COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARING BUDGET HEARING

STATE CAPITOL
MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2008, 1:30 P.M.

VOLUME IV OF VI

PRESENTATION BY JUDICIARY

BEFORE:

HONORABLE DWIGHT EVANS, CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE MARIO J. CIVERA, JR., CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE STEPHEN E. BARRAR

HONORABLE STEVEN W. CAPPELLI

HONORABLE H. SCOTT CONKLIN

HONORABLE CRAIG A. DALLY

HONORABLE GORDON R. DENLINGER

HONORABLE BRIAN ELLIS

HONORABLE DAN B. FRANKEL

HONORABLE JOHN T. GALLOWAY

HONORABLE WILLIAM F. KELLER

HONORABLE TIM MAHONEY

HONORABLE KATHY M. MANDERINO

HONORABLE FRED McILHATTAN

HONORABLE DAVID R. MILLARD

HONORABLE RON MILLER

HONORABLE JOHN MYERS

HONORABLE CHERELLE PARKER

HONORABLE JOSEPH A. PETRARCA

HONORABLE SCOTT A. PETRI

HONORABLE SEAN M. RAMALEY

```
1
    BEFORE (cont.'d):
       HONORABLE DAVE REED
 2
       HONORABLE DOUGLAS G. REICHLEY
       HONORABLE DANTE SANTONI, JR.
 3
       HONORABLE MARIO M. SCAVELLO
       HONORABLE JOSHUA D. SHAPIRO
 4
       HONORABLE JOHN SIPTROTH
       HONORABLE MATTHEW SMITH
 5
       HONORABLE KATIE TRUE
       HONORABLE GREGORY S. VITALI
 6
       HONORABLE DON WALKO
       HONORABLE JAKE WHEATLEY, JR.
7
8
    ALSO PRESENT:
       MIRIAM FOX
9
       EDWARD NOLAN
10
11
                                  JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER
                                  NOTARY PUBLIC
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX	
2	TESTIFIERS	
3		
4	NAMES	PAGE
5	JUSTICE THOMAS G. SAYLOR	4
6	MR. ZYGMONT A. PINES, ESQ.	7
7	MS. DEBORAH McDIVITT	7
8	JUSTICE MAX BAER	8
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CHAIRMAN EVANS: I would like to reconvene
the House Appropriations Committee.

As you know, I'll just let you introduce yourselves.

JUSTICE SAYLOR: Thank you, Chairman.

I'm Justice Tom Saylor. I'm here with my colleague, Justice Max Baer.

And on behalf of the Pennsylvania Judiciary, we very much appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee and respond to any questions which you or your members may have regarding our budget submission.

I know that -- we don't have an opening statement. I know also that time is short. So I really have no extensive remarks to make, but we will respond, as I said, to your questions.

But if I could, Chairman, just make two brief points, very brief, and they're reflected in the handout that was submitted to the committee in advance, and they are, first of all, that historically -- and this year is no different -- year in and year out, the appropriation for the Pennsylvania Judiciary, keeping in mind that we are the sixth largest State in the nation and that we have a Judiciary ranging from our magistrate judges

up through our trial judges in all of our 67 counties, our intermediate courts, our Supreme Court, and all the ancillary functions.

Our budget request in the budget we ultimately receive from the Legislature is, year in and year out, always in the neighborhood of only one-half of 1 percent of the State appropriation. So that puts the thing in perspective.

And the other point that I want to make, briefly, before we go to the questioning, is that if we could identify one area that has become more and more problematic from the standpoint of the Judiciary's budget on an ongoing basis, it's the addition, the necessary addition, of judges throughout our trial courts in Pennsylvania.

But the problem area, Chairman and members of the committee, is that these newly created judgeships, which are created from time to time to meet needs based on population in the counties, aren't accompanied by funding for the newly created judgeships, and that has created an ongoing problem for the Judiciary, because in the dynamic process between the Judiciary's budget people, the Governor's budget people, and the Legislature and your committee's budget people, that's always a point that

