HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

House Bill 1436

* * * * * * * * * * *

House Judiciary Committee
Task Force on Domestic Relations

East Hempfield Township Municipal Building 1700 Nissley Road Landisville, Pennsylvania 17538

Tuesday, August 24, 1999 - 9:00 a.m.

--000--

BEFORE:

Honorable Lita Indzel Cohen, Majority Chairperson

Honorable Stephen R. Maitland

Honorable Katie True

Honorable Andrew J. Carn

Honorable Peter J. Daley

Honorable Don Walko

ALSO	PRESENT:
	n Dalton jority Executive Director
	Mendlow nority Research Analyst
Bery Mi	l Kuhr nority Counsel to Judiciary Committee

CONTENTS

WITNESSES	<u>PAGE</u>
Honorable Katie True 37th Legislative District	6
Honorable Andrew Carn 197th Legislative District	7
Donald R. Totaro, Assistant DA Susan E. Ellison, Assistant DA Lancaster County DA's Office	11 19
Susan J. Atkins, Ph.D. Transitions	36
Pamela Grosh, Program Director Victim's Witness Services Lancaster County DA's Office	44
Linda Young, Victim	49
Wanda D. Filer, M.D. Pennsylvania Academy of Family Physicians Public Policy Commission Chair	61
Travis J. Tu Assistant to Executive Director American Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania	74
John Capowski Associate Professor of Law Widener University School of Law	82
Judy Yupcavage, Public Policy Manager Vicki Cuscino, Communications & Publications Specialist Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence	98 101

I'm State

1

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Good morning. 2 Representative Lita Cohen from Montgomery County, 148th District. Welcome to the hearing, the Pennsylvania House 3 of Representatives Judiciary Committee Task Force on

Domestic Relations Hearing. We will today be discussing

House Bill 1436.

As many of you know, the House has established the Task Force on Domestic Relations to delve into all aspects of in fact domestic relations dealing with divorce, custody, support, as well as other issues. And one of the issues that we've been dealing with for the past several years is domestic violence.

House Bill 1436 has been prime sponsored by Representative Katie True of Lancaster County and Representative Andrew Carn of Philadelphia County. will give opening statements. And at that point, we will proceed with the testimony from the people that have been scheduled to appear before us today.

I'll make an announcement now and I will make it again at the close of the hearing that if there is anyone that is interested in presenting testimony that has not been listed and not been scheduled, we will take written testimony and written reports from anyone that's interested and we will include that as part of the official record of these proceedings today.

And I will make that announcement again at the end of the hearing, the scheduled hearing today. I must remind all of you that we are on a very, very tight schedule today. You have the agenda before you. We will stick very close to that agenda so that please keep your remarks to the time that you've been allotted.

And also, we would like you to allot time and be available for questions from our panel of legislators as well as staff. I would like to introduce Karen Dalton who is the Chief Counsel to the Task Force as well as our two representatives who are the prime sponsors of this legislation.

They will give opening remarks, and then we will proceed with the first person scheduled to testify.

First I would like to introduce Representative Katie True.

We want to thank you for hosting us in this wonderful environment. And thank you for bringing us at this time of year to your wonderful Lancaster County.

You and Representative Carn are the prime sponsors so why don't you proceed with your opening statement.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Thank you,

Representative Cohen. And I'd like to welcome everybody,

Representative Carn, to the 37th District here in Lancaster

County. We appreciate the consideration of this hearing

very much. Just a couple brief remarks.

Domestic violence is something all of us in the House, Senate, the public light, it's an issue that we hear about a lot. And I'm pleased to have worked on this legislation with Representative Carn. Hopefully, we will be showing to all that can hear and all that can see that this is not just an urban issue but very much, as we hope hits home because we are here in Lancaster County, that this is an issue that hits everybody no matter where you live, the very rural areas, the very urban areas.

This is a problem that is everywhere. And so

I am very pleased to be working with Representative Carn on
this. And we do hope, as we go down the road and bring
this legislation hopefully to the floor to be voted on,
that everyone will keep in mind just what a very important
issue this is to deal with.

And I thank everyone in the audience for coming also. And now I'd like -- Representative Carn would like to make some remarks.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you. I would like to thank Representative Cohen and the members of the Task Force on Domestic Violence for the opportunity to discuss this important issue and an important weapon in the fight to combat this very serious problem in our society.

Address confidentiality provides an important

safety mechanism for victims of domestic violence who wish
to end abusive relationships. A woman is at 75 percent
greater risk of being seriously or fatally injured at the
time of separation.

Last year, there were 136 domestic violence related homicides in the Commonwealth. At least 42 of the deaths occurred after the victim had separated or was attempting to separate from the abuser. Address confidentiality programs provide substitute addresses and mail-forwarding service for victims.

The substitute address, usually a post office box, ensures abusers cannot locate victims or use public records to locate victims. Address confidentiality allows victims to get on with their lives free from harassment. Under this program, a victim's address is kept confidential and can only be revealed in three circumstances: One, a judge's order; two, at the request of law enforcement; or three, in a medical emergency.

Several states, including California,
Washington, Nevada, New Jersey and Florida, have already
seen the wisdom of address confidentiality and have
implemented this program, while several other states are
considering it.

In addition, I would also like to thank
Representative Katie True for working with me in a

bipartisan fashion on a campaign to make this program a reality in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Our partnership on this issue symbolizes how widespread the problem of domestic violence is in our state and nation.

Domestic violence affects rural and urban areas. Domestic violence occurs in every community regardless of race, ethnicity, wealth or religion.

Domestic violence is a problem that affects men, women and children.

Recently, Central Pennsylvania has been the site of two domestic violence tragedies with the deaths of Kim LaRosa and Barbara Mort in York. While there are no magic bullets or cure-alls, there are steps that we can take to make sure that victims of domestic violence are safe from abusers.

The value of individual's safety or the loss of a loved one cannot be calculated. However, there are some costs that can be measured, and the totals are staggering. In 1996, the Pennsylvania Blue Shield Institute estimated the total — the total medical costs associated with domestic violence in Pennsylvania was \$326 million.

Almost 40 percent of all Pennsylvania women who visited emergency rooms do so for emergencies inflicted by current or former partners. However, address

confidentiality programs are relatively cheap to
administer. Annually, other states spend less than \$200
per participant.

According to the experiences of states, I believe that an address confidentiality program in Pennsylvania would cost approximately a half million dollars. This is not much considering our incredible state surplus.

In conclusion, I urge the members of this Task
Force to support House Bill 1436 for a number of reasons:
First, address confidentiality protects crime victims;
second, address confidentiality prevents crime in that it
prevents further abuse of victims; third, address
confidentiality is cost effective; and finally, address
confidentiality is the right thing to do. Thank you, Madam
Chairman.

True. Thank you, Representative Carn. Understand that the hearing today is exploring the issues as presented in House Bill 1436. We will hopefully explore all of the issues that relate to this bill and be able to determine the fate of this bill and how we will proceed in the future.

So it is very important that we hear from everyone, those of you that are scheduled to testify and, again, anyone who has views relating to this bill, pro or

con. It really doesn't matter. We want to explore all of the issues surrounding this particular bill so that we can come up with and present to the members of the House of Representatives an intelligent solution to what we consider

5 | a vast and very serious problem.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The first two people that are scheduled to testify are Assistant District Attorneys in Lancaster County. We have Donald Totaro and Susan Ellison. If you are here, would you please come forth? Are you Ms. Ellison?

MS. ELLISON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Why don't you come up also. And we do have written testimony from you. You may read from it if you'd like. You are scheduled to testify until 9:40. You can share your time any way you want. We'd like you to leave some time for questions from the panel if you'd like.

So you can either read from this or you can just speak and present your testimony. Which of you is going first?

MR. TOTARO: I'll start first.

22 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Mr. Totaro, please, any 23 time you're ready.

MR. TOTARO: Thank you very much,

25 Representative Cohen. It's my pleasure to be here this

morning. My name is Donald Totaro. I'm an Assistant

District Attorney in Lancaster County. I've had the

privilege, the honor of serving in Lancaster County as an

Assistant District Attorney now for the past 12 years. And

on behalf of the District Attorney's Office, we would like

to welcome the Task Force on Domestic Relations to

Lancaster County this morning.

Over the past 12 years, unfortunately, I have seen a tremendous increase in crime in Lancaster County. A lot of times -- oftentimes in the newspaper -- you see crimes involving drug -- drug use, drug abuse, drug dealing, homicides. Not as often domestic violence. But over the same period of time, there has also been a tremendous increase in domestic violence in Lancaster County.

And as I think was mentioned by the two
Representatives in their opening remarks, there is no limit
to where these violent acts occur with regard to race, with
regard to socioeconomic factors. It does not matter.

I have provided in my written statement statistics from Lancaster County. And I don't know that I necessarily have to recite those, other than to indicate they do reflect the problems that we have not only in Lancaster County but I'm sure also throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In 1997, we had 1,181 cases in which protection from abuse orders were obtained. In 1998, that went up to 1,253 cases. And in 1999, as of early August, it was 745 cases reported. We also have a large number of indirect criminal contempt charges that have been filed against individuals who have violated their protection from abuse orders: In 1997, 362 cases; in 1998, 325; and in 1999, 200.

And you might look at that and question whether there is actually a reduction in individuals who violate the protection from abuse orders, and that actually is not the case. Because of recent court rulings, we now have made a decision in our office to only charge indirect criminal contempt against a perpetrator if they have not committed some sort of crime of violence for which they would be charged with, criminal assault, terroristic threats, stalking, et cetera.

I would also point out that the Domestic

Violence Unit in our office, which is actually headed up by

Susan Ellison, was created in 1996 as a result of the

drastic increase in domestic violence cases in this county.

It is now a unit that she will I'm sure provide additional detail on.

But a full-time attorney, a county detective and a paralegal who operate within that unit and do nothing

but domestic violence criminal prosecutions. We also have another assistant district attorney who is responsible for protection from abuse orders.

In the past 10 years in Lancaster County, we have had 26 victims who have been killed as a result of domestic violence. And what I think is even more drastic is in the last two years, we have had 10 victims killed as a result of domestic violence.

And I think with regard to the legislation that is presented in House Bill 1436, it is legislation that we believe, with regard to the District Attorney's Office, our position is that it is legislation that is good legislation, it is legislation that will help victims of domestic violence who choose to break away from an abusive relationship and attempt to move on in their lives.

I would point out, however, in reading the legislation, I don't know whether it includes certain victims that might also benefit from the provisions. And if I could, I would like to address some remarks with regard to that.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Please.

MR. TOTARO: The bill is a good bill for those who have already taken that step and moved out of the abusive relationship, a victim who has obtained another apartment or another location who does not want to be found

by the abuser.

I would like to share with this Task Force a case that I prosecuted earlier this year. It was a homicide here in Lancaster. The homicide actually occurred in May of 1998. In that case, the abused victim had not yet taken the steps to move out of the apartment complex that she shared with the abuser and their son.

She was in the process of making those efforts when he found out and when he murdered her. And in that case -- and this would be testimony that was presented to the jury at trial. -- there was testimony that there was an abusive relationship.

There was testimony that the defendant in that case had previously threatened the victim with a butcher knife; that he had made comments to other individuals, including her parents, that if she attempted to move out on him, he would kill her; that there would be, quote, hell to pay.

Despite those threats, she did go to a local apartment complex in Lancaster County and at that time fill out a rental application for herself and for her son. It was very clear -- and she had told a number of her friends. -- it was very clear that she intended to move out and away from this abusive relationship.

Unfortunately, when she filled out the rental

application, it called for her address and her phone
number. And the address she put in was the address that
she shared with this abusive individual. On May 1st of
1998, she was scheduled to move into that apartment. She
did not show up.

She had paid the security deposit. She did not call to indicate why she didn't show up. The apartment complex then, without understanding what the situation was here, called the phone number to the apartment that the two individuals shared. No one was home, and a message was left on that machine. And that was on May 4th.

On May 12th, a second phone call was placed; and a message was left on the answering machine again inquiring as to whether she still intended to move into this apartment. On that same date, a letter was sent out from the manager of the apartment complex to the address on the application that was shared by these two individuals again inquiring as to whether she intended to move into this apartment.

