## COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARING

STATE CAPITOL
MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM
ROOM 140
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

MONDAY, JULY 14, 2008 10:06 A.M.

PRESENTATION ON
HOUSE BILL 1371 AND HOUSE BILL 2371
PREPAID WIRELESS PHONE SALES

## BEFORE:

HONORABLE THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HONORABLE CRAIG A. DALLY HONORABLE JOHN R. EVANS HONORABLE CARL W. MANTZ HONORABLE DON WALKO

## ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

HONORABLE JAMES E. CASORIO, JR. HONORABLE JAY R. MOYER HONORABLE EDDIE DAY PASHINSKI HONORABLE CHRIS SAINATO HONORABLE DANTE SANTONI, JR.

1	ALSO PRESENT:
2	WILLIAM H. ANDRING, ESQ. MAJORITY LEGAL COUNSEL
3	
4	DEBRA B. MILLER REPORTER
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX
2	<u>TESTIFIERS</u>
3	NAME
4	NAME PAGE
5	REPRESENTATIVE JAY R. MOYER COSPONSOR OF LEGISLATION4
6 7	REPRESENTATIVE EDDIE DAY PASHINSKI PRIME SPONSOR OF LEGISLATION8
8	BRIAN RIDER PA RETAILERS' ASSOCIATION15
9	K. DANE SNOWDEN VICE PRESIDENT, EXTERNAL AND STATE AFFAIRS, CTIA THE WIRELESS ASSOCIATION
11 12	DETECTIVE JOSEPH COFFAY WILKES-BARRE CITY POLICE, DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY40
13 14	KEVIN LUTKINS, ESQ. PA CONVENIENCE STORE COUNCIL76
15 16	CAPTAIN DANTE ORLANDI DIRECTOR, DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION, BUREAU OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION, PA STATE POLICE86
17	SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY
18	ANDY HOOVER
19	COMMUNITY ORGANIZER/LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF PA
20	NICOLE A. LINDEMYER, ESQ.
21	POLICY AND SPECIAL PROJECTS MANAGER, PA COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE138
22	
23	
24	
25	

## PROCEEDINGS

2.0

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Good morning.

I would like to open the House Judiciary

Committee hearing on House Bills 1371 and 2371, and
we have two of our Representatives here that would

like to open up with some opening remarks.

We will start off with Jay, Representative

Jay Moyer, and then we will go to Representative

Eddie Pashinski.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman, and good morning to the committee as well, and I want to thank you all for coming here this morning.

Breakthroughs in communications technology have made all of our lives easier. Cell phones have improved our work and personal lives, making it possible for us to stay in touch with our workplaces and our families from nearly anywhere.

So-called disposable, or pay-as-you-go, cell phones have provided consumers with convenient, less expensive access to this wonderful technology.

However, as is often the case with technological advances, the criminal elements of our society have found ways to use this progress to

further their illegal activities.

Because they can purchase disposable cell phones without divulging their name, address, or other personal information, criminals and terrorists are able to use these devices to commit their illegal deeds without fear of detection by law enforcement.

In my own district in Montgomery County, a local police department recently found 500 empty boxes that once contained these disposable cell phones.

Where are these phones now? Are they being used in the illegal drug trade or to plan terrorist attacks on our citizens? Unfortunately, without any kind of registration system or means of tracking them, we cannot know the answer to these questions.

At a recent hearing of the Republican Policy
Committee at Ursinus College, former Montgomery
County district attorney, Bruce Castor, testified
about a recent drug trade in Norristown that yielded
\$13 million in illegal drugs and a case of disposable
cell phones.

Now, clearly these phones were intended to play an important part in the criminals' efforts to

distribute their drugs in our communities. We must act now to cut off this means of communication for criminals and terrorists.

House Bill 1371 is a bipartisan effort to do just that. Under this bill, anyone purchasing a disposable cell phone with cash or three or more with any form of consideration would be required to provide at least two forms of identification, including one form of photo ID, upon purchase. Sellers would be required to maintain records of these purchases for at least 2 years from the date of purchase.

I have heard from law enforcement officials throughout my district that this legislation will provide them with a valuable tool in their efforts to stem the tide of illegal activity.

Although he could not be with us today, former district attorney in Montgomery County, Bruce Castor, has expressed his support for this legislation, as has the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association, the Chiefs of Police, the Pennsylvania State Police, and other law enforcement agencies.

In fact, Pennsylvania Attorney General,
Tom Corbett, has voiced his support for this

important piece of legislation.

