COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARING BUDGET HEARING

STATE CAPITOL MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2008, 3:15 P.M.

VOLUME IV OF V

PRESENTATION BY PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE

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 THADDEUS KIRKLAND

HONORABLE BRYAN R. LENTZ

HONORABLE KATHY M. MANDERINO

HONORABLE MICHAEL P. McGEEHAN

HONORABLE FRED McILHATTAN

HONORABLE DAVID R. MILLARD

HONORABLE RON MILLER

HONORABLE JOHN MYERS

HONORABLE CHERELLE PARKER

HONORABLE JOSEPH A. PETRARCA

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

1	INDEX	
2	TESTIFIERS	
3		
4	NAMES	PAGE
5	COL. JEFFREY B. MILLER	4
6	COL. JOHN BROWN	47
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I would like to 2 reconvene the Appropriations Committee meeting with the State Police. 3 4 Colonel Miller, good afternoon. Thank you for coming. 5 COLONEL MILLER: Good afternoon. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: You know the format we use. You can submit your written testimony for 8 the record and we'll get right into the questions. 9 10 If you wouldn't mind, if your panel, if your complement, could introduce themselves for the 11 record, please. 12 13 COLONEL MILLER: Yes; I'll introduce. To my immediate right is the Deputy 14 Commissioner of Operations for the State Police, 15 Lieutenant Colonel Frank Pawlowski. To his right is 16 the Deputy Commissioner of Administration and 17 18 Professional Responsibility, Lieutenant Colonel 19 John R. Brown. To my immediate left is Mr. Scott 20 Frederick; he's our fiscal officer. To his left is Lieutenant Colonel Jon Kurtz, the Deputy Commissioner 21 22 of Staff for the State Police. 23 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you. 24 These are joint hearings; Chairman Evans 25 makes them joint hearings. So we'll start out with

```
1
    the Minority Chairman of the Gaming Control
2
    Committee, Representative Clymer.
 3
            REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Thank you very much,
    Mr. Chairman.
4
            Colonel Miller and staff, good afternoon.
 5
            COLONEL MILLER: Good afternoon.
 6
7
            REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Colonel Miller,
    could you just give us an oversight, an overview, of
8
    what has been transacting these last 3 or 4 weeks?
9
10
    The reports that we've been reading in the paper as
    to who knew what, I think at this point in time, that
11
12
    testimony would be very pertinent, as then we would
13
    be able to focus on some other questions.
14
            But your overview would be very much
15
    appreciated.
16
            COLONEL MILLER: Okay. Yes, sir.
17
    you.
18
            I'll read to you -- I'll be as concise as I
19
    can, but I think this will give you a real good
20
    overview of what happened and what our involvement
21
    was in the process.
22
            REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER:
                                     Thank you.
23
            COLONEL MILLER:
                              The former chair of the
24
    Gaming Control Board, Tad Decker, claims the Board
25
    did not have any evidence that would have permitted
```

them to find DeNaples unsuitable for a license.

Mary DiGiacomo Colins, the Board's current chair, said in testimony before the Senate Committee last week that the Board would have delayed consideration of DeNaples' license if they had just known, quote, "there's an investigation ongoing," unquote.

Board member Kenneth McCabe, a retired

FBI agent, accused retired Lieutenant Colonel

Ralph Periandi and me of misleading him, violating
the law, and violating our written agreement

concerning background investigations.

David Kwait, Director of the Board's Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement, also a retired FBI agent, denied any perjury referral to the State Police.

Let me tell you what really happened.

First of all, the State Police did not conduct a background investigation of Louis DeNaples or any other applicant for a Category 2 license.

The Gaming Control Board assigned DeNaples' background investigation to investigators in its own Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement, known as the BIE. These investigators were competent and did their best to conduct the background investigation.

From the very beginning, Chairman Decker knew there was certain information that law enforcement agencies like the State Police or the FBI could not legally provide to the Board or to the BIE. I personally told him so, and Chairman Decker subsequently received letters from the FBI and the State Attorney General telling him the exact same thing.

2.0

In testimony before the Senate Committee last week, Kenneth McCabe accused retired Lieutenant Colonel Periandi and me of arbitrarily making decisions contrary to the law on what could be shared. His accusations are completely false.

McCabe's former employer, the FBI, stated in an October 10, 2007, letter to Chairwoman Colins, quote, "The FBI has not, can not and will not provide the BIE with any investigative information. We are generally prohibited from providing investigative information to non-law enforcement agencies and the BIE is not a law enforcement agency," end quote.

McCabe's assertions are even at odds with testimony provided last week by Cyrus Pitre, the Board's Chief Enforcement Counsel, who acknowledged that, quote, "You cannot interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation. You just can't do that,"

unquote.

Much has been made of the Federal wiretap that captured a conversation involving Mr. DeNaples, and you have probably heard a lot of misleading information about Judge Robreno's order.

In May 2006, BIE investigators somehow learned that DeNaples had a telephone conversation that was intercepted during a Federal wiretap, and they asked the Federal government for a copy of the intercept.

At BIE's request, the United States Attorney asked Judge Robreno, who supervised the wiretap, to allow the State Police, which is clearly a law enforcement agency, to review the intercept to determine whether the conversation contained information relevant to the DeNaples' background investigation. Judge Robreno authorized that limited disclosure.

The Court also authorized the State Police to make use of the wiretap information as necessary pursuant to its law enforcement duties under the Gaming Act. Pursuant to the Gaming Act, the State Police have a duty to enforce the provisions of the Act and all other criminal laws of the Commonwealth.

The BIE, which does not have the power to

arrest, is required to refer possible criminal violations to the State Police.

2.0

Let me be clear: Judge Robreno did not, as it has been suggested, set up some sort of procedure whereby the State Police could come back to him for permission to share federally-protected information with the BIE.

Rather, Judge Robreno said, quote, "In the event that Title 3 information is relevant to the scope of the background investigation, the government" -- meaning the Assistant U.S. Attorney -- "may apply for a supplemental limited disclosure regarding the disclosure of the Title 3 information to the Gaming Control Board and its authorized agents," unquote.

The State Police reviewed the intercepted conversation and concluded there was nothing in it evidencing criminal conduct or anything else relevant to the background investigation. The Assistant United States Attorney agreed with that assessment.

The State Police advised the Court and the BIE of that fact. But bear in mind, at this point, Mr. DeNaples had not been deposed.

In June of 2006, the Board and the State

Police entered into a written agreement to clarify

1 | how background investigations would be conducted.

2 Pursuant to that agreement, all background

2.0

3 investigation referrals to the State Police would be

4 | made in writing on a form that we agreed upon.

If the Board asks the State Police to conduct the background investigation, the State Police will provide the Board with a report of all the agencies queried in the investigation and their responses.

If their responses contained federally-protected information, the report will include the maximum amount of information legally allowed to be shared so the BIE is in a position to follow up on its own or find another avenue to obtain relevant information.

In this case, the BIE did not ask the State Police to conduct DeNaples background investigation. Instead, David Kwait, the director of BIE, sent referral forms to the State Police which only asked for database and credit checks.

Regardless, the State Police did not need to tell the BIE about the existence or source of the Federal wiretap information. The BIE investigators knew DeNaples was captured on the wiretap before the State Police did.

BIE investigators deposed DeNaples under oath in August and September of 2006. Based on information they gathered during their own investigation, the BIE investigators did not believe DeNaples had been truthful in his depositions.

In fact, BIE investigators were so concerned that they made a criminal referral of possible perjury to the State Police. This referral is documented between the BIE and the State Police.

Chairwoman Colins claimed that the Board would not have granted DeNaples a license if it knew of the State Police investigation. David Kwait said BIE had not made a perjury referral.

Board spokesman Richard McGarvey is quoted in a March 2 Patriot-News article stating, quote, "The State Police actually asked us for the transcripts of the depositions. It wasn't a referral for the Gaming Control Board. They specifically asked us for the depositions. Obviously, being partners, we sent it to them," end quote.

They are engaging in a game of semantics.

The very reason BIE gave transcripts to the State

Police was so the State Police, as a criminal justice agency, could determine whether DeNaples had been truthful in his sworn depositions.

The State Police had no involvement whatsoever in DeNaples' depositions or transcript preparation, and therefore, had no perspective on his truthfulness.

Had the BIE not expressed their concerns that the applicant had been untruthful under oath and specifically asked the State Police to make a written request for the transcripts, we would not have had any reason to do so.

BIE is not a law enforcement agency and does not have the power to arrest. The Gaming Act requires the BIE to refer possible criminal violations to the State Police.

On September 13, 2006, Tom Sturgeon, Deputy
Director of BIE, asked for a meeting with the State
Police to discuss DeNaples' application and potential
criminal issues associated with it.

Sturgeon specifically asked Captain

Tim Allue to come to the BIE or assign someone to

come to the BIE to accept all information that BIE

investigators had that they believed to be of a

criminal nature. State troopers met BIE agents the

next day.

BIE agents believed DeNaples had been untruthful in his depositions. On or about

October 3, 2006, Nan Davenport of the Gaming Control
Board advised Captain Allue that the State Police
should submit a written request to obtain the
transcripts of DeNaples' depositions.

The next day, Captain Allue submitted a written request, and Davenport sent transcripts of the depositions to the State Police.

During that same time frame, October and

November 2006, BIE investigators were also concerned

about evidence they had uncovered concerning possible

illegal conduct by DeNaples that was unrelated to the

perjury investigation. As a result, BIE

investigators made referrals to at least three other

outside agencies.

For the same reasons I cannot provide more specific information about the perjury investigation, I cannot provide any further information about the other referrals.

Mowever, I can say that from the time BIE made the criminal referral to the State Police up until DeNaples' license, the Director and Deputy Director of the BIE, Mr. David Kwait and Mr. Thomas Sturgeon, were in regular contact with Captain Tim Allue, the Director of our Gaming Enforcement Office.