```
1
    continually needs to be addressed, whether you call
2
    it an unfunded mandate or whatever you want to refer
    it to. But obviously to the extent that the
 3
    Legislature sees fit to create new judgeships, they
4
    must be accompanied by the necessary funding.
5
            So having said that, we'll respond to any
6
7
    questions that the committee has.
            CHAIRMAN EVANS:
                              Thank you.
8
            Did you notice, Justice, I didn't interrupt
9
10
    you? I just let you do your thing, right?
11
            JUSTICE SAYLOR:
                             I appreciate it -- always.
12
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Anybody else I would have
13
    said, you're out of order, but I figured I'll yield.
    So I just wanted to let you know.
14
            I'm going to go to Chairman Mario Civera.
15
16
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
            Welcome, Justices. I appreciate you being
17
18
    in front of us, and thank you for taking the time.
19
            Supplemental appropriations. What I see
    here about the magistrates, the district judges,
20
    that's been removed? Or what's the story of what I'm
21
22
    reading here? Do you know that?
23
            JUSTICE SAYLOR: Well, I think Mr. Pines
24
    does, because he's kind of our State Court
25
    Administrator and he's overall in charge of the
```

```
1
    budget.
2
            MR. PINES: There is still a significant
    shortfall with regard to funding the magisterial
3
4
    district judges. Justice Saylor had mentioned the
    short-funding of judicial positions. Magisterial
5
6
    district judges are still short-funded in this
7
    budget.
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: How much? What are you
8
    lacking on that?
9
10
            MS. McDIVITT: If you're talking in the
    current fiscal year, which is the supplemental, I
11
12
    believe, you're referring to?
13
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Yes; yes.
            MS. McDIVITT: We're short almost
14
15
    $14 million between the Court of Common Pleas judges
    and the magisterial district judges. Now, the
16
    Governor's recommended budget has included about
17
18
    $10 million towards the CP shortfall, the Common
    Pleas shortfall.
19
20
             CHAIRMAN CIVERA: He puts $10 million
    towards the shortfall?
21
22
            MS. McDIVITT: Right. That was included in
    his fiscal year '08-09 recommended budget.
23
24
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: So you're still short
    about $4 million?
25
```

MS. McDIVITT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: We go through this every year. There's always some type of a shortfall, and the Legislature has to come back and put the additional dollars in so everybody can get up, and I don't understand why. I have an idea why.

That's basically what my question was right now until I have another one.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

JUSTICE BAER: Representative, it's interesting, because I was here last year, and you asked the same question. You expressed displeasure with the Executive Branch, and it's deja vu. Here we are again.

You know, we could talk about things like specialty courts or pro se litigants and should we be in the business of making things easier for them? We don't have any choice when it comes to funding judges. We've got to pay their salaries, and that's our principal shortfall. You expressed that displeasure last year, and here we are again.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: The Judiciary and the Legislature can form an alliance and kick the Executive Branch out, huh?

I want to make note -- don't start a coup.

Don't start it. You could start a quick coup around here. There we go.

I want to make note of the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee here, Representative Tom Caltagirone, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee; the Chairman of the House Insurance Committee, Representative Tony DeLuca; also Chairman Hess, and he's Chairman of Commerce. So the various chairs are here.

The next person is Representative Kathy

Manderino, who, as a matter of fact, is on the House

Judiciary Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you,

14 Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, Justices and Mr. Pines.

Two questions. We see every day that we're in Harrisburg the new building going up on Commonwealth Avenue, which is the new Judicial Center, but I'm not quite sure that everyone understands, A, what that's all about, that building that's under construction -- what's going to go on there; what the staffing needs are going to be for that building.

Can you just explain everything and whether or not that center, which I think opens next year,

during the next fiscal year, is adequately provided for in the budget.

JUSTICE BAER: Sure, I'd be glad to, and

Justice Saylor would be glad to expand on anything I

would say.

For the first time -- we're the oldest

Judiciary in the Western Hemisphere, about 365 years,

about 60 years older than the U.S. Supreme Court.

For the first time in our history, we're going to

have a presence on the Capitol Campus, and we think

that's long overdue. We thank you for making that

happen.

We have extensive administrative offices in Philadelphia and in Mechanicsburg, both in lease space, and then we have a small contingent in Pittsburgh. And what we're going to do is move our administration as well as the Commonwealth Court, which has been housed on the sixth floor of the South Office Building since its inception, into the new building.

Now, exactly how we're going to do that, what time frame, we haven't all decided yet. Those are difficult issues, because we will lose some people who don't want to move, et cetera. But we will move our administrative staff and our

Commonwealth Court into that building.

In this budget, we sought money for about

15 positions, not highly compensated positions -
people to work a copy room, people to deliver

messages, people to provide some technical assistance

-- because all of a sudden, we're going to have all

of these people in one location. We're going to need

to both relocate them and service them.

Now, interestingly, apropos the Governor's budget, the Department of General Services will also be involved in servicing some of these positions.

They sought additional positions to do that. Those were recommended for full funding. None of our positions were funded, and we need that funding or we can't make this new building, which is extraordinarily expensive and gives us this presence on Capitol Hill, we can't make it work.

So we do need funding for that. We will obviously need to move people. We'll need to do all the things that it would take if we were moving the legislative branch or some of its staff from one building to the next.

So we'll be moving from Philadelphia and Mechanicsburg into there when it opens.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: What was your

