ORIGINAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND CORRECTIONS HEARING

IN RE: HOUSE BILLS 2054 AND 2208
BOTTLE CLUBS

PITTSBURGH CITY HALL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
414 GRANT STREET
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 2002, 10:02 A.M.

BEFORE:

HON. STEPHEN MAITLAND, CHAIRMAN HON. DONALD WALKO

ALSO PRESENT:

JANE MENDLOW
MICHAEL SCHWOYER
JASON KLIPA

JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER NOTARY PUBLIC



ARCHIVE REPORTING SERVICE

2336 N Second Street (717) 234-5922 Harrisburg, PA 17110 FAX (717) 234-6190

T2002-099

ı		
1		I N D E X
2		
3	WITNESS	PAGE
4	Stephen Zappala	3
5	Barbara Burns	4 5
6	Regina McDonald	51
7	William Valenta	73
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Good morning. Wе 2 will call the meeting of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Corrections to order. 3 4 My name is Steve Maitland. I'm the 5 chairman, recently named Chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime and Corrections. 6 7 I'm joined today to my left by 8 Representative Don Walko from Pittsburgh here. from the Gettysburg area in Adams County. And to my 9 right is Mike Schwoyer, Chief Counsel of the 10 11 Judiciary Committee, and Jane Mendlow from the staff 12 of the Democratic Chairman, Kevin Blaum. 13 I want to welcome everyone to the 14 hearing. We are here to discuss bottle clubs and 15 some proposed legislation. 16 We have three parties testifying This is a new issue for me. I'm very 17 today. 18 interested to learn what the problems and concerns 19 are with bottle clubs here in Allegheny County and 20 what your proposed solutions are. 21 Without any further adieu, I would 22 like to invite the Allegheny County District 23 Attorney, Stephen Zappala. Please, have a seat 24 right here.

MR. ZAPPALA: I believe that the

25

chairman and the committee have been provided with my written statement. I'm going to paraphrase with your permission.

1 1

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Certainly.

MR. ZAPPALA: I preface my remarks with my thanks to the committee for your willingness to address this issue. I think it's rather significant. Hopefully, this is an issue that the entire Commonwealth can address, but certainly from Allegheny County's perspective, we've had some very substantial problems with after-hours clubs. And the fact of your willingness to address this is very much appreciated from our perspective.

thousand words, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, there is a video which is actually a compilation of seven different local news stories. There is one piece in particular involving an after-hours club on Wood Street in the city of Pittsburgh, SLP Club, and an event that took place there. And I know Commander Valenta and, I believe, Commander McDonald will speak to some extent about that particular incident and others that we have unfortunately experienced.

With your permission, may I?

1 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Please. 2 MR. ZAPPALA: The clip that you are going to see is an investigative report undertaken 3 by Andy Gastmeyer, who is an investigative reporter. 4 5 (Tape played.) MR. ZAPPALA: If I may also, 6 7 Representative Walko has been somebody who is a very substantial friend of law enforcement. And he was the first person we had contacted, not only because 9 10 this particular matter was within his district but 11 really, as I said before, he is a friend of law 12 enforcement and he's been very responsive to some of 13 the other needs that we had. 14 I appreciate that, sir. 15 REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you. MR. ZAPPALA: As I said from the 16 outset, I want to thank the Judiciary Committee and 17 18 their consideration and ask their support of House 19 Bill 2208, which creates a new Crimes Code Section 20 7330 which would prohibit weapons on the premises of 21 bottle clubs. 22 I'm not sure that our initial drafting 23 of this legislation which we did in conjunction with 24 Representative Walko was specific in that we were 25 identifying weapons being carried by patrons or

persons who had come onto the premises as opposed to persons who own the premises.

And, also, we would ask that you please consider supporting House Bill 2209, which amends existing Crimes Code Section 7327 concerning storage, consumption and sale of alcohol on an unlicensed business premises.

I proposed these amendments because of the pervasive and growing number of violent crimes. As was indicated with just this particular establishment, we had ten shootings in that area. I know that Commander Valenta -- and this is downtown in the city of Pittsburgh. It's not ironic that we sit here in City Council Chambers -- and you are going to hear from Councilwoman Barbara Burns who is the representative of the north side and some of the city.

There's been a very substantial effort by the Mayor's Office and by City Council to undertake something in the nature of a Renaissance, a very ambitious project to change the face, especially in the inner part of the city of Pittsburgh. It's issues like this that create unnecessary and very problematic issues for council and the mayor to overcome.

These are after-hours clubs. They are loosely defined as unlicensed operations dispensing liquor and alcoholic beverages beginning at 2 a.m. in the morning until 8 a.m. in the morning. You are going to hear more from Commander Valenta about some of the logistical and staffing and enforcement issues for a police department, the city of Pittsburgh specifically, to undertake police activities between those particular hours.

House Bill 2208 is designed to remedy the problem of owner/operator accountability. A second problem is that under current law, owner/operators face very little in the way of penalties with only summary offenses and some misdemeanors applying exclusively to actions involving the storage and consumption and sale of alcohol in after-hours clubs. This is an enforcement nightmare, and, again, you're going to hear more from the commanders and the councilwoman about that matter.

House Bill 2209 is designed to remedy deficiencies in penalties by beefing up the penalties under existing Crimes Code Section 7327.

Also, I understand that the Judiciary Committee is considering House Bill 2054. And with

respect to that particular piece of legislation, on behalf of law enforcement in Allegheny County, we do appreciate Representative Casorio's attention to this matter, but with all due respect, we believe that the manner of the redrafting of the definition of bottle club would be inconsistent with what we believe needs to be done to effectively enforce the Crimes Code and effectively control the operation of these types of establishments.

. 14

I cannot support that, and I would ask that the Judiciary Committee please consider that as this legislation moves forward.

House Bill 2208, I would like to emphasize that the targets of the bill are bottle clubs and after-hours clubs, all of which are not licensed operators under the Liquor Code. The bill is restricted in its application, and any licensed establishment under the Liquor Code would be unaffected by House Bill 2208.

The fact that the bill is limited in its overall application does not lessen the need for its passage. House Bill 2208 would be viewed as a carefully crafted piece of legislation designed to create a real deterrence to violent criminal behavior in unlicensed liquor establishments.

Examination of the bill demonstrates how it will accomplish this goal.

House Bill 2208 will add a new section, Section 7330, to the Crimes Code and incorporate by reference the definition of bottle club found in existing Section 7329. That definition is set forth in the prepared statement which has been offered into the record.

operator under the Liquor Code. The status of a bottle club avoids the licensing requirements of the Liquor Code because the owner/operator generally gives the alcohol away for free and charges an admission and/or show. Some of the more common types of bottle club situations are exotic dancing, those types of things.

Although there are other variations on this theme of running a club, by employing the definition of a bottle club the bill will certainly encompass an after-hours club, which is a completely illegal operation that seeks to dispense liquor in violation of existing Crimes Codes 7327 between the hours of 2 a.m. and 8 a.m.

Patrons typically arrive after the hours of normal licensed restaurants and bars. I

think you are going to hear from Commander Valenta that, in fact, there are a lot of persons who come into the city of Pittsburgh. And I think we are going to talk to some extent about the Strip District area, which I believe is also part of Representative Walko's constituency.

- 23

It's an area of tremendous potential.

There's some great places to go. There's some great places to eat down there. It's an area that the city promotes when it advertises what we do and who we are to other persons throughout this country.

I do not believe that it was the intention of City Council or the Mayor -- and, certainly, the Councilwoman will speak to this matter if I'm incorrect in this assumption -- as this area began to develop and continues to develop for patrons to come down after the hours. If that was the idea from the beginning, then the businesses that began to locate down there and began to run their operations, I think they would have viewed coming to that area differently. It's just a different type of clientele, and it creates very different types of situations in terms of police operations.

House Bill 2208 targets the

owner/operator of the bar, not for the liquor offense he or she may be committing under Crimes Code 7327, but the collateral crimes that the club generates at the establishment. By imposing liability on the owner/operator for the violent crimes committed by his patrons, the law will force him to police his own establishment to avoid prosecution.

2.4

It is these collateral crimes that often create the biggest nuisance for the community and run the grave risk of death or bodily harm. I would reference the committee to the video footage that we started with.

The law is not quick to allow criminal liability on one person for the criminal conduct committed by a third party if there is no accomplice or conspiracy liability present. Thus, it's virtually impossible to hold the owner/operator guilty for the third-party actions of his patrons should they kill someone or get into a fight or commit some other type of serious crime.

Yet, a way to impose significant criminal liability on the owner/operator is possible with House Bill 2208, because it drafts a statute that makes the operator liable for allowing a

potentially dangerous situation to arise.

2.1

making the owner/operator liable for firearms or offensive weapons found and/or used on the premises. A statute that makes the offense itself allowing or permitting the firearms or offensive weapons onto the premises in effect makes the bottle club operator and his employees the watchdog of the premises.

The grading of such an offense can then be differentiated by whether the weapon was used or was not used in a crime on the premises. This would make the owner/operator liable not for the criminal conduct of the third party patron, but liable for his own action of failing to keep the premises weapon free. House Bill 2208's creation of Crimes Code Section 7330 furthers the goal of holding operators of bottle clubs accountable for their patrons' actions. I would again emphasize that this is directed at patrons.

House Bill 2208's

prohibition-of-weapons-on-premises statute for the

bottle club is consistent in regulating bottle clubs

in the same manner as existing Statute 7329, which

prohibits certain types of lewd, immoral or improper

entertainment on the premises, and makes the operator liable for that type of activity. The operator would be liable if he lets the weapons on the premises. Thus, bottle clubs are already regulated under the law in this fashion, and House Bill 2208 does not create a novel approach to regulating these types of establishments. It simply targets a different societal ill that is present in bottle clubs.

Use of the bottle club definition of Section 7329 serves a number of useful purposes. Please remember that an after-hours club operator is always operating an illegal operation by its very nature, because it's illegal under Section 7327 of the Crimes Code to sell or provide for consumption of alcohol between the hours of 2 a.m. and 8 a.m. A regular bottle club that gives the alcohol away during regular hours is not illegal.

However, by using the definition of bottle club, those clubs operating during allowable business hours will have to comply with the new weapons offense. Without the potential threat of losing a liquor license, the bottle club operator currently does not have the proper incentive to keep the public nuisance to a minimum at his

establishment.