On multiple occasions, Captain Allue confirmed to them that the criminal investigation was ongoing.

Frankly, it is obvious that even Chairman

Decker knew of the ongoing investigation. Just

2 days before the Board awarded DeNaples a license,

he sent me a letter that said, quote, "...it is also

my understanding that your office may be in the

possession of some important background information

which may affect the suitability decision of the

Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board with respect to an

applicant for a Category 2 license."

Applicants are not presumed "suitable" for a gaming license. To the contrary, the burden is on the applicant to prove his suitability. The Gaming Act explicitly provides, quote, "Every application for a slot machine license shall include such information, documentation and assurances as may be required to establish by clear and convincing evidence the applicant's good character, honesty and integrity."

The State Police did not conduct DeNaples' background investigation or any other background investigation for a Category 2 license.

25 | Consequently, I'm not privy to everything the Board

possessed concerning DeNaples' suitability.

2.0

However, at a minimum, the Board had access to the following information at the time of their decision to grant DeNaples a license:

One, in March 1978, DeNaples was convicted of conspiracy to defraud the Unites States.

Two, the Board's investigators had provided the State Police with transcripts of DeNaples' depositions to initiate a possible perjury investigation. The Director and Deputy Director of the BIE knew the investigation was still ongoing.

Three, the Board's investigators had referred evidence of DeNaples possible legal conduct in other matters to at least three other outside agencies. Those referrals had not been resolved.

Four, the Board's investigators asked

DeNaples to give them copies of documents he obtained

from the FBI through a Freedom of Information Act

request. DeNaples failed to produce the requested

documents.

According to the Board's regulations, failure to provide relevant information is in and of itself grounds to deny a license.

Even without the confidential law enforcement information under review by the State

Police in the perjury investigation, the Board had sufficient information to either determine whether DeNaples had proven his suitability by clear and convincing evidence, delay that determination until a later date, or decide another applicant was more suitable for the Category 2 license.

On December 18, 2006, Chairman Decker sent me a letter stating, quote, "...it is also my understanding that your office may be in the possession of some important background information which may affect the suitability decision of the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board with respect to an applicant for a Category 2 license," end quote.

Decker went on to ask me to disclose that information to the Board.

The next day I wrote back, quote, "Our previous submissions have provided you with the full extent of information permitted by law and in accordance with our agreement of June 12, 2006," end quote.

That same day, December 19, 2006, Chairman Decker wrote, quote, "...your response causes me concern because in it you did not directly address the question as to whether the Pennsylvania State Police...is in possession of additional background

information, which has not been produced to the

Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board's Bureau of

Investigations and Enforcement...because it is

somehow, in your view, beyond the scope 'of

information permitted [to be disseminated] by law,' "

end quote.

2.0

He went on to say, quote, "Should the PSP fail to provide the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board with any additional information, we will operate under the assumption that the PSP does not currently have any information on any Category 2 applicant, which would affect their suitability for licensure in the Commonwealth," end quote.

Don't forget, at the time Chairman Decker wrote that letter, he already knew I would not be able to provide him with any federally-protected information. He knew I could not legally provide that information, and he knew I would not violate the law.

Consequently, on December 20, 2006, before

DeNaples was granted a license, I sent the following

letter to Chairman Decker. Quote: "As I indicated

in my previous correspondence, the Pennsylvania State

Police has already provided the Board with the level

of cooperation that it requires. To reiterate, we

have, to the best of our ability, provided present relevant information on applicants for a Category 2 license. As you know, we have given the Board source and contact information regarding other law enforcement agencies that may have, or come into possession of, additional information regarding the applicants. Obviously, we cannot speak for other law enforcement agencies, nor can we be expected to predict when and if they may develop further information. Certainly, we are not in a position to forecast if and when action may be taken by any such agency or to divine what effect it may have on the Board's licensing decision.

"I am sure you realize that the Pennsylvania State Police has the duty to serve and to protect the public in spheres far broader than gaming licensure -- specifically, in the ongoing detection of crime and in the apprehension of those who commit criminal acts.

"In view of the level of cooperation provided by the Pennsylvania State Police, the Board should be in a position to properly exercise its statutory duty to determine an applicant's suitability for a gaming license," end quote.

Chairwoman Colins testified that she

believed, quote, "that letter was a green light," unquote.

I have never stated, nor implied, that Mr.

DeNaples was suitable for a gaming license. I simply told the Board that they should be in a position to determine the applicant's suitability. I believed it then and I believe it now, and I have never said otherwise.

Remember, the Board's own investigators had serious concerns about the applicant's suitability and had made a criminal referral for possible perjury that was still ongoing.

Finally, I need to correct an error that appeared in a press release dated February 3, 2008, from the Governor's press office. The release mistakenly reported that I said the Board's decision to award a license to DeNaples was appropriate based on the information available at the time.

That is not what I said. Based on what I knew at the time, I was willing to give the Board the benefit of the doubt in stating that I believed they acted in good faith in making their decision.

In conclusion, make no mistake about it, the Pennsylvania State Police followed the law, to the letter, in every instance. We do not have the leeway

to pick and choose which laws we want to follow. Our troopers conducted themselves professionally and with integrity.

I am deeply disappointed, however, that both current and former members of the Board have resorted to making personal attacks against me and my former Deputy Commissioner of Operations, Ralph M. Periandi. I personally know Lieutenant Colonel Periandi to be a man of high character and integrity who spent 33 years in service to the citizens of Pennsylvania as a member of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Thank you very much,
Colonel, for the testimony and for that very
effective and informative overview. I appreciate it.
I just have a few questions.

An observation is that from my personal perspective, the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board had enough information, enough red flags were raised before they awarded the casino license to the Mount Airy Casino and Lodge applicant, and you did a remarkable job bringing up to date all those important facts.

During the correspondence between yourself and the Gaming Control Board, other than Chairman

Decker and Judge Colins, did you hear from any other member of the Board? There's a total of seven. What about the other six? Did they get involved in the process at all? Did you hear from them?

2.0

COLONEL MILLER: I can't say that I specifically heard from them. I mainly dealt with the Chairperson of the Board, which initially was Mr. Decker and afterwards was Ms. Colins.

REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Right.

COLONEL MILLER: Normally, they were the ones that talked to us. But I was under the impression, and, of course, from listening to Chairwoman Colins's testimony, she made it clear that even though the law might prevent the State Police from sharing the investigative information behind the investigation, the mere fact that we were conducting one, she felt, would be something that perhaps if BIE would know that, then the reference was that the Board would know that and they would have made a different decision.

But my response is that that's what happened in this case. I mean, the only reason that we were involved at all -- remember, we didn't do the background investigation.

REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Yes.

COLONEL MILLER: These suitability depositions were done behind closed doors. We didn't know anything about what the applicant said.

So the only way we became involved was after the BIE investigators shared with us the fact that they thought the applicant may have been untruthful and asked us to make a request for these transcripts.

So once we made the request for the transcripts, we commenced a criminal investigation.

REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Okay.

COLONEL MILLER: Obviously, they were aware of that criminal investigation because they were the ones that referred to us the transcripts and the possible perjury.

We started the investigation. They made a number of contacts with our office to say, is that thing still going on? And we let them know it's still in process. We couldn't share any details, but the fact that it was ongoing was something that they knew. And I would presume the Board had to have known that, and from Mr. Decker's letters, I would think that he did know that.

REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Okay. I just have one question, an observation and a question.

Speaking for myself, being involved in the

process when the gaming bill was finally approved back in July of 2004, many of us in the General Assembly wanted the State Police to be primary investigators -- I want to make that perfectly clear -- and there was great disappointment when we found out that the State Police were not to be primary investigators.

Now, here's my final question, and it's a great certain as we look to the future of this whole operation of casino gambling in Pennsylvania. We know that we're in a global market; we've heard about that, and my concern is that there's going to be some international gambling cartel that's going to come in and buy into Pennsylvania to one of our casino licenses or buy the entire operation.

Now, who is going to do those international law enforcement investigations which will be so critical, more so than a company here in the United States? Because we don't know who is going to be involved in these international cartels, and we need to do it right or we may be very sorry that we did it wrong.

COLONEL MILLER: Right.

At this point, Representative, the way the law is written, BIE would either do that themselves

```
1
    or they would perhaps contract with an outside
2
    entity.
 3
            REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
4
            Thank you, Colonel.
 5
            COLONEL MILLER:
                              Thank you.
 6
7
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Oh, boy. After
    that, I guess we can all go home now, right?
8
            The Chairman of the Judiciary Committee,
9
10
    Representative Tom Caltagirone, please.
11
            REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
12
13
            I have a couple quick questions that I would
    like to see if you can answer.
14
15
            COLONEL MILLER:
                              Sure.
16
            REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: When you're
17
    competing with New York and New Jersey for the best
18
    and brightest in the recruits for replacements for
19
    the State Police, I understand that New Jersey and
20
    New York offer much better salary incentives,
21
    especially after the first or second year of service.
22
            Does this budget propose to remedy that
23
    inequity?
24
            COLONEL MILLER: I don't believe this budget
25
    actually speaks to that. We have a contract with the
```

Troopers Association that will expire this June 30, I believe, and so right now we're currently involved in negotiations for a new contract. That's what would affect the salary and benefits ultimately. So this budget doesn't address any change in that potential contract.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: All right. Since we're in the middle of this budget negotiation -- that's what this hearing is about today -- in your request for the '08-09 fiscal year, what allowance are you making for those wage increases with the collective bargaining that's going to be going on before the end of June?

COLONEL MILLER: We were instructed not to include any in there.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: So there's no adjustment that's anticipated, even though you know there's collective bargaining that's going on? will be.