Now, we could not prove conclusively at trial that he intercepted the letter or that he actually heard these phone messages that were left. However, we do know that on May 18th, he did storm down to the victim's parents' home, at that time very, very upset, screaming at her parents that he had discovered she was intending to

move out, that they were helping her financially to buy items for a new apartment.

And then approximately one hour later, she was actually murdered in that apartment. And that's where I question whether we might be able to -- the Legislature might be able to expand the language of this House Bill to include not only those who have been able to take that step, but those who are trying to take that step; in this case, Martha Kurtz.

A confidential address at that point in time that she could have used on that application I think would have been significant. And I've tried to follow through with the language of the bill as to how that would work. And any correspondence then I think from the apartment complex would go to the Secretary of State, Department of State.

Obviously, under the language of the bill, the mail is forwarded then from the Secretary of the Department of State to the actual residence of the victim, which in this case would go right back to the residence that she was at that time sharing with the abuser. And that wouldn't help either.

And I throw this out just as a possibility.

But that perhaps on the application that is filled out by
the victim, she could put on there the nearest post office

so that she could then retrieve any mail from the post office of this sort.

And so in that situation, Martha Kurtz might have been able to escape this household and get out before he knew about it. And I mean, there's no way in hindsight to say, Well, that would have made a difference in this case. We don't know what he would have done even if she was able to successfully move out and he tracked her down.

But I think that in a lot of cases I have dealt with, not just domestic violence but other cases in general, the first few moments, first few hours after a volatile situation are the worst. And if there is an opportunity for a cool-down, maybe some of these incidents could be avoided.

So I would like to, if there are any questions, certainly answer any of those questions but yield at this time to Susan Ellison because I think she will offer you greater detail with regard to our Domestic Violence Unit, the procedures within the unit, and any questions you might have with regard to those cases on a day-by-day basis because she deals with them on a daily basis.

But I would throw that out to the Task Force as a possibility as far as expanding the language to include those individuals who are attempting but have not

yet moved out of this abusive household.

2 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Thanks, Mr.

3 | Totaro. Ms. Ellison, do you want to make your

4 presentation, and then we can have some time for questions

5 after both of you. While we're doing that, I'd like to

6 | welcome Representative Walko from Allegheny County, a

7 member of the Domestic Relations Task Force. Welcome.

Yes, proceed any time you're ready, Ms.

9 Ellison.

1

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ELLISON: Thank you very much. Good morning, Chairperson Cohen, ladies and gentlemen of the committee. I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to be present this morning. My name is Susan Ellison. I'm an Assistant District Attorney in Lancaster County.

I am the Director of the Domestic Violence
Unit in our office. The unit in our office tracks
approximately 500 criminal cases per year in Lancaster
County. In addition, through the District Attorney's
Office, we also prosecute approximately 300 cases per year,
violations of PFA orders.

Within our unit, we try to coordinate these cases so that we are aware not only of the criminal conduct of an offender but continuing violations against a victim to continue to intimidate her as a criminal case is pending.

_ |

.

_

of the first three recipients in the state of Pennsylvania.

Through my association with the Commission on Crime and

Delinquency, I have had the very fortunate opportunity to
serve on their Technical Assistance Team and to travel to
many other counties throughout the state to provide
assistance in forming domestic violence units.

This has given me an invaluable opportunity to

Violence Unit, which was created with STOP Grant Funds

through PCCD in 1996 -- Lancaster County's project was one

Through my association with the Domestic

meet with colleagues who are also specialized prosecutors to discuss case management, to discuss concerns about cases. And confidentiality of a victim who is trying to hide from an abuser is something that quite frequently comes up.

I'm here today to thank you for proposing
House Bill 1436. This would constitute, if enacted,
legislative recognition of the need to safeguard victims of
domestic violence in their homes. I've contained in my
testimony submitted to this Task Force statistics, and they
were also cited -- some of them -- by Representative Carn
as to the type of violence and the type of people who are
subject to separation violence. This legislation would
help these people in an instance when they really truly
need it.

I think this Task Force is aware, but I would like to briefly put forth what a domestic violence victim quite frequently faces right after a violent incident. If an incident is reported and police are called to the scene, it's very common that this is not the first incidence of violence that has occurred.

When the police come, they do an investigation. They determine if they have sufficient probable cause. And if they do, they arrest the offender. And essentially, the victim is then left to face the fact that she has been victimized by a loved one, to face the general emotional turmoil that a victim of crime faces.

If they have children in common, she's going to have to face her children's questions: Where's Daddy, why isn't Daddy here, when is Daddy coming home? If the defendant has been released on bail, frequently they have bail conditions telling them that they are not to contact the victim.

Quite frequently, they don't pay any attention to those conditions. They will call and they will use subtle pressure and say, you know, I'm sorry. I'm begging forgiveness. I'll never do it again. Sometimes they will resort to threatening future violence. The victim has to deal with this.

The victim has to deal with the fact that if

she wants to get a protection from abuse order, she's
probably going to have to take a day off work. She's
probably going to have to spend a few hours in the county
courthouse or at a domestic violence victim service agency
filling out the necessary paperwork.

She's going to have to go to a hearing to obtain a permanent PFA order. If the defendant hasn't been served, that hearing will have to be rescheduled to have him served. Quite frequently, even if he has been served, he hasn't had the opportunity to obtain counsel so it's going to have to be rescheduled anyway.

And we haven't even yet talked about the scheduling of the criminal case. When an offender is taken out of the home, the financial considerations the victims of domestic violence face are horrible. On top of all of that, they have to take days off work to attend all of these various court proceedings.

And many victims end up feeling that they are at the mercy of the civil and criminal justice systems because even though -- in the most victim-friendly court systems, even though they have access to a civil attorney, they have access to the district attorney's office, they have a considerate police department who is giving them information, the bottom line is decisions are made by police, by district magistrates, by prosecutors and by

judges.

The one thing that a victim of domestic violence can do if she has the ability, if she has the financial resources or if she has the assistance of others is decide that she's going to leave, that she's going to establish a new address and that she's going to get to safety.

If she has the financial resources, she can establish her own home or she can go to friends or family or, if necessary, a local domestic violence shelter. So imagine the impact on a victim who is then tracked to that address by an offender.

If that victim is lucky, the offender's intent is simply to intimidate and harass. I can find you. The police can't protect you. I don't care what the bail conditions say. I don't care what the PFA says. If she's lucky, that's his intent.

But as earlier mentioned, that's the point when abusers become more violent. It escalates in frequency; it escalates in severity. An abuser will recognize that he is losing control, and he will do what he needs to do to continue to influence that victim.

That is an extremely dangerous time for victims of domestic violence. And this proposed legislation would help victims, as Mr. Totaro indicated,

who have already left the address. We did discuss this
yesterday -- and I also echo his concerns. -- that somehow
a mechanism be put into place to provide confidentiality to
people who indicate perhaps on the application that is
mentioned in the legislation that due to domestic violence,
it is their intent to relocate and they need help with the
confidential address as well.

Being a lawyer -- and just technically the one other thing that I want to mention about the legislation that was proposed, under the section which indicates the waiver process, the Secretary can impose limitations and restrictions on the recipient agency who gets the information, limited use and access and things of that nature.

I just want to make sure that that is also imposed on the emergency disclosure as well. It didn't seem to be in the same section. Everything else that I would indicate to this panel is included in my written testimony so I won't reiterate that.

If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. And I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you this morning.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you very much. And we certainly appreciate your willingness to answer some questions, and we will ask the panel members. But I just

25 1 have one question. Obviously, it's too late. 2 hindsight, it's 20/20 as they say. 3 Mr. Totaro, in the Kurtz incident that you gave us -- and I realize the mental state of victims, 5 having dealt in this area. -- why did this woman give the 6 address and phone number? She was fortunate because many, 7 many victims have no support system at all. This woman was fortunate in that she had 8 9 parents and others. Why did she give the address, her 10 residence as opposed to her parents' address and phone 11 number? 12 MR. TOTARO: You're right. In fact --13 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: And actually -- excuse me. 14 The point that I'm making is that none -- the reason that 15 I'm asking is that none of us really likes to see any 16 additional legislation unless it's necessary. 17 MR. TOTARO: Right, right. 18 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: And in the case you gave, 19 this legislation may not have been necessary, unless I'm 20 missing something. 21 MR. TOTARO: Right. I don't know if I need to switch for the microphones or not but --22 23 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: If you can just -- why

MR. TOTARO: Sure. I think you're right with

don't you move a little closer.

24

25

regard to your comments in this particular case. I cannot
answer why Martha Kurtz did not use the address of her
parents because they did know of the ongoing problems
between their daughter and with regard to the individual

that she was living with.

And I've thought about this as well. This legislation might not actually benefit her because she chose not to use the address of her parents. However, I would point out that I'm sure there are other cases where the victim -- and I know there are other cases. -- where the victim will not share these problems with their family or with their friends.

They do not want to acknowledge that they are in an abusive relationship; and therefore, they are not going to utilize the -- I guess the address of their parents or their friends. They may not even be in an area where they have family or friends.

And in that particular case or under those circumstances, then I think that there would be help provided by additional language within the bill.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: My other problem is a practical matter. And again, we have to use the Martha Kurtz situation that you gave us. Assuming this law were in place, again, when we talk about victims who, number one, don't want to tell anyone, again, I think as a very

practical matter -- and ignorance of the law is not an
excuse. -- when a person presents themselves, himself or
herself, to a prospective landlord and is using an address
such as this, a confidential address, number one, that's an
admission that they're in an abusive relationship. I'm not
sure that someone would be willing to do it.

And number two, I'm not sure that a landlord -- unless the victim came out and said, Look, I'm the victim. There's House Bill 1436 that's now in law. It's in place, and you have to take this post office box and another number that I'm giving you because I can't give you the address where I am, I think some -- some landlords again would be very reticent.

That's not to say that 1436 shouldn't be in place. But as a practical matter, which we again have to deal with, would this work, number one? Would it be out there for victims to know they have an alternative if they haven't sought help, if they haven't had counseling?

And number two, trying to find a landlord who knows the risk of taking in a victim, someone who's been abused, knowing the risk and the statistics that abusers pursue. I'm not sure. And again, that's not to say this wouldn't work.

MR. TOTARO: Right. No. I've thought of that as well actually. And there is the concern that a landlord

might not want to take someone in who would acknowledge
that they were in an abusive relationship. On the flip
side, if nothing is done, if no effort is made, you're very
possibly going to run into additional situations where, in
the Martha Kurtz case, violence is brought upon the victim.

So I don't know maybe if it's a balancing test here as to which is more important in the end, whether, you know, the individual can fill out an application with a confidential address that she knows will not get back to the abusive partner or whether the -- the apartment manager, the landlord as a result would exclude them as a possibility where I think then she could move on to another location.

But again, I think maybe it's a balancing test here. As misses -- Ms. Ellison stated earlier in her comments, I think at that point in time, you're dealing with a situation where the abuser may, if they discover that she is attempting to find a residence elsewhere, feels that the situation is slipping away; they are losing power; they are losing authority.

And that's when they may become most violent. So I'm questioning whether that might not be a time when they should have additional protections.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Thank you.

MS. ELLISON: I just made a quick

consultation. One of our domestic violence legal clinic
workers is in the audience today. I don't believe that
Martha Kurtz contacted any victim service agencies, and I
don't think she had any contact with the police department
about the situation before her homicide occurred.

And this also, I think, would go to where access to the Secretary's applications would come from, would it be at victim service agencies, or how a domestic violence victim would be made aware that this program is available.

Had Ms. Kurtz had some safety planning from a domestic violence counselor, she would have -- somebody probably would have said, Don't use your address. Use somebody else's address. It's a step of a domestic violence victim to seek help. But when they make the step to seek help, it's what access we have available to them and what programs we have available to them.

And expanding this legislation in this way would give them that one extra step of protection before they can make the move to a safe place.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Did you achieve a conviction?