1.5

Creating a weapons-on-the-premises offense will provide a proper inducement to require the bottle club operator to at the very least ensure that his premises do not have deadly offensive weapons, with all the collateral consequences such items entail. And, again, we are not talking just about potential harm to other patrons. We are talking about potential harm to police officers who would respond to a 911 call, for instance.

bottle club definition, the new weapons statute effectively applies only to unlicensed premises. The proposed weapons statute would not apply to restaurants that have a BYOB type of designation, because they will not meet the definition of bottle club.

Accordingly, the Legislature will not only be regulating the illicit after-hours clubs, but will in addition be once again regulating a very narrow industry of bottle clubs with the new statute. This is an area it has already felt compelled to treat specially in the past, as exhibited by Section 7329 and 7328 which allow for a community referendum to ban bottle clubs altogether.

The most significant difference between the 7329 lewd entertainment offense and House Bill 2208's proposed Section 7330 weapons-on-the-premises offense is that 7329 has an enumerated intent of knowingly imposed as an element of the offense, but the new Section 7330 has no specific intent required as an element and imposes absolute liability on the operator of the bottle club.

Mr. Chairman, pages -- and I have a working copy of what I submitted so I'm not sure the pages will be the same. In my working copy, pages 6, 7, 8, 9, there is a legal analysis of the Constitution protections that a person who is accused of a crime should be entitled to and specifically the due process protections, as well as a history of the use of absolute liability.

For the committee's information, I sit on the Executive Board of the District Attorneys'
Association. And I'm the Chairman of the Appeals
Section of that association. The gentleman who primarily assists me in drafting appeals -- we file amicus briefs on behalf of all the District
Attorneys in Pennsylvania -- is a gentleman named
James Gilmour. He's an Assistant District Attorney

in my office.

I know that Jim and I want to thank Council for working with Mr. Gilmour on developing some of these theories. I know they've talked this through.

I would respectfully submit that we have taken this matter to the District Attorneys'
Association Executive Committee. And that committee has voted unanimously to support my efforts to assist the committee in bringing about these changes in the law.

In addition, House Bill 2208's

Subsection (c) of the proposed Section 7330 is

present to impose liability for violation of the

weapon-on-the-premises offense on the corporations

that may own and operate bottle clubs. This

provision will allow prosecutors to pierce the

corporate veil of companies so that individuals

cannot try to mask their connection and

responsibility for actions that occur on the

premises.

In other matters which my office is presently addressing, one specifically deals with a nursing care facility. We are seeing elaborate types of corporate structures used to protect

persons I believe to be criminals. And any time that we have the opportunity to advance to the Legislature some of the issues that we have with piercing the corporate veil and an opportunity to better address these structures, which, in my opinion, in certain respects do protect criminals on particular types of offenses. We would ask that the committee just recognize that we do have some very difficult legal issues sometimes with these corporate structures.

Lastly, in House Bill 2208 the definition of firearm and offensive weapon is simply taken verbatim from the existing language of Section 908 of the Crimes Code. The exemption for the use of blackjacks by trained law enforcement officers provided in Section 908(d) is specifically incorporated into the definition of offensive weapon.

Accordingly, House Bill 2208
represents a comprehensive piece of legislation that
will act to hold bottle clubs and after-hours clubs
accountable, in our opinion, in a meaningful way for
collateral criminal conduct that may arise from
dangerous weapons on the clubs' premises.

With the enactment of Section 7330 and

its newly proscribed criminal conduct, the owner/operators of the after-hour clubs and bottle clubs will finally be liable for running establishments that generate a large amount of collateral nuisance crime to our community, and that type of crime being very often violent in nature. I respectfully request that you support 2208.

As to House Bill 2209, I had said repeatedly that current law prohibiting the illegal storage, sale or consumption of alcohol between the hours of 2 a.m. and 8 a.m. must be revised, and House Bill 2209 accomplishes this task in many significant ways.

Although House Bill 2208 and House Bill 2209 are independent pieces of legislation and not dependent upon one another, I feel they should be viewed as a coordinated approach to curbing the problem of after-hours clubs. Therefore, I urge the committee to support both pieces of legislation in their entirety.

Passage of House Bill 2209 will amend Section 7327 of the Crimes Code by increasing the penalties for the operation of these illegal businesses.

Presently 7327 is the single

comprehensive section that applies to an owner/operator of an unlicensed after-hours business. Section 7327 makes it a summary offense for a person to allow the storage for the purpose of consumption of alcohol between 2 a.m. and 8 a.m. or the consumption or sale of liquor between the hours of 2 a.m. and 8 a.m. on premises not licensed under the Liquor Code.

1.0

.12

I think the committee has had an opportunity to see -- in part, this was a nuisance bar operation. And I think my involvement was characterized as chairing. I do not. I am an active partner with the Nuisance Bar Task Force and very proud of the participation of the city of Pittsburgh Police, the Sheriff's Department, and the Liquor Control and Enforcement Agents of the State Police.

Sometimes those are very costly, very time consuming types of operations. Commander McDonald is here, I guess, for the pleasure of the committee, and she can speak to logistical issues and some of the successes and difficulties we have had with the Nuisance Bar Task Force.

I've also been advised by colleagues of mine in the east, our Nuisance Bar Task Force is

one of the most active in the Commonwealth. And we are very proud of the work they do, but nonetheless when we are addressing these types of situations and the most significant penalty that the owner of these establishments is looking at is a summary offense, obviously, we can confiscate the liquor and some of the other items on the premises, but they kind of laugh at you and then operate someplace else.

2.1

Passage of House Bill 2209 would amend 7327 increasing penalties. Presently 7327 is a single -- I went through that already, didn't I? Section -- it makes it a summary offense. Summary offenses are punishable with a term of incarceration of up to 90 days and a fine of up to \$300. There is no other Crimes Code section applying to alcohol-related activities of after-hours clubs that is the subject of this memorandum.

The Liquor Code also prohibits certain unlicensed activity regarding alcohol in three subsections. Section 4-491(1) prohibits the sale -- this is under the Liquor Code -- of alcohol in contravention to the Liquor Code and prohibiting unlicensed sale of alcohol; Section 4-492(2) prohibits the unlicensed sale of alcohol for consumption on premises where sold; and 4-492(3)

prohibits the unlicensed sale of alcohol not for consumption upon such premises where sold, take out beer establishments.

The penalties for these violations of unlicensed activity is an ungraded misdemeanor with the penalty being set forth as a mandatory fine of \$100 to \$500; and if no payment of the fine is made, imprisonment of not less than one month nor more than three months. Second or subsequent offenses face a mandatory \$300 to \$500 fine, and imprisonment of for not less than three months and up to a year.

In addition, the Liquor Code penalizes unlicensed violations of the Code with a graduated fine based on the quantity of alcohol involved, with a \$2 per fluid ounce for each container of beer (malt or brewed beverage) and \$4 per fluid ounce for each container of wine or liquor found on the premises where the sale was made or attempted.

House Bill 2209 acts to enhance the existing penalties for storage, consumption, and sale of alcohol after 2 a.m. under 18 PA C.S., Section 7327 from a mere summary to a misdemeanor grade. What we are advocating is for the first time offenders, House Bill 2209 imposes a second degree misdemeanor. A DUI is a second degree misdemeanor.

A second degree misdemeanor would allow for a fine up to \$5,000 and a term of imprisonment of not more than two years. For second and subsequent offenses, House Bill 2209 enhances the penalty to a first degree misdemeanor, which would allow for a fine up to \$10,000 and a term of imprisonment of not more than five years. These are the types of tools that I believe -- and based upon conversations with members of our Judiciary -- can do effective work in assisting law enforcement in restricting these types of illegal activities.

2.4

. 25

In addition to the grade change, House Bill 2209 properly amends Crimes Code Section 7327 to impose mandatory fines. The after-hours clubs are extremely lucrative, we believe, in terms of their cash flow. And current fines of up to \$300 on a summary offense under Section 1101, Subparagraph (7) are simply not a deterrent.

Moreover, because these operations are blatantly illegal, with no room for an innocent mistake by the actor in the commission of the offense, and, again, being lucrative in our opinion, the imposition of a mandatory minimum fine of \$1,000 for the first offense and a mandatory minimum fine of \$5,000 for second and subsequent offenses I think

is fully justified.

The seriousness of the offense of running an after-hours club with all the collateral nuisance crime and disturbance to the neighborhoods they engender warrants mandatory prison terms in addition to the mandatory fines. I'm not a big advocate of mandatory sentences, but that's something that we considered and we would submit that, and whatever the committee believes is best.

This mandatory minimum is wholly consistent with the minimum imposed in the Liquor Code, which provides mandatory minimums for licensed violators. If licensed violators can receive a mandatory minimum, it makes little sense that an unlicensed violator doing a completely illegal act receive a lesser punishment. The mandatory minimum after the first violation should serve as a clear warning and deterrent.

These changes in grade from a summary to a misdemeanor would be wholly consistent with the current practices for other nuisance type of crimes. As noted earlier, the Liquor Code offenses are at a minimum ungraded misdemeanors with stiffer fines than the present summary penalties imposed, and the Liquor Code has mandatory minimum terms of

Incarceration.

The Legislature's use of stiff

penalties in nuisance situations is not

unprecedented. For example, the nuisance offense of

scattering rubbish jumps to a third degree

misdemeanor on the second and subsequent offense for

a regular individual, but a commercial trash hauler

is guilty of a second degree misdemeanor for the

first offense and a first degree misdemeanor for the

second and subsequent offense.

Accordingly, I would respectfully submit that the bottle club can be likened to the commercial trash hauler, in that it is a business for pecuniary gain that is causing the nuisance and should be treated in a more severe manner for blatantly violating the law.

Likewise, under the Crimes Code, a regular offense of public nuisance is a second degree misdemeanor. It simply doesn't make sense that nuisances that are caused by owner/operators of illegal activity with the controlled substance of alcohol should be treated as a mere summary offense. This is especially true when the collateral consequences of these after-hours clubs are weighed into consideration.

For this reason, I feel both the change in grade and the imposition of mandatory minimum terms of imprisonment and fines is appropriate and should be, in my opinion respectfully, supported by the committee.