COLONEL MILLER: Right. I mean, we know ultimately there's going to be a change of some sort. But I believe the position of the Office of the Budget was, we don't know exactly what that's going to be. So to try to forecast it at this particular juncture would be something they didn't want to get

25

1 involved in. 2 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: How does that compare with previous collective bargaining 3 4 agreements on the wage increases? I'm just curious, because you've been around for a while; I've been 5 6 around for a while. 7 COLONEL MILLER: Yeah, and for the time I have been Commissioner, for the last 5-plus years, I 8 think we had one other contract. And I don't believe 9 10 that that potential impact was felt in the way that it was in the proposed budget. So I think this is 11 consistent with that. 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: All right. 14 I read your report, and you are looking at a complement of 4,660 that you are saying that ---15 16 COLONEL MILLER: Actually now, with some of 17 the gaming positions, it would be 4,696. Of course, 18 the gaming and the turnpike and other ones don't 19 count against our complement. 2.0 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: And you know there's always rollovers, retirements, and whatnot. 21 22 COLONEL MILLER: Sure. 23 REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Supposedly, you

know, I understand there's a shortfall of

approximately 139. Are you telling us here today

24

25

that you're going to have that complement up to the figure that you had just said, by June of this year, with the last class that's going in?

COLONEL MILLER: What we hope to do is to be able to get to our maximum complement, if not by September of this year, hopefully sometime in 2009. It all depends on the attrition rate we have in each class and how quickly we're able to put the classes together.

REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Right.

COLONEL MILLER: Sometimes classes need to be delayed because of funding issues. But what we've tried to do -- in fact, we're right now engaged in a process where we've identified a way to shorten the length of our academy class by like 2 weeks so that we can put perhaps three classes in at one time.

So, you know, I'm very thankful that the Governor has included enough funding in the proposed budget to allow us to train as many cadets as we can as quickly as we can to try to reach that statutory cap as soon as possible.

We'll never quite get there because we can't hire in advance. Do you know what I mean? We have to wait until there's a vacancy. But given that as our marching orders, we still try to project in a way

```
1
    that will get us as close as we can to that process,
2
    you know, that point in time.
 3
            REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.
            COLONEL MILLER: Thank you.
 4
            REPRESENTATIVE CALTAGIRONE:
 5
                                          Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
6
7
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Representative
    Doug Reichley, please.
8
9
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
10
11
            Thank you, Colonel, for coming in this
12
    afternoon.
13
            COLONEL MILLER: You're welcome.
14
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: I'm just trying to
    clarify a little bit from the first part of your
15
16
    testimony. I know there's a lot of issues to go over
17
    with many of the members regarding your law
    enforcement duties.
18
19
            But sort of beginning toward the end of your
20
    statement, you mentioned that a press statement had
    been released on February 3 which attributed a
21
22
    comment to you regarding the issuance of the DeNaples
23
    license, and can you explain, number one, what the
24
    statement was and the background by which that was
25
    produced?
```

COLONEL MILLER: The statement was -- the part of the statement that was inaccurate and mistakenly put in there was that I had stated that the Board's action in giving Mr. DeNaples a license was appropriate based on the facts they knew at the time.

I hadn't said that. What I said was, I was willing to give the Board the benefit of the doubt in stating that I believed they acted in good faith, but I couldn't say that their decision was ultimately appropriate.

Somehow I'm led to believe that there was a mistake made with a prior version of something that someone was working from in the press office, and that ultimately went out without me knowing it. And then, of course, I discovered it the next day and immediately checked in with the appropriate people at the Governor's Office, and they apologized for the fact that the wrong one went out.

I just didn't want anyone to misunderstand what I had really said at that particular time.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And when you said the press office, I take it you're referring to the Governor's press office rather than the State Police press office?

```
1
            COLONEL MILLER: Right; correct.
2
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And it probably
    goes without saying, but I think in the Senate this
3
4
    morning you gave testimony which was under oath, and
    I take it that your comments here today would been
5
    under the similar circumstance, if you were sworn.
6
7
            COLONEL MILLER:
                             Absolutely.
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: To clarify the
8
    time frame or the time line that you described in
9
10
    your testimony with regard to Judge Robreno's
11
    order -- I believe that was in May of 2006?
12
            COLONEL MILLER: Yes. I believe it was
13
    May 19 of 2006.
14
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: All right.
15
            And the alleged perjurious statements of
16
    Mr. DeNaples were in September and October of 2006?
    Is that correct?
17
18
            COLONEL MILLER: Actually, they were August
19
    16 -- alleged to be August 16 of 2006 and I believe
20
    September 28 of 2006.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: So August and
22
    September.
23
            When was the referral made to the State
24
    Police by the Bureau of Investigations and
25
    Enforcement?
```

COLONEL MILLER: The first time that I can point to was September 13 of 2006, and that was at a time when the Deputy Director of the BIE contacted our gaming office and made a request for a meeting, because they wanted to discuss with our troopers information that they had uncovered that they believed was of a criminal nature.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay.

COLONEL MILLER: And this was various information covering a number of topics. We met with them, and that led to more meetings and discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: I see.

COLONEL MILLER: And ultimately on October

-- I believe it was on or about October 3, one of the attorneys from BIE contacted our gaming office and asked us specifically, you know, said, hey, look, you should make a request for these transcripts in writing.

So we made the request, we received the transcripts, and we began an investigation to determine whether Mr. DeNaples had committed perjury under oath.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And you mentioned that Mr. Kwait, the Director of the Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement, was in contact with

- the State Police leading up to the December 20
 decision to issue a license. Are you able to
 describe how frequently Mr. Kwait was in contact with
 the State Police?
 - COLONEL MILLER: Well, it was Mr. Kwait and Mr. Thomas Sturgeon, who is the Deputy Director of the BIE. And I would characterize their contacts as fairly frequent. Probably three or four contacts were made -- on a number of issues, but touched on this topic as well.
- 11 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay.

- COLONEL MILLER: In other words, is that, by
 comparison, is that information still being looked
 at? Yes; it's still in process.
 - We weren't able to talk about the details, obviously, but we were able to say, yes, it's still in process.
 - REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And to the best of your knowledge, did the Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement or the Gaming Board make a subsequent request to the U.S. Attorney's Office to go back to Judge Robreno to allow for review of the wiretap transcripts in comparison to what you were getting from the testimony?
- 25 COLONEL MILLER: I'm not aware of any

subsequent request that was made.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay.

Judge Colins has stated that you could have told her about the existence -- or you could have told the Board about the existence of the DeNaples investigation prior to the issuance of the DeNaples license on December 20. Do you have any response to that statement?

COLONEL MILLER: Well, I think what she said

-- because I listened very closely to the words that

she used -- I believe that she said that we could

have told the BIE about the existence of an

investigation. And had they only known that, then

the inference was that the Board would have known it,

and therefore, they would have taken a different

approach.

And my response to that would be, that's exactly what happened, because the Board was the one -- I'm sorry -- the Board's investigators, BIE, were the ones that actually referred to us the fact that they believed that Mr. DeNaples had been untruthful in his depositions and requested that we make a request in writing for the transcripts.

So the Board was aware that we were doing an investigation just merely because they had provided

```
1
    it to us. There's no other reason for a regulatory
    body to provide to a law enforcement body this
2
    information other than for that particular reason.
3
            And obviously we had had discussions with
 4
    their investigators, and we knew what their thought
5
    process was. So we took that information and began
6
7
    to do an investigation.
            Now, once we started to do that, we couldn't
8
9
    tell them where it was going. Obviously, ultimately
10
    it led into a grand jury situation. But they did
    know it was ongoing, and they did make a point of
11
12
    checking with us to determine whether it was.
13
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Were you familiar
14
    with who the agents from BIE were that were assigned
    to do the background investigation on Mr. DeNaples?
15
            COLONEL MILLER: I didn't know them
16
17
    personally, but I have seen their names in reports.
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And that's
18
    Mr. Greenback and Meehan?
19
2.0
            COLONEL MILLER: Greenbank and Meehan.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay.
22
            Were you familiar with the process by which
23
    any recommendations were drafted or submitted from
24
    the BIE up to the Gaming Board regarding particular
```

25

licensees' applications?

COLONEL MILLER: I can't say that I'm familiar with exactly how and what they shared with the Board.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay.

Now, you stated that Mr. Decker knew you would not provide him with sensitive criminal background information prior to December 20. How do you know that?

COLONEL MILLER: Because I had had a personal face-to-face meeting with him many months before that, where we sat down and I explained -- this is in advance of any issues coming forth -- but just my concerns that, listen, we will not be able to share certain federally-protected criminal information because of 28 CFR 23 of the Federal Code, and he disagreed with that.

We discussed it, but ultimately Mr. Decker was in receipt of letters from the Attorney General and from the U.S. Department of Justice and the FBI. And, of course, Chairwoman Colins also was in receipt of correspondence from the FBI that very clearly laid out what could be shared and what could not be shared.

And I just want to stress, we're not trying to -- the State Police would get nothing out of the

fact that somebody gets a license whey they shouldn't get a license and then we have to turn around and arrest them. That's not what we're about.

We're also not interested in trying to embarrass the Board in any way. We don't care who does the backgrounds; we really don't. If BIE would be moved to the Attorney General, we'd be fine with that. If for some reason the powers of the BIE saw fit to put that under the State Police, that's fine, too. We'll do whatever anyone wants us to do.

But I would state for the record, our troopers that work with BIE work just fine together. I've personally spoken to BIE investigators. They like working with our troopers. There's no problem at that level. There really is no problem.

I think the only problem here was there was a disagreement as to what the Federal law was. But again, I tried to stress to Mr. Decker, we want to cooperate in every way that we can. I mean, that's our goal. But we just want you to be aware that there are certain provisions in Federal law that even after the law was changed in Pennsylvania to deal with Chapter 91 and Korea, it did not excuse us or did not permit us to violate the Federal law. And Attorney General Corbett, the FBI, and others have

opined the same way.

