to work.

When I take my count, I count every inmate present. If I don't see them standing, I beat on the door or I open the door physically and awaken the inmate, where that policy was not in place prior to the escape.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. You jumped a little ahead of me because I'm going to get to the standing counts in a minute. I'm still on flesh and movement.

MR. SMATKO: Okay. The flesh and movement -REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You didn't have a
policy that required the sight of flesh and movement when a
person was sleeping prior to the escape, is that what
you're telling me?

MR. SMATKO: No, we didn't. On the midnight shift, you were required to see flesh or movement when you made your count.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Is that a realistic policy to assure that a human being is sleeping in there, and is that a realistic system for us to rely on with regard to corrections officers being able to tell if somebody's in there? Or should we throw that out as an indicator of safety?

MR. SMATKO: No. What happened was prior to
the escape, should an officer awaken an inmate on a
midnight count, say, 1:00 in the morning, 5:00 in the
morning --

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I'm not saying wake him up. I'm talking flesh or movement.

MR. SMATKO: But if you didn't see flesh or movement, that would be your next action. You would have to physically awaken the inmate. And what happened was inmates started writing grievances against the officers saying they're harassing them.

So then officers in turn got paperwork that they would have to answer to management stating why they were harassing this inmate. The flesh and movement policy is a good policy. Inmates know now and officers know now, since the escape and since the discipline, that you will do whatever it takes to see flesh and movement in that cell.

And as long as --

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So that we can continue to rely on in terms of a human system?

21 MR. SMATKO: That we can continue to rely on, 22 yes, ma'am.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. Now let's talk about the standing counts.

MR. SMATKO: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: We were told at past prison tours -- I was not here to go on yesterday's prison tour, but I can rest assured they were told it again -- that the policy prior to the breakouts were for standing counts at the first count after whatever you considered the wake-up 6:00 a.m. time.

Are you telling me that was not the policy here in your manuals and in your procedures prior to the breakout?

MR. SMATKO: That's exactly what I'm saying,

11 ma'am.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You're saying that was not the practice and that was also not the written policy? Or it was your written policy; we just didn't practice it?

MR. SMATKO: No, ma'am. It was neither written, nor was it the practice of the institution.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. That's the end of my questions. I just have one comment. And I'm glad that Representative James picked up on it, too. And sometimes you see things from only one vantage point. But just for the record, I was very disturbed -- maybe I understand it a little bit better -- to hear you at least suggest what I thought you were suggesting when you said that millions and millions of dollars have been poured into

1 | treatment programs and you believe that security needs to

2 be the first and foremost responsibility and that we

3 | shouldn't invest in treatment and training until we've

invested in staffing, at least at the level that you as the

5 Union think we should.

And I guess I just want to tell you from the big picture, we invest a whole lot of money more on all of the systems and just a pittance, when you look at the big scheme of things, on treatment and treatment-related programs.

(Applause.)

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And the reason -- and the reason that we do that is the same reason that we are concerned about security breakouts of prisons, because we want our communities to be safe. And we know that except for the lifers in Pennsylvania, all of these folks are at some point returning to their community.

And at least I as a lawmaker feel that I have an obligation to make sure that when people are returning to their communities, that we have done something here that makes the people back in their communities that they will be returning to safe.

So I will assume from your clarifying remarks that you are not suggesting that we do away with treatment, and I hope that the Union won't take that kind of position.

MR. SMATKO: No, that was not my intention. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative Josephs. REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okav. On behalf of 4 5 Representative Josephs again, thank you both for testifying. First, she says that I have little confidence 6 7 in mechanical or electronic security, anti-escape devices. Safety depends on the quality of the personnel, especially 8

those in contact most with inmates.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm happy for the new procedures designed to improve communications and ask Officer Smatko the following question: Please describe past and present communications between correction officers and prison management. And how would you improve these communications, and when and how would you evaluate the response to the COs' security concerns?

MR. SMATKO: The past relationship when Mr.

Larkins was a superintendent was atrocious. And I would

feel safe to say that there was no communication. It was a

confrontational issue every time that the Union and

management met concerning any issue, not just security.

That made it very difficult to deal with him and his administration. Since Mr. Varner has taken over, the process has been a 180-degree turnaround. Mr. Varner is very open to the Union's concerns, and he hears every

one of them. We don't expect everything that we want to come to light, but we do expect to be heard on our concerns.

And in lieu of what Mr. Fox had testified to about the upcoming security councils that they have planned, I think that's a great idea. The most important thing is the superintendents and deputy superintendents and the Union officials that work at the institutions need to understand each other's job.

They need to understand where he's coming from, and they need to understand where I'm coming from. When you have an open and established rapport, the issue, irregardless of whatever it may be, is resolvable to both liking.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So you think -- how would you improve them when you said that describing --

MR. SMATKO: That's one way to definitely address security issues is you need a forum where you can solely address security issues. The labor management forum that we have now encompasses every concern that we have, staffing, maintenance, trades, secretarial, so on and so forth.

I think the inclusion of simply a security forum is much needed given the time and, you know, the year coming into the future.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you. How does
the overcrowding affect the security for correctional
officers?

MR. SMATKO: Well, because -- again, as a housing unit officer, I know 150 of the 160 inmates assigned to me. When you deal with overcrowding, it becomes almost impossible, especially now that there are no civilian clothes to make distinguishable marks or pick somebody out.

You have to know who they are, and you have to know their face. When you don't have the staff available, it makes it difficult to identify an inmate, let alone understand what he's going through and, you know, where we're trying to get.

With more officers, you have better security.

Officers feel more inclined to interact with inmates. When you have a ratio of 1300 to 6 in the yard, most officers don't feel inclined to go over and stand by the weight pile and talk to a convict because you have to worry about watching your fellow officer as much as you have to worry about a fight breaking out or an assault or so on and so forth.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Now, how does the crackdown on prisons, such as what has been happening after the escapes, affect the security for correctional

officers?

MR. SMATKO: Actually, the security has improved, especially at our prison. With the superintendent, they've incorporated programs that now give inmates a lot more free time, allow inmates more time at work. And in turn, when an inmate is receiving things that they may have not received in years past and receiving respect, then in turn, inmates give respect back.

And that's what they're starting to see now, that the changes we're making -- although most are security-minded, they are keeping in mind of what inmates' needs are and that inmates need to be working, they need to make money, and they need to be given an opportunity to improve them self.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Well, that's the key word I haven't heard too much of. But it's a key word in terms of respect because, like you said, if you give respect, you can get that back most of the time.

MR. SMATKO: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: And the next question from Representative Josephs is to Mr. Fox. What does Union management do about hate groups, racism, et cetera, among Union members and inmates?

MR. FOX: Well, the -- in corrections -AFSCME Council 13 on a statewide basis has a -- a

corrections conference that we sponsor. It's a weekend conference where we bring in instructors on various topics.

In fact, our next one's coming up in January.

And we have -- we have corrections officers -in fact, two of the best work at SCI-Pittsburgh -- who are
excellent instructors with regard to gangs, identifying
gangs, understanding their language, understanding their
signs, knowing how to react to them, interact with them.

And, you know, so we -- so we have training programs to instruct our members on various issues with regard to gangs, issues on -- dealing with conflicts inside a correctional institution, how to defuse a conflict, hopefully, without physical intervention.

When we're -- when we're made aware of racism and, you know, hate groups and that, I mean, we try to work with the Department, to the extent we can, to investigate it. You know, we don't have as free access to look into those types of things as you might think we would. So it's difficult for us to get into that.

But when it's brought to our attention, you know, we -- we attempt to deal with it through management. I will go to management and say, Listen, you have a problem here that needs to get addressed. Because if you have -- if you have acts of racism, whether it's, you know, going from one inmate to another, staff to an inmate, or

inmates to staff, you know, that's a recipe for confrontation, for violence.

And it's not only a -- a threat to the safety of our members, but it's also a threat to the security of the institution. So to the extent we can and to the extent we're made aware of it, we -- we work within the system to try to resolve it.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Do you work on increasing or helping to increase minority recruitment, or do you encourage it?

MR. FOX: Well, the Department of Corrections approached us several years ago with regard to that problem. One of the things -- one of the things that, you know, we did was -- well, for example, we had a big -- as a result of a lawsuit we filed -- a big hiring move at Graterford several years ago.