```
1
    fiscal request for that that is unfulfilled, and do
2
    you need all of that in next year's budget or is it a
3
    quesstimate as to when it needs to be phased in?
            JUSTICE BAER:
                           Deb, do you know? I know we
 4
    have 15 positions. I do not know the amount.
5
            MS. McDIVITT:
                           Yes.
6
                                  We requested
7
    approximately---
8
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Could you please introduce
    yourself for the purposes of the record?
9
10
            MS. McDIVITT: Deborah McDivitt, Director of
11
    Finance.
12
            We requested approximately $1.4 million.
13
    Part of that is for the 15 positions for half-year
14
    funding. The rest of it is in operating, maintenance
    on equipment that we anticipate will be funded
15
16
    through the FF&E budget.
            And as Justice Baer had mentioned, these are
17
    pretty standard, well, they're support positions that
18
19
    we need to operate this facility to make it work.
            REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you.
2.0
            On a second note, I'd probably say that most
21
22
    of my colleagues would agree that a large percent of
23
    our constituents, when they come to see us and have
24
    had an interface with the judicial system -- it's not
25
    really with the criminal side, which some might
```

think; it's with the civil side and particularly with the family court side of our court and judicial system. It's never a happy time for families if they end up in family court. It's usually an unhappy time.

But that's where we'll get a lot of complaints or questions about how the system works from an administrative point of view, from a serving-the-family point of view, from a serving-the-needs-of-the-children point of view.

My recollection is that last year, Justice
Baer, you may have talked a little bit about some new
initiative, a family court children's initiative that
you were starting. If you could, and I don't know if
I've captured it exactly right, but if you could
explain to us where that is and what is happening
and what is being accomplished through that
initiative.

JUSTICE BAER: I would be glad to. The Chair should feel free to cut me off, because I could spend 6 weeks on the topic.

We opened -- and your memory is excellent -- we opened the first ever permanent Office of Children and Families in the Courts about 18 months ago. And we've actually been working on it for 3 years, but we

opened it 18 months ago, and it continues to operate and go full guns.

2.0

Now, it is funded by restricted Federal moneys, what are known as the Court Improvement Project moneys. That's about a million dollars, and the money must be used to try to provide permanency to abused and neglected kids and to better their lives and to better the court process for those children generally.

And that's where we are now. The Executive Director is Sandy Moore. She was Director of Human Services and the Director of Children and Youth in Dauphin County. We recruited her, and she's fabulous. She has an excellent staff.

We are in the process of taking our county-based judicial system, in which counties do not communicate very well with each other, do not build programs together, do not cross county solve problems together, and change that so that we have a statewide system on this issue.

And we are in the process now of rolling out programs, and let me conclude by being concrete. For the last year and 3 months, our IT technical people, computer people, have been working on a data collection system so we can find out what's happening

with abused and neglected kids in Pennsylvania: How often are siblings split? How long are they spending in shelter care? How long are they spending in foster care? How many foster-care homes are they in? How often do they see their parents? We're ready to roll that out statewide, and every county in Pennsylvania, I believe, is going to participate voluntarily, because we don't want to be coercive.

Family group decisionmaking is an alternative to traditional dispute resolution where the family, extended family -- friends, neighbors, et cetera -- step in to take care of a child if their parents can't. That's operating in about 28 Pennsylvania counties. It's going to operate in every county.

Family Finding is a program out of

California where when you don't have anybody to take

care of a child, you can find 30 to 40 people inside

of 2 hours. We don't know quite how they do that,

but the originator is a gentleman named Kevin

Campbell. We're in communication with him. We're

going to bring that to Pennsylvania. We're going to

do that statewide.

And we're going to do several other programs like that, which I'd be glad to fill Representative

Manderino in on or anybody else.

Now, so far we're doing this with a very small staff and we're doing it only with this small amount of money, and we're doing fine. But I said last year that at some point, we're going to come to you and we're going to ask for money for this office, and we're going to do that because we can't impact custody, which is a tremendous problem. I don't have to tell you all that. We can't impact that because our staff and our people can't work on that with these restricted dollars.

I told you last year that we were in the process of having a committee report done by the Commission For Justice Initiatives, chaired by Judge Tom Kistler of Centre County. The report is done. It's excellent. We could get into what it recommends, but again, we can't implement. And we're probably a year away from starting that, because we got to get what we're doing for abused and neglected kids under way first.

But we are absolutely making great progress. You'll begin to see real changes in your local county courts in the next 6 months.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: A closing comment.

I think that the move into the custody issue will be something that at least I would welcome and I suspect a lot of other colleagues will, too, because that is probably the area that we get the most grief about. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you.

Representative Katie True.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Contrary to what some people believe,

Republicans and Democrats can be like-minded, and on
this particular issue, I agree very much with

Representative Manderino and was kind of going to go
to the same place that she did. I'm very pleased