So in this process, our goal was to make sure we did our job properly. We felt that because the Board, through BIE, had access to information that I just laid out about pending investigations, et cetera, that they had ample information to be able to do their statutory duty.

To me, it's irrelevant whether they knew that we were moving towards a grand jury, because they knew that that investigation was ongoing. I know that Mr. Decker was quoted as saying, do we wait forever? do we wait 20 years? something along those lines.

And my comment to that would be that in reality, they would have had to wait only 2 months for confirmation, because in December, they voted for the license. In February, they were served grand jury subpoenas, which put them on notice that the investigation they had referred to us had now reached the grand jury stage.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And I take it that if in fact you were given the background investigation responsibilities, you would need additional manpower to perform those functions?

COLONEL MILLER: Well, if BIE came over,

```
1
    let's say, then BIE, if they were a part of that
    process, that would be part of the manpower.
2
    would just have to be funded to make sure that we
3
4
    could handle that.
            But again, I wouldn't object if it was with
 5
    us or if it was with the Attorney General.
6
7
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay. My last
    area of inquiry for you, Colonel.
8
9
            During your testimony, you made reference to
10
    the fact that there were, during the course of your
    investigation, other referrals made. And I
11
12
    understand you can't talk about those in great
    detail.
13
            There was an article this past week in the
14
    Allentown Morning Call that referred to, I guess I'll
15
16
    call it a title washing or vehicle misidentification
17
    situation. The referrals made mention of, are those
18
    other than that title washing?
19
            COLONEL MILLER: I really can't --
20
    unfortunately, I really can't get into that at this
21
    moment.
22
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And was the
23
    existence of the other referrals also made known to
24
    the Gaming Board or to BIE?
```

25 COLONEL MILLER: Well, BIE knew because they

1 were the ones that actually made the referrals. 2 actually made the referrals. They made one to the State Police, and then they made three additional 3 4 potential illegal conduct referrals to three other outside agencies. 5 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: 6 7 COLONEL MILLER: So BIE was absolutely aware of the referrals. And all four of those referrals 8 were still not resolved. 9 10 So BIE knew about them. I would presume the 11 Board would know, but I can't say for sure they shared that with the Board. 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay. Now, let me get this straight. BIE had made 14 a referral to the Pennsylvania State Police on the 15 16 perjury allegation alone? COLONEL MILLER: Yes. 17 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: But there were 18 19 three other referrals made by the BIE to other 20 agencies for separate investigation purposes? 21 COLONEL MILLER: As well as the State 22 Police, too. But yes, there were three other 23 separate topics of referral that allege potential 24 illegal conduct on the part of the applicant. 25 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: And this was all

1 prior to December 20 when the license was issued to 2 Mr. DeNaples? COLONEL MILLER: 3 That's correct. REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Was there 4 5 anything, based upon your knowledge of the gaming 6 law, that compelled the Gaming Board to issue the 7 license to Mr. DeNaples on December 20? COLONEL MILLER: None that I'm aware of. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Could they have 10 waited? 11 COLONEL MILLER: I believe they had a number 12 of options. 13 Number one, they could have. If they felt that the applicant had met his burden of proving by 14 clear and convincing evidence that he was suitable 15 16 for a license in the areas of character, honesty, and 17 integrity, they could have issued the license. Or 18 they could have delayed a decision on that pending 19 the other investigations and other information that 20 they didn't have yet. 21 Or it's my understanding that the Board did 22 conclude ultimately that all the applicants for 23 Category 2 licenses were in fact suitable. 24 another option that would have been available to them 25 would have been to award that particular Category 2

license to a different applicant.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: But I think you've stated, at least today on previous grounds, that under your reading of the gaming law, Mr. DeNaples could have been denied a license based upon his prior felony conviction, based upon the ongoing perjury investigation that you were conducting, or based upon his refusal to turn over his FBI file, which he had obtained.

mentioned the prior criminal record for Mr. DeNaples only under the fact that even though it wasn't an automatic bar -- in other words, his conviction was outside of the 15-year window -- it could still be considered by the Board in conjunction with other items.

As to the fact that -- I lost my train of thought there. As to the fact that -- I'm sorry; what was the second part of it?

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: On the perjury investigation, the FBI file which he refused to disclose.

COLONEL MILLER: Right. On the FBI file or the FBI reports, the documents that he received from the FBI, my reading of the statute would lead me to

conclude that in and of itself, the fact that an 1 2 applicant who is coming before you to secure a license, that doesn't provide you with access to 3 4 documents that you deem to be relevant in your background investigation, my reading of their own 5 regulation suggests that that in and of itself is 6 7 enough to deny a licensee there. So I would think that there would at least 8 be some flags there that they would want to consider 9 10 with regard to this applicant before they made a 11 decision to actually go ahead and award the license. REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay. And then 12 13 possibly these three other matters. 14 COLONEL MILLER: Right. REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, thank you, 15 Colonel. 16 17 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your indulgence 18 for these questions. 19 Colonel, I think your testimony is 20 courageous. I think you and the State Police have been slandered by the Gaming Board. 21 22 And, Mr. Chairman, I will submit the request 23 to you, but if you will convey to Chairman Evans that 24 I believe the Gaming Board should be recalled before 25 the Appropriations Committee to answer further

```
1
    questions about the propriety of this license and
2
    whether we need to transfer the investigation
3
    powers.
 4
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER:
 5
                                     Thank you.
            Representative Cherelle Parker, please.
 6
7
            REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman, and I'll be as brief as possible.
8
9
            I have two questions, Colonel.
10
            COLONEL MILLER:
                              Yes, ma'am.
11
            REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: I want to thank you
12
    and the members of your executive team for being
13
    here.
            First, I want to follow up on Chairman
14
    Caltagirone's concern about recruitment for the
15
16
    State Police. I thank you and members of your team
17
    for meeting with a group of legislators from
18
    southeastern Pennsylvania after we had read reports
19
    in our local press about that process.
2.0
            COLONEL MILLER:
                              Sure.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: But I felt very much
22
    assured after meeting with you that you understood
23
    our concern about diversity in the department as it
24
    relates to people of color and also women.
25
            But I was really moved about the challenges
```

in the recruitment process and actually your efforts
to find individuals to actually serve on our State
Police.

So I wanted you to just on the record talk about some of the challenges and then some of the aggressive tools that members of your department have used in that process.

COLONEL MILLER: Thank you, Representative Parker. I appreciate your comments.

I would just say where we are right now within the State Police, just briefly, there was a Federal consent decree that was signed in 1974. At the time that was signed, the State Police was at, I believe, 1.48-percent minorities.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Okay.

COLONEL MILLER: And we had just started having females come into the department in 1972.

When the consent decree was signed, our numbers for the minority quotient was 9.2 percent. Then in 1983, it was amended to 10.2 percent, and then in 1993 to 12.3 percent. In 1999, the consent decree was dissolved.

What has happened is that between June 22 of 1978 and February 6 of 1984, the department hired 448 minority members during a time, under the consent

decree, when we were 50/50 classes -- 50 percent minority, 50 percent non-minority. So there were a lot of folks that came on to the State Police in a short period of time.

What happened is that the State Police, once the consent decree was dissolved, the State Police was now responsible to ensure that we were able to find qualified applicants of diversity and females around the Commonwealth and throughout this part of the country.

What happened was, when you hire a lot of people in a short period of time, when they reach 20 to 25 years of service, now they can retire. And what happened is, we lost about 300 minorities in a short window, between '02 and '08.

Right now, as I sit here today, we're at 7.3-percent minorities and we're about 4.6-percent female, and that is not where we want to be on either note. However, the female quotient has crept up slightly since I came here. The minority numbers are reflective of the fact that so many people were able to reach retirement age.

So the numbers couldn't look any worse on that side. However, there are some reasons for hope and optimism, and that is, Lieutenant Colonel Brown

and our team -- as you know personally, because we met with you -- are engaged in a number of initiatives that are very important, but also they're striking at new ground.

2.0

We're testing not only in Pennsylvania, but now we're testing at John Jay College, at Morgan State University, at Howard University, Cleveland State University. That's the written, the oral -- the whole thing. We're trying to come to people to bring them into the fold.

We have a number of things ongoing with regard to the Latino community in advertising. We're also looking to do some more -- you guys had some great suggestions, and we talked about the fact that there are a number of local newspapers in neighborhoods, and that's where we need to be. So we're going to do that. And we also are going to take you up on the offer of assistance in coming to different meetings, et cetera.

We've got a lot of things going on right now, and I would point to a big class we did, the 124th class, which was a recent class we did where there were 200 members of that class. Twenty percent went in that were minorities, and 20 percent went in as females. That was a good result, and what we need

to do is have more consistent results that mirror that.

And I can share with you -- I just picked this up yesterday; it was just presented to me -- we have two classes scheduled for this year in '08, one June 2 and one August 4, and right now the numbers of people that have made it through the written and the oral and are now processing with the last several steps, we have total minorities, 14.6 percent for the 127th class; total females, 14.28 percent. For the 128th, total minorities, 11 percent; total females, 21 percent.

So those are some encouraging numbers. And again, it's like turning a battleship. It's not going to happen overnight, just from the sheer fact that the only way you can keep pace when people are leaving in those numbers, because they were hired at the same time, is if you're hiring one for one or better. But unfortunately, we can't do that, because then we'd be violating somebody else's civil rights.

And let me let Colonel Brown just make a quick comment on some of the other things that we're doing.

COLONEL BROWN: Sure. Absolutely.

And once again, thank you for your support

of our recruitment effort. I know our recruiter has been down to meet with you on some of the advertising things.

2.0

But we're looking at increasing advertising in Pittsburgh, Erie, Cleveland, and Philadelphia with mass transit vehicles, the buses. We're looking at billboards. We're doing Black magazines and newspapers, and we're looking to do something with television this year. Hopefully we can do something with Univision on the Hispanic side and something with Comcast, the full range of diversity that we're looking for.