And we worked with the Department at that time to go into the minority communities to recruit from those communities into the jobs at Graterford. We have also worked with the Department, where necessary, to provide for the appropriate minority recruitment, you know, where the Department will go to Civil Service.

Secretary Horn said earlier, you know, some of this is controlled by Civil Service. And if we see a need and there's a need at an institution for recruitment in the minority areas, whether it be African American, Hispanic or
women, the Department can request, from the Civil Service
Commission, request for a selective certification.

So the Civil Service Commission then will send them only a list of the requested class. And that's something that we worked with the Department several years ago in developing the method of doing that.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Thank you on behalf of Representative Josephs.

MR. FOX: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr.

12 | Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony. Appreciate it. Is Mr. Fred Newman here? Mr. Fred Newman, are you present? I assume by no answer that he's not. We're going to take a 5-minute break to give everybody a chance to stretch and give our stenographer a short break. And I mean exactly five minutes.

(A brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Please take your seats.

I'd like to invite our next set of testifiers to please

come forward. We have, hopefully, enough chairs for you.

They include Joan Gauker of Graterfriends, Incorporated;

Dianna Hollis, President of Pennsylvania CURE; Vince

Wallace, Lay Minister here at SCI-Dallas; and Angus Love,Esquire from the Pennsylvania Institutional Law Project.

If you folks would all find your seats, I would appreciate that so we could get started. I asked earlier if Mr. Newman was here. He apparently is not going to be here. So we only have two more sets of testifiers, and then we will be finished for the day.

I'm going to ask the folks who are testifying now as a panel if they would testify in the order in which they are a listed on our agenda. And that would mean that, Joan, you would be first; second would be Dianna; third would be Vince; and fourth would be Angus Love.

And we would ask that you all would present your testimony before any of you take any questions. And then as a group, as members wish to, they could ask individually or ask blanket questions that maybe they'll want a response from all of you on. But I know from, you know, skimming through the testimony that you have to present, we're coming from a broad angle of concerns here.

So why don't we get started with Joan Gauker from Graterfriends. Would you begin with your testimony, please?

MS. GAUKER: Thank you, Chairman Birmelin and the distinguished Committee members. I feel like I

25 | should --

1 | REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Do you have --

MS. GAUKER: I gave it to you. It's got

Graterfriends attached to it. It's a thick packet. I gave

it to your counsel. He was passing it out.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Joan, we're going to put you on hold. Apparently, we need a few more copies. How many copies did you bring?

MS. GAUKER: I made 12, I think.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: We're in the process of making some more copies. Apparently, somebody absconded with them or put them in the back.

MS. GAUKER: Here's some more, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: People took them that didn't -- weren't on the Committee. Well, Joan, I think we've got you covered. Go ahead. Sorry for the interruption.

MS. GAUKER: It was a very interesting morning. And almost listening to everyone here, I felt I needed to reconstruct my talk because there's so many things that I really wanted to respond to. So I may go off on little tangents.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Yeah. Don't feel like you're obligated to read this. I will caution you that this is probably the only testimony that will be received by members who are not present. If you wish to ignore what

you have written and given to us in the hopes that

everybody reads it, that's fine, and you wish to talk about

other things.

The only caveat I would ask you is that you try to keep your remarks to the subject at hand and that they not be far afield from the subjects that we've been discussing this morning. And keep in mind also you have three compatriots here who also would like to have --

MS. GAUKER: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: -- an opportunity to present their remarks as well.

MS. GAUKER: Well, I am managing editor of the publication that I've attached to your testimony called Graterfriends. I believe I have two recent copies there. I've been a prison volunteer for 19 years. I go into the Graterford Prison regularly on a weekly basis.

And actually, I have free access to Graterford Prison because I'm Volunteer Coordinator there. So I'm considered volunteer staff. So what you're going to hear from me is a different perspective than you've heard from other people today.

Some of you may not like it. But believe me, I'm inside to a large degree as much as some of the other people that testified here today. And I can tell you things that are happening in there. Because of my

experience and the thousands of letters and phone calls
that I receive each year from inside, as well as families
on the outside, I'm here to tell you that the problem of
escapes has nothing to do with fences or a lack of
correctional officers.

Escapes happen when top administrators do not manage well. Secretary Horn said to you, You don't let the little guy hang. He said that to you. He said it's at the top. The monstrous leadership failures are at the top. But he didn't go all the way to the top.

He stopped with his top of his -- each institution. I'm here to tell you it's at the top. The mismanagement is at the top. This top administration that's not managing right now allows guards -- that concept that's there allows the guards to become complacent or lazy, not do their jobs correctly.

The Pennsylvania Prison System is nothing less than a bloated bureaucracy characterized by inefficiency and incompetence beginning with the top administration.

And I know there are many good people in the DOC. They have compassion; they have good intentions; they do good works.

But their desire to actually rehabilitate prisoners is stifled into silence as they dare not risk offending top administrators. And I can tell you that

because of the people that I speak to when I'm inside
prison. The whole atmosphere in the last five years has
changed dramatically.

Not only has the system oppressed prisoners, which I'll speak to, and given them a sense of hopelessness, it has done the same for the staff. We're also gravely concerned with a system that rewards incompetence; for instance, the DOC transfer of Superintendent Varner to SCI-Dallas.

Now, I won't speak anymore about that. But we do consider this a management move that outrages and bewilders us. Dianna will speak more to that. Secretary Horn wants more guards to thwart escapes and better manage his prisons. But he said that the system was built on layers and layers of redundancy was his word.

What has happened now is the administration has turned these layers and layers of redundancy into layers and layers of oppression. So we may have things we have to change. But in the process when we change them, this system has become a very oppressive one.

In fact, if this is a system with long periods of idleness unfortunately built into the workday, then more guards -- adding more guards to the system will actually add more conflict because COs with idle time will look for ways to pass the time.

1

6

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't care what the CO said here before.

2 | Believe me, they have a lot of idle time. If all they have

3 to do is open doors and issue passes when there's no one

there to open doors for or to give a pass to, they don't

5 | have anything else to do.

They write up prisoners for petty things.

7 | They deliberately aggravate prisoners. They play cards.

8 | They read newspapers, and they truly do sleep on jobs. And

9 if you need confirmation of that, we can provide it.

10 | Secretary Horn's budget also will seek excessive

11 overtime -- CO overtime pay, but common sense tells us that

12 | quards on overtime only compound the management problem.

prisoners involved in programs are not troublesome.

Guards cannot be at peak performance after an 8-hour shift. And if shifts were properly managed, there would be no need for excessive overtime. Instead, money is needed for education and activities for prisoners because

We recognize the problem has many, many facets. And the one thing that the CO did say was the unit management problem. I have to agree with the unit management program or concept. I have to agree. I don't think that's a good one. The point he made was very good.

The same person has to be the disciplinarian as the treatment. And on honestly, if you give somebody those choices, a lot of times it's going to go toward

discipline as -- in a way that's not treatment oriented.

So that is one of the problems.

But there's also inefficiency in our system to a degree that it's actually encouraged by the way our days are chopped up. Instead of counting prisoners on the job or in classrooms, as in many other systems, including the federal system, Pennsylvania sends its prisoners back to the cells for count.

This constant interruption and short time constraints leave teachers with precious little time to teach and civilians and prison workers with very little time for maintenance, correctional industries, laundry, painting, and so forth.

For example, civilians generally arrive around 7:00 a.m. Prisoners get to the job about 8:00. Now, this is the institution I know. It could be different times other places. But then they have to leave by 11:00 for the lunch count. They don't return till 1:00 or 1:30, and they must leave again at 3:00. Then the civilian worker leaves at 3:00.

This lack of continuity on the job wastes times, it wastes taxpayers' money, it causes long delays in repair work. And we saw here at Dallas how some repair work is absolutely necessary. This inefficiency affects the whole prison.

We are here as part of a coalition. That's

why we're sitting this way. And this coalition is growing

daily, and it intends to be a presence in the challenge of

holding prison administrators accountable for their

management. We are troubled by the dramatic increase in

management. We are troubled by the dramatic increase in the number of allegations of wastefulness, abuse, and

7 discrimination we are receiving.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In fact, I have in the past received copies of the SCI-Dallas correctional officers' newsletter. And if you ever want to see a racist newsletter, get that, unless it's improved dramatically over the recent past. We are here because we know there's better ways to manage.