MR. TOTARO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Oh, okay. Thank you. I'd like to welcome Representative Daley. Thank you for being

here. Any questions, Representative True? Do you have a question? Representative Carn.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you, Madam

Chairperson. I have a question in terms of when do victims contact your office? Is there -- or is there a counseling service that victims utilize in Lancaster County? Because the question that I have is when someone's going through this kind of a situation, I was just trying to figure out, is there easy access to any services presently?

MS. ELLISON: The way -- under our STOP Grant Program, the way a victim accesses the district attorney's office generally is when the police are called to a criminal incident and charges are filed. Within three to five days, a copy of those charges is sent to the Domestic Violence Unit.

Our unit sends out a letter to the victim which basically reiterates the rights in 2711. It tells them how to get in touch with the district attorney's office, how to get in touch with the shelter, how to get a PFA order, things of that nature.

We have an excellent victim service office in the district attorney's office. We then send our domestic files up to the victims. And if we have a phone number, they call them and go over the criminal process with them, find out who else they need to be in contact with, where they need to go to get a PFA, if they want someone to accompany them to criminal proceedings, things of that nature.

A copy of our letter is also forwarded to the Domestic Violence Legal Clinic so that if somebody goes to their office to access services, they know that that victim is also the victim of a pending criminal charge and that we're in contact with her as well.

We've developed a really good relationship with these offices. We work very closely together. We call each other constantly saying, you know, could you look -- they call me saying, Look at this criminal case. I think the victim needs some more information.

Or if a victim calls me and it's not a criminal matter that the police can intercede in or that my office can help her with, I can say, You need to contact the Domestic Violence Legal Clinic. They can give you help with civil problems and things of that nature.

If a victim chooses not to contact the police or if criminal charges are not filed, victims can go to the Bail Administration Office in the Lancaster County Courthouse. There is an advocate from the Domestic Violence Legal Clinic who is stationed in the courthouse to assist victims fill out PFA orders.

She also, in the context of talking with them,

quite frequently finds out that there was a criminal incident that wasn't reported. So we catch a lot of them that way. Some people just go to the shelter. They don't want to contact the police.

But the way we've set up our program, we're all in contact so that hopefully we are getting to all the people we need to get to.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: So there has to be a criminal matter before contact is made with your office?

MS. ELLISON: Yes, usually.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: If you could just limit your answers because we're running short of time. We've got lots of questions. Thank you. Representative True.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Thank you,

Representative Cohen. Ms. Ellison, I just -- I've been asked a lot since this bill has been proposed, What would you think of as far as numbers are concerned? My feeling is that this is going to be a real group of dedicated people that would want to use this confidentiality.

Am I wrong on that? Is that something -- I know it will be an inconvenience to some people. Would your feeling be these are going to be people that are very desperate, that very much want to hide that would need to access this?

And the second part of that, if I may, this to me is such an emotional issue. Wouldn't knowing that something like this is out there, if we do a good job educating through all the things that you all do, wouldn't this be a comfort and perhaps bring people in to help if they know something like this is out there, that they can truly hide if they need to rather than nobody can help me and I have nowhere to go? That's kind of a long -- I'm sorry about that.

MS. ELLISON: I'll try to limit my answer.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: I'm trying to squeeze everything in here.

MS. ELLISON: In response to the first part of your question, my experience with domestic violence victims is that they are much more forgiving than I would hope they would be. It's quite frequent the first time that I work with them to say I want him to get probation; I want him to go to counseling; I want him to get help; it's okay, I want him to see his kids. And then another incident occurs.

So by the time somebody would, I think, access legislation like this, they would want to hide. They would want to be away from this person. With regard to the second part of your question, yes, I think that knowing that there is a program there that can provide help is a great support to people in this situation.

1	REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Thank you. Thank you.
2	CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Representative Walko.
3	REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you, Madam Chair.
4	I certainly am one of the cosponsors and certainly support
5	the whole concept and approach basically. But I was
6	wondering if you had any concerns about the state
7	administering it versus it being administered on a county
8	level, or is that question sort of meaningless because it
9	can't be administered on a county level?
10	MS. ELLISON: I'm not quite sure. I have
11	thought a little bit about the administration, and I
12	haven't worked it through myself how how it would work.
13	I have had thoughts about how access to these applications
14	would be made.
15	Certainly, if it's administered by the state,
16	local domestic violence agencies could make victims aware
17	of the program. Where they would get the applications and
18	how that would work I really haven't processed. I'm sorry.
19	REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: And as far I think
20	Representative True answered a concern I was having about
21	the volume because out of the 300 PFAs in Lancaster
22	County I guess that's annual perhaps a small
23	percentage of those would participate in this program.
24	MS. ELLISON: That's actually, that number

25 is only the violation of PFA orders. We have over 1,000

PFAs filed a year. And actually, in the PFA program, the victim can ask for a confidential address as well; but that's only as long as the PFA is in effect.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Ms. Dalton.

MS. DALTON: I just want to ask a couple of questions about the bill. How would this legislation change law enforcement's access to information?

MR. TOTARO: I know that was a concern that was raised by Chief Bagnoli of the East Hempfield Township Police Department. As I understand, there is a provision for emergency disclosure. His concern was in a situation where they might know that an individual is in their jurisdiction, an abuser who might have a PFA order out against him but they don't know that the abuser or the victim is in their jurisdiction.

And at that point in time, I question whether they could, under the bill as written, access with the 24-hour access to find out whether -- or where the address is of that individual. As I see it, there is emergency disclosure for law enforcement if they feel the need to determine the location.

Whether that is sufficient for law enforcement concerns, I don't know. But I do know -- at least it's my understanding that Chief Bagnoli had submitted testimony to

36 1 the Task Force on that issue. 2 MS. DALTON: Okay. I have a second question. 3 How will schools, elementary and high schools, be treated under this bill? Children are allowed to get a I was just wondering if this bill 5 confidential address. 6 required school districts and schools not to have the 7 addresses of the children that are in their schools? 8 MS. ELLISON: I think they would probably have 9 to have the address, the actual address for truancy 10 concerns. I think that would be important. But that would 11 probably fall under the limited use and limited access 12 I would think that would be the way that provision. 13 practically it should work. 14 MS. DALTON: Thank you. 15 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Okay. Thank you both 16 very, very much. We appreciate the information that you've 17 given to us. Any further comments, please feel free to 18 provide us and advise us. Thank you. 19 MR. TOTARO: Thank you. 20 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: The next person to testify 21 is Dr. Susan Atkins from Transitions. Thank you, Dr. 22 Atkins. You may proceed at any time.

DR. ATKINS: Good morning. I'm here to basically talk about the psychological aspects of battering, both from a little bit about the victim, a

23

24

25

little bit about batterers and where I see the intersection of people's personal lives and government.

I've worked professionally with battered women since 1985. During that time, I've listened to hundreds of stories from women as they have attempted to restore safety and sanity to their lives. I've seen women struggle with their own internal constraints.

But far more painful to watch is the struggle to obtain the societal support which validates their struggle and increases the potential for safety. In the next few minutes, I would like to share with you what I've learned about domestic violence over the past 15 years.

First, battered women themselves minimize and deny the danger. I have frequently said that the single most dangerous thing a woman can do in this culture is to fall in love. According to the Bureau of Justice statistics, more women are injured and killed at the hands of their husbands and lovers than by any other cause.

Battering behavior in a relationship generally begins slowly and insidiously. No one gets punched in the nose on a first date. Studies have demonstrated that many of the tactics used in brainwashing are used by batterers in intimate relationships. The effect is even more compelling because the relationship typically begins with love, care and sexual intimacy which reduces interpersonal

boundaries and makes one more susceptible to control.

The violence is usually noncontingent and unpredictable which produces a constant state of terror and instability. Often, women are financially dependent on their attacker which further complicates their coping responses. In order to survive repeated assaults, denial of the violence is used as the primary defense mechanism. Victims of violence become habituated to terror.

Levels of violence and terror which would make many of us in this room run for cover become a routine aspect of daily life. For anyone who lives a violent-free life, it is hard to imagine how victims of domestic violence survive on a day-to-day basis; but they do.

Watch the faces of refugees in Bosnia and you can see the same numb ability to copy with daily life in the face of unbelievable terror and the fear of death. To the extent that our society refuses to grasp this reality and to the extent that our government does not provide all possible validation relief, the denial of peril is the only possible strategy for victims.

Domestic violence flourishes in a climate of denial. It is not easy to believe that love can turn to violence and sometimes murder. It is not easy to look at the underbelly of family life. It is not easy to know what will help victims to be safe. And I congratulate you for

being courageous enough to look.

The second thing that I've learned is that men who batter can be extremely dangerous. They're either sociopathic or desperately dependent. It is hard to imagine the man who sits next to you in church or your colleague at work or your fellow committee member could be so emotionally regressed that the very idea of relationship loss constitutes an emotional death.

Macho underpinnings, a childhood history of an absent or abusive father, and homophobia in our culture denies many men the opportunity to develop emotionally expressive relationships with other men. Many men can only express their emotional need for support and comfort within an emotional relationship with a woman.

For some men, the only expression of this is sexual intimacy. The fear of losing the sole object with whom this intimacy is shared creates the need to control that object, violently if necessary. This is the reason women steal away to hide out in shelters. Unfortunately, few people understand the underlying psychological reason why we need to put fleeing women under lock and key.

Additionally, this level of psychological dependency does not remit quickly. While the most dangerous time for a domestic violence victim is immediately after leaving the relationship, this danger can

continue unabated for some time.

I was glad to see the provisions being made in this bill for providing the service for three years. In some cases, I would suggest that this may need to be extended on a case by case basis.

Finally, recent studies indicate it is extremely difficult for providers of psychological services to predict who might react to relationship dissolution with fatal levels of violence. The common wisdom is that the best predictor of future violence is past violence. However, with domestic violence, this is often much more difficult to determine.

Women frequently don't tell or don't have the opportunity to tell. Often, nonviolent control is being exerted. And unless providers are well trained in domestic violence, they miss this as a predictor. I believe the best predictor of lethality is the perpetrator's emotional dependence on the victim.

Unfortunately, that is often not assessed or considered. I'm constantly amazed at how often mental health providers miss signs of domestic violence and control. Victims will tell but only when asked. Victims will act on their own behalf but only when they feel safe enough to do so. Victims will drop the denial, but they can't do so until others acknowledge the danger and

validate their concerns.

The single most important thing that society can do to prevent injury and loss of life once a victim leaves an abusive relationship is to acknowledge the potential lethality of the situation. I believe House Bill 1436 may serve to save the lives of some victims of domestic violence in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

It serves as an acknowledgment that a true danger exists. It provides a mechanism for providing continued safety over time and will grant victims of domestic violence the assurance that the danger is real and at least in Pennsylvania it will not be tolerated. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you, Dr. Atkins. I would like to welcome Representative Maitland from Adams

County. Thank you for being here. I believe that

Representative Carn has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Yes, just one question. How is it that mental health providers are missing the signs of domestic violence?

DR. ATKINS: I think just like it's hard for anybody to see it unless it's right in your face. We don't want to believe that about families. We don't want to believe, as I had said earlier, that love can turn to violence and possibly death.

1 REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Isn't that one of the 2 instances that they're searching for? I'm just trying to 3 get a sense of what it is. 4 DR. ATKINS: Generally not. Our -- my experience has been, having been in graduate school, that 5 6 there is very little training actually in domestic violence. The level of denial of violence in our families 7 does not just exist at the personal level, but it exists at 8 9 the personal and societal level as well. And I believe 10 that's the problem. 11 REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Representative Daley. 13 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you, Madam 14 I was briefly looking through 1436. And Chairman. 15 Representative True maybe can correct me. I think this 16 legislation is neutral -- is gender neutral, is it not? 17 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: It is, yes. 18 DR. ATKINS: Yes. 19 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: And I'm reading and 20 listening to your comments, Dr. Atkins. It's -- have you 21 dealt with men that have been battered? 22 DR. ATKINS: Yes, I have some. And I thought 23 in writing this to do it in a gender neutral way. However, 24 as we do that, it often begs the question. The primary

victims of domestic violence in this culture continue to be

25

female. The whole weight of the culture of violence in this country is particularly male; although, I've worked with male domestic violence victims.