So right now, John Jay, we were just up there last week, and they've offered to allow us to test up there, so we're really encouraged about that because of the numbers they have up there.

And the thing I just want to mention is the mentoring program we discussed. We've expanded it statewide, and we have good results with that.

And one of the other things I'm looking at is the process itself to see if we can collapse some of the processing time down to where there's not so much time from the test to the academy, that we can compress it a little bit.

So we think that those things are bringing

us forward faster.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you.

I just want to follow up to that, and again, just like you're being questioned about other issues here today, I think the good that you do should also be a part of the public record.

And when we did question you about having a strategic plan overall as it relates to your recruitment process, it's obvious to me today that you've responded.

And I've seen it firsthand in the northwest section of Philadelphia. I happen to represent one of the most diverse districts in the city of Philadelphia, and you all have been at every major meeting where we've had over 100, 200 people on the ground trying to recruit from residents. So I thank you for those efforts.

Finally, my second question, there has been a very unusual tie that I've been witnessing in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and that is, aside from the usual advocates that we see working to support the control of the flow of illegal handguns in the Commonwealth, there has been a rallying cry from law enforcement officials across the Commonwealth, our chiefs of police, from the major areas aside from

Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, saying to the
Legislature that there needs to be some law
associated with the mandatory reporting of lost and
stolen guns for the purpose of cutting down on straw
purchasing and for supporting our law-abiding
citizens who are sportsmen, who are hunters, and who
are responsible gun owners, who traditionally usually
wouldn't have a problem if their gun was lost or
stolen reporting it because they are responsible gun
owners.

2.0

But this is not coming from the advocacy side now; it's coming more from law enforcement. And in fact, I was reading an article that was actually in the Post-Gazette, because lots of times this issue is perceived as being a Philadelphia issue, but it was in the Post-Gazette, and there was a man in Butler County arrested with 410 weapons in his home. He was actually caught selling guns, illegal handguns, to felons.

So I just wanted to know, as head of our State Police, what is your thinking as it relates to the mandatory reporting of lost and stolen guns while making sure that we do want to protect the rights of our law-abiding citizens who own guns and who are hunters and who are sportsmen but recognizing that

there's a problem going on with straw purchasing and we need to address it.

COLONEL MILLER: Right. I wholeheartedly support the Governor's proposal that we require individuals to report to law enforcement that their gun has been lost or stolen within 24 hours, I believe was the proposal.

I support that, I believe that other people in law enforcement support that, just from the perspective that we see so much on the straw purchase side that allows people to act with impunity in providing guns to other individuals that are going to use those guns to kill and maim people.

So I think that there's a way in which it could be, I think that reasonable people from both sides of the issue could come together and hammer out some language that would provide the requisite protections for law -abiding gun owners.

Again, I would agree with you,
Representative. Most gun owners are law-abiding
citizens, and they would be the first ones to call
the State Police or call the local police to report a
gun missing or stolen, because they want to get that
gun back.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Right.

COLONEL MILLER: So I think there's probably some common ground here where something could be hammered out that would not be objectionable to either side and would still serve the purposes that the Governor's bill would seek to achieve.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you.

That's it, Mr. Chairman.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.

Colonel, I'm just curious, you're doing a great job on recruiting, but is there an outreach to returning Pennsylvania veterans?

COLONEL MILLER: Actually, veterans do get preference points in the testing process. Let me let Colonel Brown talk. We have some other things I'll let him tell you about.

COLONEL BROWN: We give preference points in the testing process, but they also get a waiver of some of the educational requirements, 30/30 credits for 4 years of military service.

And this spring, we have some of our recruiters going down to Camp Lejeune and also, I think it's Fort Benning. We're looking at some other military installations. We're trying to get the veterans as they're coming out of the Service.

So yes, sir, that's one of our initiatives.

```
1
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER:
                                     Thank you.
2
            Representative Mario Scavello, please.
 3
            REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
4
            Good afternoon.
 5
            COLONEL MILLER:
                             Good afternoon.
 6
7
            REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: When you talked
    about the recruitment -- and I'd like to check the
8
    complement, the 4,660 troopers -- how short from the
9
10
    legislative cap of 4,310 troopers are we?
11
            COLONEL MILLER: We're going to be coming up
12
    pretty close to that this year. And actually, the
13
    number, including some additional gaming positions,
    is probably more like 4,696, I believe, on the
14
    enlisted side.
15
16
            REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Okay.
17
            COLONEL MILLER: We have about 164 liquor
    enforcement officers that are not enlisted.
18
                                                  We have
19
    64 motor carrier enforcement officers, and 1,525
20
    civilians. That's our authorized complement.
                                                    So I
    think all told, it's like 6,400-some people.
21
22
            But your point is well taken, and that is
23
    that we are getting closer, as we fill positions, we
24
    are going to be getting closer to the actual
25
    statutory cap.
```

So there is some concern on my part that perhaps we need to remove that or move it up, just so we have enough flexibility that if we end up hiring somebody in anticipation, that we don't go over the cap.

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: That was my -- fine. Okay.

I noticed in the 2006-2007 budget, you had a \$900,000 appropriation for gun checks, and it's not there in 2007-08 or in the proposed budget. What does the gun checks do?

COLONEL MILLER: Well, what is present in the Governor's proposed budget for '08-09 is that if you look back in time to Act 17 of 1995, Act 17 never provided adequate funding because the ratio of handguns versus long guns was never quite right. So from the time the law was passed in 1995 to the present, we have never been able to go through a fiscal year and allow the instant check system to support itself really, and what we've needed is a gun check appropriation.

So we can estimate that with the current fees, which is a \$2 fee and a \$3 surcharge per weapon or per transaction, that with that, we can expect to receive \$1.8 million that we would need authorization

to spend. But that's not enough to run the system.

We would need an additional \$3.8 million.

2.0

So what the Governor has proposed is moving both of those fees up from \$2 to \$10 for the PICS check fee, and that would put it in line with what we charge right now to do a criminal history check across Pennsylvania.

And it should be noted that in the PICS check, that check is not just what we do in criminal history; it checks a lot of other things. So it's fair to say that we have had that priced way too low for a long time.

So right now if we moved that up to \$10 and the \$3 surcharge fee to \$10, then we would not need a gun check appropriation augmentation of \$3.8 million. We could expect that we would have additional moneys there so that we could not only support PICS but also build in a PICS upgrade. We desperately need a PICS upgrade. The system is older.

I know there's some confusion; we did an upgrade last year on the computerized criminal history record information system. That's different. They tap into that, but it's not PICS.

So if we move those fees up, as the Governor proposes, which I think we should do, it would allow

us to let the system run on its own and pay for itself in doing an upgrade that we desperately need to do to the system.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Chairman Evans isn't here, but, you know, he relates to me as another Legislator from Philadelphia, so I have a Philadelphia question.

What is the status of deploying troopers to patrol the major highways in Philadelphia, how many troopers are currently assigned to Philly, and are we assigning more troopers to Philly in the 2008-2009 budget or are any more needed?

COLONEL MILLER: I've actually transferred all my troopers to Philadelphia. No, I'm just kidding. Just kidding. Just a joke; just a joke.

Actually, what we have is we have about 60 troopers that are assigned to Philadelphia now.

The status of the project is this: We currently, as of March 1, we have all the interstate highways within the city of Philadelphia.

So it took a while, we were transitioning, and now we have all of 76, 95, and 676. So we have additional troopers down there for that. We're doing that as we speak.

Was there a second part of your question?

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Yes. So you feel that that's enough, or are we going to have to add more to that complement?

COLONEL MILLER: No, I think we're going to be okay with what we have down there. I think we're going to be all right with that. And we're also involved in some other things in Philadelphia, Allentown, other places, where we're dealing with gun violence issues. But you're specifically talking about the interstates.

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Do we have an adequate barracks or an operations space?

COLONEL MILLER: No, we don't. We don't have an adequate barracks. We're trying to work -- and I had a recent meeting with Mayor Nutter and Commissioner Ramsey and we talked about a number of issues, but we also talked about that.

We're hopeful that -- we're working right now with the Department of General Services and the Office of Administration, because there's a plot of ground, if you're familiar at all with where our barracks is on Belmont Avenue---

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Yes.

COLONEL MILLER: ---there's a plot of ground just adjacent to it on the north side where our radio

```
1
    tower is. That is, I believe, about 3 acres of
2
    ground. Yeah; it's 3 acres of ground.
            If we could work out an agreement with the
 3
4
    city, what we would ultimately like to do is build a
    new facility, like a 40,000-square-foot facility, on
5
    that piece of ground, then knock down the current
6
7
    1949 structure and use that area for parking.
            REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: I know that the
8
    turnpike reimburses us for the troopers on the
9
10
    turnpike system. Does Philadelphia do the same
11
    thing?
            COLONEL MILLER: Well, they reimburse us
12
13
    just the same as Pittsburgh does, which is, they
    don't reimburse us. And, of course, the turnpike is
14
    a toll road; it's a little bit different animal.
15
16
            I know you said that in jest.
17
            REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Thank you very
18
    much.
19
            COLONEL MILLER:
                             Thank you.
20
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Does Monroe County
    reimburse you for their roads?
21
22
            COLONEL MILLER: I don't think. I'm going
23
    to look at that when I get back.
24
            REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Excuse me; 80
25
    percent of my municipalities have regional police
```

```
1
    departments. I have a great police department.
2
    have Paradise Township and Jackson Township that
3
    don't have, and one has the casino.
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I'm going to get up
 4
    there someday to see that garden spot.
5
            Chairman Civera, please.
6
7
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
            Colonel, just a brief question.
8
9
            COLONEL MILLER: Yes, sir.
10
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: If the General Assembly
11
    was to give you the enforcement for the gaming, how
    would you go about that? We gave you in 1985 the
12
13
    enforcement for the LCB, and over the years there has
    been some problems enforcing the LCB laws, and the
14
    gaming, I believe, were two different types of
15
    enforcement.
16
17
            But what would you recommend and how would
    you do, compared to what the Gaming Board is doing
18
19
    now, with the investigations and enforcement?
2.0
             COLONEL MILLER: Well, first off, I just
21
    want to say, again for the record, that I believe
22
    that the BIE investigators are good investigators.
23
    They're competent investigators. I think they're
24
    doing everything that they can do under their
25
    circumstances.
```

I think if you're asking me how would we look at maybe doing some things differently, I think in general terms, there were some recommendations that were presented in the grand jury presentment, and one of them was to open up to public scrutiny the suitability hearings rather than having them behind closed doors. I think that's a good suggestion to look at.