about this initiative, and I'm glad to know that, you
know, you're pleased with it and that it's working.

I did have a question. In regard to the court-appointed special advocates, a request had been made of me to put into appropriation \$200,000 for the Harrisburg office to reach out to the counties that are putting this into effect. As a matter of fact, Judges Leslie Gorbey and Louis Farina in Lancaster County were finally going to have a CASA program. Does that fit into this in any way, or would that be a whole separate issue to help kids?

JUSTICE BAER: No; it absolutely fits into it. Court-appointed special advocates, CASAs, it's a national program; it's an excellent program. It gives kids eyes and ears in courts.

2.0

I must tell you that Pennsylvania is the only State of the top, and I think it's top seven, give or take one, the only State that has never funded a dollar for CASA -- the only State -- and I frankly think we've been remiss in that.

So I would join your local judges in suggesting that that be funded. I am in touch and I have had multiple meetings with Dennis Hockensmith, who is the statewide CASA Director. I actually have met with the national CASA Director on the issue.

We, as part of our Office of Children and
Families in the Courts, would like to take on CASA.
There's a cost factor involved. It's not an
inexpensive program to run. And we also have so much
on our plate, and we want to do what we're doing
before we move forward.

But it absolutely would be appropriate for us to do, and we would like to do it if, A, we had the money, and B, we had the staff time, which go hand in hand because money is staff. But I would recommend that to the Legislature. It's a very

worthwhile program.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: And I appreciate those comments very much.

Just for the viewing public to understand, when you're talking about taking money, you're talking about administrative costs, because it's still a volunteer program as far as the CASA volunteers, or are you looking to make it go further?

JUSTICE BAER: No, no, no. The essence of CASA -- it's a beautiful public-private partnership -- is that citizen volunteers become advocates for children in courtrooms.

And our child welfare system is so overwhelmingly busy that in extraordinarily complicated cases where the kids have multiple difficulties, from being victims of sexual abuse to having mental health problems to being fire-starters, et cetera, and the parents have multiple problems, if we know who the parents are -- we know who mom is; usually we don't know who dad is -- that it's hard to get to the bottom of how to untie Gideon's knot and to save these kids.

And so what the CASA does, it's one CASA to one sibling group, and they spend 10 hours a week with that family, at minimum. Then they write

extensive reports, and they provide the judge -- and again, I was there; I was a juvenile court trial judge for many years -- they provide the judge with what's really going on and what these kids really need and how these kids should be taken care of.

So when you get these kids at age 4 to 7, by the time they're 13 or 14, they're looking at junior high school, they're looking at high school, they're looking at college or vocation or the military. If you fail with them, they come into your system at 6 or 7. By the time they're 13 or 14, they're looking at the gang; they're looking at the weapon they are going to carry; they're looking at drug addiction. If they're women, they're looking at teenage pregnancy, sometimes prostitution, et cetera, et cetera.

So in a sense, these kids, their whole lives are in front of them, and there's a fork in the road. One road leads to a successful life; one road leads to delinquency, criminality, public assistance, mental health, et cetera, et cetera. The fork of that road is in our courtrooms, and CASAs help us. And it's more than just CASAs, but CASAs help measurably with these very difficult kids to start that road.

And it's difficult to believe if you're not there, but by the time these kids are 14 or 15, the die is cast. We have a devil of a time bringing them back.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: It's always easier to fix up front than it is from behind, and I certainly appreciate your remarks.

JUSTICE BAER: And, Representative True, can I say one other thing? And again, I warned the Chairman I could spend 6 weeks on this and I will not.

It's the best money you can spend. And I'm glad to come back and spend time and do a PowerPoint for you. It's dirt cheap compared to the delinquency, the adult criminality, and all the loss to society when these kids become dysfunctional citizens. The dependency system costs nothing compared to the other systems, and yet it saves kids.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: I couldn't agree with you more.

And if I just may, in conclusion, remind leadership of the Appropriations Committee, Judge Baer helped us pull together when we did a task force in 1997. Out of that task force came the CASA

1 recommendation. It was passed unanimously by the 2 General Assembly, and now I look forward to all of us 3 working together to hopefully make this little light 4 at the end of the tunnel happen. And thank you very much for your remarks. 5 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 7 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you. 8 Representative Walko. 9 REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you, 10 Mr. Chairman. For fear of being redundant or seeking the 11 12 same information again, you noted earlier, Justice Saylor, in particular, that we created 18 judgeships 13 in 2005 and have not funded them, and now we have 14 another 12 judgeships pending in this year's budget, 15 16 I believe, or legislation is pending and those are not funded. 17 18 And what I'm wondering is, what needs are 19 not being met because of that lack of funding? 20 what initiatives are not being funded, important initiatives, down the road because of that 21 22 shortfall? 23 JUSTICE SAYLOR: Thanks, Representative. 24 And Deborah, who handles the finite details 25 of the budget, can finish my answer, but the overview is this.

2.0

Obviously, as Justice Baer said, judicial personnel are funded. Judges are paid. The AOPC has money, some of which is marginally fungible, meaning you can move it a little bit from account to account.