Unfortunately, our system is so punishment oriented, it penalizes those with no involvement in the infractions; in this case, the escapes. Think about it.

Three people escaped. There were no riots, and no one was hurt. But the rest of 36,000 behaving prisoners became the brunt of the DOC oppression.

Prisoners are escape goats for DOC mismanagement. Such subjective management is not cost-effective, nor is it rehabilitative. DOC doesn't need an army to count people, open doors, sign passes. It doesn't need new regulations or more prisons. It needs to manage better and more humanely.

The system wastes food, it wastes materials

1 | and resources. It throws away -- I've been told that all

2 the food that's left over gets thrown away. There's

3 | nothing given to shelters. There's no creative cooking. I

know that now in some of the county jails, they do this

5 | creative loaf cooking with leftover foods.

I understand nothing like that happens in our system. In addition, when there's a shakedown, which now they're doing more and more in every prison, they throw out randomly the prisoners' towels, sheets, pillow cases, all of which have to be reissued to the prisoners. So this has to be expensive for the system.

And in the midst of the spiraling DOC costs, the DOC has now ordered new black uniforms for the guards. These black Gestapo-type uniforms had to be a tremendous expense to the DOC. And what is the purpose of the Gestapo-type uniform in an institution that's supposed to foster corrections?

Also an enormous waste of money and resources is the routine transport of prisoners across the state to house them as far away from their home as possible and then shuttle them back to their local courts whenever necessary. Doesn't this mean-spiritedness and its ensuing expense seem extreme?

Then there's the debacle concerning the prison farms. The farms were a tremendous management tool giving

incentives to thousands of prisoners. But just before
closing the farms, saying they were losing money, the DOC
bought horses and farm machinery and plowed under rows of
tomatoes and potatoes.

And this same administration is spending -- I believe you asked the price -- \$100,000 on the Blue Ribbon Investigative Panel that no doubt will whitewash the DOC's mismanagement. This management already knows and Secretary Horn already told you people he knew what the problems were.

He didn't act on them, and now we're paying \$100,000 for a Blue Ribbon Panel to tell us what we already know. Secretary Horn said he'll be timid with his new budget request and -- more timid than he was in the past.

And those budgets rose from 700 million to 1.2 billion.

However, if the Legislature obliges him, it will reward him and his administration for presiding over more escapes on his watch than in recent history. It will reward him for allowing guards to sleep on the job and for lax security that permitted these escapes, for staff not observing a kid being sexually molested in a visiting room for months on end, and for abusive and outrageous discrimination against prisoners.

At this point, it's not the prisoners who need restrictions. It's the DOC. Legislators need to insist on

1 zero prison growth, better management, line item budgeting.

When you say you're going to give them more money for something, you have no idea if it goes to that.

The problem is not overcrowding. The problem is mismanagement. Every prison in the country is overcrowded, but some are managed a whole lot better than others. We ask you to hold the DOC accountable for each budget line, for proper prison management, and for working to make our streets safe by properly treating those in

custody.

Possibly the DOC should be judged by its recidivism rate. With recidivism well over 60 percent, perhaps we should measure DOC management competence not by the money it spends and wastes, but by its success in preventing crime through lower recidivism rates.

Interestingly, this administration -- and I
mean this administration -- I have been in the system
over -- throughout the administration of many secretaries.
They used to be called commissioners. And it was this
administration who now has gutted all of our good programs
or eliminated the very programs that reduce recidivism such
as literacy, higher education, relevant job training,
religious opportunities, and drug abuse.

And when we consider the continuing drug abuse problem as it relates to recidivism, clearly the existing

prison drug treatment programs are not effective or not applied to enough prisoners. If you please the Secretary, you virtually are handing him a blank check.

.12

We ask you not to do this. As this system's manager, he must be held accountable for all the missed management and resulting escapes. Now, I have given you a copy of this month's Graterfriends, the November issue. And my cover editorial isn't something that I want to read to you.

But I was encouraged to pull out a few things because we believed Secretary Horn when he first spoke to us when he came here. We had a reception for him in Philadelphia. He spoke to us. He told us that he would run compassionate and just prisons.

However, if things weren't bad enough before he arrived, I say in my editorial, over the past five years, they've become immeasurably worse. Across the state, we've experienced a wave of oppression we could not have anticipated.

And then I write about the many positive volunteer programs that were gutted, particularly the prison literacy program and the family resource center program that works with prisoners -- or with children, particularly at Graterford.

In both of these programs, prisoners served as

volunteers and learned many valuable skills as a result of being program leaders and partners. They learned how to work as a team for the good of the program. They learned how to be positive leaders. They learned teaching and other skills, and they learned how to interact with outside volunteers.

.12

They learned they were capable, worthwhile people who could make a positive contribution to society. They learned they could care and hope. But all this was taken away when, among other oppressive and mean measures, the DOC decreed that no prisoner could be in a leadership position in a group with outside volunteers.

And I've lived long enough that -- I've lived through World War II. And I know what a fascist system is. And I'm telling you, in this democracy, we are running a fascist prison system. And it's appalling that we should have such a system.

It's appalling enough that we have the system; but it's even more appalling that we place more of our citizens in it than necessary, keep them there longer than is prudent, take away their freedoms, and demean and isolate them, in fact oppress them, and then have the audacity to cast them back into society to make it on their own or repeat the prison experience.

Please help me understand this logic. I have

to agree with Chairman Birmelin, who said there is many

other -- there are many other programs we have to institute

here, alternatives to prison and getting back away from

mandatory sentencing, all those things.

That's part of it. But immediately, we have a management problem in our prison system in Pennsylvania.

Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you, Joan.
9 Dianna Hollis.

.12

MS. HOLLIS: Chairman Birmelin, distinguished Committee members, my name is Dianna Hollis. I'm president of Pennsylvania CURE. And that stands for Citizens United for the Rehabilitation of Errants. I live in Central Pennsylvania. I have been a registered nurse for 30 years.

I worked as a registered nurse at SCI-Camp
Hill back in 1982. Since that time, I've been involved
with the prison system. I visit prisons. I speak with
inmates and families through direct contact, through mail,
and through the telephone.

But I come here today with some fears, some real fears, fear of retaliation because when I and others spoke out at the Capitol Rotunda in April of this past year, soon after I spoke out, my husband was transferred. He was an honor inmate. He is an honor inmate.

He was president of the inmate organization at

Coal Township. He was just informed one day, You're being

2 transferred, much to the shock, quite honestly, of even his

counselor, who had tears in her eyes the day she told him. 3

So I know what retaliation is. We've been there.

5 done that.

13

15

16

6 Well, he was transferred from Coal Township to

This is a Level II inmate, which is the 7 Frackville.

8 highest level inmate you can get, to Frackville which is a

Level IV institution. It's really an AC lock down

10 institution. Most of the men are locked down in their

11 cells most of the day.

So he was told this was a reward. This is a 12

14

never been a risk, a security risk. Well, today, the DOC still has not explained to us, you know, why these actions

occurred. We have our own ideas, which I think you know or

reward, going to a stricter housing institution when he has

know where I'm getting at. 17

18 The inmates at Coal Township in June had their

19 annual banquet. In fact, my husband was planning, you

20 know, planning the banquet. He's the president. And I was

21 to receive a volunteer award, the Lois Williamson Award.

was approved to go in to receive the award. 22

23 My husband was suddenly transferred, and my

24 permission to come into the institution to receive my award

25 was revoked. So Mr. Chairman, it's my hope and prayer that you and your committee would take steps with Secretary Horn and his administration to ensure that no retaliation comes against me. But my most concern is my husband within those walls, that staff will not retaliate against him.

So I ask, Mr. Chairman, can you assure me and the other members of our panel today that there will be no retaliation against my husband or us for us speaking out today?

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I don't know that I can give you that assurance since I don't run DOC. I can only tell you that from my part, I will take your comments today and I will keep them in mind. And you will have to let me know if anything does happen. And I will investigate the matter if that -- if anything happens.

It would be false assurance if I told you that I can run DOC and tell them what to do. I mean, that's not my function. And I don't want to give you a false assurance. I can only tell you that from my perspective, I will do my best to represent you if you feel that that has happened.