I think right now -- to give you an example

-- I think right now the way the law is written,

there are a number of things that I think could be

changed, that at least should be looked at, and if

BIE was removed from the Board and placed with the

Attorney General or with the State Police, wherever

you want to put it, with a law enforcement agency,

they would have access to more information. And

probably from a perception standpoint, it might be

better than having them under the Board.

But ultimately I think there would be -- and I believe the Attorney General would agree with me -- there would have to be some other changes. For instance, maybe we would want to look at whether or not a recommendation could be built into the law.

Let's say that BIE was moved under the Attorney General. Maybe there could be a

recommendation that the Attorney General could make to the Board as to the suitability of an applicant.

2.0

But at the same time, I think there's some onerous due-process requirements on the back end of the law that will need to be adjusted, because right now, for example, if somebody like John Gotti, let's say, walked in and he applied for a gaming license in Pennsylvania, not because he wanted a license but because strategically he wanted access to information, he could apply for a license.

An investigation would occur, and under today's law, he would have the right to an adversarial hearing where confidential information could be presented to him, which he could then use for criminal means.

So that's an example, but I think that's a realistic example. I think we have to maybe look at the back end of the law to see what can be done on that side of it.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: One more question.

The State of New Jersey, under their gaming and their investigation, basically the State Police, do they assist them in any way under their gaming regulations in New Jersey?

COLONEL MILLER: Yes. There are State

1 troopers in the casinos in New Jersey. 2 CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Well, don't we have them 3 in Pennsylvania, too? COLONEL MILLER: We do. CHAIRMAN CIVERA: What are their 5 responsibilities in the casinos in Pennsylvania? 6 7 mean, they're just like enforcement? COLONEL MILLER: 8 Right. The troopers that we have from our Gaming Enforcement Office in the 9 10 casinos, they do things like fingerprinting under the harness racing acts; they monitor surveillance; they 11 make arrests for violation of the Gaming Act or 12 13 violations of any law in the facility. I think we had about 968 criminal offenses we investigated in 14 2007 in the casinos themselves. So they're busy 15 16 doing a number of different requirements under the 17 law, including the fingerprinting and surveillance 18 and making arrests. 19 But to answer your question, in New Jersey, 20 the New Jersey State Police, it's a different 21 structure in New Jersey. The New Jersey State Police 22 is under the Attorney General. Their regulatory arm 23 is also under the Attorney General. So it's a little 24 bit different process in New Jersey. But the 25 troopers are there. They're in those facilities

1 alongside of the regulatory arm. 2 I mean, they're still -- in New Jersey, they still can't share protected information. I mean, 3 4 these same challenges, you know, are all over the place. The challenge is for us to try to construct 5 6 something that will allow everyone to be able to do 7 their job properly in a way that we don't violate Federal law. 8 CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Okay. Thank you. 10 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: The gentleman from 11 Monroe County, Representative John Siptroth. 12 REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 Colonel Miller, good afternoon. 14 15 COLONEL MILLER: Good afternoon. REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Unlike 16 Representative Scavello, I don't have a lot of 17 18 regional police departments in my district; I only 19 have one, but there has been significant growth. 20 have asked you this question probably year after year since Philadelphia received the additional State 21 22 Police under the 2006 authorization and complement 23 change. 24 What about the northeast and barracks like

Blooming Grove? If you don't have those numbers with

25

you today, if you could submit them, I would appreciate it. Has there been any change, any additional troopers placed in those growth areas?

2.0

COLONEL MILLER: Yes. And I want to be clear, and I believe the Governor has made this point as well, and that is that what we are doing in Philadelphia is no different than what we've done anywhere else. It's just that we weren't in the city before. We were doing the interstates, but just outside of the city. Now we're doing it consistent with what we do in Pittsburgh, Harrisburg, and other places.

As to the other part of your question, the additional troopers that I thank the General Assembly and the Governor for providing have been deployed throughout the Commonwealth. In other words, 60 of them went to Philadelphia, but the vast majority went everywhere else, via our staffing formula. So we're in the process of continuing to put more resources in areas based on the calls for service that we have.

So that area I know, the Troop R Blooming
Grove area, et cetera, that's been an area that has
received more home buyers, more home owners, et
cetera, so there are more calls for assistance in
some of those areas.

```
1
            And I know that Blooming Grove -- I don't
2
    have in front of me the number of troopers assigned
3
    to the barracks at present, but I know that they have
4
    most likely seen an increase over the last few years.
5
            REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Okay.
                                              If you
6
    could---
7
            COLONEL MILLER:
                              Sure.
            REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: --- and you have
8
    that available, that data, could you submit that
9
10
    through the Chairman -- for Blooming Grove, Pike
    County as a whole, and Monroe County as a whole.
11
12
    you could break it down by barracks, that would be
    fabulous.
13
            COLONEL MILLER: Monroe and Pike.
14
15
            REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Yes, sir.
16
            COLONEL MILLER: We will do that for you,
    sir.
17
18
            REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Thank you very
19
    much, sir.
2.0
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
22
            Representative Katie True.
23
            REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Thank you,
24
    Mr. Chairman.
            Good afternoon, Colonel.
25
```

COLONEL MILLER: Good afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Of interest to a lot of taxpayers is the DNA issue relating to crimes committed, and I'm just curious, how many DNA and non-DNA cases were processed through your labs?

COLONEL MILLER: We have seen an increase, Representative, on both counts. On the convicted offenders side, it's been a great success of the change in the law that required offenders to submit samples for the lab. And now we upload those into CODIS and we have the opportunity then to compare unknown samples at scenes versus known samples in a database.

And in 2007, the DNA lab, all told, with outsourcing and what we did ourselves, put 85,485 DNA samples in through CODIS. That's a lot of samples.

But it also pays off because we had a number of cold case hits. We had 678 cold case hits in 2007, which is an increase of 125 percent over the 301 we had in 2006. So that's a positive. That's a real tangible result of a law that the General Assembly passed. I mean, that is helping to make the community safer.

Now on the other side of it, you know, programs like CSI are probably interesting programs,

people enjoy watching them, but on the other side of the equation, now every piece of evidence that someone stumbles upon they would like it to be tested in the DNA realm. And because of that fact, we have seen an increase in our DNA caseload. In fact, last year, we processed 1,800 regular criminal cases with DNA. That's a 38-percent increase over the 1,300 cases we had in 2006.

So that has caused us a little bit of a backlog in the lab, because we're dealing with some new technology that has to be tested and validated and we're dealing with the convicted offender samples.

We're hoping this year, we should be about done with the work we have to do on the convicted offender samples, the large portion that we had. Then we validate the new equipment, and now we attack the backlog that has been created in the case log.

But unfortunately, we expect that instead of getting 1,800 cases this year, we'll probably get 2,000 or more. So it's a growing field, and the good news is that DNA is great evidence, but it's also very labor intensive.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: And is there something that you would like to recommend that we could do to

help you with that backlog? I mean, where's the
funding---

COLONEL MILLER: Well, we have made available -- to the best of our ability, the grant funding we've been able to get from the Federal government, we continue to pursue every single dollar that we can.

I am concerned that as we go down the road, we will have to look closely at not only the facilities in which we do this work, because a lot of the facilities that we use for laboratories are facilities that when they were constructed and conceived, there was no thought of the kind of evidentiary processes that we have in place now. So we have to look at those facilities, I think in the future broad based, and make a plan.

And we also have to look at perhaps some personnel issues, because there's only so much -- we are taking advantage of robotics in the DNA field. That's a very interesting field, and I've seen that in person. But at the same time, we still have to continue to have scientists doing this work. So that's an area that we're going to have to look at if things continue to go the way they're going.

And the grant funding is starting to dry up

```
a little bit from Washington, so I have some concerns
1
2
    there. We're going to need approximately
    $1.7 million in funding to keep up with the backlog.
3
            So we're going to have to work as best we
 4
    can to be as efficient as we can be with our DNA
5
6
    labs.
7
            REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Have you been relying
    totally on grant funding for the DNA so far?
8
9
            COLONEL MILLER: Well, no, not totally.
10
    have funding in the budget to support personnel and
    equipment and positions. But we have relied upon a
11
12
    number of grant dollars that have helped us to
13
    actually hire some additional people, not a lot, but
14
    some, and also buy some additional equipment.
            And our DNA budget in '08-09 is $1.6
15
16
    million, I believe, in the general government
17
    appropriation.
18
            REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Okay.
                                          Thank you very
19
    much.
20
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
22
            Representative Gordon Denlinger, please.
23
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Thank you,
24
    Mr. Chairman.
            Good afternoon.
25
```

1 | COLONEL MILLER: Good afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: A question about the statewide emergency radio system. I'm hearing some conflicting information out there.

We had Fire Commissioner Ed Mann before us a couple of days ago -- I guess it was last week -- and he kind of gave the assurance that the 800 megahertz radio system is on track, widely accepted, and there are virtually, in his words, no complaints about it.

Anecdotally, in my county, I hear many concerns about it. Obviously, as it relates to a potential terrorist attack or emergency situation, some kind of catastrophe, we would rely on that radio system being up, running, operational, in peak performance.