And, Mr. Chairman, I became interested in this legislation when I myself was victimized by one of these phones in my 2006 election. As a result, the perpetrator is now serving time in prison.

However, the pain that was inflicted upon myself and my family pales little to the suffering inflicted by the criminal element in this country or that which is inflicted, more importantly, upon our troops abroad in feeders such as Afghanistan and Iraq where these cell phones are used and weaponized.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Representative Pashinski for reaching across the aisle to work with me on this bill. Oftentimes, partisanship and political maneuvering make for good news stories and, therefore, seem to get the most attention from the press. However, in this case, we have put partisan rancor aside to push for legislation that is in the best interests of every Pennsylvanian.

I urge my colleagues from both parties to join Eddie and I in this effort. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you for your testimony.

And I was a little remiss. I would like to

```
1
    have the members of the panel who are here today, if
2
    they would just introduce themselves and the counties
    they are from.
3
            REPRESENTATIVE SAINATO: I'm Representative
 4
    Chris Sainato. I represent parts of Lawrence and a
5
6
    small section of Beaver County.
7
            REPRESENTATIVE WALKO: Don Walko, Allegheny
8
    County.
            REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: Carl Mantz, the
9
10
    187th, Berks and Lehigh Counties.
11
            MR. ANDRING: Bill Andring, Chief Counsel.
12
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And Carl is sitting
13
    in as my Chair for the Republicans. Ronnie Marsico,
    I'm not sure if he will be here. I talked to him
14
    last week, and he was on vacation, so Carl is sitting
15
16
    in for him today.
            Eddie, you are up.
17
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you very
18
19
    much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the members of
20
    the committee for taking this time to listen to our
21
    presentation.
22
            Representative Moyer said a lot of wonderful
23
    things, things that are very accurate, and also the
24
    fact that both Representative Moyer and I have been
25
    working on this particular bill, House Bill 2371 as
```

amended, since February of '07.

Let me just give you a little background of how this thing took place.

Back in the election of '06, one of the major concerns of our constituents back in my district was the deterioration of neighborhoods, which was brought about by an increase of drug trafficking and drug dealing.

In my conversation with law enforcement, not one conversation went by without the fact that law enforcement indicated time and time again that one of the major tools that drug dealers use is the cell phone.

It was to my astonishment to find out that particular cell phones can be purchased with cash and provide total anonymity to the purchaser.

I'm not quite understanding how that could be. I went to a local retail store and purchased a TracFone. I purchased it for cash. It cost about \$20 plus tax. I took it back to my office, and with my staff, we went through the process of how we could initiate phone communication.

To my total amazement, we called the number, and then they instructed us as to what we had to do. They asked us to give us our name. The name

indicated was "Mickey Mouse." They asked for our address. The address was "000 Goofy Lane." They asked for the city. We put down "Wally World, Pennsylvania." Our zip code, we said, was "12345." And with that, that telephone was initiated, activated, and was able to be used.

2.0

So we gave absolutely ridiculous responses to those requests -- never questioned -- and that phone was now capable of being used. That is the main reason why the drug dealers are using this, because there is total anonymity.

You will hear from law enforcement; they are going to tell you the frustration that they have in order to try to find out who is using this form of communication.

Because of the fact that it is untraceable, prepaid cell phones are among the favorite tools of drug dealers, sex offenders, and terrorists since those, unlike those cell phones purchased throughout the contract arrangements, they cannot be traced.

I want to make it very clear that those that have the contracts, those that have gone through the process, can be traced. It is the cash phones that we are talking about.

Law enforcement has noted the growing use of

these phones, even to the point that some criminals will set up a phony corporation enabling them to buy hundreds of phones at one time. Once again, all untraceable.

Law enforcement officials have repeatedly requested assistance from the Legislature.

House Bill 2371 provides a tool that can be used to track down the criminals who utilize these phones for illegal activities.

Let me clarify some areas. House Bill 2371 does not limit the number of phones that an individual can purchase. House Bill 2371 does not place any restrictions on the number of prepaid cell phones that can be purchased within a specific period of time. House Bill 2371 does not require the purchaser to provide any information when purchasing one or two phones that are purchased by a credit card or a bank-issued debit card.

What does House Bill 2371 do? It does require the purchaser to provide two acceptable forms of ID when purchasing three or more phones and they are made using credit cards, debit cards not linked to a bank account, gift cards, or gift certificates.

In other words, any form of tender other

than a bank-issued credit card or a bank-issued debit card, they will have to offer two forms of ID when purchasing three or more.