So what happens to make sure that the full Judiciary complement is paid is that there are moneys within that budget that are used for that purpose in anticipation that eventually they'll be funded. And there are from time to time vacancies in the system -- judges die; judges retire -- but the point of all that is, at the end of the day, ultimately the dollars have to be there. So to the extent that the dollars aren't there when they need to be and money is moved, you do destroy the funding priorities of the Unified Judicial System.

But Deb could probably give you just three examples of what you've had to do to cover these, what I'll call shortfalls.

MS. McDIVITT: What we've had to do -- this is the third year in a row that we've encountered this situation. But what it precludes us from doing is addressing some of the things that the court would like to initiate.

By way of example, surplus funds in the past have been used to launch programs such as our security initiative until we could get funding of its own through the General Assembly. There are certain things within AOPC that we've worked on. I believe that some of the problem-solving courts have used moneys from other areas where we had surplus funds.

So there are things that from time to time, when we have to go through and glean the surplus funds from other appropriations in order to fund the judges' salaries, which should be funded on their own merit, it precludes us from reacting to those things that we need to react to otherwise.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: You did touch on one thing that I think is very important.

And I remember back in '97 or '98,

Philadelphia established a drug treatment court,

which is a type of a problem-solving court. And we

attended the graduation ceremony this summer, and it

was very enlightening, heartwarming -- lives are

being saved, the prison population is kept down

slightly, costs are being saved -- and that was one

of my concerns, not only that kind of problem-solving

court but mental health court, perhaps other

initiatives that we don't even know about as new ways to look at courts.

And I was wondering -- and you did mention problem-solving courts in your presentation, either Justice -- I mean, is there something more we as a General Assembly should be doing to promote these kinds of problem-solving courts?

I understand that back in '97 we heard testimony from the DAs Association that every dollar invested in problem-solving courts leads to a savings of \$7 on down the road, whether it's in incarceration, medical expenses, and the like. And I just wondered, one, are we doing enough; and two, if you have suggestions for us, what should we do?

JUSTICE SAYLOR: Yeah; well, we appreciate that, because my sense is, and I've not been here every year but I will be here every year from now on, but a lot of you have been here for a lot of years, so I'm glad we are building this institutional relationship, because you are truly out on the front lines because you have to interact with your constituents. And their problems are your problems and they are our problems, so it's kind of like we are all in the same boat.

And the court has done a lot and the

Judiciary has done a lot under the supervision of the Supreme Court to try to deal with these specific types of problems. And actually, Representative, the Administrative Office of the Pennsylvania Courts put together a very nice little piece on problem-solving courts. I don't think that's come up to the members yet, but we are certainly going to get you that right after the hearing.

But to specifically come to your question, my sense is -- and Max, you can speak to this, because as you can tell from Justice Baer, he's an expert and an advocate for problem-solving -- but my sense is that when asked, the Legislature has been very responsive in these specific areas, because it's kind of easy -- you see a need and you see a solution, and you are willing to try it.

And I think that comes back full circle to the beginning of your problem. If you are underfunded in areas that you have to work on, to that extent, you don't have the money to either start or continue or refine or expand these special initiatives.

REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: I agree with all of that.

JUSTICE SAYLOR: Would you say that's fair?

JUSTICE BAER: I absolutely would say that's fair.

I think Representative Evans, the Chairman, and I actually had this conversation last year after we were done, because he shared with us that at one point, he wanted to fund a gun court in Philadelphia County and the Judiciary said no thank you.

We are a different Supreme Court under the leadership of Steve Zappala, and especially Ralph Cappy, who, of course, just retired. We are a court that very much wants to engage in solving problems and eliminating the cause of, let's say litigation for us, which could be criminal and could be otherwise, as opposed to merely deciding the case and moving on.

So what you have going on all over the United States are mental health courts, drug courts, and a subbranch of that, juvenile drug courts, and we do have one of those in Pennsylvania. I think York County, but I can't swear to that. Is that right? Thank you. Gun courts, and Philadelphia does have one -- oh; we actually have a list, thank you, and we'll give this to you -- DUI courts, a prostitution court, mental health courts, et cetera.

They are doing unbelievable work, wonderful

work, at not only eliminating the criminality but the costs or the disfunctionality as to costs, and we are willing to do that. That is why I started my comment with we've changed. We want to do that. We want to reach out and help you and help the Executive Branch help the people of Pennsylvania.

2.0

And it does come back to funding, not just for the court but for the whole judicial system, because at the end, before we start doing these things, we have got to take care of our cases.

And you've seen the volume of our cases.

Child support alone, we did 350,000 cases last year plus the appeals from those. Child support alone; think about that number and how do you do that. And with everything else we do, I would think -- and I don't know this; I'm guessing -- that the number of cases adjudicated in the Pennsylvania Judiciary between the district justices on up, probably 500,000, 600,000 cases, maybe more than that.

So we have to do that, and then we have to do these initiatives. But we -- and I'm going to conclude with this -- we want to do this as a coherent body, as a State, because there are wonderful things going on around the nation, there are wonderful things going on around Pennsylvania,