MS. HOLLIS: Well, I appreciate that. And this will be on the record then.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: By the way, your husband's name is?

MS. HOLLIS: Douglas.

1	CHAIRPERSON	BIRMELIN:	Hollis?

- MS. HOLLIS: And by the way, he now is at
- 3 | Mahanoy.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Hollis is his last
- 5 name?
- 6 MS. HOLLIS: Hollis, yes. He was transferred
- 7 | from Frackville to Mahanoy.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Later on, you can give

me his number, assuming that he's assigned a number but --

- MS. HOLLIS: I have it if you want it.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Go ahead.
- MS. HOLLIS: AF6355.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: The letter "A", letter
- 14 "F" --
- 15 MS. HOLLIS: "A" like Adam, Frank. AF6355.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Is that Mahanoy?
- MS. HOLLIS: Yes, uh-huh.
- 18 | CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Okay. You can
- 19 | continue.
- 20 MS. HOLLIS: Okay. Well, some of the -- the
- 21 | two issues I'd like to talk to you a little bit about go
- 22 | hand-in-hand. It's the two R words, racism and
- 23 retaliation. I've already talked a little bit about
- 24 retaliation with my own personal experiences.
- 25 With my vast experiences and my contacts with

1 hundreds of inmates and their families, there is no

2 | question that racism and blatant discrimination is

3 prevalent throughout the DOC system. It persists because

those at the top ignore it, or they refuse to take

5 appropriate steps to stop it.

By their inaction, the good-old-boy network has allowed the Ku Klux Klan sympathizers, white supremacists, and racist activity to pervade in nearly every state prison. What investigations there are result in whitewashes of the offensive guard behavior.

There is not a single incident in my memory where a prisoner's charge of abuse or discrimination was believed over a guard's denial. In many cases, there was incredible and substantial evidence to back up the inmate's claim. But, you know, we all know the inmate lies. The staff always tells the truth.

True, there is a grievance process that the inmate has. However, it's simply a farce. It's a rubber-stamping of the initial denial by the institutional staff. Even at SCI-Greene where just last year two high-ranking officers publicly confirmed widespread racial and physical abuse perpetrated by guards against inmates, there was no independent investigation conducted.

As a result, 40 officers accused got slaps on the wrist; and then two were initially fired. But later,

quietly, they were reinstated. What a message this
whitewash sent to the inmates and to the other faithful
officers who may never ever now speak out when they see
abuse.

The very fact that Secretary Horn has promoted the then superintendent of SCI-Greene during this reign of terror, Ben Varner, to become now the superintendent of Dallas is further confirmation of our worst fears. It needs to be said that Mr. Varner was removed from SCI-Greene and transferred despite the DOC's own tepid investigation which revealed that dozens of his guards continually and repeatedly beat, abused, and used unnecessary force on people of color.

Guards under his control conducted an unauthorized raid on inmates, and they destroyed their meager personal possessions that later the DOC had to reimburse the inmates for their losses. The guards under his command were also accused of criminally altering and falsifying documents.

During Mr. Varner's watch at Greene, an inmate filed a federal lawsuit alleging a guard there severely beat him. With the inmate's own blood that spilled on the floor, the guard drew the initials KKK. Even more recently, inmates have written that guards, they're now bolder than ever. They think they can do more.

-

.

They have painted boxes with the lettering "Niggers R Us", and then in view of the colored inmate, kicked the box and then laughed. I have in my possession statements from inmates that certain guards at SCI-Greene are now trying to start a race war.

They're putting the blacks against the whites and vice versa. Lest you or anyone else doubt the widespread nature of KKK and white supremacist activity, please, I beg you, have your investigator check with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission to determine where such activity took place in the last decade.

And you will soon discover that the majority took place in counties where there are state prisons. It also needs to be repeated that in this decade, there have been actually cross burnings on some of the grounds of the state prisons. There are countless incidents that I could talk about and that we can document.

For example, at SCI-Huntingdon, there is a registered nurse who was escorted by an officer to make rounds to the cells of the inmates. The guard, whose name she gave me, which I will not share with you at this moment but I will give you later if you would like, as he would go with her, he would go up to the black inmates' cell doors and he would whisper the MF nigger word.

She told me daily -- there was daily verbal

abuse, dehumanization, degradation. That was part of the guards' routine. The black inmates are spoken to as if they are children. I sat here, and I listened today about the physical abuse that the guards are receiving.

I ask you, Why? Are they doing something?

Are they harassing the inmate? Are they pushing him over the edge that he's retaliating, he can't take it no more?

You kick a dog long enough, and he's going to bite you.

And then when the dog bites you, you know, it's the dog's fault.

I ask you to look into why are these physical abuses happening to the staff? At Huntington, when I visited there, I saw a Klansman in his white sheet standing along the road a few miles outside of Huntingdon. There's a sign there, 7 o'clock Saturday night, back this road there's a KKK meeting.

The guards up there talk about being members. It's a known fact. Superintendent Love was appalled that he had guards there that belonged to the KKK. So it is here. It is within these institutions. There is another woman, a white woman, who left a black visitor stay overnight at her home up in the Huntingdon area.

She found a noose in her yard. At Coal Township, before that institution was completely built, on the walls, the skinheads, the Klansmen, they wrote on the

walls, "Nigger go home." Well, I guess they'd like to go home. But it does exist.

The whole question of the KKK and white supremacist infiltration has been ignored by this DOC administration. It has been ignored even in the face of clear evidence, not just from the inmates but from concerned even correctional officers. It has been ignored.

The atmosphere within these institutions is such that staff know they can get away with it. They know they can get away with racism, racial comment, racist comments and abuse, despite what Secretary Horn says in public. Why? Because when these instances come up of abuse, it's always denied, it's whitewashed, and it's covered up.

I'm reminded that the men who escaped were white. They weren't black. They were white. But the black inmate is more watched. He is more oppressed than the -- than the white inmate. The more the system keeps repressing and oppressing, the more resentment there is, the more anger there is from the inmates, and the less they are to be rehabilitated.

No wonder our recidivism rate is over 60 percent. Moreover, desperate men with no hope and full of anger are more likely to take desperate actions. The more the DOC is allowed to be autonomous with no legislative

accountability or oversight, the more acts like escapes will happen and embarrass this Commonwealth.

This DOC administration has continually turned a deaf ear to the grievances of inmates and their families. Even lawyers visiting prisons that complain of racism, discrimination, humiliation. I have letters and affidavits that I can turn over to this Committee, but please don't shuffle them back to the DOC for a response because it will surely generate retaliation at worst and a whitewash at best.

Representative James, I know that you have been informed by several guards at state institutions about the DOC failures to hire people of color. I know you've addressed this issue today. Those who are hired are severely scrutinized and disciplined more severely than the white guards.

And the institutions that I had visited in over the years, Representative James, the few white staff people, guards they've had are treated so badly that they leave. One corrective measure the DOC could take, though, through good management would be to ensure that those people of color who are hired are not all clustered in a few institutions but, rather, they are uniformly spread throughout the system.

This one management tool will eliminate the

high ratio of white to black staff that exists, especially in our rural institutions. Significant reduction of the nearly all white staff at these institutions will curtail much of the blatant discrimination.

What we ask then is that there be a committee investigation or hearings into these concerns. We need more legislative oversight to hold this administration responsible from the top down, and that is Secretary Horn. He needs to be held accountable for its mismanagement and its tolerance of the pervasive discrimination that exists in this DOC.

Thank you for letting me testify and for your time.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Mr. Wallace, you're next.

MR. WALLACE: Thank you, Chairman Birmelin and distinguished Committee members. My name is Vince Wallace from the Second Chance Ministries of Pennsylvania. I want to thank you for this opportunity to express some concerns I have since the escapes in August.

Each Tuesday afternoon, Second Chance

Ministries has the honor of coming here to SCI-Dallas to do

Bible studies. Prior to the escapes, we were able to meet

from 3:00 p.m. through 4:30 p.m., a period of an hour and

30 minutes. This time was sufficient to have the men

called out and present an entire Bible study.