Lastly, in amending Section 7327,

House Bill 2209 adds an enforcement subsection to
authorize not only regular police that are Act 120
certified and the Pennsylvania State Police to
enforce the provision, but to include authorization
of the Pennsylvania State Police enforcement
officers and investigators. As I said previously,
the ladies and gentlemen of the LCE are very
prominent members of the Nuisance Bar Task Force.
They provide substantial intelligence to the police
community, and they are active partners in this
initiative. Presently, they have no jurisdiction
with unlicensed establishments.

As I said also previously, as to House Bill 2054, I again want to thank Representative Casorio for his attention to this matter. And I have had the opportunity this morning to try to express the significance of this particular legislation to the people of Allegheny County and to the city of Pittsburgh.

The city of Pittsburgh has just untaken a referendum restricting bottle clubs in certain neighborhoods. I'm sure Representative Walko can speak more to that issue and supplement the record in that regard. The definition that's being advocated on that piece of legislation is inconsistent, I think, in a lot of respects with what we are trying to accomplish.

Rather than get into the detail, this is a part of the written information that has been offered to the committee. I will let Councilwoman Burns and/or the commanders who are present this morning at the discretion of the chairman elaborate on the referendum as well as the definitions.

Sir, with that being said, I would offer the tape that was shown initially, again, the segment which was viewed was from WPXI which is the NBC affiliate here in Pittsburgh, and I would also offer this very short memorandum which outlines some of the other matters.

You have my remarks, I think, Mr.

Chairman?

1 4

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Yes.

MR. ZAPPALA: With that, I have taken up a lot of your time this morning. I welcome you

```
1
     to Pittsburgh. I thank you, again, for your
 2
     attention to this, in our opinion, very significant
 3
     matter.
 4
                   I will be pleased to address whatever
 5
     issues I may for you at this point.
 6
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Well, thank you
 7
     very much for your very comprehensive testimony.
 8
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Thank you, sir.
 9
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Are there any
10
     questions?
11
                   REPRESENTATIVE WALKO:
                                           Yes.
12
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Representative
     Walko.
13
14
                   REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you, Mr.
15
     Zappala.
16
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Thank you, sir.
17
                   REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I'm unclear.
                                                          Ι
18
     think even if these pieces of legislation become law
19
     and even with the Home-Rule Charter Amendment --
20
     correct me if I'm wrong -- bottle clubs are still
21
     legal?
22
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Bottle clubs are legal,
23
     yes.
24
                   REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: It's just
25
     certain conduct, storage of alcohol, selling
```

```
alcohol, and then, of course, the firearm issues?
 1
 2
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Yes, sir.
 3
                   REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Why is storage
 4
     of alcohol a problem?
 5
                   MR. ZAPPALA: It's part and parcel of
     the business. It's a bar. It's a bar business.
 6
 7
                   REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: It is legal for
     patrons to get alcohol from the bottle clubs,
 8
 9
     correct?
10
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Yes. But alcohol cannot
11
     be sold.
               There's an admission that's paid. We're
12
     seeing something similar at these rave parties. You
13
     come in and you pay for the price of admission or
14
     you pay for bottled water, when really it's a front
15
     for an illegal activity, which is the distribution
16
     of Ecstacy. We see some similarity in that.
17
                   REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: And I quess --
18
     would you prefer to wait for Councilwoman Burns to
19
     talk about the Home-Rule Charter and the impact of
20
     the passage of the amendment?
21
                   MR. ZAPPALA: I would, sir, because I
     know the Councilwoman has been very outspoken and
22
     she rather eloquently has expressed the position of
23
24
     the city and the significance of the referendum.
25
                   REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you.
                                                       Ι
```

```
1
      really appreciate you involving the General Assembly
      in the manner in which you did on this and other
 2
 3
      issues.
  4
                    MR. ZAPPALA: And I thank you for your
 5
      help, sir.
  6
                    CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: I have a couple
 7
      questions for you. I'm trying to grasp the
      difference between a bottle club and an after-hours
 8
 9
      club. Can you just give me the layman's
10
      distinction?
11
                    MR. ZAPPALA: Bottle clubs are
12
      licensed. You can enter the premises, but you can't
13
      sell alcohol. Alcohol can be on the premises.
                                                       Ι
14
      used the example of the exotic dancers.
15
                    After-hours clubs would be kind of
16
      like a speakeasy in the early days of the 1900s.
17
      They are illegal. That was the SLP Club. They are
18
      not licensed, and they are obviously not regulated
19
      sufficiently in our opinion.
20
                    CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: And bottle clubs
21
      are licensed by?
22
                    MR. ZAPPALA:
                                  The LCB.
23
                    CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Okay. You had
24
      mentioned problems piercing the corporate veil. Can
. 25
      you maybe illustrate for me, give me an example of
```

what you mean by that and how the legislation gets to that?

MR. ZAPPALA: Yes, sir. In my tenure

-- we are seeing more and more elaborate criminal
conspiracies because of the use of technology. In

my tenure as District Attorney, I do not recall the
need to even analyze matters for the imposition of
corporate criminal liability until the last year and
a half. I used specific reference to a facility
which takes care of the needs of Alzheimer's
patients who are seniors. There is a very, very
substantial corporate structure, and it makes it
very difficult to assign specific criminal
responsibility.

I don't know how to explain this in a short period of time, and I have taken a lot of your time this morning. It is something we are seeing more and more of. In the entertainment business, in the liquor business, there are people that we are aware of that have multiple numbers of interest or parts of interest in different types of entertainment establishments.

We anticipate and we believe that some of the same corporate structures would be utilized to protect not only from civil liability in the

```
event of somebody suing because of injuries on
 1
     premises, and I'm not sure about the insurance
 2
 3
     issues in that regard either. They are, in my
     opinion, being used to shield people from criminal
 5
     liability.
 6
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: How many bottle
 7
     clubs are there in your jurisdiction, roughly?
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Bottles clubs, I quess
 8
 9
     we could give you an answer through the LCB.
10
     After-hours clubs we cannot. When we do hit these
11
     places, they move. With the SLP Club, we actually
12
     padlocked the premises which we had the ability to
13
     do as a common nuisance. We go to the civil side of
14
     the courts and we close them.
15
                   But this gives us, I think, a lot more
16
     ammunition and better weapons to address the
17
     problems because they just move around.
18
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Is it currently
19
     legal for a person licensed to carry a firearm to
20
     carry a firearm into a regular bar establishment?
21
                   MR. ZAPPALA: I believe it would be as
22
     long as you have a license to carry the weapon
23
     concealed.
24
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Under this
25
     legislation, it would be illegal to carry one into a
```

```
bottle club?
 1
 2
                   MR. ZAPPALA: It would impose
 3
     liability on the owner/operator if that weapon comes
 4
     onto the premises and is used in the commission of a
     crime, yes. I believe that's how we drafted it.
 5
 6
                    CHAIRMAN MAITLAND:
                                        Thank you.
 7
     the staff have any questions?
 8
                   MR. SCHWOYER: I do.
                                          Thank you.
                                                      As a
 9
     follow-up to that last question, your intent is to
10
     impose liability only if the weapon is brought into
11
     the bottle club and used in the commission of a
12
     crime?
13
                   MR. ZAPPALA: We had drafted it
14
     several different ways.
15
                   REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I think the
16
     bill does not require it to have been used, the mere
17
     presence on the premises.
18
                   MR. ZAPPALA: I'm sorry, that's the
19
     final version, yes.
20
                   MR. SCHWOYER: And my reading of 2208,
2.1
     it would not be an offense for a person who was
22
     properly licensed to bring it onto the premises?
                                                         Ιt
23
     would not be an offense for the person to do so, it
24
     would be an offense for the owner/operator or the
25
     corporation who permitted it to come on?
```

```
1
                   MR. ZAPPALA:
                                  Yes, sir.
 2
                   MR. SCHWOYER: Do you --
 3
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Excuse me, assuming
 4
     properly licensed and you're not a felon in
 5
     possession of this weapon.
 6
                   MR. SCHWOYER:
                                  Right. So then if a
 7
     properly licensed individual was attempting to enter
     a premises with his properly licensed firearm, then
 8
 9
     his choices are leave it outside or don't enter the
10
     premises?
11
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Right. And he's not
12
     going to leave it outside. He's going to leave.
13
                   MR. SCHWOYER: Some general questions
14
     in 2208 under (e) exemptions, if you would have an
15
     opportunity or your staff to review the current
16
     prohibition of firearms in court facilities and the
17
     language used there to permit law enforcement
18
     officers and persons engaged in enforcing the law
19
     within the court facilities to bring weapons and
20
     firearms, etc., in just in the interest of trying to
2.1
     be consistent and make sure we don't conflict
22
     between two different sections?
23
                   MR. ZAPPALA: I would be glad to.
24
                   MR. SCHWOYER: You talked several
25
     times about the difficulty that these corporate
```

structures caused for holding somebody accountable on both the civil and the criminal side.

MR. ZAPPALA: If I may, I have a philosophical issue that we wrestle with, with what happened nationally with Enron and with the criminal indictments of Arthur Anderson as a corporation. I have a problem proceeding against a corporation where it may hurt innocent people or persons that have no involvement whatsoever with the criminal activity. It's one of the considerations.

MR. SCHWOYER: Is that a problem with current Section 7327? There is no express language in there. Just a thought I had, is that the Crimes Code has a section on how to charge a corporation, hold a corporation accountable and members of the board of directors or whatever officers are held accountable.

MR. ZAPPALA: It's not a difficult theory in most circumstances.

MR. SCHWOYER: Right. Just a thought that I have is by having 7327, 28, 29, now 30, all dealing with the same sort of conduct in bottle clubs, and then putting this special corporate section into 7330 and not at least looking at whether or not it needs to be in 27, 28, 29, could

```
1
      cause the courts to start interpreting things
 2
      perhaps in ways that we don't wish them to be
 3
      interpreted.
  4
                    Again, if somebody could look and
 5
      provide us with thoughts on just that same corporate
  6
      language maybe put in any of these other sections.
 7
                    MR. ZAPPALA: With your permission,
      Mr. Chairman, I will have my lawyers work with
 8
      counsel for the committee.
 9
10
                    CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Certainly.
11
                    MR. ZAPPALA: Thank you.
12
                    MR. SCHWOYER: Your thoughts on the --
13
      you talked about the Liquor Code and the fines
14
      there. Do you believe those fines are consistent
15
      with the fines in the proposed section of the Crimes
16
      Code?
17
                    MR. ZAPPALA: We tried to make them
18
      consistent, yes.
19
                    MR. SCHWOYER: Are the fines in the
20
      Liquor Code for the unlicensed sale of alcohol in
- 21
      your opinion sufficient? One hundred to five
22
      hundred I believe I heard you say at one point.
23
                    MR. ZAPPALA: Is it sufficient?
                                                      Ι
24
      don't know about that, but it's a movement in the
25
      right direction.
```

What makes it difficult is we rarely have financial -- good financial information on the persons who operate these types of businesses. It's a lot of cash.