There are some differences. We don't tend to need the levels of shelter and protection of men that we do of women in this culture. At least that's my experience, and that's also what most of the studies have also shown.

I could have written this from a gender neutral perspective, however.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Well, I was amazed by the one line where you said, "I have frequently said that the single most dangerous thing a woman can do in this culture is to fall in love." I mean, I can understand in the context in which you're writing that.

Have you seen historically that the number of male battering cases have increased recently or --

DR. ATKINS: Violence directed toward men?
REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Yes.

DR. ATKINS: There certainly are levels of battering by men in gay relationships, probably much more so in female relationships. I do see it as a differential in power typically in relationships. One of the men that I've worked with who's battered in his relationship suffered from multiple sclerosis and was in a wheelchair.

So there usually has to be some differential

in power just from in a stance in terms of physicality, the
use of violence. If you look statistically, many more
female partners are killed by male partners than the other

4 way around so the weight of the evidence still suggests

that this is a problem with women.

or can be.

But absolutely, it's a problem for men as well

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you. Thank you,
Madam Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Any other members? Well, Dr. Atkins, we want to thank you for being here. And I appreciate the information that you've given to us.

DR. ATKINS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. The next person that will appear before us is Pamela Grosh, the program director of Victim/Witness Services, Lancaster County District Attorney's Office. And I believe you've brought with you Linda Young. So please feel free to make your presentation at any point, Ms. Grosh.

MS. GROSH: Good morning. My name is Pamela Grosh. And for the last ten and a half years, I've worked with crime victims as part of my responsibilities as program director in Victim/Witness Services, which is part of the office of the District Attorney in Lancaster County.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

through the court system.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

defendants on the police report as part of the discovery process or gathered by defendants through checking the clerk of courts' records for original subpoenas or in restitution statements attached to presentence reports, I came to the reluctant and sad conclusion that it is, while a worthy goal, it's nearly impossible to eliminate a victim's address in every piece of paper that proceeds

to keep my address confidential. At one time, I believe

However, after failings occasioned by addresses provided to

that we could assure a victim that that was possible.

In our office, we regularly receive requests

I also sadly acknowledged that it was foolish, misleading and, in some cases, dangerous for me to suggest that it could be done. There was always a way for a defendant to obtain this information. Ironically, the best possible scenario for a victim was a change of address mid-course in the proceedings.

All of the official documents carried an old, no longer valid address. And the new address could be better protected. This legislation contemplates a far more sophisticated version of that process.

Frequently, in the course of dealing with situations involving long-term stalking and abuse, a victim will share the advice given to her by some concerned

person, frequently an individual with some responsibilities
in relation to the offender's future actions, a law
enforcement officer, a probation or parole officer, "You
need to move. Just leave the area before something
happens."

This advice, generally given with the sincerest motives, fails to acknowledge the complexities of such an action. It is also given without regard for the ties that may legally and legitimately bind the victim and the offender together. Following this advice in its purest forms would, in many cases, create an offender from a victim.

obvious to me. While acknowledging the limitations of action by any legislation or program to safeguard victims from all harm, this legislation offers a solution to one part of the puzzle of reclaiming a life in the aftermath of disruptive stalking and violence.

It offers an opportunity to get a driver's license or a library card, to give an address for school registration, to resume some of the most ordinary activities that are part of our everyday lives. It offers an opportunity to program participants to shield their addresses while responding to the myriad entanglements that criminal, divorce, custody and protection from abuse

actions entail.

While I recognize the undesirability of encumbering the legislation with provisions better addressed in regulations, I would suggest that a fuller discussion of the exact mechanisms to be utilized in the implementation of this legislation include a clear understanding of the procedure for service of process.

I'm intrigued by the California statute's proactive provision providing for disclosure of existing and active court actions regarding child support, child custody, or child visitation upon application to the program. Further, their statute provides for notice by the address confidentiality program to the other party involved in these actions.

may have that the program provides a shield behind which children can be hidden. When the time arrives to consider implementation, I also encourage you to ensure that there is provision made for assistance with application to the program at the local level by programs with access to and knowledge of victims who may be most helped by this process.

Finally, I want to address my greatest concern with the bill as it is currently conceived. A concern lies with the eligibility issue. While acknowledging that most

stalking cases do involve domestic partners, many do not.

Currently, eligibility for the confidential address program is wholly tied to protection from abuse definitions which limits the class of people eligible for participation to spouses or persons who have been spouses, persons living as spouses or who lived as spouses, parents and children, other persons related by consanguinity or affinity, current

I believe that it is important for you to consider the addition of victims of stalking in the classes of persons eligible for this program. I recognize that this recommendation may seem to open a floodgate of potential and new participants.

or former sexual partners, or persons who share biological

parenthood.

However, considering the other major factor this remedy presupposes, the fact that the victim feels strongly enough about the potential danger to move, I do not think I am advocating for an unreasonable addition. Given the same actions by an offender, it is often easier to obtain a protection from abuse order than to have criminal charges brought.

Stalking victims who are not eligible for protection from abuse protection have a harder road to justice in many cases. I encourage you to focus on the harm caused by the offender and the perceived need for

protection by the victim as a criteria for participation in this program rather than the current limitation of relationship of the parties as an eliqibility factor.

To illustrate the importance of this point, I invite you to listen to Linda Young's story. Linda is a stalking victim who could greatly benefit by the existence of the address confidentiality program but would not qualify as the legislation is currently written.

I commend the hard work envisioned which has brought this House Bill to this point. I ardently support its passage. It provides a significant acknowledgment of the difficulties faced by victims as they attempt to reorder their lives and provides them with a powerful tool to bring a new existence into being.

I appreciate the opportunity to address you concerning my concerns and support. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you, Ms. Grosh. I think what we'll do is hear Ms. Young and then open it up for questions if you don't mind.

MS. GROSH: Sure. That's fine.

MS. YOUNG: Good morning. I'm Linda Young.

I'm a victim of a stalker. My stalking situation is very unusual compared to most stalking situations. I was being stalked by a young girl who is 20 years my junior. I met this girl at a restaurant where I had worked.

She came into the restaurant one day

crying -- she worked there also. -- that her mother had

kicked her out of the house; she had nowhere to go; she had

no clothes to wear. Several people from the restaurant

were taking turns taking this girl home with them for the

night, and they'd bring her back to work. They were

donating clothes to her. They were feeding her.

After a few days of this, I offered this girl to stay in my home for a couple of weeks, as my son was out of town and she could use his room. We would take her to Welfare and see if we could find her shelter somewhere and get her some food stamps.

As it ends up, she eventually started stalking me. While she was living in my home, within about a week of her being there, she started. I had switched jobs, gone to another restaurant to work. She quit her job at the restaurant where we originally worked, tried to get a job where I was working.

She would follow me to work every day. She would stay in the parking lot where I worked and just circle the building the entire time I was at work during the day. Her behavior became very erratic in my house. She started using drugs. She would follow me constantly.

She was going through my dresser drawers. And eventually, it came to the point where she was buying

clothes exactly like mine, underwear, socks, brassieres,

slips. Anything that I had, she would go out and find the

exact same brand, style, color of clothing that I would

wear and she would start wearing them. And she was

basically just trying to take over my identity.

I had gone to the police department. I asked the girl to leave my home, and she would not leave. I was working with an officer in the Manheim Township Police Department. And she said, Well, you know Linda, you're being stalked. And I kind of laughed because I had never heard of a girl stalking a girl.

And I always thought of stalking as a man stalking a woman, a woman stalking a man. So this continued. They had her taken out of my house eventually. She was put in a mental health unit. While in the mental health unit, I had her clothing and all her possessions removed from my home.

She was told in the mental health unit she was not allowed to have contact with me. She was given a no trespass order. Now, I was not eligible to have a PFA against her because it was not a lesbian affair, it was not a relative or anything that goes under the PFA order.

Within one hour of her being released from the mental health unit -- she was in there, I believe, five days. -- she was back at my house banging on the door. And

that's when we, working with the Manheim Township Police

Department, we started pressing the issue of stalking,

which for stalking, you have to go through a lot to have

the charges pressed.

This girl would be at my house all night long, all day long. She would show up where I worked. This girl did not drive a car. She rode a bicycle. If she could not find me, she would follow my daughter. It got to the point we put security on my daughter at school.

My daughter never came home if I was not home in the evening. If I had to work that evening, she went to someone else's house where there was a parent there. Each day, she went to a different home so there would be no way this girl could find her.

When I was at work, like I said, the girl would be outside the building continuously circling the building on her bicycle. If I was driving down the street, I stopped at a red light, she would circle my car on her bicycle while I was sitting at the red light.

If I went shopping, she would be behind me in the store the whole way through the store. This went on for several months before we had enough charges against her to press the stalking charges. She was put into prison.

Actually, what had gotten her into prison was a shoplifting charge.

And while she was in prison, my first set of stalking charges went through. She continually, although in prison, contacted me from prison, called me collect from prison. She would call my home 20 or 30 times in an hour. She sent me letters from prison, which while she was in

there, she knew she was not allowed to contact me in any way, shape or form.

Most of the letters that I had received was, I forgive you for what you have done to me. In her mind, I did all of this to her. Every time -- I had police officers, before she went to prison, at my house constantly. She would hide.

Here she was using her cell phone to tap into my cordless phone and was listening to the conversations. So every time I called the police, she knew they were coming; and she would disappear. But while they were there, they would send several cars out looking for her.

She would call me up and laugh how they couldn't find her and how smart she was. And several times, the police officer was standing in my house, took the phone from me and would listen to the things she was saying; but they still could not catch her.

So what had -- like I said before, what had gotten her in prison was she was caught shoplifting. And while she was in prison, the stalking charges had gone

through. She contacted me from prison telling me how much she forgives me for what I did to her, how could you do this to me, I don't know why you did this to me, which was a continual theme from the beginning to the end of this.

When she would call me, Why are you doing this to me, Linda? What's wrong with you? She was in prison for four months. She was paroled. In the meantime, I had moved. I split my family up. I received from the police officer, Move out of this area, get jobs out of this area, leave this area.

I had a daughter in high school who wanted to finish high school with her friends. She had lived in this area all of her life. So what I had done is sent her to live with a friend that lived in the area. I had a son. He moved to Chester County with my sister.

And I basically stayed in hotels for several months till I totally depleted my savings. Then I moved in with my sister that lives up in the same area. I was there about a month, and Tanya was released from prison. And she was paroled. She was allowed no contact with me through a third party, telephone. She was not allowed to write to me.

Within three days of being released from prison, she found me. And I had moved. She was picked back up. It took them about a week to find her. And she

was picked back up for a parole violation in which a second set of stalking charges were pressed on her, which she pleaded guilty to.

She is presently in prison right now. She will be released the end of this year, near the end of this year. But from my moving -- I moved so many times in that month. And for several months, since I was living in hotels -- I would switch hotels every night. Even though she was in prison, they kept telling me that they didn't know the date when she could be released so I did not take a permanent address.

I had to go to a hearing for her when the second set of stalking charges went in. At this point, I had moved in with my sister. They read my new address out in the court right in front of her so I moved again. I had to leave because she now had my new address.

One of the things -- the problem I'm having now is -- I do have a permanent address now. I have moved so many times, had my mail forwarded so many times. I had mail going to a relative's house. I had mail going -- I left some with my old address so it would get forwarded to a post office box. I had mail going all over the place.

I've had a permanent address now since

December, and I don't receive my mail half the time. It is

gone. I do not receive bank statements. I do not receive

telephone bills. I had my car insurance cancelled because I never received the bill.

The part that alarms me is some of the bills that are being returned to the companies have my new address label on them. I do not know if Tanya tried to contact me from prison since I've moved to this address. If she sent something to an old address, got the new address label on it and it was still returned to her, she now has my new address, which I have no way of finding out.

This -- I think under this bill, if you would include stalking, it would be wonderful to have. Even though I would be moving around, one address for my mail to go to; if I would have to appear in court, my new address is not read out in front of the stalker. It was basically handed to her there.