I want to add that more often than not, a grace period was given of 10 minutes, extending our time to one hour and 40 minutes. Since the escapes, the time has been cut, this due to the fact of the men having to go back to their cells for count. Now we go from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

And several problems have risen with this time cut. First, the men get called at 3:00 p.m. This means that by the time everyone arrives at chapel, it's now 3:10 to 3:15 p.m. Each week, I'm approached by several men who say they hear the call on the their block, but their CO won't allow them to leave the block until 3:15, therefore arriving, say, by 3:20 and therefore missing the initial stages of the Bible study.

Secondly, the men have to be back in their cell for the 4:10 count. It says 4 o'clock on the sheet. The count is at 4:10. With this, we're -- it's causing us to break up at 3:50 p.m. And as you can see, this cuts our time more than in half of what it was before, 85 minutes versus the 35 minutes we're now allotted.

I'm aware that Superintendent Varner has proposed on a trial basis that the 4:10 count be run through the intramural activities in the gym. May I suggest now that this trial basis -- this trial count take

place in the chapel where it would be much easier to accommodate a count.

Allow us to be the testing ground that he needs. This would serve a twofold purpose. Firstly, it would open up the original time slots for the Tuesday afternoon Bible study. And secondly, it would restore the New Discipleship Class which has been cancelled. They run almost simultaneously.

The New Discipleship Class will run from 4 o'clock to 5 o'clock in the hallway outside the chapel. So again, we're meeting at roughly the same time. It would also restore both services on Wednesday. It would reserve -- restore the Bible study done by Mr. John Pugh which has been cancelled.

And Mr. Pugh, by the way, is a former

Volunteer of the Year award winner here at Dallas. I can't say enough, just the impact that I've seen of what volunteers mean to the inmates here at Dallas. And again, also restored would be Chaplain Paul's Wednesday night choir practice.

What is the relevance in all this? We spoke of treatment before, money compared to security. Because of the monastic nature of prison life, an individual's hope must be maintained. Without hope, what does any of us have to live for? Their normal -- the normal life they lived

has been stripped away.

The normal use of money has become a practice in bartering. Interaction with the opposite sex is all but nonexistent, and freedom is gone. Again, what is left? It's hope, hope brought on by faith-based ministries. The impact of these ministries is immeasurable.

I've been blessed to gain the acquaintance of men not only here at Dallas, but at SCI-Retreat,
SCI-Waymart, as well as the Luzerne County Correctional
Facility. And I am privileged to know those whose lives have genuinely been changed by following Biblical principles.

Men who have embraced Biblical principles while incarcerated have become productive members of society as we all want them to be. They're still following and still embracing the same Biblical principles learned in a Bible study while incarcerated.

Many of the prisoners I've talked to or correspond with here at Dallas are feeling the loss of hope. They know the impact of their -- in their lives because of their faith in God. They feel the institution is now stripping that away, too.

They are aware that as the 11:10 count goes, there are men out working. That count goes with these men at work. They do not return to their cells. And they're

curious why this can't fly in the chapel. Same situation.

A man at work or a man at the chapel could be counted very

3 | easily.

As you know, oppression does not breed hope. It breeds hostility. Faith-based programs, Biblical directives, faith in Jesus Christ, these breed hope. Hope allows one to continue to excel and to persevere through the trials of life.

In closing, I would ask that these words not fall on deaf ears. The majority of us here today want to see a positive change, a safer community surrounding the prison, better communication with the administration and guards, a recidivism rate which will continue to decline, and men that will leave prison changed forever.

The changes proposed today are of no added cost to the system whatsoever. And I know that the rewards they reap will be great. The other thing you have in your hands that I presented was a letter from a Mr. Mitchell DiVentura who is incarcerated here at Dallas. Time doesn't permit me to go through this entire letter.

I would ask that you take the time and sit and read this. It's a letter of hopelessness describing the warehouses of human beings and utilizing of Draconian measures as punishment. I ask you to please take the time to read through this letter.

The last thing I want to address is something that Mr. Brian Smatko from AFSCME said earlier. He testified that millions of dollars have been spent on treatment of inmates versus scarce dollars spent on correction officers. By his testimony, he said there are 450 correction officers here at Dallas.

This does not include the 30 additional security staff as lieutenants, captains and majors, which would bring our actual count to 480. The Legislature should be aware of the disparity of dollars spent between security and treatment.

At SCI-Dallas, for treatment purposes, there are -- and I'll run down this list -- 12 correction counselors, 6 drug and alcohol treatment specialists, 6 psychological staff members, 6 privatized drug and alcohol therapeutic community staff, and 3 chaplains, for a total of 33.

Now, if we look at the teachers and again have them in question as their -- as being termed as treatment personnel, there's a total of 9, which brings our count to 41. Security has 12 staff for every one treatment staff, and they want more money to enhance security.

Gentlemen and ladies, it lies in treatment.

It lies in treatment of these men. I've seen too many

lives changed by the treatment. And again, we want to see

the recidivism come down. But it comes from the treatment. It's not more guards. It is more treatment.

I just want to close by saying that there are 100 volunteers here at Dallas. And if you take the time and learn who these people are and learn what they're about and listen to what they have to say, that can reshape, that can restore a prison system that has gone far awry. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Attorney Love.

MR. LOVE: Good morning. My name is Angus

Love. And I'm the Executive Director of the Pennsylvania

Institutional Law Project, the nonprofit public interest

organization that seeks to provide civil legal services to

the over 75,000 institutionalized persons in our

Commonwealth.

I'm also a board member of CURE of
Pennsylvania, Community Assistance for Prisoners, and the
Pennsylvania Prison Society. I'd like to thank Chairman
Birmelin and the Committee for the opportunity to testify
today. We commend Commissioner Horn, the Department of
Corrections, and the State Police for the successful
capture of the three inmates who recently escaped.

We also breathed a sigh of relief knowing that public safety was not compromised by these escapes. But now that we have time to reflect on these events and to

take the necessary steps to minimize the potential of more incidents of this nature, we trust the Pennsylvania

Department of Corrections can adequately handle the

security issues involved.

The concern that I bring to our attention today involves the potential for scapegoating. The Webster's Dictionary defines it as, quote, One who has to shoulder blame due to another, unquote. We must be careful to conduct this investigation in a rational and professional manner.

All too often, the powerless, those who are already stigmatized are easy targets in the blame game.

After the SCI-Pittsburgh escapes, uniforms were required of all Pennsylvania Department of Corrections inmates; although, this issue seemed to have little to do with the escape.

Recent changes in the count policy and the privacy issues suggest we may be going down this path again. I would like to, however, focus on three serious problems that do need attention rather than contributing to the blame game. These three issues involve the adequacy of medical care, the excessive telephone rates, and the incidence of physical and sexual abuse.

My office received as many as 10,000 complaints per year. The largest number of these

complaints involved medical treatment. Many of these complaints are about the need for follow-up or specialized treatment of already diagnosed conditions.

If you think the man on the street is frustrated with the HMO-type policy decisions, you could imagine how frustrated an inmate can be. The problem involves nonmedical personnel controlling the flow of medical services regardless of the doctor's wishes.

The need to see a specialist, the need for so-called elective surgery, the need for outside hospitalization have become a major source of complaints. Cost-cutting incentives by for-profit private medical providers is a major source of concern.

Unlike the person on the street who can always go to an emergency room, the inmate has no other options. The profit motive and the alternatives -- the lack of alternatives create an atmosphere of mistrust and potential abuse. An example of that involves hypertension which disproportionately affects Afro-Americans. Doctors often prescribe medication but do little to no follow-up or monitoring. We continue to oppose profit making in the context of a core governmental function such as this.

The second issue involves telephone rates for individuals who accept telephone calls from persons incarcerated in the Pennsylvania State System. While the

public at large enjoys the benefits of long distance

telephone competition, family and friends of incarcerated

individuals are suffering the burdens of deregulation in a

unique way.

Currently, the telephone calls cost \$4.84 for the first minute and 60 cents for every minute thereafter. This is a far cry from the 7 cents per minute commercials you see on television. At a recent hearing before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission in the case of Feigley v. AT&T, John Malcolm, who is responsible for all of the Pennsylvania telecommunications contracts, testified.

He indicated that the current contract between AT&T and the Commonwealth allows the Commonwealth to take the 47 percent profit off the gross receipts. The Commonwealth contract involving the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections which generates 90 percent of these revenues also involves pay phones located on Commonwealth property.