1 4

MR. SCHWOYER: Okay. So I understand current law, 7327 of Title 18 dealing with storage, that's what makes it an offense for these after-hours clubs, unlicensed clubs, to have people pay to get in the door and then drink for free out of a keg?

MR. ZAPPALA: Anything alcohol related, whether you are a bottle club, whether you are a BYOB, whether you are a restaurant or whatever, those are all regulated by the Liquor Code. After-hours clubs are wholly illegal. They have alcohol on premises, they are not licensed, they are not regulated.

And what's even more problematic is some of the ladies and gentlemen who are most necessary for our efforts in enforcing the Liquor Code, the liquor control enforcement agents, they have no jurisdiction to assist us. So from an intelligence standpoint, we oftentimes are at a disadvantage.

MR. SCHWOYER: So we would have to

```
amendment the Liquor Code to give the liquor
 1
 2
     enforcement officers jurisdiction to help you?
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Under House Bill 2209,
 3
     we are amending the Crimes Code under Section 7327.
 4
                   MR. SCHWOYER: I see.
 5
                   MR. ZAPPALA: If you would be more
 6
 7
     comfortable with us trying to do that under the
     Liquor Code, I'm sure we could work with counsel.
 8
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: I'm not sure what
 9
10
     would be best.
11
                   REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Probably that.
12
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Yes.
13
                   MR. SCHWOYER: May I?
14
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Yes.
15
                   MR. ZAPPALA: I thank you, by the way,
16
     for your office's comprehensive analysis of the
17
     proposed legislation.
18
                   MR. SCHWOYER: I'm trying to learn to
19
     stay with you.
20
                   MR. ZAPPALA: We may have a job for
21
     this guy in Pittsburgh.
22
                   MR. SCHWOYER: You talked about
23
     different ways which these -- again, I too, I'm sure
24
     that I misuse the term bottle club and after-hours
25
     club. We're talking about these places where they
```

```
1
     aren't licensed and you drink after 2 a.m.
                                                  When the
 2
     other bars close, you get there. I guess that's the
 3
     after-hours club.
 4
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Right.
 5
                   MR. SCHWOYER: You mention there are
 6
     different ways in which these places operate. You
7
     talked about you get in the door for free and
     there's the alcohol, but everybody is there to see
 8
 9
     the entertainment in the back room that costs you
10
     money to get in.
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Actually, that's a
11
12
     bottle club.
13
                   MR. SCHWOYER: That's a bottle club.
14
                   MR. ZAPPALA: You pay to get in and
15
     they don't charge you for the alcohol. We are
16
     talking about the same hours, 2 a.m. to 8 a.m.
     After-hours clubs are like the SLP club.
17
18
     like Dodge City, there are no rules. People are
19
     coming --
20
                   MR. SCHWOYER: Go in and drink and
21
     dance.
22
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Whatever you want to do,
23
     drugs, whatever.
24
                   MR. SCHWOYER: Based upon the current
25
     law, if I were to be an aspiring entrepreneur and
```

went out and I rented some building and let people

walk up my steps for free and get into this area

where I had a keg and we were just doing pitcher

after pitcher after pitcher; and then I had

entertainment or a dance floor in the back and I

charged you ten bucks to get to the dance floor, it

doesn't seem that that sort of conduct would even be

covered by the definition of a bottle club. So

would that be a --

MR. ZAPPALA: We're talking somebody in the business, the entertainment business, as opposed to just a group of people getting together with a keg or something like that dancing.

MR. SCHWOYER: Right.

MR. ZAPPALA: We want young people, especially in our city, to have a good time. What our problem is, is kind of I think what you saw from the WPXI footage.

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Jane.

MS. MENDLOW: Mr. Zappala, I was just wondering if you could explain why it makes sense for these sections of law to deal with the bottle clubs to appear in the Crimes Code rather than in the Liquor Code. Clarify that for me.

MR. ZAPPALA: As I said before, my

attorneys who advise the other District Attorneys
throughout this Commonwealth on legal matters,
appellant matters, looked at the relevant Crimes
Code provisions as well as the Liquor Code
provisions, and we tried to create a scheme that
created the least volatility in terms of adding new
things to the law.

accomplished, we certainly are pleased to work with the committee and with the Legislature. Certainly, if the committee or counsel for the committee believes that there is a more effective way to implement the intent of what I've tried to express this morning, then certainly that's fine with me.

MS. MENDLOW: The other question I have is with respect to 2054 -- and I apologize for my confusion -- but let's just say the objective of the bill were to so restrict bottle clubs that they prohibited the sale of any alcoholic -- well, I guess provision of any alcoholic beverages, you know, that thereby the way these brackets are in the bill right now, it seems to me that it would state that the bottle clubs could only allow people to actually bring the liquor into the place.

I gather that I'm not interpreting the

bill in the right way, because I don't think that's

-- in your description, I think you argued that it

somehow reduced your ability to intervene and

control these places as you feel the public and the

law so states. So could you correct my thinking?

MR. ZAPPALA: Sure. I could do this in a couple different ways. In the last one, two, three, four and a half pages of the document, which was offered into evidence to the committee, in our opinion there is a very substantial analysis of the impact of House Bill 2054.

And, again, respectfully we may not disagree. Our conclusion was that it would be inconsistent with both the referendum, which was undertaken by the city of Pittsburgh recently, and would be inconsistent with what we are trying to accomplish on the two other pieces of legislation. But I would be glad to read that if you would like me to.

MS. MENDLOW: No, thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: If I may ask three quick questions. If you are a patron at a bottle club and you take your bottle of Southern Comfort to the club and you open it and consume part of it and then you take it home with you, are you committing a

```
violation by having an open container of liquor in
 1
 2
     your vehicle?
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Bottle clubs contemplate
 3
 4
     alcohol already on premises, so you would not be
     bringing alcohol onto the premises. I believe that
 5
 6
     the Legislature sunsetted the open container statute
 7
     some time ago.
 8
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Next, the
     perpetrators and victims of violence at these
 9
1.0
     establishments, are they primarily local or do they
     come in from out of town?
11
12
                   MR. ZAPPALA: No, they're local.
1.3
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: They're local?
14
                   MR. ZAPPALA: Yes, sir. We have 1.2
15
     million people that live in Allegheny County.
16
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: A little bigger
     than Adams County is. Finally, do you ever work
17
18
     with the Department of Revenue or the IRS on
19
     investigating perhaps tax violations of the owners
20
     of these?
21
                   MR. ZAPPALA: We work with the IRS all
22
     the time. But they take a more covert type of
23
     initiative on these types of things. We do not work
2.4
     with the Department of Revenue regularly unless it's
25
     a securities matter.
```

```
1
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Anything else?
 2
     Jay.
 3
                   MR. KLIPA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 4
     Thank you for your testimony. Two quick questions.
 5
     First of all, what is stopping me from going and
 6
     leasing or buying a building and having an
 7
     after-hours establishment, nothing whatsoever?
 8
                   MR. ZAPPALA: It would be the police.
 9
                   MR. KLIPA: Otherwise, I have to go
10
     through no --
11
                   MR. ZAPPALA: If you want to operate
12
     between 2 and 8, you would have to be licensed as a
     bottle club.
13
14
                   MR. KLIPA: Second, I know you're not
15
     targeting in any way -- I spoke with your office at
16
     length on the issue. I know you're not targeting in
17
     any way fraternities or me having buddies over late
18
     night to watch a fight or a ballgame and getting a
19
     keq.
20
                   MR. ZAPPALA: As long as you're of
21
     age.
22
                   MR. KLIPA: Technically, I guess my
23
     question is what is the difference between myself
2.4
     and buddies of mine late at night, I'm buying a keg
25
     or I have liquor and I'm charging just to cover my
```

own costs and watching a late night fight or a ball game as opposed to these downtown establishments?

Technically, what is the difference, if there is any?

MR. ZAPPALA: I understand, and counsel I think indicated this previously. We are not targeting that type of situation. We were targeting the people who run the business, in the bar business. These are people that are either in the entertainment or the bar business. That was our — that's where we are going with this. How do we make that distinction legally? I mean —

MR. KLIPA: Technically, there is no difference but obviously you are not targeting myself having friends over or fraternities, things like that?

MR. ZAPPALA: I would hope when we get to the point where we have something that the committee is in favor of and the Legislature would act obviously in favor of, that we have made it clear and we've made the distinction between just a group of people wanting to have a good time and persons who are in the business of selling alcohol.

MR. KLIPA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Thank you very

1 much. I appreciate your testimony today.
2 MR. ZAPPALA: Thank you.

. 14

2.3

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Next we have Barbara Burns. I would like to thank you for hosting us here today.

MS. BURNS: Happy to. Actually, I prepared testimony to speak on House Bill 2054 and 2208. I certainly, after hearing the testimony about 2209, would like to state for the record that I support it.

I do appreciate coming after our

District Attorney who is obviously much more

prepared to speak about the legal aspect, but I

certainly as an elected person, I'm a councilwoman

in the city of Pittsburgh, I represent district one

which is comprised exclusively on the north side of

the city of Pittsburgh, where I did have issues with

bottle clubs.

But as a city as a whole, clearly this issue has become a more prominent issue, and I think it affects the city as a whole in the sense of our desire to position our city as a place of entertainment. The state has participated with us in funding things like stadiums and others.

25 | Certainly, we want people to feel that they can come

into our city, enjoy themselves, have a great time and be safe in the establishments that are operated here.

What I would like to begin with is
that I, along with city council, passed an ordinance
that placed a referendum question on the May primary
this year. And it stated: Do you favor the
prohibition of the operation of establishments,
commonly referred to as bottle clubs, in the city of
Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania?