I think that this bill is a wonderful idea, but I would definitely like to see victims of stalkers included under this bill.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Thank you for your very dynamic and certainly poignant testimony. We appreciate it. Any members of the panel have questions? Representative Carn.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Yes. Can we get a sense of how prevalent stalking is in Lancaster County?

MS. GROSH: Stalking cases are in a form --

should I switch? Stalking cases alone that do not involve

other types of criminal charges and/or the existence of a

protection from abuse order are rare. I will say that that

is true.

Again, it may be more rare because of the difficulty in pursuing this type of charge. It is still somewhat difficult to have that type of a criminal charge brought. And while I can't give you exact numbers, it is not a high number.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Representative Daley.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you, Madam

Chairwoman. Couple questions. I'm amazed by your story.

It was almost like a made for TV movie when you're explaining it. And first of all, I know we're not getting -- we're getting the Reader's Digest version.

And the criminal justice system seems like it's failed you somehow here with criminal trespass, with harassment, some of the things that could have been done by the criminal justice system to get her away from you prior to the shoplifting charge.

There seems to be things that could have been done by the local police department or by the district attorney's office or by someone in order to remove her.

She was obviously an adult, a young adult. The involuntary commitment, could someone have gotten her an involuntary commitment under the Mental Health Procedures Act? I mean, obviously this woman --

MS. YOUNG: That is what happened to her eventually. The problem is for stalking to go through, you must have five -- she had to be detained five times, caught five times at my home by a police officer. And we went through -- she was at my home continuously. But someone had to see her there on my property for them to pick her up.

And as much as they tried, I mean, they even put unmarked cars in my neighborhood to watch for her. And we had made these plans over the phone. And apparently, she was listening and didn't show up for two days, that she knew the unmarked cars would be there.

They -- I must say with the police department, they just went -- I cannot complain about them. They did everything possible they could. But they had to follow the guidelines for stalking. We -- we would literally -- the police officer would pull out the book of exactly what we had to do to get these stalking charges through, that we did not mess anything up, that it was all done and it was legal, that there would never be a catch that she could get out of prison when she got in.

And it took a very long time. I mean, driving down the highway, there is no way a police officer can be right there to follow me every minute of every day. And she was -- although she was said to have a very low IQ, she was very conniving and she was very smart in certain ways.

She would hide in the bushes and tell me exactly what the police officers were doing -- she would call me from her cell phone. -- of exactly where they were, how many times they passed her. And she would laugh about it.

And they were very diligent in working with me. I can't say that the system failed me. It was -there are so many problems with stalking. You have to have five criminal trespass charges to get the stalking charges through. And for them to catch her five times --

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Is there a guideline set up, is that in the Crimes Code?

MS. GROSH: No. As far as I -- from the Crimes Code, I would say you need a course of conduct. And my guess is that this is what they had believed would establish a course of conduct.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Surely the -- the course of conduct, if she came to your house and then she followed you with a bicycle to work and rode around work, when you stopped at a stop sign and then rode around you on

a bicycle, I mean, the course of conduct in any harassment charges I've ever been involved with before a district justice, I mean, that was pretty much right there. That's the threshold.

MS. YOUNG: But see, part of the issue was with her, she would -- I would stop at a red light. She would be sitting on that corner, and she would circle my car. And she would try to press charges against me that I was harassing her and following her.

So we always had this issue of she -- at the same time, she was trying to press charges on me that I was stalking her because she knew what way I went to work. I would change the way I went to work. I would go a different way all the time.

And somewhere along the way, I would pass her.

And she would call the police and try to have charges

pressed on me that I was following her. See, it was a -
REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: She received treatment;

she is out?

MS. YOUNG: She's not out yet. She gets out in November.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: She's still in the -MS. YOUNG: She's still in prison, yes.
CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you, Ms. Young and
Ms. Grosh. We appreciate you being here. And now we want
to welcome back Dr. Wanda Filer representing the
Pennsylvania Academy of Family Physicians. It's good to
see you again. We're certainly glad to have you here to
address us today.

DR. FILER: It's my pleasure.

support of House Bill 1436.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Any time you're ready.

DR. FILER: Okay. Thank you. Good morning.
Familiar faces. I am here on behalf of the Pennsylvania
Academy of Family Physicians. I actually chair their
Public Policy Commission. And I am here to speak in

I became involved in the issues of domestic violence education and awareness in the health care community about nine years ago when I was on call one weekend, and I got a call from the answering service to come in and please evaluate this newborn.

The mother was a patient in my practice. I went in and saw this beautiful new baby and then went and spoke to the mother. I spoke to the mother about all those things I had been trained to talk to new moms about, car seats, immunizations, breast-feeding, and basically the general health of her baby.

I did not know to talk to her about safety. I

1 | had never been trained in the issues of domestic violence.

2 When that baby was several months old, the mother, all of

3 that baby's siblings, the grandmother, and a toddler who

4 was the uncle of this newborn were murdered by the father

5 of the newborn, the mother's husband. This gentleman now

6 sits on death row in Pennsylvania.

That was quite an experience for me. And what I vividly remember is watching my partner, who was the primary care physician for this family, sobbing into her Dictaphone as she dictated all of the closing paragraphs in these particular charts.

Right about that same time, I had begun doing some television broadcasting here in Lancaster County. And we did a call-in show. We did a two-part series on domestic violence. I had read something in a throwaway journal, and I had never been trained on this. And I really was struggling with this whole concept.

Could this issue be as prevalent as what I was reading and what I was beginning to hear? During that seven minutes of the call-in show on a Tuesday morning at 10:30 in the morning, we had more than 200 phone calls.

One woman called in and talked about how she -- we did not obviously ask her name. -- but talked about how just a couple of days before that, on a Friday, her husband had broken her leq.

She had gone to the emergency department. No one asked her directly how this happened. She told them she had fallen down the stairs. She told us on the phone that she had fallen down the stairs quite a few times and been to the emergency room quite a few times, in fact to several emergency departments to hide some of the patterns.

No one bothered to acknowledge that she had been in that same emergency department for bouts of suicidal thought, with depression, migraine headaches, black eyes and head trauma. That really raised internal worry for me. And I began to wonder how many of the people that I was seeing were being afflicted this way, were suffering in these kinds of family relationships? How many black eyes had I seen and not recognized?

And so I began for myself an internal course of professional and personal education. Since that time, I've learned a lot, in great part from the Pennsylvania Academy -- or Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. And what this woman exemplified was a very classically recognizable pattern of violence, the cycle of family violence.

She fit this profile unbelievably well. I have become very familiar with that profile now. I use it not only to identify the patients at risk, but also as a patient education tool. I began to ask myself as a family

physician if truly 50 percent of women in their lifetime were battered at the hands of a partner.

Was there something that I could do to acknowledge this to hopefully prevent future deaths in patients? I learned about the RADAR tool, and I use that at this -- all over. I travel all over Pennsylvania in a variety of my professional capacities.

I've traveled all over Pennsylvania and several other states. And I educate health care providers to do a screening tool called the RADAR tool. And it really gives them, if you will, a template by which they can identify, counsel, and refer patients on domestic violence issues.

I have in my testimony here a couple of statements I wanted to share with you. Battery by a spouse is more common than injury by motor vehicle accidents, muggings and rape combined. Domestic violence is the leading cause of injury to women.

It is in fact an issue that the Center For Disease Control has taken on great importance. They have an office down there as well. I and many of my colleagues have never been trained in this unbelievably large public health issue. I now do routine screenings on patients in my office. Are you safe at home? Does anyone hurt you? What happens when you argue?

Every single day that I see patients, I identify multiple people who are in battering relationships. Sometimes they don't identify themselves right off the bat, but they'll often tell me. They'll tell me later on because they don't know me, they're not going to share this intimate risky part of their life until they get a better sense that maybe I will be respectful and be able to know how to handle this information.

There was a recent -- in fact, I believe it
was last month's issue of the Journal of Family Practice
that not only spoke about the human toll of domestic
violence, but also talked about the financial burden. In a
California managed care company, they did a survey. And
they had patients who were identified as having been
victims of domestic violence.

What they found is that those women had 92 percent higher health care costs to that plan than did those people who were not afflicted with domestic violence in their home relationships. These people -- I will tell you because I see them regularly. I have heard absolutely heart wrenching stories of how women and frequently their children are being battered.

We know there is a 70 percent concordance rate from many studies between domestic violence and child abuse. These people are living with patterns and cycles of

violence that are absolutely unbelievable, physical
violence, physical control, emotional control, financial
control, sexual control, any insidious way to be able to
pull away the identity and to control that individual.

I have the opportunity to live in York County. And what I have found -- and I'm very proud of York County because we've done a lot of work in our county in terms of trying to bring together multi-disciplinary groups of people. And we now have, through our Health of York County Coalition, task forces set up for health care, media, law enforcement, school, business, many kinds of ways that the community has come together across usual disciplinary lines.

We've broken out of our silos. And we've begun to say, What can we as a community do? As of 1995, all health care delivery systems that are certified by the Joint Commission on a federal level -- and basically, that's all of them. If they want Medicare funding, they better be certified by the Joint Commission.

We're required to have standing protocols in place. I chaired the group that did those in York at York Health System. And I have moved all over -- I was in Iowa in October working at the University Hospital there helping them look at their protocols.

These protocols, though, required a tremendous

amount of that interdisciplinary effort. They require
health care delivery systems to have ongoing conversations
with law enforcement, with the advocacy community and so
forth. Because of a lot of the issues of violence in
communities, the business community -- and because of the
cost -- the business community has really had -- has taken
a step up.

In York, I sit on the Fatality Review Team.

There are not a lot of these in this state. There is one in Pennsylvania. And I worked with Philadelphia through their district attorney's office for several years. They have a Fatality Review Team. And we, unfortunately from about two weeks ago, have three more fatalities to review in York County at our next review meeting.

But what this has done -- I sit next to the district attorney, one of our judges, people from the advocacy community, the whole groups of people on batterers' treatment program looking at fatalities. And I believe fully that House Bill 1436 would make the safety planning that I try to begin to engage my -- my patients in and also when I refer them to the advocates, to the shelters and so forth, it would make that much more feasible.

It would give them one more protective device that they could use to try to protect their safety. I also

know that the majority of the people that I see at greatest
danger are at the time that they are getting ready to
leave. Those people who died in York County, one was a
murder, the other a murder/suicide.

My patient and her family who were murdered, she was getting ready to leave. We know that at the time that they leave and for the first year thereafter, the risk of serious injury and death is greatest. And I believe that this bill could really make a difference.

It's estimated -- and this is an old study. -- but it's estimated that there are at least 800,000 women in Pennsylvania that are being battered every year. And I would ask you as a family physician who only sees a fraction of those people, but with my colleagues, to please consider passing this bill.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Well, as usual, you've made an extraordinary presentation. And we're always happy to see you.

DR. FILER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Representative Walko, do you have a question?

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Dr. Filer, I don't know that you could answer this. But I know you've had extensive experience in state government.

The administration of this program, I'm trying -- I'm a

little confused about how the administration of this
program by the Department of State relates to other
agencies that have addresses like the federal government,
the various agencies of the federal government and all of
those different agencies.

And my mailbox is so full of mail every day.

I'm just trying to understand how those entities will be stopped from using or learning. Would you actually be designating the Secretary of State to make you have an address?

DR. FILER: Well, I'm going to defer part of that answer, I think, to the Pennsylvania Coalition folks who are coming up. And I've worked with them for years.

This bill, as I understand it, is modeled after some legislation in Washington State that has been working quite effectively.

And the catch-22, I guess, is how everyone will communicate. I think of it as, from a family physician perspective, if I have a patient that I need to get in touch with, perhaps with a mammogram report or whatever it might be, how can I contact that person under this bill? It can be done.

From my perspective in terms of the medical care arena -- and sometimes in the medical care arena, we need to contact people immediately. -- I think there are

provisos in here from what I have seen, protections for
that kind of information that the Secretary of State
can -- can override that, can contact, give that
information of the address but also at the same time,
notify the person that that has been done, that there was
this -- I hate to say breach. -- but this need to give out

that information for protection.