The entire contract generates \$6 million of profit per year. 3 million is placed into the general fund, and 3 million goes to the inmate general welfare fund. The Commonwealth's portion has grown from, according to Mr. Malcolm, 2 percent in the early '80s to the current level of 47 percent with authorization to reach 50 percent.

The main reason for this increase is the

Telecommunications Act of 1996. While it has created

competition for some, it has created a literal and

figurative captive market for others. Commissioner Horn

recently responded to inquiries on this subject from

5 Representative Bill DeWeese.

And I would -- if I could ask that this letter that Commissioner Horn wrote to Mr. DeWeese be entered into the record. He abdicated responsibility for this contractual arrangement noting that it was another department that negotiated and signed the contract.

But he did take credit for the profits, claiming that they reduced the cost of incarceration for Pennsylvania taxpayers. Unfortunately, he didn't mention who was picking up the tab; i.e., inmate families and friends. Many families, who are often low income and already devastated by the criminal acts of their loved ones, must now pay the extra cost to assist in incarcerating their kin.

This reminds me of third world policies that often require families to provide food for their incarcerated loved ones. This is a dangerous road to follow. Families, as Commissioner Horn recognizes, are an intricate part of rehabilitation. The closer the ties, the better chance of breaking out of the cycle of recidivism. Why should these folks pay their disproportionate share?

__

_

•

. .

-1-1

me say first of all that all four of you have addressed issues that go far beyond the issue of a -- an escape by

two prisoners. And to that extent, that's --

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN:

abuse. With rampant overcrowding, tensions rise and abuse occurs. The sex scandal at SCI-Cambridge Springs is an example, five criminal convictions and a dozen terminations of male staff for sexually abusing female inmates. Yet the superintendent continues on his job as if nothing had

Finally, a few words on sexual and physical

happened, unlike the superintendent at this facility.

How long can we ignore these problems of cross-gender supervision, training and investigation of sexual misconduct? Excessive use of force complaints come into my office every single day. While only one -- only a few are ever proven, the problem is real.

Our office has won dozens -- won or settled dozens of cases in this area. The Office of Professional Responsibility at the DOC has disciplined several guards for this problem. These issues are real. They aren't going away. I encourage this committee to expand its charge and cover the overall conditions of the DOC and not just the cosmetic and often counterproductive changes in light of the escapes. Thank you.

Before I turn the questioning period over to the panel, let

Thank you, Mr. Love.

MS. GAUKER: We disagree.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Oh, yes, you have. You have gone far afield of the subject of the escape.

However, if you'll let me finish without interrupting me, I would appreciate that. That's acceptable. I don't have a problem with that.

The only thing I'm going to ask our panel members is, is if we can try to relate the questions that they have -- I'm referring to this panel, my fellow colleagues -- if we can relate our questions in light of that problem that we are here to investigate and not use this simply as a springboard to criticize any and all things about the prison system that we may legitimately agree with you on or disagree with you on.

But we can probably spend the next three or four days discussing a lot of the topics that you've raised; for instance, the telephone situation or the Bible studies, et cetera. So in order to focus today -- and you've had the opportunity -- and I've not interrupted any of you -- to present your viewpoints on these things.

And you've certainly given us plenty of suggestions for future hearings. I do want to make sure that we don't want to just go so far afield with what we're doing here today that this becomes an all out critique of the prison system. This is not the time or place for it.

And I've given you all opportunity to share
with us what you felt your concerns were. So I'm asking my
fellow members on the panel if they would please, in their
questioning, make sure that you focus in on the problems
that related to the escape as regards of the testimony and
not to get into subject matters that did not have some
connection in that regard and in the comments that were

All that having been said, Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You know that I was coming next. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I recognize the voice of the panel and the point that you were making in terms of how each of the things that you discussed in your mind had a direct impact on the atmosphere both before and after the escape. So I see the connection.

But having said that, I would like to ask Joan to just tell me -- you said that after the escape, the administration gutted literacy programs. And I was under the impression from our prison tours after the escape that there was a policy of mandatory literacy education.

And so maybe I'm just misunderstanding and you're talking about something different.

MS. GAUKER: I think I said -- I'm sorry. I think I said in the past five years, those things have been

gutted, not necessarily right after this escape. But they
continue to -- at the prison that I'm familiar and from
what I hear from other prisons, the -- the timing is not

allowed for.

The support by the security staff is not there. And the way they've changed things, it's almost impossible, just as Vincent described, to conduct programs. They took away the ability to comanage by prisoners, which was a vital part of those programs.

It was the way those programs were set up, particularly the literacy program. It gave prisoners an opportunity to develop some attributes of leadership and to work with outside volunteers. The DOC absolutely mandated that that cannot happen anymore. And so that gutted a vital part of that program.

The literacy program is almost nonexistent at Graterford at this point because they can't find the time to -- or the space to have --

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: When you say literacy program then, you're talking about an adjunct literacy program where volunteers came in.

MS. GAUKER: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You're not talking about the educational programs --

MS. GAUKER: Right.

-	DEDDECENERATIVE MANDED TWO
1	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: operated in the
2	classrooms by DOC?
3	MS. GAUKER: Correct. But those also are not
4	living up to what we would hope for. The men are told
5	there's a waiting list. And when they get on the waiting
6	list, they see that the classrooms are empty or could have
7	more students in them so and the Pell Grants are gone.
8	So, you know, there's I know our staff
9	didn't do that but
10	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Yeah. No, I
11	understand that. Mr. Love, without going into a lot of
12	details because this question, which I need to know the
13	answer to but it's not directly on point, just tell me when
14	the staff eliminations at SCI-Cambridge Springs with regard
15	to sexual conduct happened.
16	MR. LOVE: The allegations of sexual abuse at
17	Cambridge Springs began just shortly after it opened in the
18	early 1990s.
19	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And I'm very aware
20	of those. When did the staff
21	MR. LOVE: Terminations?
22	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: firings and
23	terminations happen?
24	MR. LOVE: I would say the last one probably

25

happened about two years ago and occurred for three or four

years up until that point.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So nothing -- those

12 staff -- there wasn't, like, something that happened in
the last two years where 12 staff were let go?

MR. LOVE: No.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Because I was there two years ago, and I heard all of these allegations. And I thought you were telling me that something has happened since then. You're not telling me that. You're telling me that what you're referring to happened before that?

MR. LOVE: Yeah. I'm involved in litigation.

So I'm very familiar with that current -- that period of time. I can't honestly say what the most recent activities are one way or the other.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative James and Representative Josephs through Representative James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you all for testifying. As the Chairman stated, that you did give us a lot of information that should result in some additional hearings. And that needs to be looked at because you raised the consciousness of these incidents.

You said that Mr. Varner, the superintendent,

because now -- and I was going to ask this question -- but
you say that he came from Greene County and then was
assigned here. I think that's what you stated.

MS. GAUKER: Not directly. I recognize he didn't come directly, but he went via Retreat and then came here.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. And so you felt as though that by him being assigned here as a result of the escape, that that you thought was inappropriate because of the situation that was allowed to have happened at SCI-Greene?

MS. GAUKER: I believe it's inappropriate to reward incompetence. And this man is being moved -- he was not demoted. He was given another superintendent position at Retreat. And he had tremendous allegations at Greene. You know, lots of terrible things happened under his watch.

So he wasn't demoted or fired or whatever. He was given another superintendent position, and now he's working his way back up. I think that's rewarding incompetence, and that speaks to the prisoner population as well as the rest of the staff. So we'll get a slap on the wrist. We can continue to survive.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: That's where they had some correction officers, as you said, came -- one of you said came back. A couple was dismissed and then got their

1 | jobs back.

MS. GAUKER: Dianna spoke to that, yes.

3 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: They got their jobs

4 back, but are they still at that institution?

5 MS. GAUKER: Were they reinstated at the same

6 | institution?

7 MS. HOLLIS: I don't know where they were

8 | reinstated.

9

10

11

12

13

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: And that was because of the Union bargaining or something like that?

MS. HOLLIS: Probably the Union involvement.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: All right. So it seems as though that's what allows the other guards, the other

14 correctional officers to say, Well, nothing's going to

15 happen to me because of what happened to them or didn't

16 happen. All right.