This referendum question specifically defined the term bottle club as an establishment in which alcoholic beverages are not legally sold, but where alcoholic beverages are either provided by the operator, or agents, or employees of the operator for consumption on the premises, or are brought into or kept at the establishment by the patrons or persons assembling there for use and consumption.

My colleagues and I introduced this referendum question due to the increased number of bottle clubs operating in the city of Pittsburgh, the amount of complaints, the police incidents at these types of clubs and the concerns of the residents of the city of Pittsburgh.

After public discussions and meetings

on the referendum question, the voters of this municipality made an informed decision to prohibit bottle clubs in the city of Pittsburgh, making the operation of bottle clubs a misdemeanor of the third degree.

In May of 2002, voters in the city of Pittsburgh showed their support for this change in the law overwhelmingly by passing the referendum pursuant to Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, Section 7328, prohibiting bottle clubs within the city of Pittsburgh.

House Bill 2054 proposes to amend the definition of bottle club, which would effectively nullify the actions of the voters of this municipality. In fact, the proposed amendment would render the voice of the voters of this municipality and other municipalities silent.

House Bill 2054 amends the current definition of bottle club, removing the wording establishments where alcoholic beverages are provided by the operator, or agents, or employees of the operator, for consumption on the premises or are kept at the establishment for use and consumption by patrons. This means that the clubs operating prior

to the referendum were businesses in which the operator of the establishment was providing or storing the alcohol at his or her premises.

House Bill 2054 would make it possible for establishments operating prior to the passage of the referendum to resume operations as if the referendum was never passed. This outcome is unacceptable to the residents of the city of Pittsburgh. Through the passage of the referendum, the residents of the City of Pittsburgh have voiced their opinion, and it is incumbent upon us as elected officials to act accordingly.

This referendum question was certified by the Allegheny County Board of Elections, and after 30 days that law was implemented by the city of Pittsburgh's Bureau of Police. Since the Bureau of Police has begun to enforce the new law, which makes it a misdemeanor of the third degree to operate a bottle club, they have witnessed a significant and overwhelming result. They have witnessed increased compliance by those establishments that still operate legally in the city of Pittsburgh.

I did bring with me Regina McDonald. She is the Commander of the Pittsburgh Police

Narcotics and Vice, Firearms Tracking Unit, who can speak about the enforcement issues prior and subsequent to the passage of the referendum.

2.1

In conclusion, if passed, Bill 2054 would legalize those establishments that the voters of the city of Pittsburgh intended and affirmatively voted to prohibit. Therefore, it is imperative as elected officials that you oppose the passage of Bill 2054.

Conversely, House Bill 2208, which amends Title 18, (Crimes and Offenses) by adding an 18 Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, Section 7330, would prohibit weapons on bottle club premises and is a step in the right direction. As the law exists today, the city of Pittsburgh has prohibited bottle clubs. The operation of a bottle club in Pittsburgh is illegal pursuant to Section 18 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, Section 7328.

For Bill 2208 to be applicable in the city, an operator would already be in direct violation of the current law. However, if an individual at an illegal bottle club has a weapon, as defined in Bill 2208, that individual could be prosecuted under a more severe penalty proposed by this bill. And I do favor this type of legislation.

My only recommendation is that this prohibition of weapons be expanded to include licensed establishments pursuant to the Liquor Code and other places of public assembly.

To summarize, I would like to make my position very clear. The passage of Bill 2054, I am opposed to. And Bill 2208 is an initial step to combating violence in the city.

I thought it would be very appropriate, since I am not a law enforcement agent but elected official who basically responded to complaints of my constituents, and through research determined that we could through state law do the referendum, that I had fulfilled my part of trying to represent that desire on the part of people I represent. But we always in government turn to those who we have assigned appropriate responsibility to carry out our ordinances and our statutes.

So I thought Commander McDonald is very appropriate, if you don't mind, to add to the body of my testimony as to the actual real effect in the city of Pittsburgh.

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Please do,

Commander.

MS. McDONALD: Thank you. I prepared copies of my testimony.

Good morning.

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Good morning.

MS. McDONALD: I would like to thank
you for the opportunity to speak before the
subcommittee. As Barbara said, my name is Regina
McDonald, and I'm Commander of the Pittsburgh Bureau
of Police Narcotics and Vice, Firearms Tracking
Unit.

aggressively addressed the increase in the establishment and operation of illegal bottle clubs throughout the city of Pittsburgh. As Councilwoman Barbara Burns has testified, the city of Pittsburgh has conducted a bottle club referendum which passed in the last May primary election. Therefore, as of July 12, 2002, bottle clubs are prohibited in the city of Pittsburgh.

operators of these clubs have been notified by me in writing of the referendum and the penalties involved. Under the ordinance now under the law, if anybody is found in violation of that law, instead of a summary violation they are charged with a misdemeanor three violation.

We have visited these establishments since the new law took effect, and we're trying to ensure that the owner/operators of these establishments are in compliance with the new law. We found that they are in compliance, those that remained open.

One of them was giving away or selling actually nonalcoholic beer. Others have provided water and soft drinks to their patrons. We will continue to monitor them throughout the course of time.

House Bill 2054 will undue the progress we have made in addressing this problem and will create an even greater problem. What this bill does is legalize bottle clubs, including after-hours clubs, by removing law enforcement's ability to prevent the operation of such establishments.

The wording to be removed from the current law "either provided by the operator or agents or employees of the operator for consumption on the premises or are" ... (or kept at) will take away our ability to stop the operation of illegal bottle clubs and after-hours clubs.

As Commander of Narcotics and Vice and Firearms Tracking Unit, I am responsible for the

investigation of nursance bars, speakeasies, after-hours clubs and illegal bottle clubs. What we've seen over the past two years is an increase in the number of bottle clubs and after-hours clubs throughout the city of Pittsburgh.

2.2

I would like to share with you some of the concerns I have regarding these establishments, including the violence, illegal drug use and nuisance type activities associated with these clubs. Within the past two years, two clubs have been closed and padlocked. And District Attorney Zappala addressed that. They were closed because of shootings that occurred in and around the clubs involving patrons as well as security guards.

A third club closed after its owners/operators were arrested in connection with the operation of a multi-state Ecstasy drug ring. Conspirators met to arrange and receive payments for Ecstasy sales at the club. The owner of another club closed his club and left town after learning that we had an arrest warrant because of accusations that he assaulted his partner with a baseball bat.

Within the past month, we had a homicide at a fifth club. Keep in mind that most of these clubs open at 2 a.m., attracting people who

are leaving legal establishments. No one is carded so minors have been known to frequent these clubs. All patrons are served whether or not they are intoxicated, and the clubs are filled beyond capacity, with patrons ignoring occupancy permits, health code and fire code ordinances, as well as building codes.

While conducting surveillance at these clubs, my detectives have witnessed patrons arriving and exiting vehicles, openly urinating on sidewalks and against buildings in surrounding areas. We've received numerous complaints of vandalism, litter and other undesirable things from legitimate business owners surrounding these clubs.

Clubs in residential areas have been subject of complaints from nearby residents because of the loud noise and disturbances in their neighborhoods.

In addition to these concerns, I would like to give you an idea of the tax free income generated by an after-hours club. The typical club is open Thursday, Friday and Saturday night after 2 a.m. The normal attendance for these nights is upwards of 1,000 patrons, and many times that's a violation of their occupancy permit.

People pay \$10 to get into the club. The owner/operator can take in \$520 thousand a year. Expenses are minimal. There are no license fees, because they are not a licensed establishment nor regulated by any municipal, county or state agency. Rent varies. Some operators own their buildings, while others may pay as much as \$2,500 a month. Utilities generally run \$500 a month. If they have a disk jockey, that may cost \$2,400 a month. they hire security guards, that would cost \$720 a month per quard. Beer and alcohol generally run \$1,500 a month. So total monthly expenses can run \$7,620 with yearly expenses totaling \$91,440. you subtract that from their actual income of \$520 thousand, they make \$428,000 a year. I was able to get these figures from my detectives who have talked to the owners/operators of some of these clubs. And, again, this just gives you a general idea. Some of the clubs are operating more frequently, four, five, and as many as seven nights a week. So they're generating far more income. Again, it's tax free. They are not regulated nor licensed by the city, the county or the state. CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: It's all cash?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

MS. McDONALD: All cash. I plan to -one of you had asked whether or not we're working
with the IRS. As our investigations continue, I
have already contacted a supervisor in the IRS, and
I am going to set up a meeting with him to see what
we can in regards to these owners and in regards to
IRS issues.

1 4

2.0

2.4

In closing, I would like to ask you to seriously consider the ramifications of this proposed legislation. You are in effect legalizing after-hours clubs and bottle clubs. This will result in a proliferation of clubs unlicensed and unregulated by anyone, not only in the city of Pittsburgh but in municipalities throughout the state of Pennsylvania.

What's to stop anyone from opening a club in the neighborhood in which you live or even on the street that you live? What effect will these clubs have on the small business areas in your legislative districts and on legitimate licensed bars and taverns throughout Pennsylvania?

Think of the increased crime and nuisance calls your local law enforcement officers will have to deal with, thereby taking them away from neighborhood patrols and both routine and

1 emergency calls for service. 2 What's to stop licensed bars and 3 taverns from operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a They could close their bar at 2 o'clock, 4 week? reopen at 2:30 as an after-hours club or legalized 5 6 bottle club under this legislation, charging people 7 \$10, \$20, \$30 to get in and then operating the rest 8 of the night. 9 If sponsors and supporters of this 10 legislation want to legalize bottle clubs and 11 after-hours clubs, then that should be proposed 12 legislation. We are asking that you don't allow 13 these clubs to establish and operate unlicensed and 14 unregulated, because the Legislature unwittingly 15 removes law enforcement's ability to keep them from 16 operating. 17 I'd like to thank you for this 18 opportunity, and will answer any questions. 19 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Thank you,

Commander.

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

Mrs. Burns, I'm curious, what was the vote in percentage terms on the referendum?

MS. BURNS: Actually, there was a lot of discussion and coverage of the proposed bill.

25 I'm not sure. I will be happy to provide it to you in writing. We did wait for it to be certified. It was unanimously overwhelmingly supported.