```
1
    yet we have individual counties who, in all good
2
    will, take it upon themselves to try to do this,
    reinvent the wheel, make the mistakes that have been
3
4
    made, and so we are trying to do this as a statewide
5
    body.
            And, you know, we are happy to come before
6
    you and talk about anything. If you have an idea,
7
    we're as close as the telephone. But in the end, if
8
9
    we are adequately funded, we can bring the person
10
    power and we can bring the administrative power to do
11
    it.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Thank you, Mr.
13
    Justice.
14
            CHAIRMAN EVANS:
                              Thank you.
            Representative Denlinger.
15
16
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Thank you, Mr.
    Chairman.
17
            Good afternoon.
18
19
            Some members of the Appropriations Committee
20
    here have begun to receive letters from various
21
    Common Pleas Court judges who are, quite frankly,
22
    lobbying us on matters related to the budget and
23
    various line items and so forth.
```

Now, we received these letters, and they are

on official court letterhead, and that raises a point

24

25

of concern. Is there a policy within the court system about individual judges using their position to lobby the Legislative Branch?

JUSTICE SAYLOR: Yeah; my understanding,

Representative -- and, you know, I've moved up into

the second position when the Chief moved on. I guess

like anything else, if you stay around long enough,

you move up a little bit. And Justice Castille, the

Chief, is not here. But it's my understanding that

it's the policy of the Supreme Court, being

constitutionally in charge of the unified judiciary,

that our strong, strong preference is to speak with

one voice, and that is through the Chief Justice, in

matters affecting the Judiciary, particularly the

budget in the Judiciary.

So without knowing these specific examples,
I can't comment much further, but I think I
understand what you are saying, that there may be in
the counties certain judges that are looking for
certain things. And I would say -- and Justice Baer
can speak to this, too -- from a policy standpoint I
can see where that would be counterproductive in
terms of the effort to present a unified judicial
budget in a formal way through the appropriate entity
in the Legislature, which is the Appropriations

Committees in the House and the Senate.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: If I could, just a point of clarification. These were not letters about advocacy for the Judicial Branch; these were on other budget line items, specifically education.

that, I mean, I can't sit here, without, again, you know, knowing precisely what the correspondence said, and say that if a judge in a particular county has some area of interest in education or something, that there is anything untoward or improper about communicating with his or her Representative to the extent that, you know, they feel comfortable doing that.

But it seems to me that -- and then occasionally I think if the Judiciary would arrive at an initiative we would want to pursue, whether it's an area of continuing judicial education, we are still better served by speaking with this one voice and having it come through the Supreme Court.

But I defer to my colleague, Justice Baer.

JUSTICE BAER: And I agree. I agree, and I concur entirely with Justice Saylor. It's not a bad thing if an individual judge wants to seek a particular problem, as any citizen would let me know

about it.

The great tension in Pennsylvania is that our judicial system -- and I mentioned its history earlier -- is a county-based system, and before the Constitution of 1968, there was no pretense of there being any State uniformity whatsoever. You had to be admitted to every county individually. You couldn't practice in a different county without being admitted to that county.