Now, you also expressed a fear of retaliation

18 because of your comments, your testimony and your husband.

19 And you expressed that now. And I just want to say that

20 if, you know, as the Chairman said, that we cannot

21 | supervise DOC.

But if you make it aware -- make us aware of

23 any retaliation that you feel to be retaliation, there's

24 | some things that we can check out to try to assure that

25 that don't happen because that's what happens in a lot of

institutions as it relates to correctional officers who want to say the right thing.

As we walk through institutions, we have some correctional officers whisper certain things to us, we have some inmates whisper certain things to us in terms of talking about the problems of the racism and abuse or whatever is going on there.

And we have to take that into some consideration. So -- and I think that the best way to deal with this is to document these kind of incidents and these kind of reports. And that, you know, with enough documentation and enough coalition building, that we can assure that we can definitely have some hearings at some point and investigate those matters.

So you need to just continue this kind of documentation and coalition. So -- and so you believe now that you're still going to suffer some more retaliation?

MS. HOLLIS: Well, you know, it's hard to tell. Retaliation could come in a lot of forms. It can be in the simple thing that my husband would request something and be denied something, you know. It's hard to tell. You know, he can be given an excuse why he couldn't be, say, accepted into a course, a class, or anything.

It's hard sometimes to distinguish between retaliation, racism. My husband, by the way, is a black

gentleman. So we deal with the racial issue plus the
retaliation. So we've got two things going. I don't know.
I'll be visiting tomorrow. You know, we'll just take it
day by day. I pray not.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: On these -- on these concerns that you raise -- and you put a lot of things in your testimony -- you talked about racism, dehumanization, et cetera, like that. Do you think that kind of lends to the fact of a breach or cause security problems?

MS. HOLLIS: Yes, I do, cause security problems.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: How?

MS. HOLLIS: Well, Joan, go ahead.

MS. GAUKER: Those kinds of things cause security problems because of the demeanor that permeates the prison system both among the COs and among the prisoners. Prisoners are constantly being agitated, harassed, called names, fear of reprisals.

There's that aspect of racism that puts the prisoners in one frame of mind. And then there's the other aspect of it that puts the COs in a position of power if they -- greater position of power than should be in this circumstance where they feel if it's okay to be a KKK member, it's okay to say these racist remarks because their fellow COs or their staff or the administration isn't doing

anything about it.

Then you develop an atmosphere that is not safe. You develop an atmosphere of safety when people feel they can trust each other, when they have some ability to care for each other. I actually listened to the CO. I mean, I think he really does care for his -- some of his charges.

But it's difficult for him to carry out a lot of that because of the numbers of people he has, but that's one reason. But also probably because what I've seen at Graterford is as soon as a staff, a lieutenant, or a captain begins to care about the volunteer programs, that person is taunted, harassed, little snide remarks are made.

And after a while, that person won't even talk to me. So then we have to get a new lieutenant that will work with us and all that kind of stuff. So this goes on.

Now, tell me that's going to make for a safe atmosphere because you've got this kind of tension there all the time that can spark something just like that.

MR. LOVE: Can I add something to that? The current administration has cracked down very significantly on lifers in many ways. Commutation is no longer a viable release option. So they have no hope of ever being released.

They were previously -- the lifers who had

accumulated a good prison record over 10, 20 years were
given outside clearances, ability to live in the trailers
and whatnot. And prior to this regime, I don't recall any
of those folks ever escaping. And all they had to do was
walk away at Graterford, just walk down the road one night
and they'd be gone.

And I don't recall any of them ever escaping.

In this regime, put all those folks back behind the walls, cancel their ability to go to funerals, all these measures were taken, and now we have two lifers escape. And I think that's illustrative, not conclusive, but illustrative of the way things are being handled.

They've tightened up, yet they've had more escapes with the tightening of their regime than they had when they had trust.

MS. GAUKER: Because tightening can be one thing. But in this case, it's meaning oppression. The way that we're tightening under this administration is not making our -- our system secure and having the people do the job right. It's oppression. That's how they're tightening.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: What do you think that we can do as a legislature in terms of trying to work on these conditions --

MS. GAUKER: Well, you mentioned --

170 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: -- besides having 1 2 hearings? 3 MS. GAUKER: -- hearings. That's very 4 I think they'll have many family members and even prisoners who, through their testimony, such letters 5 will be -- so there's many hearings that you can have. addition, you need legislative oversight. 7 You need to have some kind of line item 8 9 budgeting, and you need to have some kind of oversight. 10 oversight committee is not unusual. There's other states that have an oversight committee for corrections. 11 state desperately needs one. 12 And review boards, you need citizen advisory 13 boards for prisons, you need review boards. You need all 14 15 kinds of opportunities for you to know what's going on in those prisons via opportunities to talk to -- to citizens 16 and to the staff. 17 18 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: What state do you see 19 has the --20 MS. GAUKER: I know that Tennessee -- I'm 21 pretty sure it's Tennessee. And if you want, I can get 22 information to you about --REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: If there's others than 23

MS. GAUKER: You do have Tennessee's, though?

Tennessee, would you produce that to our Chairman?

24

25

1 | REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: No.

MS. GAUKER: Oh, any that I have. Okay. I
know I received the Tennessee one. And I have a feeling
that there were at least other --

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So that way, we can look at it and maybe want to model something out of it because --

MS. GAUKER: I hope you will, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: As the Chairman is doing with the reparative boards. Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

MS. GAUKER: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: And make sure that you continue the communication, the documentation in terms of what you believe to be the retaliation through our Chairman and a copy to myself so that we can distribute it to the Committee. And that way, we focus the kind of attention on it that's necessary. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I'm going to try this. First, I have to apologize for my voice. But secondly -- well, I should remind you that a politician without a voice is a blessing. But I also want to say or croak that I respectfully disagree with the Chairperson here.

I think everything that you have said, all

four of you, is directly connected to security and the problem of escape that we have had in this administration and, in my memory, in no other administration since I've been in the Legislature.

So I thank you for your testimony here. And I have a request and perhaps a bargain to make with the Chairperson of this Subcommittee; although, he does not control the hearing schedule. Mr. Chairperson, if you will give me your commitment to advocate with the Chair of this Committee for some hearings on some of the subjects that have been raised by the people who have just testified on this panel before us, I will not ask any questions at this point.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I would say that one of the functions of the Subcommittee is what we're doing today, but it also should be concerned more than just about escapes and security. I have no problem with us as legislators looking into those things which taxpayers pay for, which is obviously our prison system.

And as far as advocating with the Chairman, I would do that as a member of this panel of the Subcommittee members. If they would so agree to do so, we would -- we may have to arrive at what the subject matter would be and its scope. But I have no problem with us doing that because I think that is a legitimate function of this

Subcommittee.

1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 And that doesn't mean that we're going to look at anything and everything, et cetera. There have to be 3 some parameters established. And we can do -- we can do things along those lines. And I have no problem agreeing 5 to that. Is that -- no more questions you said, right? 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: One thing. a question. Several of us on this Committee and several of 8 us who are not are also members of the Appropriations Committee. And I really invite and will call at least 10 I'd like to work on questions and other kinds of 11 Angus. 12 things we might say when DOC testifies before us on the 13 Appropriations. So thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I'm finished. 14

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I want to thank all of you.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you. I'm sorry.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the -- I don't know if you do it as a coalition. But do you make some suggestions to Secretary Horn, or do you have a meeting with him periodically, or how do you try to address some of these concerns?

MS. GAUKER: We haven't moved that far yet.
We're a new coalition. But it certainly is a point we want
to get to and a goal we have. So thank you. We're moving

in that direction.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Well, if we can, let us know when you want to have those meetings; and we can do that or we can help encourage that. I think that would be going in the right direction because I've heard all of these good things about Secretary Horn.

And to hear these things, it just seems, you know, we need to just make sure that we sit down and address them because he seems to be responsive. And we just want to make sure he stays that way. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: And I would echo
Representative James's comments. I dealt with Secretary
Horn for the five years or so that he has been the -- the
Secretary of Corrections. And I'm not sure if the picture
that you are portraying of him today is colored exclusively
through your own experience or through the experience of
those prisoners that you've dealt with.