The kinds of acceptable identification, of course, are a driver's license issued by PENNDOT or an identification card with the photo for those that do not drive.

It will request their name, date of birth, residential address, date of sale, name of manufacturer of the prepaid cell phone, name of the prepaid cell phone provider, and the serial number of the telephone.

House Bill 2371 will require sellers to maintain this information and file it with the State Police on a quarterly basis.

House Bill 2371 requires law enforcement to have access to this information only if they have secured a subpoena or a warrant.

House Bill 2371 provides immunity for sellers if they provide information on purchases in accordance with the terms of the subpoena or the warrant.

In this world, after 9/11, all of us have a responsibility to ourselves as individuals and to those that we represent. I want to make it very

clear that there has been tremendous discussion between the retailers, between the phone companies, between law enforcement, and our staff here.

It is the desire by Representative Moyer and myself to aid law enforcement in protecting the people of Pennsylvania, but also in allowing the retailers to continue to profit and to allow the telephone companies to continue to produce these outstanding forms of communication.

We are looking for, at this time, common ground so that the retailers, the phone companies, this government, can all work together in order to protect the people of Pennsylvania by aiding law enforcement in their efforts to do exactly that.

On behalf of Representative Moyer and myself

-- a bipartisan effort. I might also add that in

February of '07, Representative Moyer and I very

energetically and in a very excited fashion thought

we could be the first two freshmen to show

bipartisanship by working together on what we

considered to be incredible and important

legislation.

It is now about 19 months later, and we have not achieved that goal. So we are very confident

```
and very hopeful that all of those concerned with
1
2
    House Bill 2371 on both sides of the issue can come
    together, again, to allow law enforcement to do their
3
4
    job and protect the people of Pennsylvania.
            We thank you again, sir, and we are
5
6
    available for questions. Thank you.
7
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.
            Panel, questions? No questions? Bill,
8
    questions?
9
10
            Thank you for your entertainment on the
11
    floor of the House, by the way. It was well received
12
    on July 4.
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: It was my honor
13
    to do that, sir.
14
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Great job.
15
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you,
16
    Mr. Chairman.
17
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you very
18
19
    much.
2.0
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you both.
            We would like to next hear from Brian Rider
21
22
    from the Pennsylvania Retailers' Association.
23
            If the two of you would like to come up here
    and join the panel, you are more than welcome.
24
25
    have seats right here.
```

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you, sir.

MR. RIDER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

You have our written testimony before you, and I do apologize, because we have geared our remarks toward House Bill 1371 and not House Bill 2371, which was mentioned earlier by the prime sponsors that the legislation are very similar but there are some changes that had been made.

But I apologize for not addressing both of them in our written testimony. We were kind of on short notice for preparing this and short staffed at the end of last week.

But again, I thank you, Chairman Caltagirone and members of the Judiciary Committee, for the opportunity to testify on behalf of the Pennsylvania Retailers' Association and our concerns with certain aspects of House Bill 1371 and House Bill 2371.

I would also like to thank Representatives

Pashinski and Moyer for their ongoing willingness to

meet with interested parties on this legislation.

Although we understand and respect their support in sponsorship of these two bills, we do have concerns with the legislation in its current form that we have discussed and would like to openly

mention today.

Prepaid cell phones are purchased as "emergency" phones: as gifts by parents for children, by low-income individuals or individuals with credit issues that prevent subscriptions, or by consumers simply not wanting long-term wireless contracts and only want to pay for the minutes that they use.

House Bill 1371 and House Bill 2371 would require a sales associate in any of our member stores selling a prepaid wireless phone to a customer for cash, or selling three or more prepaid wireless phones for any payment form, to collect specific information from customers.

We not only have concerns about the delays that this could very well create in stores, but also about the possible unwillingness of legitimate customers to provide this information because of personal privacy concerns.

The sales associate would be required to, as
Representative Pashinski had mentioned, collect the
purchaser's name, date of birth, residential address,
date of sale, name of the manufacturer of the prepaid
wireless phone, name of the prepaid wireless
provider, and a serial number of the phone sold.

If a sales associate fails to obtain this

information during a transaction, he or she not only commits a summary offense but also violates

Section 4120 relating to identity theft, and that has also raised some concerns.

Also, many prepaid wireless carriers

presently request the name, address, phone number,

and e-mail address of the person activating the phone

for marketing reasons. However, providing this

information is not mandatory to activate the phone.

At least, that's the information that we have been

able to acquire.