There was a campaign. I actually had a worker of mine who said that she actually went to one of the polls and saw a sign telling people not to vote for the referendum because it would affect jobs. I thought that was kind of interesting.

Actually, it was overwhelmingly voted for.

One of the difficulties of the bill was how it was written, because when you say do you favor the removal of something that's already illegal and trying to explain to folks that right now it's a misdemeanor and it would go to a third degree, that we had a very small fine which is like \$300 up to \$1,500, where the current situation in the city for this was up to a month, of which I've never known anybody to be incarcerated, up to a year.

So clearly, there was a lot of discussion publically about this. There was, I think, a difficulty on the part of many people to understand why you're voting that you favor the prohibition of something that people believe to be already illegal. The wording was very awkwardly written. But the majority of people, informed

voters, really did understand and understood why we were favoring to oppose something we didn't think was already not allowed.

But I think that what also happened, my interest in this really came from more of a neighborhood nuisance establishment that we went through the traditional calling of enforcement officers, having them come, seeing the process really be very ineffective in the sense of the \$300 fine and then seeing business as usual. It was really a public safety committee chairman, who is an attorney in my neighborhood, who then researched it because of our own frustration of why the system was unable to respond appropriately to what we thought was illegal activity in our business district.

And I like everyone else said, huh, why would we have to vote no against something illegal. But when you began to understand it and understand that there was a greater sanction to it, that it was really a slap on the hand, then we knew it had to be on a primary referendum. So we worked to get that done through counsel versus doing it as a petition as lay people.

In doing so, we also saw around the success in our Strip District and in downtown, these

other people kind of adding themselves to legitimate bona fide licensed premises, and some of the other violence that you saw downtown seemed to come concurrent with that.

discussion for our city, not that people always worry about something small and local in their neighborhood. What I've tried to say to folks is this could be something very small in your community destroying your business district, or it could be something that really creates a black eye for a city that is really trying to work hard to attract legitimate legalized licensed premises to create a wonderful entertainment venue for people.

So I think the timing of all these incidents made this topic a very hot topic. So it was something -- you know, usually people don't look up and vote on referendums, but I do think that people did, and it was substantial, the number. And I'll be happy to get that.

We had to wait for it to be certified, and then we did the 30 days as we believe, and we sent the letter. So it was very up front. There's nobody that could possibly operating in the city of Pittsburgh with the discussion that was here, that

1 would do so out of ignorance. 2 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: I was given some unofficial information, it was 61 percent in favor 3 of the referendum and 38 percent opposed. 4 5 MS. BURNS: And that included the people that were confused. 6 7 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: One other guestion 8 for you, Mrs. Burns. The referendum prohibited 9 bottle clubs, but later in your testimony you 10 mention establishments that are still operating. 11 If the bottle clubs are illegal, what is still 12 operating? 13 MS. BURNS: Well, there are people who 14 just ignore the law and they set up shop. They just 15 think they can do this. 16 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: So they're risking 17 the sanctions, the increased sanctions? 18 MS. BURNS: Right. And I think the 19 law was not clear in the sense of our ability to --20 you know, we don't have enough police to just come 21 every night and take the booze. It's just not 22 possible for us to do. They will overtake us in the 23 sense of our capacity and resources of law 24 enforcement to act as though like a child, you are 25 going to come and take the bottle and remove it and

they will shut down. We just don't have the kind of police enforcement resources to play that kind of, I would call, cat and mouse game.

What we needed was real sanctions that said to people who are operating very much in a proprietary way, that you are not going to come and illegally operate. My feeling is that in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania it is a privilege to dispense alcohol. We have a state store system for that. We have licensed premises. The greatest sanction we have as a state is the revocation of license.

These people start from the premise that they don't care. So all they do is rent a space and set up shop and pass out fliers, think they're doing something, take in a lot of money and basically wreak a lot of havoc next to legitimate businesses in the neighborhoods. And I don't think anyone should protect them.

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Commander, what has the difference been in your workload since the passage of the referendum?

MS. McDONALD: Well, we always find something else to do.

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: I mean in regards

2.2

to the clubs.

2.1

MS. McDONALD: Well, the first weekend after it became effective, we went out and visited all the clubs, and they were in appliance. So we were able to cover five clubs in one evening within a couple of hours, because they were either providing soft drinks, water, and one place nonalcoholic beer. One of the other clubs had closed down.

Now, we are aware of a couple clubs that are still operating, and it's a matter of us getting undercover people in the establishments, because the doors are locked and they only let in people they know. But once we get in, then we will charge them with a misdemeanor and be able to arrest them on the premises.

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Thank you.

MS. McDONALD: I might add that we are in support of Bill 2209 which would increase the penalties and fines. After listening to District Attorney Zappala, I hadn't received a copy of that legislation, but having listened to him in reading his proposed legislation previously, we are in support of that legislation which would increase the penalties and would make our job a lot easier.

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Thank you. Mr.

2 Schwoyer.

1.5

2.3

2.4

MR. SCHWOYER: Thank you. My question is directed to the Commander with regards to your figures and what's available under current law. My understanding of 7327, which basically deals with the hours of 2 a.m. to 8 a.m. by unlicensed premises, each time a person allows another to consume liquor or malt or brewed beverages on an unlicensed premises, it is an offense.

I guess what I'm getting at is if there are 1,000 people at an after-hours club on a three-day period, what are the problems with charging them with 1,000 violations each carrying up to \$300 in fines? I'll let you respond just once.

But the other part of my question is you mentioned in your testimony that they don't card individuals. Furnishing alcohol or malt or brewed beverages to minors carries with it \$1,000 fine. If that's happening, too, they can get charged or cited with \$1,000 fine. And it seems to me that that's a way to get these things to shut down. They are in the business to make money. If you start taking the money away from them, why isn't that practical or why isn't that happening, or what are your

restraints, etc.?

2.3

MS. McDONALD: Well, it sounds like a simple thing to do to charge them with every violation of each person that buys a beer. But we would have to witness the purchase and the consumption of that beer by each individual, which would require us to stay maybe eight hours that the club is open, which would be virtually humanly impossible for us to do that.

The second question as far as identifying or carding each person in there, we've tried to -- when we do the nursance bar raids with the Nursance Bar Task Force, it includes the District Attorney, the District Attorney's Office, Pittsburgh Police, the Sheriff's Office, the LCE, the probation and parole agents who are going to check and see if any of their clients are in violation, as well as health department and building inspection, possibly the fire department from the city of Pittsburgh if we're in the city of Pittsburgh, just so that we can have all the bases covered.

When we raid a club and probation and parole is with us, and they want to check every individual in that club to make sure that they are

not on their list as parolees or someone that they are looking for, that could take us an hour or more just for a hundred people. Imagine if there's two or three hundred people. And these places are jam packed, so the danger involved as far as keeping those people packed in, not letting them exit freely because we're checking them, creates more havoc.

So we do that when we have to do it as far as checking people for possible probation or parole violations. Normally, what we try to do is get in, get out, have the people exit as orderly as possible to avoid any confrontations, any fights, violence of any kind, and then cite the owner.

Under this new ordinance, then we can arrest them because it's a misdemeanor offense.

So when we consider the safety of the officers, the safety of the patrons, the practicality of trying to cite for each individual, trying to identify each individual and their age -- many of these kids don't carry IDs with them -- it's not possible, it's not practical either.

You go in with enough force to ensure the officer's safety and to ensure that when we close these clubs, it's done in an orderly fashion.

The club crowds are dispersed. And once they hit

```
the streets, everybody moves on their way.
 1
                   There have been times where fights
 2
     have broken out and riots have broken out. When we
 3
 4
     first started this process, I can think of one
 5
     situation where this occurred. So we try to go in
 6
     with force, be as visible as possible, have the
 7
     people exit as orderly as possible.
 8
                   MR. SCHWOYER: So last night -- I
 9
     don't know if it was you or when I read over
10
     Commander Valenta's testimony, when they talked
11
     about a Club Chrome, if that place is -- if last
     night they were allowing patrons -- checking ID at
12
13
     the door, allowing people upstairs for $10, and then
14
     had a DJ and providing alcohol, they were in
15
     violation of Title 18 as well as in violation of the
16
     new Pittsburgh ordinance, etc.; is that right?
17
                   MS. McDONALD: Club Chrome no longer
18
     provides alcohol. They're serving nonalcoholic
19
     beer, O'Doul's. We check that every time we go in.
20
                   MR. SCHWOYER:
                                   Thank you.
2.1
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Any others?
22
     Jane.
23
                   MS. MENDLOW: Councilwoman Burns, I
24
     was wondering if you could tell me with respect to
25
     your feelings about the statewide implications
```

therefore, a statute that would prohibit bottle clubs, to ban them as you have done here in Pittsburgh. My understanding of the testimony today is the referendum passed, you took action where you are seeking to enforce that and to actually shut down bottle clubs. What would be your thinking in terms of the current state statute simply being repealed that permits their existence? Would that be too extreme or what would your feeling be?

2.3

extreme. I believe that the state licenses premises and has a whole system that hopefully works along with those licensed businesses to provide the dispensing of alcoholic beverages in this Commonwealth. I think it's a good system. I think if we as Pennsylvanians want our establishments, be they licensed to operate until 2, or if we have social clubs that are allowed to operate until 3, if we think that it ought to be extended, if we're going to extend the hours in this Commonwealth for the dispensing of alcohol, why would you not consider extending them to those who are licensed?

Why would we allow people to not even incur the proper expense of licensing, care about those licenses, to kind of appendage themselves to

people who are really creating the industry, paying the taxes, paying and supporting the privilege to dispense alcohol?

So I don't really have any respect for those who cannot properly go through the process of being licensed, being subject to the various rules and regulations as well as the citations. If we want to change how we do business in Pennsylvania, I would look to those changes within the establishments that have complied. I don't really have any respect for people who basically do none of the above, and I don't think there's really a lot of place in commerce for them or anything else, because if you're not willing to play by some very fundamental rules, the others don't have really much meaning along with it. So I just don't think they have a place in the proper dispensing of alcohol in this Commonwealth.

CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Commander.

MS. McDONALD: I think there might be some confusion over bottle clubs and after-hours clubs. They're used interchangeably. Legally, there are legal bottle clubs. And as long as they follow the law, they can stay open until 2 o'clock. But if they remain open after 2 and serve -- give

away the beer, then they're in violation. Our experiences have not been with the legal bottle clubs. We have no problems with them. It's the after-hours clubs.