Can you share for me your perspective on where we stand on the 800 megahertz system?

COLONEL MILLER: Yes; yes.

I'm much more optimistic about the 800 megahertz system this year than I was in the past. I've seen evidence with my own eyes of it working well in many cases.

In fact, when we had the tragedy at
West Nickel Mines, that whole incident we did on 800.
In fact, one of the individuals involved with

communications made a suggestion: Do we want to stay on 800 -- because this was new down. Do you want to stay on this or do you want to switch over? And one of the corporals that responded to the scene said, stay on 800; we have the 800 portables. Well, that was a good decision that he made, and that whole incident worked very, very well from a communications standpoint. We had, within a short period of time, 50 or so troopers operating off the same tower. So that worked very well.

2.0

On the broader sense, we have been successful now -- I believe we have 14 stations that were dispatching on 800 for voice. We have 1,395 mobile offices out there in the patrol cars that we're supplying through the 800 data. We also have about 845 voice users on the 800 megahertz.

For instance, Troop G Hollidaysburg, that entire troop, all seven stations, are now on the 800 megahertz system, and we do regular station visits around the State.

We've heard a lot of positive things. We've also heard some, hey, we just got this; we're not really sure how this works; what's going on? But things have been going in a positive direction.

So right now we have 14 stations. We have

six gaming offices. We have our helicopters using 800. And in some cases, like Cumberland County, our helicopters can talk directly to local municipal police officers in their car using the 800.

For instance, in Philadelphia, we built a bridge from our 800 to their 800, and we communicate directly, car to car, in back-up situations and emergencies.

So I see this thing really progressing forward, and I'm optimistic that when we get to the end -- and I think we're talking about '09, the end of '09 -- we hope to be fully operational with the 800 megahertz for voice.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Very good. Well, that's good news for all of us. It really is.

We've had a lot of discussion in this committee about the potential leasing of the turnpike, and I'm wondering what potential impacts there are to your force if we would in fact go to some kind of a public-private partnership arrangement.

COLONEL MILLER: Well, I've had some very basic discussions with the people involved in the process, and my understanding is that if that were to come to be, that whomever, whatever entity would take

over that responsibility, would still need the State Police in a similar function like we are right now.

So I'm led to believe that not much would change with regard to what we're doing out there on the turnpike.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: And then finally,

I just want to provide an opportunity for you to

express, I guess, any concerns with trends that we

see in law enforcement. Obviously, we're dealing

with increased rates of incarceration. We do seem to

be having, you know, somewhat of a crime increase

going on.

As your rank-and-file officers are out there on the job day in and day out, are they noticing more difficulty in dealing with the general public? Are there things that we should know about as a committee as it relates to their interaction with the public?

COLONEL MILLER: Well, I guess I would answer that by saying that what we've seen, I think, is an increase in many mid-sized or smaller cities with violent crime. We have seen that occur. And some of that crime is related to gang activity.

And I can tell that you that we have gang enforcement teams. We have task forces in all five

of our area commands now, and we have two troopers assigned plus a supervisor at headquarters. The troopers work in conjunction with State and Federal and local officers in the various jurisdictions.

In 2007, we made a number of arrests -seized weapons, made arrests -- but also identified
255 gangs of various strengths and association that
are operating within Pennsylvania.

And I think that one of the challenges for law enforcement moving forward is working together to, A, share the intelligence that needs to be shared, and we think we're providing that conduit with our Pennsylvania Criminal Intelligence Center.

And more and more every day, more people are talking advantage of that. Last year we had 10,726, I think, requests for information through PaCIC. Well, that's an increase of 18 percent over the previous year and an increase of 163 percent from 3 years ago.

So people are tuned in to that now, because criminals don't respect jurisdictional boundaries, and we in law enforcement can't restrict ourselves as well. We have to share that information on a burglary happening over here with a group that's

operating over there. So I think that's one of the challenges.

Secondly, an overarching challenge that I think law enforcement and local governments are going to deal with, have to deal with, is that the rising costs of providing law enforcement services are such that I believe two things are going to happen.

Either in some cases municipalities are going to have to combine their resources to provide police services, or some municipalities are going to go out of business in that regard, because the costs are going up.

might say, well, that's going to force people to do what they should have been doing all along, which is kind of regionalizing some of these services. And I hope that happens. I mean, we're all from Pennsylvania. We all know what we are, okay? So I don't really have to say much more about that. But I hope that we can get to that point, because I think that services could be provided a lot more efficiently.

But I think that's a challenge that people are going to be facing, because there's a lot of hesitancy to maybe give up that loyal control, but I

```
1
    think it's going to come down now to a fiscal
2
    decision: Do you want to raise taxes, or do you want
    to combine some of these resources?
3
            This past year in '07, I think we had three
 4
    municipalities that went out of business that we had
5
    to take over, not large ones necessarily, about 2,800
6
7
    in population, maybe 19 square miles, 53 highway
8
    miles. But we only had, I think, one municipality
    that cut back and one that went up. I think there
9
10
    was one in Potter County that didn't have a PD that
    now has a PD, but they only have about 691 people,
11
12
    and I think the rest are bears and elk and things
    like that.
13
            So that's the trend I see, and I think
14
    that's a challenge. I think that's a challenge
15
16
    moving forward.
17
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Very good.
                                                    Well,
    those comments are appreciated.
18
19
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2.0
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
21
            Representative Dave Millard, please.
22
            REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD:
                                      Thank you,
23
    Mr. Chairman.
24
            Colonel Miller and company, welcome before
25
    our committee today.
```

COLONEL MILLER: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: You answered

Representative Scavello when he asked you about the firearms sale surcharge and the PICS system. I guess I would like to follow up with that with a question of, what if these fees are not implemented? Then what happens to the program?

COLONEL MILLER: Well, if the fees are not implemented, then we're probably going to need a supplemental appropriation of some sort to make up the difference, probably at least \$3.8 million. And that doesn't even touch any update to the PICS system.

So we would need an additional \$3.8 million based on what we can forecast we're going to receive from the \$2 and \$3 fees based on the number of weapons that will be purchased and transferred in Pennsylvania in '08-09. So we would need a \$3.8 million supplement to augment what we need to support the program.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: And all those fees, they're directed toward the information technology and upgrades, not the administration program; is that correct?

COLONEL MILLER: That's correct. It

basically would support the program itself, meaning what it takes to do the checks associated with PICS, as well as it would provide us with an avenue to pay for needed improvements in the system.

2.0

Because eventually, if we don't make those adjustments to the system, then sportsmen and hunters and others are going to be facing more delays, and we don't want that to happen. So eventually we have to get our arms around that, and I think the Governor's proposal is a good one, which will allow the users to actually pay a fair price for what it is that we need to improve and the benefits that will come back to them in that process.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Okay.

Now, one other question for you. You answered Representative Denlinger concerning the radios and how you're using them and being able to communicate from your helicopter right to the members in the squad cars and everything.

Along this vein, what's the status of your aerial fleet, given that the Governor is selling one of the State planes? How many helicopters do you have? And, you know, we're talking funding here, immediate and in the future. What is their life expectancy? You know, what's the status of your

equipment?

COLONEL MILLER: Right. Well, we have eight helicopters and seven fixed-wing aircraft as I sit here right now.

On the fixed-wing aircraft side, we have just finished arrangements to take our fleet of five of our Cessna aircraft and we're going to be turning them over and replacing them with four Cessna 206H aircraft, which is going to give us a little bit more flexibility in our operational environment. But instead of five, we'll have four, but that will be okay with us.

On the helicopter side, as I said, we have eight helicopters presently. We're currently in discussions with the Governor's Office to determine whether we might be better suited to standardize our fleet with a lease-purchase option to turn our fleet over completely.

We have some older helicopters that are going to have to be replaced anyway, but if we come up with a -- we have one plan that's on the table that would allow us to take all of our helicopters and turn them over to one type of helicopter, get a new fleet, and it would give us a fixed cost for a period of, I think, 10 years.

```
1
            So that's one of the things we're discussing
2
    right now with the Governor's Office.
            REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: And are these
 3
4
    aircraft equipped to communicate with the Civil Air
5
    Patrol, the Department of Homeland Security, if
6
    needed?
7
            COLONEL MILLER: Well, the aircraft have
8
    basic -- they have radios in them that they can
    communicate to pretty much anybody that they need to.
9
10
    And the beauty of the new 800 system is that we can
11
    talk to any system that we want to talk to as long as
12
    the other system will allow us to, and we can put the
13
    fix in place to do that.
            In other words, if someone's willing to talk
14
    to us, there's a way to do it. But with the
15
16
    helicopters, they have always been able to talk
    across bans that we in the cars couldn't do.
17
            REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: I see.
18
19
            Thank you, Colonel Miller.
2.0
            COLONEL MILLER:
                              Thank you.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD:
                                      Thank you,
22
    Mr. Chairman.
23
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
24
            Representative Ron Miller.
25
            REPRESENTATIVE MILLER:
                                     Thank you,
```

1 Mr. Chairman. 2 Colonel. COLONEL MILLER: Good afternoon. 3 REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Good afternoon. 4 Tt. is still afternoon. 5 A little while ago there was some 6 7 lighthearted banter about complement deployment, and 8 one of the things that you had asked for in the past, I believe, was a consideration of a budget initiative 10 for cost reimbursement for municipalities for State 11 Police coverage? Did you request that again this 12 year? 13 COLONEL MILLER: That is something that we have talked about. That wasn't a part, I don't 14 believe, in the final PRR process, that that was in 15 16 there. But certainly that's an issue, and I discussed it in the Senate this morning as well. 17 18 It is something that I think still needs to be discussed because of the fact that there are --19 20 we're mainly a rural police department, and we supply police services to areas that don't have the budget 21 22 to support their own PD. 23 In some places, though, we are supplying 24 resources to an area that obviously has the tax base 25 to support a local police department. So the

question that comes up is, is there a fairer way to assess some fees so that if that municipality wants to stay with the State Police, which is fine, there might be a fair compromise that is a win-win for both sides.