So it's been a relatively short time that we have had a unified Judiciary, and counties, because of this 300-plus year history of not having a unified system, don't act unified, and it's one of the things that we are trying to change. And not change for change sake but change because we believe that in today's world, we can do better if we pool our resources, pool our expertise, pool our knowledge.

So we don't want counties -- and the trial court judges know this, because we talked about this at length and I have talked to them at length -- we don't want them to advocate on behalf of themselves. We want to decide what is good for Pennsylvania, and we want to do it in Pennsylvania and we want to do it in a coherent fashion.

So, you know, there is nothing wrong with

somebody -- and it's de minimis if they use a piece of Judiciary stationary. They want you to know that they have obtained some position in their community. But by and large, we don't want that to be a habit. We want to come to you, because we want to be a coherent branch of government, as you are and the Executive Branch is.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: So what I'm hearing is a preference, not necessarily a violation of the Canons of Judicial Conduct? Is that fair to say?

JUSTICE BAER: Well, I think it's fair to say that neither Justice Saylor nor I want to opine on that without the case in front of us and the rules in front of us. But it is so de minimis in any event. But our preference would be it comes through us, and if we were aware of that, then we could pick up the phone and talk to that trial judge.

JUSTICE SAYLOR: Yeah; clearly I spoke on it, and I would think without some specific example there wouldn't be any way you could arguably file it to the canons, any type of canon. I was speaking merely from a preferential policy matter on the point of the protocol of relations between coequal branches of government.

And I think on matters of funding, appropriations, things of interest to the Judiciary, it should come through the Supreme Court to your Chairman and members. And it keeps it a lot simpler rather than judges in certain counties saying it to a certain Legislator. I really think we should do this, and I think I'm clear and I think you understand.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: I do, and I appreciate that. Based on this line of questioning, is that something you would consider?

JUSTICE SAYLOR: I think that periodically the Chief from time to time, or whoever that person has been, has reiterated that notion. And oftentimes it has probably been after the budget hearings, you know, that that's the policy of our court on matters affecting the Unified Judicial System.

We like to speak through the Office of the Chief Justice to the Chairman of the committee or to the Governor's Office.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Okay.

JUSTICE SAYLOR: But let me make another point on this subject, and I think it has been an interesting session, because we can readily sense the interest that your committee has in actually getting

things done back in your district. So we do have that commonality of interest.

And the other reason is, if you could try to run this through the Supreme Court, which it should be in the Constitution anyhow. We have the ability to look at the whole State, because it is a diverse State, and our judicial system is unified, but it has to take into account dispirit interests. We have rural counties with one judge. We have middle-sized counties. We have urban counties. And the problems in the judicial system vary from those counties.

The Chairman knows the problems in

Philadelphia aren't the problems that you have out in

Clearfield County or Somerset County. So to make a

Unified Judicial System work, you have to have

someone at the top trying to look at it on a global

basis and say, certainly it's not one size fits all.

And that's why these specialty courts are good,

because you can tailor them to the different counties

and the needs of those counties.

And Pennsylvania is not unique. I mean, New York is a big State. Ohio is a big State. You know what I'm saying.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Okay. I can