You know, I do have some experience. I can tell you that from state government perspective, I think it would not be a problematic thing to default to the Secretary of State in terms of he or she and their -- their whole system in place as long as it's recognizable.

I am, frankly, a little bit concerned about the facet in there -- and I realize it has to stand. -- but the facet in there that says that there are certain people who can order that the address be given out. Some of the previous testimony and some of the experiences that I have with patients is while I think sometimes other members -- more in the judiciary branch and more local governments -- are well-intentioned, they sometimes do not recognize the danger with which these people -- under which these people are living.

And giving out that address or ordering it to be given out freely could be a risk. And frankly, from my perspective as a physician, death is the greatest risk. 1 REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Counsel Dalton has a

3 question.

MS. DALTON: I just want to follow up on what Representative Walko started to raise. And Dr. Filer, if you don't have the answer, that's okay because I don't either. But I know the folks that do are coming up after you.

DR. FILER: Right.

MS. DALTON: I'm just reading here regarding the waiver process. And it says, An agency that requests disclosure shall provide in writing to the Secretary. So I'm wondering -- I don't see any language here that speaks to private -- private folks like yourself.

If you saw a victim of domestic violence and that person gave you a confidential address, I'm wondering under the bill how you would get the actual address if in fact you did not meet the criteria on page 9 --

DR. FILER: As an agency.

MS. DALTON: -- which says, Failure to disclose a participant's actual address may result in physical harm to the program participant or family. And the other criteria is for law enforcement. So I just kind of raise a question there.

DR. FILER: I think that's a legitimate

question. I don't have the answer to that. Clearly, for
me, it would be at times critical. Hopefully, it would not
be -- the bar would still be kept very high. But there
will be times that it would be critical to contact an
individual.

If that can be done and the agent to do that is the Secretary of State or one of their designees, that would probably be very appropriate. There are times when, if we have a critical value, we may need to reach that person with some expediency.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Representative Daley.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you. Dr. Filer, could you repeat what Medicare eligible facilities must do with respect to training physicians?

DR. FILER: There is an organization called the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations, also affectionately known as JCAHO, J-C-A-H-O. And basically, they are -- they are inspected, these health care facilities are inspected on a regular basis by the Joint Commission.

They receive accreditation. They look not so much at the physical plant, but they look at policies and procedures. They look at really the nitty-gritty of the operations and whether they meet basic standards. It's a very cumbersome process, and yet it's designed to ensure

quality.

In this country, if you are to receive

Medicare payments from the federal government, you need to
be Joint Commission certified and -- or I'm sorry. -accredited; and that occurs every couple of years. The
Joint Commission, when it comes through, determines when
they need to come back.

And I believe it's five years is the maximum, but I may not -- that may be a little long. But there are some facilities which are deemed to be a little more precarious in their -- in their care. And they may be given a one-year. And they'll have to -- have to do some remedial work and be reevaluated again in a year if they do not meet Joint Commission standards and a whole series of standards that was written actually by a friend of mine who's an emergency room physician in Baltimore who sits on the Joint Commission. She also does a lot of domestic violence work. She wrote these -- the facets of this regulation.

And there are frankly many, many health care delivery systems in this state who are not yet fully operational. And it's not only this state. And yet I will tell you that from my experiences in traveling around the country, this state is way ahead of many others.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you.

74 1 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Dr. Filer, 2 again --3 DR. FILER: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON COHEN: -- our thanks, our 4 5 personal thanks to you for taking the time and being here. 6 DR. FILER: Thank you very much. 7 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: We appreciate it. 8 The next person to make a presentation to us is 9 Travis Tu, who is the Assistant to the Executive Director 10 of the American Civil Liberties Union. Mr. Tu, welcome. (Discussion off the record.) 11 12 Thank you again. And you CHAIRPERSON COHEN: 13 may begin to either read from your written testimony or 14 just make a presentation because we will certainly read 15 what you've brought before us. 16 MR. TU: Thanks so much. And thanks for 17 inviting us today. Good morning. My name is Travis Tu, 18 and I am here today on behalf of the over 10,000 members of 19 the American Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania to 20 express our support of House Bill 1436, a bill that would 21 create a system of confidential addresses for people 22 escaping domestic violence. 23 The ACLU has consistently advocated for 24 citizens' constitutional rights to privacy. But perhaps

the importance of ensuring a person's confidentiality is

25

1 never greater than in the case of survivors of domestic abuse who are attempting to conceal their whereabouts from their abusers.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Article 1, Section 1 of the Pennsylvania Constitution provides for certain inherent and indefeasible rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty; of acquiring, possessing and protecting property and reputation; and in pursuing their own happiness.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court has interpreted the constitutional protection of property and reputation to be an explicit quarantee of Pennsylvanians' rights to privacy. Tragically, victims of domestic abuse are commonly deprived of each of the enumerated inherent and indefeasible rights through physical violence, emotional abuse, and intimidation.

The ACLU believes that assisting a victim and maintaining confidentiality is one of the surest ways to adequately protect that person's constitutionally guarded rights and liberties.

With the proliferation of Caller ID phone services, the privacy rights of people fleeing abuse have been on the ACLU agenda nationally throughout this decade. In 1990, the ACLU was involved in a legal challenge to the implementation of Caller ID here in Pennsylvania.

We, along with the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence, feared that perpetrators of domestic violence could use Caller ID to discover where a victim was taking refuge and with whom. The plaintiffs asserted that potential breaches in confidentiality could put victims of domestic violence as well as their shelters and care providers at risk of retribution and increased violence.

The Commonwealth Court agreed, upholding an Administrative Law Judge's finding that Caller ID erodes an individual's privacy and thus presents a threat to battered women and those attempting to assist battered women.

Maintaining battered people's confidentiality not only serves to protect them from their abusers.

According to a newspaper report earlier this year, a fathers' advocacy group in Boston lawfully copied from court documents the addresses and phone numbers of all of the women who sought protection from abuse orders in that state in the last two years.

The group contacted a number of the women and questioned them about the validity of their charges. The group thought it could somehow substantiate its belief that charges of domestic violence are often falsified in order to secure sole custody of children. Because these court documents are public record, this or any group have the

ability to create lists of domestic abuse victims for solicitation.

This incident in Boston prompted Massachusetts
Attorney General Thomas Reilly to support legislative
measures to further protect victims' confidentiality. In
March, he told reporters, quote, A victim should not have
to forfeit the right to privacy simply because she has
sought court-ordered protection to domestic violence.

The ACLU urges the Pennsylvania General

Assembly to take the initiative to protect victims'

confidentiality before such invasions of privacy occur here
in Pennsylvania.

The ACLU recognizes and often advocates for people's right to information. The Pittsburgh Chapter of the ACLU concluded a case just this year that involved more than ten years of legal wrangling to obtain information from withheld FBI documents.

However, in our civil society, it commonly arises that full exercise of people's liberties creates conflict; and the courts are called upon to decide to what extent one person's liberty must be curtailed to ensure the more vital liberty of another.

We believe that the privacy interests of a person escaping domestic violence would far outweigh society's interest in having unfettered access to a

victim's personal information that is contained in the public record.

The growth of information technologies has dramatically affected ways in which the government and private agencies collect, store, and disseminate information. And the ACLU believes that easier access and exchange of information must be accompanied by more stringent privacy protections.

We are actively lobbying on both state and federal levels for measures that would guarantee the confidentiality of people's medical records and social security numbers. The erosion of people's privacy rights has most certainly infringed upon their pursuit of liberty and happiness. And we know too well that for domestic violence victims, disclosure of private information can sadly become a matter of life and death.

Confidentiality is not only a protective measure but also a necessary component in the process of psychological and emotional recovery from abuse. In 1980, the Pittsburgh Chapter of the ACLU was an amicus in a case that ultimately kept private some of the records of women recovering from sexual assault.

In its opinion in the case, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court stated that there is, quote, An undoubtable public interest in helping victims as well as an equally

compelling public interest in encouraging victims of
violent crime to come forward. One justice wrote in a
concurring opinion that the guarantee of confidentiality is
critical to fulfilling this public interest and essential
to achieve the maximum benefit from therapy.

state legislatures throughout the country have recognized a public interest in providing for the safety of victims. In all 50 states, civil protection order statutes have been enacted providing victims relief ranging from injunctions against future violence, exclusion from the family domicile, relinquishment of weapons, and payment of losses and attorneys' fees.

The federal government has also recognized the importance of ensuring the privacy of battered women. Federal grant money is withheld from support service programs that fail to provide documentation that procedures have been developed to assure the confidentiality of records pertaining to any individual provided family violence prevention or treatment services.

One of the provisions of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 called upon the US Postal Service to put in place new regulations to secure the confidentiality of domestic violence shelters and abused persons' addresses. Only five states, however, have gone so far as to adopt a system of protecting battered women by offering

state-monitored mailboxes.

In the state of Washington, hundreds of women have utilized that state's pioneering address confidentiality program. We are glad to report that the ACLU of Washington State has not received a single civil liberties complaint related to the program.

Numerous states are recognizing the benefits of such a program, and legislation similar to Pennsylvania's House Bill 1436 has been introduced this session in California and Massachusetts.

The ACLU of Pennsylvania believes that the Pennsylvania General Assembly should recognize the state's interest in providing for the privacy of victims of domestic violence. House Bill 1436 would go a long way toward fulfilling this obligation and thereby benefit the hundreds of Pennsylvanians who have been terrorized in their own homes.

Section 2 of Article 1 of the Pennsylvania

Constitution reads: "All power is inherent in the people.

And all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their peace, safety and happiness." It, therefore, seems appropriate that where this Commonwealth has an opportunity to procure the peace and safety of the all too common victims of domestic violence, it should do so.

1 Thank you for your consideration. And I would 2 be glad to take any comments or questions you have at this 3 time. CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Tu. 4 5 appreciate you being here. I believe that Counsel Dalton 6 has a question. 7 MR. TU: Sure. 8 MS. DALTON: Thanks for coming. Have you 9 taken a look at the other five states' statutes? 10 MR. TU: I haven't. 11 MS. DALTON: Okay. Well, then I'm going to 12 pass. 13 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Representative Daley. 14 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Yes. Are there any 15 steps that probably you recommend that the local courts 16 could take immediately in terms of adopting local court 17 rules to better protect the privacy of domestic abuse 18 victims? 19 MR. TU: I recognize that -- the issue there. 20 And unfortunately, since I'm not an attorney -- I'm just a 21 spokesperson for the ACLU. -- maybe that's a better 22 question to take back to the lawyers in our office and 23 provide you some recommendations in writing. 24 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Could you do that for

25

us?

1	MR. TU: Sure.
2	REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: And give that to the
3	Chairwoman.
4	CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Anything else?
5	REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: No. Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Well, again, we thank you
7	for your presentation and look forward to receiving the
8	additional information from you.
9	MR. TU: Thanks so much.
10	CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you very much.
11	MR. TU: Good luck to you.
12	CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. The next
13	person to make a presentation before the committee is John
14	Capowski who is the Associate Professor of Law at Widener
15	University School of Law. I believe that is the
16	Representative Daley's alma mater.
17	REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Yes. That's the
18	Harvard on the Susquehanna.
19	CHAIRPERSON COHEN: We want to thank you for
20	being here, and you may proceed any time.
21	MR. CAPOWSKI: As has already been mentioned,
22	I'm John Capowski, an Associate Professor of Law at
23	Widener's Harrisburg Campus, the Harvard on the
24	Susquehanna.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: We want to ask you what

25

kind of student Representative Daley was?

MR. CAPOWSKI: I was not there at the time, but I'm sure he was excellent.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: But you've heard. Okay.

MR. CAPOWSKI: I very much appreciate the opportunity to be here today really for two reasons. First is I believe strongly that victims of domestic violence in Pennsylvania very much need an address confidentiality program. Others have spoke eloquently to the need, and others will so I will not address that issue.

The other reason I'm very pleased to be here is that I and my students actually drafted the bill upon which 1436 is based. You people know better than I the often pace -- slow pace of the legislative process. And those students have since graduated, passed the bar and are practicing law as assistant district attorneys, as domestic violence victims' advocates, and in private practice in Pennsylvania but also in Colorado, Arizona and Florida.