I mean, when you look at it, if you throw out Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, the average, the median population of a municipality that has a full-time police department, is 5,173 residents.

But when you look at that, there are a total of 423 municipalities with populations less than 5,000 that have full-time PDs. But there are also 99 municipalities that have more than 5,000 population that have no PDs whatsoever and 32 that have only a part-time police department.

So there have been a number of -- and I think in the House in the past, I think

Representative Sturla had a measure that he proposed, and I think Representative Pallone had one that he proposed as well, but I think Representative Sturla's measure was something along the lines of a \$52 assessment that would be charged for the municipality's entire population. And using his figure, which was a population greater than 10,000 or greater than 160 persons per square mile, just as an

example, and if you took that \$52 assessment and you assessed it to every person that lived in that municipality, you would be assessing 400 municipalities in the Commonwealth, but you'd come up with about \$59.4 million that would go back into the General Fund.

So again, it's not in the Governor's proposal, but obviously it is something that has been talked about in the past, and I do think it still warrants some evaluation. I think there probably is a way. And believe me, the number of proposals go anywhere from about \$10 million that you could bring back in to almost \$60 million, as you saw in that proposal.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: I appreciate that answer.

Many of us were not opposed the first time we heard this -- I think it was under Tom Ridge as Governor -- but were opposed to the cliff where it was something that was going to be enacted, and there was this cliff cutoff like 6 months later or 3 months later and a huge bill for municipalities.

So I think if we can work together to structure something, even if it's a sliding scale based on the size of the municipality. But it's an

```
1
    important issue, because many of us represent
2
    districts where it has municipalities that are
    adjacent to each other, they don't want to cooperate
3
4
    on some of these things, and this could help to
    foster that.
5
            So I hope you continue to support this, and
6
7
    I appreciate that. Thank you.
8
            COLONEL MILLER:
                              Thank you.
9
            REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
10
11
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.
12
            Vice Chair, Representative Craig Dally,
13
    please.
14
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:
                                    Thank you,
15
    Mr. Chairman.
            Good afternoon.
16
            COLONEL MILLER: Good afternoon.
17
18
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: I just want to return
19
    briefly to a line of questions from Representative
20
    Reichley on the press release that was issued, which
21
    you are refuting in terms of your -- I guess the
22
    quote that was attributed to you.
23
            COLONEL MILLER:
                              Yes.
24
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: And I believe that
25
    press release was issued on the weekend. So you're
```

saying that the quote that was utilized in that press release attributed to you was not your quotation?

COLONEL MILLER: Right. There was a lot -the vast majority of that press release was exactly
what, you know, I was comfortable with saying.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay.

COLONEL MILLER: Just one area. I think that there was, you know, it appears to me there was an honest mistake made by someone in the press office that used a prior version that, you know, I had not approved. And I didn't know that this went out until after I saw it in print, and by then it's too late.

But I just wanted to make sure the committee was under the correction impression of what I had actually said at the time.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: I know, at least in our caucus, I mean, it's common practice that press releases are approved prior to being released to the press. So you're saying that wasn't done in this instance for you?

COLONEL MILLER: Right.

I was involved in the process, but the final that I approved was not the final that went out

1 mistakenly. That's what happened, I believe. 2 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: I see. Okay. 3 And this press release came out of the 4 Governor's Office as opposed to the State Police? COLONEL MILLER: 5 That's correct. REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. Do you know or 6 7 have any reason to know why the Governor's Office felt they had to come to the defense of the Gaming 8 Commission? 9 COLONEL MILLER: Well, I think the intent of 10 the Governor's Office was to try to put some 11 12 information out there that might help to shed light 13 on -- I think there was an article or something was written that I believe they felt was not completely 14 accurate, so they wanted to kind of correct the 15 16 record a bit. And I think that there was a mistake 17 made, obviously, and I just wanted to be clear. 18 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. And I 19 appreciate that. Thank you. 20 Now, getting to your budget, I note that, as 21 been the practice in recent years, there has been 22 additional funds, a larger percentage of funds, 23 that are now coming to fund your budget from the 24 Motor License Fund. In fact, this year's budget is 25 73 percent.

And with all of the additional obligations that your agency has in terms of meth labs and gaming and patrolling jurisdictions without local police,

I'm wondering how much of the time that your agency spends is actually done patrolling the highways of Pennsylvania?

colonel Miller: I think that -- and I would echo what I believe Secretary Masch said -- I heard him make a comment on this and I believe he is accurate when he says that basically the moneys in the Motor License Fund that are assigned to the State Police, which I think were \$511 million in this fiscal year, amount to, when we look at our budget, 73 percent of that. Twenty-seven percent comes from General Fund appropriations.

The utilization of our personnel in marked vehicles and uniform, that's the vast majority of what we do. We do have people that do criminal investigative work; we have undercover personnel.

But by and large, particularly in today's environment, what we are doing is we are having a marked car with a uniformed trooper responding to a whole host of everything, from a crime response to a crash response to protecting critical infrastructure. You name it, they are doing it.

So we do believe that -- and I know that

Secretary Masch is very precise about how those

figures are arrived at in that if we see something in
a portion of our appropriation that perhaps does not

fall into the category that would allow us to charge
it under that circumstance, it will be charged

100-percent to a General Fund appropriation.

So my experience with Secretary Masch is he is very precise when it comes to that, and I'm very confident that we comply with the legal requirements with regard to the use of those funds.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. Thank you.

Back in 2001, the Legislative Budget and

Finance Committee issued a report that said just

36 percent of a patrolled trooper's time is available for patrol duties. Has that percentage increased or decreased since that report was issued?

COLONEL MILLER: Well, that percentage, that is a moving target. I mean, any day of the week, we can take a temperature of where we are at a given station across the State.

I think, by and large, we are probably somewhere in the neighborhood of 54 percent, let us say, average, across-the-board obligated time. So there would be about maybe somewhere in the

neighborhood -- and again, it depends on the station

there may be 40, 46 percent, maybe less than that,

maybe more than that, depending on the nature of the station.

So the majority of the time, what we would like to do, our goal would be 50-percent obligated, 50-percent unobligated time. That would be our goal.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Thank you.

And finally, according to past figures presented by you and your department, the Consolidated Dispatch Centers were to have been operational by now and would result in the equivalent of 170 troopers being returned to patrol duty.

What I would like to know is the status of those and your plans for the five Consolidated Dispatch Centers.

COLONEL MILLER: Yes, sir.

Right now, we have two Consolidated Dispatch
Centers -- Harrisburg and Skippack. I'm sorry;
Harrisburg and -- I'm drawing a blank. Norristown;
sorry. Skippack is dispatched by Norristown.

We have two that are up and running. We also have the Greensburg and the Wyoming facility built, but we are not utilizing them for consolidated dispatch at this time because -- for a number of

reasons.

But to have a CDC operational, you need a CDC that is built and equipped, you need the 800 megahertz on line in the area that you wish to utilize the CDC, and you also need the staffing.

There is one question that hasn't been resolved yet that we are still going back and forth on, and that is, let's say tomorrow we open another CDC and there are a number of stations that are affected, because we are going to draw the dispatchers from those stations to work at the CDC, but in the initial rollout, some of the stations that we would draw the dispatchers from would not be covered, so what happens to those stations?

So that's a question. What we don't want to do is have to put troopers on the desk. So we need an answer to the question of whether or not we would be staffing all of our substations 24/7 with a clerk/reader type position, which is 405 bodies at about \$17.3 million in costs, or whether we are going to go with the administrative call center approach, which we have piloted now at Troop K Skippack, where off-hours -- in order words, after like 4 in the afternoon -- if someone walks in there, they pick up the phone, it's a ring-down line, and they can

communicate directly with the dispatch center. Or if it's an administrative question, it goes to our administrative call center.

So that decision has yet to be made on the part of the General Assembly and the Governor's Office, and until we get that done, we can't really move forward as aggressively.

But the other thing we are trying to do is make sure that we have the 800 megahertz rolled out for voice in as many areas as possible as we spread the Consolidated Dispatch Center process out, because that does allow us the opportunity to, basically right now, if you are in an area with no CDC, in this station, nothing might be going on, the dispatchers are just sitting there; two stations over they might have so much work that one person or two can't handle it. But with the CDC environment, all that workload is actually evened out through the system.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: So it is still your intention to roll out those three additional dispatch centers?

COLONEL MILLER: It is still our intention to do that. And I don't know if I mentioned the Clarion facility. We have the property, but we haven't built anything on that site.

```
1
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: And are the dollars
2
    to do that in this year's budget?
 3
            COLONEL MILLER: No. No; they are not.
 4
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. I'll just end
    with a comment.
5
            I would just like to enlist your support for
6
7
    my House Bill 466.
8
            COLONEL MILLER: Which one was that?
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:
                                    It would reaffirm the
9
10
    longstanding common law powers of the sheriffs and
11
    deputy sheriffs in the Commonwealth.
12
            Thank you.
13
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you, Colonel.
            We'd like to thank you and the panel for
14
    your answers today and for your testimony. Let's all
15
16
    hope that next year when you come back, all we'll be
17
    talking about is budget questions.
18
            COLONEL MILLER: I hope so.
            REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: And I know I
19
20
    expressed the thanks of Chairman Evans and the whole
21
    committee, and thank you and your troopers for the
22
    great job you do in protecting the citizens of
23
    Pennsylvania. We thank you very much.
24
            COLONEL MILLER: Okay. Thank you for your
25
    support.
```

```
1
             REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: We are going to take
2
    a 5-minute break. We'll be back with the Office of
    Health Care Reform, and we'll start with the citizens
3
4
    panel first.
 5
             Thank you.
 6
7
             (The hearing concluded at 5:05 p.m.)
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