But we deal with him on a different level and from a different perspective. And I can tell you that I have found him to be responsive, but I found him to be interested in running a better prison system. And I found him to be what I would essentially say is a good administrator who has to listen to all parties.

There's obviously those people that you are most concerned with, the prisoners. He also has to deal

with communities; he has to deal with the Governor's office; he has to deal with the taxpayers; he has to deal with the corrections officers and the educational staff, et cetera, and so forth.

And while I'm not disputing that your opinions that you shared today are your opinions honestly, I would say that I would probably not have those opinions and would disagree with you if you were to ask my opinion of he and his correction staff and the job that they do.

And I think Secretary Horn -- although, I don't want to speak for him. He's not here -- I think he would be the first to say that this is not a perfect system and could use improvement. He would also be the first to say that he would welcome help in doing it to make it a better system rather than simply pointing blame at people.

And I think that ought to be our approach if we do anything further in the area of public hearings, is we ought to say, Well, let's not just find out what we think is wrong; but let's find out what we think the system ought to be and how it can be improved.

And I think -- I think that's the approach that we should take. And I think that representative -- or Secretary Horn would be receptive to that if it's done in that light. If it's simply a witch-hunt -- and I don't think you intend it to be -- but if it simply were that, I

don't think that would be the best approach nor that it would be productive. You have the last word.

MS. GAUKER: I honestly think that that's why we were so anxious to speak here today because the perspective is colored by the -- by where you see him. You are not aware of -- you do not go inside the institutions on a regular basis. You do not communicate with the families or the prisoners themselves or the folks like us who are the volunteers who are actually on the front lines, possibly not even with the correctional officers to a large degree.

And so I respect where you're seeing it from.

I fully understand that. I have no problem with that. But

I believe that you need to be as open to our information

that we're able to bring to you as what you've been able to

see. And I only have to end with, while he may be open to

improving the system, I've lived through many other

commissioners and -- commissioners. He's the first one

became a secretary -- and the oppressiveness, the number of

escapes, the abuse, all that's going on since Commissioner

Horn has come in.

If this is his watch, then I have to hold him responsible for it. It's not a witch-hunt. It's an administrative dilemma that we need to deal with. And it can be a multifactored thing. I'm not saying that. But

there is another perspective, and there are other things going on. And he is responsible, and that's why he was singled out today.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: And I would say in response to your comments that you would probably be amazed at the insight and knowledge that these people on this Judiciary staff have about our prison system. Not only do we tour them regularly, but we get letters, we get parents, we get loved ones, we get ex-felons who come in to see us.

So we're not as uninformed, perhaps, as you might think we are. And I'm not sure that you said that about us. And we're certainly not as involved as you are. However, I know from my own perspective, I've been in 20 of the 24 prisons. I have -- I get letters every month from prisoners. We talk to them privately.

We deal with issues. I know Representative

James and I have had meetings with staff people, et cetera,
et cetera, et cetera. So don't assume that we're

completely ignorant of what's going on. But neither do we
have the, you know, the in-depth knowledge that the people
in the system that work with it do.

Representative -- or excuse me. Counsel

Preski had a question he wants to ask you.

MR. PRESKI: One housekeeping matter. I know that you have a lobbyist now, and that's Mr. Preate. Would

1 it be permissible that I coordinate the meetings or 2 anything we do in the future through him?

MS. GAUKER: Exactly. Exactly.

4 MR. PRESKI: Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Thank you all for

6 coming. Thank you.

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7 MS. GAUKER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: The last testifier for the day is Greg Griffin, Vice President of the Pennsylvania State Correctional Officers Association. Mr. Griffin, is Mr. Ludwig with you today?

MR. GRIFFIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: He is. Okay. I'm sorry. I didn't introduce him as well. I wasn't sure if he was here. Lawrence Ludwig is the President of Pennsylvania State Correctional Officers Association. And they have testimony to present to us as well. Mr. Griffin, when you're prepared, you may do so.

MR. GRIFFIN: Good afternoon, members of the House Judiciary Committee. I am Gregory Griffin, a state corrections officer and Vice President of the Pennsylvania State Corrections Officers Association. With me also is President Larry Ludwig, a state corrections officer at SCI-Graterford. Officer Ludwig will be available for any questions.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

On behalf of thousands of state corrections officers, I want to thank your committee for allowing us the opportunity to testify. State corrections officers are now testifying at this and future hearings because we believe there are very troubling times ahead for the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections unless immediate action is taken.

As I speak, thousands of state corrections officers are on duty behind the wire faced with the difficult task of maintaining order inside our 25 State Correctional Institutions. Our officers report for duty to the fourth most overcrowded institutions in the country. Many institutions are close to 200 percent capacity.

Pennsylvania officers are assaulted at the fourth highest rate in the nation. At SCI-Houtzdale, over 80 corrections officers were assaulted last year. month, three Houtzdale officers were viciously attacked while facing 125 to 1 odds. One officer was stabbed eight times. Another officer was beaten so badly his family did not recognize him in the emergency room.

Even inmates are victims of the dangerous conditions behind the wire of Pennsylvania State Institutions. Pennsylvania inmates face the third highest inmate to inmate homicide rate in the nation. these horrible conditions, it would make sense to provide

more and better trained officers; but that is not the case.

Pennsylvania State Corrections Officers are

27th in the nation in training hours, 38th in the nation at
inmate to corrections officer ratios. Twenty-seven years

ago, in an upstate New York community in a jail called

Attica, 11 corrections officers and 22 inmates lost their
lives in five bloody days of riots.

In 1989, the Camp Hill riot, over 120 inmates and corrections officers were seriously injured when Camp Hill was nearly burnt to the ground. The investigations of these two riots determined that the contributing factors were understaffing of corrections officer posts, inadequate training of corrections officers, and severe overcrowding.

These exist -- these conditions exist here today in most of the 25 state institutions. The recent riot in 1995 at SCI-Coal Township where corrections officers and inmates alike suffered horrible injuries should have been a wake-up call.

I want to thank you, the members of the House Judiciary, for passing House Bill 6, the Corrections Peace Officer Bill, through your committee. With the eventual passage of House Bill 6 into law, state corrections officers will receive the latest law enforcement training.

In turn, public safety will be increased at our state institutions. Corrections officers accepted the

risks when we took our oath to serve and protect the public. Unfortunately, in my opinion, the training provided to state corrections officers is willfully inadequate to fulfill this obligation to the public.

Would Pennsylvania state taxpayers feel safe if they knew their State Police were 27th in the nation in training and standards? State Police are the highest trained police in the nation here in Pennsylvania. Why then is it okay to train our corrections officers at 27th in the nation?

Secretary Horn has stated that a substantial number of corrections officers will be hired if the Legislature passes the Department of Corrections budget request. Members of the House Judiciary Committee, an enormous responsibility rests in your hands.

Hard earned taxpayer dollars will have to be authorized by you in order to bring the state corrections officers up to the standards that will ensure increased public safety. I believe the public will support additional spending if the end result will be less escapes and safer institutions.

State corrections officers will be ready to testify at the budget hearings, if asked, in order to better inform the Legislature and the taxpayer. Thank you very much, and we're available for any questions that you

	182
1	may have.
2	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative
3	Manderino?
4	REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: No.
5	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Representative James?
6	REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: No.
7	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: Well, see, that's one
8	of the problems when you're last. Nobody wants to ask you
9	any questions.
10	MR. GRIFFIN: Well, we'll always return, sir.
11	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: I believe you
12	work is it here or Retreat?
13	MR. GRIFFIN: State Correctional Institution
14	at Retreat, sir.
15	CHAIRPERSON BIRMELIN: So you're not that far
16	away. So thankfully you didn't come a long way to present
17	your testimony. And you may be disappointed that we didn't
18	ask you a lot of questions. Most people are. But maybe
19	you're not. That concludes our hearing today. This
20	meeting is adjourned. Thank you, gentlemen.
21	(Whereupon, at 1:10 p.m., the hearing
22	adjourned.)
23	
24	

25

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me during the hearing of the within cause and that this is a true and correct transcript of the same. JENNĬFER P. TROUTMAN Registered Professional Reporter My Commission Expires: April 30, 2001 JENNIFER P. TROUTMAN, RPR P.O. Box 1383 2nd & W. Norwegian Streets Pottsville, Pennsylvania 17901