I do have this semester a group of students who are going to be working with me on public interest legislation. So if you have any questions that I can't answer, they will stand ready to assist the committee. And we can provide you with written answers, I hope, in a relatively short time. They may not know yet that they stand ready since our first day of classes was just

yesterday.

1

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The legislation, as I see it, is actually quite modest in its scope. The draft that my students and 3 I initially produced would actually have been much wider and protected a much wider class of individuals, including 5 6 really any person who felt that he or she would be in 7 physical danger because of the release of an actual address. 8

The initial legislation we drafted included mental health workers who are in fact in the most dangerous profession in this country, as well as prosecutors, judges, and simply others who might fear a level of physical harm. I mention this not to denigrate the current legislation -- I think it's very good, very much needed. -- but simply to suggest that it is rather modest in scope. And one should not have great reservations about enacting a program of this -- this nature.

Because the legislation has been pared down, there should be one minor change made, assuming it stays in its current form, to line 7 on page 1 of the bill. It mentions "and others in physical danger." And in fact, if that's omitted, domestic violence victims are the only persons currently covered and would be the only persons mentioned in paragraph 1.

One question that comes up with any new piece
of legislation is whether it will work. This legislation
is working very well in the state of Washington, and 1436
is patterned after that Washington legislation. The
Washington program is administered as this one would be, by

the Secretary of State.

And the Secretary of State there is a very strong advocate of the address confidentiality program and has worked to support the establishment of these programs in other states. Our former Secretary of State, Yvette Kane, who is now a US District Court Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, has been very supportive of the establishment of an address confidentiality program as well.

And there are at this point six states that in fact have address confidentiality programs and several states that are considering establishing it. Pennsylvania, because of the Legislature, because in large measure the work of the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence and others, is really a leader in the area of protecting victims of domestic violence. And I believe House Bill 1436 would be a very helpful addition to the package of legislation in Pennsylvania that does protect — protect victims.

I have been told that someone's mentioned the

concern that this bill would make it easier for victims of
domestic violence to hide from court orders, from
enforcement of custody and visitation orders and from other
obligations. That simply is not the case.

First, the Secretary of State will have the actual address of the program participants. And second, the legislation actually makes it easier to get jurisdiction over a member or a person involved in the program since the legislation requires that all program participants designate the Secretary of State as a -- an agent for service of process.

So in fact, suing a person in the program will in fact be easier than suing an individual who is not in terms of jurisdiction. Now, anyone can attempt to hide, can attempt to skirt obligations. And this legislation doesn't stop a victim of domestic violence from doing that any more so than anyone else is stopped. But jurisdiction is easy to get these people, I think will be easier to find in many ways than others.

Whenever a program is established, some have a concern that people will avail themselves of the program who are not eligible. And I believe Representative True's earlier question alluded to that possibility. I don't think that's going to happen for two reasons.

I personally would dislike the idea of having

my mail delayed at the Secretary of State's office for
several days until I received it, my first-class mail.

Bills perhaps I could do without immediately. But there
are various magazines, correspondence from friends, et
cetera, that I like to have as soon as it's available.

Second, I would probably loathe even more paying for the delivery of my nonfirst-class mail. And persons involved in this program will have to do that for mail other than first class. They'll have to pay the cost of delivery from the Office of the Secretary of State.

So I don't think there will be people jumping to be involved in this program who do not need the protections of the program. In addition, there is a criminal penalty and misdemeanor for anyone giving a false statement on an application. I think that's unlikely regardless of the addition there in the legislation of the penalty.

Now, some will criticize the bill as not going far enough. And as I mentioned, I personally wanted to see a more expansive bill. But I think this is a very excellent step and perhaps will become more expansive at some time in the future.

Now, it is not a panacea by any means for victims of domestic violence in keeping their residences, their addresses, their whereabouts confidential. A

creative diligent stalker could certainly -- abuser -could certainly with diligence eventually find the
potential victim.

But it goes a long, long ways towards helping these people establish -- these people -- victims establish their confidentiality in staying away from -- from their abusers. And now I'd welcome questions that you have.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you, Professor

Capowski. We appreciate it. And thanks for getting the
ball rolling with drafting this legislation. I believe

Representative True has a question.

Professor, just to clarify something in my mind, I had read so many things and I've watched the video that was made when Washington State was putting this together.

And I thought -- and maybe that was some older information. -- that magazines and that type of thing were not to be forwarded.

So you're saying that they can be, all your first-class mail can be forwarded but you have to pay for certain things?

MR. CAPOWSKI: That's right. What I guess was formally called second or third-class mail, a recipient -- or a program participant can arrange at his or her expense

to have those materials forwarded by the Office of Secretary of State.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: So truly then, you could get almost any kind of -- any kind of mail at all so you're not limited then to --

MR. CAPOWSKI: One is not limited. It will simply cost the individual to be able to receive that mail.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Representative Maitland.

REPRESENTATIVE MAITLAND: Yes. Professor, thanks for your testimony today. In addition to asking will it work, we also like to ask what's it cost. Do you have any idea what the program cost is in other states?

MR. CAPOWSKI: I have some figures, have some figures that are outdated from Washington; and I can certainly update those. What my students and I did when we were first working on the legislation is we found out what the cost was in Washington State. We got the number of participants.

We compared the populations of Pennsylvania with those in Washington State and came up with a figure in that way. And I'd certainly be glad to provide the committee with information on the cost in Washington, and I hope we can get it from some other states as well.

REPRESENTATIVE MAITLAND: Thank you. Thank

1 you, Madam Chairman.

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Representative Carn.

3 REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you, Madam I want to thank you, Professor, for being a Chairperson. part of this effort and your students. You mentioned that initially the legislation included more than just victims of domestic violence. 7

Have that aspect of the proposal been instituted in any other state?

MR. CAPOWSKI: Actually, I'm not aware of other states that have as expansive a bill as the one we initially drafted.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: What was your reasoning for the expansion?

MR. CAPOWSKI: My reasoning was that there are other people in our society who are very much in danger in one way or another. And I believe it was Ms. Young who testified about her concerns, her experiences in stalking -- with stalking.

In addition, I know there are mental health workers who have the same problem that she faced. For example, I know judges who have been threatened and had their families threatened in similar circumstances. thinking was that these persons also deserve protection.

Now, the legislation, as one increases the

	91
1	number of persons who are eligible for the program, the
2	cost of the legislation increases as well. And I believe
3	there was some concern about the cost, that in part and
4	administrative costs that was the reason for the
5	legislation being pared down from what it was initially
6	drafted as.
7	REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Have you do you have
8	any documents or statistics that would suggest that we need
9	to expand?
10	MR. CAPOWSKI: I have no statistical
11	information that would support that. I have a good deal of
12	anecdotal information but not statistical. And I think the
13	number of additional participants would not be that large.
14	But the ones and therefore, the cost perhaps not that
15	great of including them.
16	At the same time, I think the protections for
17	those individuals would be very, very important.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Counsel Dalton, I believe, has a question.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. DALTON: Professor, thanks for coming today. I'm going to give you a chance to do what law professors do best, which is to teach us all about this bill. I have a couple of questions. For starters, can you tell me, is the intent of this legislation to cover access
by private entities like businesses and doctors' offices
and the like as well as access by state and local
governmental agencies?

MR. CAPOWSKI: After looking at the Washington State experience, we decided to really confine the legislation to state government agencies. In Washington, the experience had been that private businesses, for example, were very willing to accept the substitute address. And it had not become a problem for persons involved in the program.

In addition, we had some questions about actually enforcing the requirements of the act upon private entities, where it was very easy to do it upon state agencies.

MS. DALTON: Okay. So I guess what you're saying -- and correct me if I'm wrong. -- is that private businesses do not have to accept the confidential address then?

MR. CAPOWSKI: They would not have to under the legislation. But as I mentioned, the Washington experience is that they do.

MS. DALTON: Okay. Now I'm going to ask you the same question that I asked Dr. Filer. And that is, say, for example, a patient of hers came in and gave a

confidential address and she needed to get the real address but did not meet the waiver -- emergency requirements under the bill.

And the waiver requirements, as I read them, only pertain to state and local agencies. How would they go about getting access to the real address?

MR. CAPOWSKI: I think without knowing the circumstances in which the address was needed, it's a difficult question to answer. The bill needs to -- the legislation needs to protect the addresses as much as possible. Now, it seems to me, if it's an emergency situation, Dr. Filer's office could contact the police, who could then arrange to receive the address.

Outside an emergency situation, a situation of danger, I don't quite see or I don't at the moment have in mind situations where someone would truly need the address. Now, other than, for example, a state agency, there may be nonemergency situations concerning, for example, school registration.

MS. DALTON: Okay. That's my next question.

And I asked this of our first witnesses. Is it envisioned under the bill that elementary and high schools would be required to accept the confidential address on behalf of a child who had a PFA filed for them and the parents go ahead and get a confidential address?

MR. CAPOWSKI: Actually, at the moment, I
think it's unclear under the bill whether that would be
required. And as with any legislation affecting a state
agency, it strikes me the Secretary of State will probably
promulgate various regulations that will deal with the
specific workings of the legislation.

And it strikes me the Secretary of State's office will do that after talking with the school systems about what their need is for an actual address and whether the Secretary of State, for example, might simply certify that a student is within a district, which I see as perhaps the school's greatest need, certification within a district.

So I think that that detail, for example, still needs to be worked out but will be by the regulations with input from the school systems.

MS. DALTON: Okay. I just have one last question. And this actually goes to the wording of the bill. I'm trying to discern what you folks were -- intend us to do. It's on page 4 at lines 26 to 29. And here we're talking about who can become a program participant.

And you mentioned victims of domestic violence. And that of course --

MR. CAPOWSKI: Actually, I was grabbing my glasses first. You said page 4, line --

MS. DALTON: I'm sorry. Page 4, lines 26

through 29. And of course, victims of domestic violence

have a definition as under the PFA Act so we know what that

is.

MR. CAPOWSKI: Right.

MS. DALTON: But the first is that you file a protection from abuse order. That is very clear. I always confuse this when I don't have those little lists in front of me about whether that's a subparagraph or a paragraph or a clause so please forgive me.

The two little "i" there under -- two little
"i" at 26, what does this mean, "Are eligible to file
for a protection from abuse order pursuant to Chapter
61" -- that's in Title 23. -- "and file an affidavit
stating their belief that the affiant fears further violent
acts by the affiant's assailant"? What were you trying to
get at there?

MR. CAPOWSKI: We were trying to get at -- are getting at situations where a person has not and may not file for a protection from abuse order but would certainly have the grounds for filing for a protection from abuse order.

And I -- I know that earlier testimony, there were comments that the initial period of separation is one of great danger. The initial period of service, after a

	96
1	service of a subpoena to to appear pursuant to a
2	protection from abuse hearing is also a period of high
3	danger. And there may be people who decide not to file for
4	that very reason.
5	MS. DALTON: Okay. So what you're envisioning
6	is that the folks are eligible to file under the act but
7	they don't and instead file an affidavit?
8	MR. CAPOWSKI: Essentially saying they have
9	the same problem as if they, you know, that they would be
10	eligible to file.
11	MS. DALTON: Okay. And where would you
12	envision filing the affidavit, with the Secretary of State?
13	MR. CAPOWSKI: Secretary of State's office.
14	MS. DALTON: Thank you very much, Professor.
15	CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Oh,
16	Representative Daley has a question.
17	REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: I'm sorry, Madam
18	Chairwoman. His answer stimulated a question in my mind.
19	The whole issue about PFAs and I know this Bill 1436 is
20	dealing with one aspect of it. But by and large, I know
21	the people I deal with, I had a situation in my legislative
22	district where a woman was very fearful of her husband.
23	And she decided to get a PFA. She served the

PFA on him. He came right to the house, killed her, killed

her aunt, killed the kids. Now, that's the period of high

25

danger that you're talking about. There needs to be -- and I'm almost helpless when I talk to clients that say I want to file a PFA and I explain to them the inherent risks of doing that, that there needs to be a threshold that can be demonstrated to the court when you have that emergency hearing to get the preliminary order that can get these types of very high risk individual off the street completely and keep that person away from really hurting someone.