2.2

Some of the after-hours clubs, the owners/operators have said that they are bottle clubs and they have club memberships but they have no bottle club license at all. So that term bottle club is used freely.

MR. SCHWOYER: So the city of
Pittsburgh prohibited even licensed bottle clubs by
virtue of the referendum then in May?

MS. McDONALD: No. It stated that the legalized bottle clubs, people that have club license, a social club license, they weren't affected, because that was one of their concerns, raised by council members, whether or not these legitimate businesses would be affected, and they were not affected.

MS. BURNS: The common thing is they are unlicensed.

MR. SCHWOYER: If I wish to raise money for a cause, if we repealed the bottle club statute, if I wished to raise money for a cause and I had persons who supported my cause who paid \$150

to come to my picnic in the field; and they came to my picnic in the field and I had liquor and I had beer available for persons who attended helping me to raise money for my cause, would that be a bottle club?

MS. BURNS: Is your cause a proprietary one or is it a nonprofit?

MR. SCHWOYER: What's that?

MS. BURNS: When people do things for personal gain, it's considered proprietary in my view. If it is a social organization doing a fund-raiser to assist Make-A-Wish -- the bottle club in my neighborhood from time to time passes out and uses the good name of the Make-A-Wish Foundation, which I have great respect for, as though somehow that's okay, that what they do here all the other days of the week causing discontent from residents is okay.

So lots of people say those kind of things, but the intent here is I would be more concerned as a private person giving alcohol to someone who might go out and get into an accident.

My understanding of the state Liquor Code is there are abilities for people who want to dispense alcohol off a premise or whatever to get proper

approval to do that.

that you can't have a fund-raiser for some worthy cause where you are dispensing alcohol. This is not what this is about. They are not the same. You don't have to raise money at 6, 7 o'clock in the morning, waking up neighbors. You can do it during more traditional after-work hours, and I think it would be more effective.

MR. SCHWOYER: I'm just trying to make it clear for the record that we understand your understanding.

How about my daughter gets married and I want to have one heck of a wedding reception and I'm providing alcohol to anybody and everybody who comes in with a gift?

MS. BURNS: Well, hopefully they bought a gift for the bride and groom and didn't necessarily have to pay to enter.

MR. KLIPA: As a follow-up to the Chief Counsel, there is an exemption in 2054, Section 7328. It first talks about the license under the Liquor Code, then it also talks about there's an exemption for the solicitation of funds for the Charitable Purposes Act which, I'm assuming

```
that we're talking about, would fall under that.
 1
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Mrs. Burns,
 2
     Commander McDonald, thank you very much for your
 3
     testimony today. We appreciate it.
 4
 5
                   MS. BURNS:
                                Thank you.
 6
                   MS. McDONALD:
                                   Thank you.
 7
                   CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Last but not
     least, we have the very patient Commander William
 8
 9
     Valenta, Jr.
10
                   MR. VALENTA: Good morning.
11
     Essentially, what I would like to do today -- and I
12
     will read into the record my statements -- is to try
13
     and give you some sense of the impact of these
14
     clubs, particularly in my zone.
15
                   From that, I would like to thank you
16
     for giving me the opportunity to speak with you
17
     today on behalf of the proposed changes to the laws
18
     presented in House Bills 2054 and 2208 pertaining to
19
     bottle clubs.
20
                   As has been with prior speakers, I am
21
     in favor of 2208 regarding the prohibition of
22
     weapons on the premises identified as bottle clubs.
23
     For reasons that have been explained by Councilwoman
24
     Burns, District Attorney Zappala and my colleague,
25
     Commander McDonald, I am opposed to the changes in
```

2054, as I believe that will substantially weaken our ability to penalize the operators of bottle clubs within the confines of the city of Pittsburgh.

To give you some sense of the city of Pittsburgh for those of you that aren't aware -- Mr. Walko, if you'll bear with me as you know this very well --

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Sure.

MR. VALENTA: The city of Pittsburgh is divided into six police zones. I am in charge of zone two, and encompasses the Central Business District of the city of Pittsburgh, the Hill District and Uptown Section of the city of Pittsburgh, Polish Hill, Lawrenceville and the Strip District.

Over the past two years, we in zone two experienced a proliferation of bottle clubs within the city of Pittsburgh. The clubs have primarily been located in the Central Business District and then most recently in the Strip District. And with that growing number of clubs then became a growing number of problems.

In 2000, we experienced our first taste of what might happen when these after-hours/bottle clubs -- and as Commander

McDonald explained, these terms are sometimes interchangeable. Unfortunately, semantics doesn't often get in the way when we start to experience the impact of these clubs on our ability to enforce the law.

But the Squawker's Club began operation on Fourth Avenue in downtown. Despite having private security guards assigned to the outside of the club, in fairly short order, the area around the club became a frequent scene of fights, disorderly persons, assaults and shooting incidents. A number of these incidents, there were several injuries including injuries to police officers under my command.

Ultimately, the club was closed by court order, and that was after an incident where shots were fired at officers under my command and officers from the Nuisance Bar Task Force were assaulted inside while attempting to inspect the premises.

During the eight-month period that it ultimately took to close the Squawker's Club, I was forced to devote more and more resources to the area to the detriment of the remainder of the zone.

Unfortunately, as more proprietors began to engage

in the business of bottle clubs, I found that the resources in my zone were strained even further.

The closing of the Squawker's Club provided a merely temporary solution to what would become a chronic problem within the zone. We began, as you saw in the videotape, to experience clubs such as the SLP club downtown, Lo-Los, Club Chrome, The 50s Club. There's ones that have opened, changed names. Your sort of need a score card to keep up with all the players.

What began to happen is the clubs moved on. They began to move out of the Central Business District and into the Strip District. And that was giving patrons within the Strip District readily accessible places to go afterwards, after they were done, when these legitimate businesses closed.

talked about as far as resources, at the height of the problems with the Squawker's Club and the problems with the SLP Club, my night-turn supervisor was getting to the point that they would dedicate four to six police officers to just keep the peace and conduct surveillance on the activities in and around these clubs.

That would sometimes represent 40 to 50 percent of our entire resources for the entire police zone. So, in other words, when we had officers assigned to patrol while citizens were sleeping in neighborhoods for burglaries and other types of crimes, officers were keeping an eye on one club. The impact of that was such that we began to experience other problems in the zone. But, quite frankly, we were frightened to move police officers from these problem clubs for fear that without that presence the violence would increase even more. So, certainly, we were happy when they closed.

The other thing we began to see as these newer bottle clubs began to open was a disturbing pattern that was very similar to the Squawker's Club. Fights at 4 a.m. and 5 a.m. became the norm. Once again, despite the presence of these security guards, we began to get shots fired and arrests for weapons violations both inside and outside the club.

What was most frustrating for us was even with the great assistance of Commander McDonald and narcotics and vice, when raids were conducted on these clubs, the owners and operators of these clubs pretty much laughed and the comment was pretty much,

well, I'll go pay my traffic ticket and be open the next week. It was frustrating for us because we were beginning to see this impact that was going on and, quite frankly, felt powerless to do much about it other than to continually write these citations.

Fortunately, in the May primary, the city of Pittsburgh voters adopted a local option of increasing the penalty for illegal bottle clubs to a misdemeanor of the third degree. And Commander McDonald, as you heard, has been very diligent in moving forward with enforcement of that. That is why we were most concerned when we read over 2054, seeing that that would undermine a long effort that was several months in the making, nearly a year in the making, of getting that onto the ballot. And with 61, 62 percent of the voters voting in favor of it, I would be loathed to go back and reduce penalties and sort of have to start all over again in some way.

The other section I think -- and I was certainly glad that District Attorney Zappala brought that videotape to you, because if you get the chance to view it again, it's important to recognize the people in the street and understanding how overcrowded these clubs have become. Many of

these establishments are on second floors of buildings. There's one way in and one way out.

One incident in particular that I mentioned when a raid was conducted by the narcotics and vice squad, officers were being assaulted inside. There was shots fired inside the club. And quite literally because of the flow of people trying to come out of the club, we couldn't get police officers to assist the other police officers inside the club.

Europe and in South America, discotheque fires, and we always hear of these problems associated with entrances and exits. I'm quite frankly of the belief that if we allow these establishments to continue, it's only a matter of time before we're going to have a fire or some other problem inside one of these clubs, and we are going to see a great loss of life and injury. And that's another reason why I am so concerned about the operations of these clubs.

The other part of the problem is we have been approached by some of the owners saying, well, if you don't like private security guards, can we hire police officers to guard these clubs as we

do with legitimate establishments. And quite frankly, I don't see how I could possibly -- it's an oxymoron to me. How can I possibly allow a police officer to guard which is in effect what I believe an illegal operation? So we are stuck with these private security guards that, quite frankly, are employees for these clubs, present a whole new problem.

We have had experiences where there have been fights or problems inside the club, and the security officers locked the door and wouldn't allow the police officers in, to the effect that we have arrested the security officers for hindering apprehension. The stories go on and on.

The increase in these clubs obviously has been detrimental to my resources. I think it's also interesting, I have had the -- it's been my pleasure actually to work with a group in the Strip District called Neighbors In The Strip.

Representative Walko knows them quite well. These are a group of people that got together.

For those that haven't been in the Strip District, and the Strip District was once more produce yards, as the nightclubs began to come in and with Metropole and some of the other legal

nightclubs, there was some friction that developed between how are we going to exist, these produce yard men and folks coming in.

A man by the name of Joe Leganis started Neighbors In the Strip with the express desire to bring all these groups together. And it worked, and it worked very well. I came in to help assist them with several different issues that are happening in there. I call it the good problems to have; how do you deal with the problems associated with a growing and vibrant area? It's actually a wonderful problem to have.

For them, the bottle clubs and these illegal after-hours clubs have presented a whole new problem. What we began to see was a change in patterns of how patrons of establishments were even coming to the Strip District. Ten years ago when the Strip District first started to become a popular place to go, patrons would begin arriving at maybe 8 or 9 o'clock in the evening but stay until the bars closed at 2 o'clock, might go and have a sandwich or go somewhere else.

And we pretty much knew by about 4 o'clock that the Strip District would once again be quiet and the produce workers and the produce yard

would sort of take over. It was a very nice and natural transition.