```
1
    appreciate the direction that you are going in
2
    there.
 3
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
            JUSTICE BAER: Let me add two things.
 4
            First of all, we will reiterate that policy.
 5
    And second of all, all these problems are complex,
6
7
    but what we don't want is one trial judge to say "I
    love CASA, " write you a letter to fund CASA; one
8
9
    county over, 20 minutes away, that judge says "I hate
10
    CASA, but I love drug courts." We don't want that.
    Then we don't have a Pennsylvania, we have 67
11
12
    independent States, and that's why we want to do it
13
    through the Supreme Court.
            We can take a hard look. We can get input
14
    from everybody and we can say, we love drug courts
15
16
    and we love CASA, but the more pressing problem right
    now is one or the other, so let's get to work on that
17
18
    and then we can get to the next one next time.
19
    then you are not pulled in a thousand directions and
2.0
    Pennsylvania is not incoherent.
21
                                        Thank you.
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER:
22
            CHAIRMAN EVANS:
                              Thank you.
23
            Representative Craig Dally.
24
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Thank you, Mr.
25
    Chairman.
```

This may have been answered. I happened to be with Representative Walko at the graduation this summer at the drug court in Philadelphia. It was really an enlightening experience, and I think that those problem-solving courts are the way to go. And I have talked to my President Judge about engaging in that process in Northampton County and, you know, it comes down to funding.

And I note in your hearing book that there are 50 of these courts in the Commonwealth, but only Philadelphia courts are funded with State dollars.

Is that correct?

MR. PINES: Well, there's a distinctly different line item on that. So the Philadelphia gun court, that is separate and apart from the funding for the so-called therapeutic courts, which involve drug courts, the mental health court, and so forth.

A lot of those courts also receive grants, oftentimes Federal grants, but the AOPC has tried to provide education and training to help the counties establish these various therapeutic courts.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. So there are resources that are being used by you folks as far as these courts?

MR. PINES: But there aren't enough

resources. That's why we need the funding to support the administrative work that we have been doing in the past year. And in fact we have been fairly aggressive in trying to provide training and an analysis of the success of these various courts.

JUSTICE SAYLOR: Representative, that's why, too, we really need to get you this little synopsis on the problem-solving courts, because there is so much interest that is here. We will make copies and give it to you today actually.

It lays a lot of the history of this out, and there are Federal funds available.

And the AOPC is doing what it should. It acts as an administrative apparatus for the court system and a funding conduit in many instances, because as Justice Baer said, to make something work, you got to have money, but you have to spend it in a thoughtful fashion.

So you have people at the Administrative

Office of the Pennsylvania Courts that act with a

liaison when they are trying to organize these things

-- channel the funds, set up and provide some of the administrative staffing.

And that is, you know, back where we started 20 minutes ago. To the extent you can't fund

necessary things, then you are probably not able to fill four or five or six positions over at the Administrative Office of the Pennsylvania Courts to do this very type of work. So I think it's that simple.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Thank you.

JUSTICE BAER: Now, it was interesting that you said you spoke with your President Judge. What we want, where our aspiration is, is that you give us a call and we would take a look in knowing that's fine, because that is Pennsylvania. That's the Pennsylvania of the last 360 years, and that's my point, which is that it's a county-based system. And in large measure, therefore, your PJ will say, I like or dislike that idea. It's nice to be a dictator. And then we'll say to his people, go find some funding and let's do it, or his people will say, you know, too expensive, and the idea will die on the vine.

What we are trying to do, the reason that we're united as a Legislative and Judicial Branch here is, we want to, in a collaborative fashion, engage in some policymaking and say that a new way to do custody, or a drug court, or a mental health court, is imperative public policy, and let's do it

1 in all of Pennsylvania so that when you take a look at our State and you take a map of what counties have 2 it and you say, this is the craziest map I've ever seen, that's what you will find if you look at who 4 has CASA or if you look at who has these courts. Why? Because some President Judge said let's do it 6 7 and found some grant money, et cetera, and so they did it, and the counties around them were either not creative or they didn't have the will. 9

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

So that's why I said we are trying to do this coherently through the Administrative Office. And what Justice Saylor said is accurate, the Administrative Office is involved, but it tends right now to be more reactive. If somebody calls it and says, we want to do this program, then they try to provide some technical assistance. We want as a Judiciary to be proactive, to say, let's do this for Pennsylvania, and go out and do it.

> REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Thank you very much. JUSTICE BAER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: I would like to thank you for being here and making your presentation before us today. We have taken under advice what you have said today, and we will listen carefully.

I would like to thank you sincerely for

```
coming before us, and I would like to take about a
1
    5-minute recess. We have the Secretary of DCED
2
3
    coming next.
4
             Thank you.
 5
             (The hearing concluded at 1:55 p.m.)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same. Jean M. Davis, Reporter Notary Public