I know there's a whole host of constitutional questions regarding that. But maybe your students need to pursue that next level with making a PFA safer and much more workable in terms of protecting individuals from the death that they can perceive just by filing the PFA.

MR. CAPOWSKI: Yeah. We'd be glad to look at that. And I'm sure we'd be glad to work in conjunction with the people at the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence, seeing what additional protections might be afforded.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: We appreciate your willingness to continue to work with us. And as we make revisions to this, you can be sure we will contact you. We have a little bit of work to do concerning refining some of the language in the bill. And we appreciate the

1 | cooperation that you've given us. Thanks, Professor.

MR. CAPOWSKI: Well, we'd be very pleased to remain involved. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: You will be. Thank you.

The last two people scheduled today, Judy Yupcavage, who has appeared before us, the Public Policy Manager, as well as Vicki Cuscino, the Communications and Publications

Specialist, Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Welcome again, and you may proceed any time you're ready.

MS. YUPCAVAGE: Good morning. It's nice to see so many familiar faces here. I wanted to actually, before we start, put in a plug for Representative Cohen's bill that would require training for judges, which gets to Representative Daley's issue.

We can work really hard on providing information and guidelines on doing appropriate validity assessments in PFA proceedings. But if you don't have the audience, the judges to, you know, to teach and to preach to, it's pretty impossible to get at and to eliminate some of the homicides and the tragedies that — that occurred in this community.

And so I'd like to say we are strongly supportive of your bill that would require training for the Judiciary in Pennsylvania and we'd do whatever we can to

see that that's enacted.

2 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. I'm sorry.

3 Mr. Lane has -- who is a representative of the court, he

4 | walked out. I don't know if he --

5 MS. YUPCAVAGE: I'll say it again if he comes

6 back.

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

7 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Say it again if Mr. Lane

8 comes back.

MS. YUPCAVAGE: I'd be happy to.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. We will be pursuing that because you are correct, that is a critical

12 cog in this entire wheel. Thank you.

MS. YUPCAVAGE: Okay. Before I turn the mike over to Vicki, who's going to talk about why we worked with Widener on developing this legislation and why it's so important, I just wanted to point out that we've included today our homicide report that is for 1998 that lists 136

18 deaths in Pennsylvania.

And we know how the victims died. They were shot, stabbed, beaten, strangled, burned, suffocated, crushed and run over. We know how they died, but we don't know how they lived or tried to live before they died. And we don't know how many fled, relocated, hid, fled, relocated, hid over and over again until they were

25 hunted down and killed.

Trying to stay in hiding and maintain your privacy is incredibly hard, even for someone who's not in crisis. It's a difficult thing to do in this age of invasive technology. I practically started pandemonium in the Service Merchandise when I would not disclose my phone number when I was buying a pack of batteries, paying cash.

And the cashier said, I can't go any further until I have your phone number. The machine, you know, the transaction couldn't be completed until -- and they had to get the manager. I said, Just put in a fake number. Well, we can't do that because it throws out fake numbers. I mean, it is so hard even under the simplest circumstances.

I couldn't get a refund at K-Mart for 10.99 or something without giving my driver's license to them. I mean, everywhere you go, people want personal information about you. It is so hard. Imagine how hard it is to be in hiding, to be a battered woman, to be running for your life, to try to protect your children.

And everywhere you go, people are looking for personal, private information about you. Anything that the Legislature can do to increase protections and safeguards is so critical. And House Bill 1436 goes way beyond just a minor improvement. And so that's why we are so supportive of — of the efforts of you all in getting this enacted.

So now I'm going to turn it over to Vicki,

who's going to talk about the need for the bill.

MS. CUSCINO: Thank you. If you've never had to endure a beating, to ensure your children have a home, consider yourself lucky. If you've never had to submit to torture or rape to save your life, consider yourself lucky again. That's just a sampling of the maddening choices battered women are forced to make each day. Yet the inevitable question asked by outsiders is, Why doesn't she leave?

Domestic violence is an insidious crime with complex dynamics that make each situation different. But fear of lethal retaliation is a very real barrier.

Unfortunately, further violence upon separation from a batterer is possible and in some cases probable.

The Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence is seeking your support of an address confidentiality program in Pennsylvania because far too many of these cases end in tragedy, tragedies that could have been prevented.

Mary Ellen was a 39-year-old woman who sought refuge at one of our Pennsylvania domestic violence shelters. She feared that she could not remain safe in her home state, however, and fled to Florida to escape her husband's tyranny.

Despite her attempts, however, to escape the

violence and regain control over her own life, her husband tracked her down and killed her. Yet we dare ask, Why doesn't she leave? Clearly, escaping an abusive relationship is not as easy as the words suggest. Leaving

is a process, and it can be perilous.

methods to track down their victims so even relocation is not fail-safe. Often, the fewer people who know where a victim is, the safer she will be. That is the premise upon which the address confidentiality program was established in the state of Washington and that we hope to implement here in Pennsylvania.

This innovative legislative proposal recognizes that some battered women are forced to flee their homes, assume new names, change their social security numbers, and take myriad other precautions to keep their location a secret. In such cases, making their addresses public places them in imminent danger.

Think for a minute about all of the things we do in our daily lives that we take for granted such as voting, driving, using credit cards, making telephone calls. These are all things that battered women often must give up after escaping an abusive relationship to prevent further violence.

Pennsylvania, therefore, needs to accommodate

these citizens in establishing and maintaining confidential addresses to prevent their batterers from finding them through public records such as motor vehicles and voter registrations.

Although this legislation does not purport to protect the disclosure of the victim's address under all circumstances, it does -- excuse me. -- it does provide a significant step toward freedom and safety for those battered women who are forced to flee their batterers and their homes. A confidential address would comprise a critical component of safety planning for these women who fear further victimization or even lethal retaliation.

As you can see in our homicide report, the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence tracks homicides through Pennsylvania newspaper clippings. And we've been doing that for about the past eight years. And what we've been able to tell is that on an average, an adult or child dies every three days in this Commonwealth as a result of domestic violence.

Also, in 1992, a US Department of Justice study found that divorced or separated women are at greater risk of violence and experience the highest rate of violent crimes by relatives including spouses and ex-spouses.

Consider also that most stalking occurs in the context of domestic violence, and as many as 90 percent of women

murdered by former or current male partners are stalked prior to their deaths.

An advocate at one of our local domestic violence programs in Pennsylvania was a battered woman who escaped after 36 years of abuse. Her abusive husband had threatened to kill her, their two children and himself if she ever left. However, one night when she was sure that he would kill her regardless, she fled and successfully obtained a protection order.

Upon being served with a protection order, this woman's husband purchased four cemetery plots.

Throughout a divorce process that took several years, she continued living in fear that he could still carry out his promise.

Leaving such abusive relationships requires strategic planning and comprehensive interventions to safeguard victims and their children. Battered women simply cannot escape the violence in their lives without the support, safety, resources and justice they desperately need and deserve.

We live in a society that asks why doesn't she leave instead of why is he violent. So we need to make leaving safe and possible. Your endorsement of an address confidentiality program in Pennsylvania would help battered women reestablish their physical, social, and economic

105 1 independence and it would represent a significant 2 commitment to the prevention of domestic violence homicides in this Commonwealth. 3 4 On behalf of the Pennsylvania Coalition 5 Against Domestic Violence, I'd also like to thank Representatives True and Carn and the other members of this committee for your leadership in trying to protect battered 7 women and their children. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. 10 MS. CUSCINO: Thanks. And Judy and I will 11 take questions. 12 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: We shall. But Mr. Lane has reappeared. And I was hoping on the record you could 13 14 just make your statement again, please. 15 MS. YUPCAVAGE: I would be more than happy to. I would like to say that the Pennsylvania Coalition Against 16 17 Domestic Violence strongly supports legislation initiated and sponsored by Representative Lita Cohen that would 18 19 mandate training for the Judiciary in Pennsylvania on 20 issues of domestic violence. 21 CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. 22 MS. YUPCAVAGE: And we would be more than

fact, we already have it. So anyway, we could save that

happy to help in the development of the curriculum.

23

24

25

step.

	106
1	CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Thank you. Any questions
2	from any members of the panel? Representative Daley.
3	REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: One question. It's not
4	really a question. Good to see you, Judy, after all the
5	years of working on many issues together. I find it
6	remarkable that 35 percent of the people who were killed in
7	this domestic violence homicide report were men.
8	Now, maybe it's my naivete, but I would assume
9	that it would have been less. How do you react to that, if
10	you heard my question earlier?
11	MS. YUPCAVAGE: Sure. Twenty-seven of those
12	men were perpetrators or now wait. Let me see.
13	Twenty-seven were perpetrators who committed suicide. So
14	of that number and most of the other men were boyfriends
15	of the battered women who were killed by her by, you
16	know, her ex-partner.
17	So they weren't actually killed by women.
18	Eighty-two of the perpetrators were men of the 136
19	homicides. Thirteen of the perpetrators were women. So a
20	number of the deaths were caused by the men themselves who
21	committed suicide.
22	MS. CUSCINO: If I can add to that, out of
23	those 136, we found that at least 42 of those deaths

occurred when battered women had left or were in the

process of leaving their batterers.

24

25

And a breakdown of that: Twenty-five of the
victims were women killed by former intimate partners, ten
were men killed by their current girlfriend's former male
partners, six were children slain by their fathers, and one
was the mother of a battered woman who had left her
husband. And in that incident, the batterer also kidnapped
his estranged wife and shot her brother.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: You heard my other question concerning that next level of the PFA process where we realize that PFAs fundamentally -- really they don't stop anyone from doing anything unless they lock them up in jail unless there's some confidentiality protecting the whereabouts of the person.

At some point, Judy, maybe we could discuss with the Chairwoman and the committee about that next level that may have to be undertaken.

MS. YUPCAVAGE: We'd be happy to. I would like to say that as part of our public policy agenda of the Coalition, we're looking at omnibus amendments to the Protection from Abuse Act. And we'd be happy to strategize on what we can do to ensure some additional levels of protection.

And I still want to say, you know, training the Judiciary on lethality assessment is critical to that and identifying high risk offenders.

٦ |

•

Q

TO

of you for making your presentation today. My thanks to everyone who's been here, those of you who have presented written and/or oral testimony. I will repeat that we will take any written testimony that anyone desires to give us, and we'll incorporate it in the record.

CHAIRPERSON COHEN: Again, our thanks to both

This Domestic Relations Task Force has been in effect officially as the Domestic Relations Task Force, this is our fourth year. Two years prior to that, we dealt with a small portion of the issue. So we're really in our third term, sixth year concerning domestic issues.

We've had many hearings across the state during the last six years. We have heard from thousands of people either by letter, by telephone, in person, visit, testimony, et cetera. Before we go into each hearing, we always think we've heard it all before; we're just running these hearings as a courtesy; but we've heard everything and there's nothing new under the sun.

After we walk out of each hearing, we realize there's a lot that we didn't know. And I think this particular morning has demonstrated to us that domestic violence is far more pervasive, far greater a problem than we laypersons have realized.

It is a devastating issue that affects not just the victim and the perpetrator, but entire

communities, entire families. This particular bill, 1436,
is of critical importance. And I think the legislators
have recognized it, as we have 73 cosponsors of this bill,
which is an extraordinary number of people to sign up for a

bill just getting started off and running.

So this is an issue that we will certainly delve into, examine thoroughly and critically because it is such a vital issue and certainly one that is incumbent upon us as legislators. One of our jobs is to protect our citizenry, and this is certainly an area.

So I thank all of you for, certainly today, a rude awakening and letting us know how incredibly pervasive the area of domestic abuse is. I want to thank the members and certainly staff and a special thanks to Representatives Carn and True for introducing us to this issue.

And again, as always, my thanks to Karen

Dalton, not only counsel to the committee but my right arm.

To video, to our court reporter, thank you very much. This hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:20 a.m., the hearing adjourned.)

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. JENNIFER 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