As we began to see more and more after-hours clubs, what we began to see was the peak of activity wasn't at 10 or 11 o'clock at night.

People were just starting to come out at 10 or 11 o'clock at night. We would begin to see activity until 4, 5, 6 o'clock in the morning.

Now, why that becomes important is that much of -- if you look at police activity and police-related activity, we schedule sort of that 8 p.m. to 4 a.m. knowing that's always been our peak time, and we schedule around that for most of the rest of the district. All of a sudden we're stuck with this when some of our resources are depleted between 4 a.m. and 7 a.m., because historically that's never been a problem. All of a sudden, we have a whole lot more work to do within that period.

You can obviously imagine that between 8 p.m. and 11 p.m., the legitimate businesses are no longer able to attract patrons to their bars. What they have done in response is you have seen sort of these specials of different 25 cent drafts trying to draw people in earlier. And I've seen some of them go out of business. And I, quite frankly, suspect

it's because in their ability to try and draw more customers in in those earlier hours, they have almost cut their own throats. It's classic economics at work. You get to the point where you get into a game with your competitors trying to drum up business, and sometimes you just can't survive the game. And that's one of the things we've seen with these clubs.

Finally, I have been a very vocal opponent of bottle clubs, I think for reasons that in this very brief time that I have been able to express to you. I'm certainly pleased that the State Legislature is beginning to take this matter seriously. It is a big, big issue in the city of Pittsburgh, and particularly in my zone.

I am particularly pleased to see that the Legislature has begun to recognize the lethal mix of alcohol and weapons. I cannot stress to you enough how important it is for you to support 2208 regarding firearms inside these clubs.

I can't give you a quantifiable reason why we are seeing the proliferation of weapons in these clubs. I can only speak to you in regard to what my sense is in reading police reports every single day and on the weekends, and if not hearing

shots fired, of reading reports of illegal weapon seizures inside and outside of these clubs. It's a problem, and it's a problem that needs to be addressed, and again, if nothing else, to avert what I think most certainly will be a tragedy.

I'd encourage you to continue to work to strengthen the penalties on these bottle clubs. I think the question was asked, the complete elimination of bottle clubs, is that going too far? It isn't. What you have to understand is the liquor license -- I have been involved just this year in having two establishments, licensed establishments, closed as nuisance bars.

The one thing that we have to hold over these owners is they have made an investment in a liquor license. It may be \$50 thousand. It may be \$100 thousand. If you don't obey the rules and obey the law and keep your establishment in good working order, you stand to lose a substantial investment.

I will tell you that trying to remove a liquor license from somebody is excruciating. It is a long involved process, but I'm comfortable with that. That is how it should be. We should be able to do that.

1 In its present form, these bottle 2 clubs, we have very little to hold over them. with a misdemeanor of the third degree, we are going 3 to take them out and arrest them and they are going 4 to have a criminal record. But the revenue numbers 5 speak for themselves as Commander McDonald was able 7 to explain. So I think it's important to understand that really anything short of licensure of liquor 8 9 establishments isn't going too far. 10 With that, I will take any questions. 11 I certainly appreciate the opportunity to come and 12 speak before you. 13 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Thank you, 14 Commander. That was very informative. You have 15 really opened my eyes to the issues you are facing 16 here in the city, and we definitely want to be part 17 of the solution. 18 Are there any questions? 19 Representative Walko? 20 REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I'll wait. 21 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Jane? 22 MS. MENDLOW: No. 23 MR. KLIPA: I have one quick related 24 to -- I wouldn't expect you to have the exact 25 numbers. But in your opinion, estimation, what kind

```
of rise in drug activity, specifically Ectasy, GHB,

club drugs, have you seen in the last three, four or

five years with the opening of the after-hours

establishments?
```

MR. VALENTA: I think there's absolutely a direct correlation between the two. It is sort of with the raves and with after-hours clubs, that's always sort of been the link between the two. I can't think of an instance where we haven't had an instance where we have had an Ectasy seizure or an Ectasy arrest of a large amount without some tie-in to either a bottle club or a rave or some type of illegal type of gathering like that. Is it one to one? Probably not. Is it .8, .9? I would say absolutely.

MR. KLIPA: Did the Ectasy bring in the raves? Did the raves bring in the Ectasy? I know Philly is struggling with it and some of the other big cities are.

MR. VALENTA: I think that's probably a good analogy. What strikes me as somewhat interesting is what Commander McDonald said, now we have Club Chrome which is seemingly in compliance, let's say, now that they're serving water and juice. Be fearful of that, because what we know from Ectasy

sales is that one of the things that it does is

cause severe thirst. So now if they come in and

still offer a fee to get in, are they selling

bottled water? And even if they are not selling

bottled water, are they giving away the Ectasy and

then charging 20 -- if you think about it, that's

even a more lucrative business, because the water is

a lot cheaper than the alcohol.

There are so many ways for them to try and get around this. For us to keep up with it is nearly a full-time job; hence, Commander McDonald's position.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I do have a question, Commander Valenta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

About how many bottle clubs are there in the Strip?

would be hard pressed to name them all -- but I would say somewhere between six and eight that we know of. And there are probably a couple that -- it's kind of interesting. We kind of get aware of them because all of a sudden you see these sort or placards going up, new club opening up. And then all of a sudden, they sort of come out of nowhere.

Club Lo-Los, all of a sudden six months ago, boom, you started seeing the name. So I think six to eight would be a good number.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I understand the nature of them as you're saying. We go to church as Saint Stanislaus. I don't know if there's a bottle club across the street or not. There looked like there was for a while.

MR. VALENTA: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Since the enactment of the home rule referendum -- or not, home rule, sorry, the referendum, has there been a decrease in the Strip or any of the rest of zone two of the clubs?

MR. VALENTA: The clubs are there.

And I'll be quite honest with you. Ask me that question in about six months to a year. This thing has really just got off the ground in the past 30 days. We're seeing some compliance. I think it's going to be effective.

What I don't know yet is how these clubs are going to evolve. They are making too much money to walk away from it. That is why, as I mentioned earlier, my fear is if they're saying, oh, we're just selling soft drinks and water, I think

it's our duty to look into -- where it doesn't -- if
you think back and it doesn't make sense, why are
you doing this. So I think in about six months to a
year, I might have a better answer for you.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Are some of the problems you noted and are experiencing in the bottle clubs, do those same problems exist or don't exist with the licensed establishments, whether it's Roland's or Voodoo Lounge? Are you hearing the same kinds of complaints from those establishments or not?

MR. VALENTA: To a degree we do. And if you'll bear with me, there's a couple parts of that question. And, certainly, Bar Pittsburgh.

Again, for those not from this area, Bar Pittsburgh was a franchise club that just closed on their own because of some problems they had with bouncers.

We have had some issues with Donzi's, which was a club on Sunday night -- they had a Sunday night dance party that was causing us some problems.

In some clubs, yes, we have noticed some of the same problems. The difference is the owners have legitimate businesses. And the Bar Pittsburgh decided to voluntarily close rather than lose a liquor license. Donzi's has worked with us

to hire additional police officers to assist.

2.1

The other thing that I've always looked at with the after-hours clubs, and the argument that I made particularly when I was testifying about the Squawker's and the SLP Club, is look at the number of patrons in a legal establishment as a ratio of number of problems, and the amount of resources devoted to it; as opposed to the ratio of problems with an after-hours club and the amount of resources.

If you look at it from that point of view, I think then you're actually comparing oranges to oranges and apples to apples. And what you're saying is if an after-hours club has 500 people inside of it but we're making five to ten arrests a night out of there for different problems, Donzi's has a couple thousand and we're making one or two a week, now all of a sudden you start to see the proportion or ratio of problems to patrons, it's a no brainer. You get rid of the after-hours/bottle clubs.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I must say that one of the first complaints I received a couple of years ago about the bottle club situation in the Strip was from Mr. Vargo of Voodoo Lounge, who is a

```
very responsible owner and has a great business.

MR. VALENTA: I have a great deal of
```

3 respect for John.

1 4

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I only ask the question to try to understand it better. I wasn't accusing any of them.

MR. VALENTA: No, no, I didn't take it that way. But I thank again, Neighbors In The Strip meetings, I have seen John there and I've seen Robert Fernandez from Club M. I've seen people from those clubs who are interested not only in their own establishments, but understanding the global nature, if we do this right, we'll continue to attract businesses.

I have yet to see an owner of a bottle club or the proprietor of a bottle club or an illegal after-hours club to come in, because quite frankly they don't care about the Strip District, they don't care about their businesses. There is no investment there. There's a rental property, maybe ownership of a small warehouse. Where is the investment in the community? It's not there. They're, quite frankly, more concerned about their own pecuniary gain.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you,

1 Commander. 2 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: I just wonder what 3 do the people that patronize these clubs do for a living that they can be out drinking until 8 o'clock 5 in the morning and support their habits. MR. VALENTA: Those days for me are 7 long gone. From all walks. And we have seen -quite frankly, you would be surprised. You name the profession, and I probably have seen it either come 10 up on an arrest report. And you look and think, if 11 your employer really knew that you were behaving 12 this way, what would they think? 13 Normally, it's on the weekends, Friday 14 and Saturday nights, like I said, when you start at 15 11 o'clock at night and go until 5 o'clock in the 16 morning. 17 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: Any other 18 questions? 19 Thank you very much, Commander. 20 MR. VALENTA: Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN MAITLAND: I appreciate your 22 testimony today. We definitely will be working on 23 this problem on your behalf back in Harrisburg. 24 We will declare this subcommittee 25 meeting closed.

```
1
                      (The hearing concluded at 11:59.)
  2
  3
  4
  5
  6
  7
  9
 10
. 11
12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
```

1	I hereby certify that the proceedings
2	and evidence are contained fully and accurately in
3	the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and
4	that this is a correct transcript of the same.
5	
6	\mathcal{L}
7	Allen M. Meus
8	J∉án M. Davis, Reporter Notary Public
9	
10	Notarial Seal Jean M Davis, Notary Public
11	Jean M Davis, Notary Public Derry Twp., Dauphin County My Commission Expires Mar. 29, 2004 Member, Pennsylvania Association of Notaries
12	Weither, Christy Vallar Coccidence
13	
14	
. 15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
J	