And if I stand to be corrected here, please do so following my remarks, but we have also been told that wireless phone service is generally under Federal jurisdiction, and there are concerns that the bill may violate Federal communication law, and if I am inaccurate in that, I would appreciate being corrected once I conclude.

If House Bill 1371 or House Bill 2371 is to be considered by the House Judiciary Committee, we would respectfully ask that the following changes be considered.

First, we would like the committee to consider an exemption for legitimate commercial purposes. I know Representative Moyer had made the

remarks of finding boxes of numerous empty phones,

but at times, stores will sell a large amount of

prepaid wireless phones to other legitimate

businesses, and that is something we have been having

some ongoing conversations with the prime sponsors.

And when that happens, we feel it should not be

mandatory to collect and remit this information when

those types of sales occur.

Now, we would also request that the number of phones purchased to require the collection of this information, when other than cash be considered, be increased from three to four.

Also, we have concerns with the term "cash."

Now, does this include payment with personal checks

and debit cards from bank accounts? Because often

retailers treat these as cash transactions.

In addition -- and we have also raised this in some meetings we have had -- we feel that if we must comply with this legislation if it becomes law, that 90 days may not be sufficient for retailers to make the necessary changes to comply with this legislation.

Again, we would ask that these concerns be addressed if the Judiciary Committee is to consider these two bills in the future. And again,

```
1
    we understand and respect the supporters of
    House Bill 1371 and House Bill 2371's intent.
2
    However, we just want to make sure that legitimate
3
4
    customers and retailers are not negatively impacted
5
    if they must comply with this legislation should it
6
    become law.
7
            Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank
    you and the committee members and staff and the
8
    prime sponsors for our opportunity to relay our
9
10
    concerns and comments today, and I would be happy to
11
    answer any questions that you may have.
12
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Thank you, Brian.
13
            MR. RIDER: You are welcome.
14
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Questions?
                                                Jay?
15
            Ed.
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you,
16
    Mr. Chairman.
17
            Thank you very much, Brian, for being here
18
19
    today.
2.0
            MR. RIDER: You are welcome, sir.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: As you know, we
22
    have had a number of discussions on this, and both
23
    Representative Moyer and myself have indicated that
24
    we are more than willing to sit down and continue the
25
    conversation.
```

The 90-day period of time does not seem as though that would be difficult to deal with. Three to four is something that could be discussed.

Let us talk about, just for a minute, you made a few statements there.

Number one, keep in mind that this legislation will not prevent those people that want to purchase these TracFones from purchasing them. It is just a matter of trying to give law enforcement some kind of trail back to the purchase, to the purchaser.

So even if they do not have an ID, like a driver's license, I mean, what would be wrong with all people to have some form of ID in the State of Pennsylvania? I think it only costs 10 bucks to go to PENNDOT and get an ID if you do not drive.

MR. RIDER: Representative, we are not, by no means, objecting to them having to produce some form of ID to verify that the individual purchasing the prepaid phone is in fact he or she. It is having to record the information, and also sometimes with customers being more and more concerned about personal privacy, being unwilling to provide this information.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Okay. Let us see

1 if we can talk about it from this standpoint.

If I want to get a fishing license, what do
I have to do?

MR. RIDER: Having not purchased a fishing license in about 25 years, I couldn't answer that.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Well, it is time that you do, Brian. This is a big thing.

When you go to purchase a fishing license, you have to show your driver's license. You have to fill out the form. The person has to make sure the form is filled out before they issue it to you.

What has happened here with this incredible invention, this prepaid phone, is just that the bad guys are using them. Now, what can we do together to help law enforcement prevent that from occurring?

Remember, if you are a law-abiding citizen, you can buy it with your debit card as long as it is bank issued or your credit card. Swipe it. That is what all the retailers are promoting now anyway; buy it with a credit card, for obvious reasons -- no hassle, no names, no identification, nothing. So if you do it with cash, then you have got to provide this stuff.

And the same thing, there is no restriction on how many you purchase, so when you talked about

those 500 cell phones or those boxes or a hundred boxes, that is not a problem either. But the company has to identify who is buying it and who they are selling it to. That is all it is.

2.0

MR. RIDER: But again, we had talked about, in the past, the possibility of getting four commercial transactions where, usually one of our member stores, as an example, IBM may go into their local Walmart, they may contract with the local AT&T and/or Verizon Wireless Store to purchase large numbers of these phones for their associates, and what we are asking for is that there be a carve-out there for legitimate business purposes.

I mean, because if it is IBM coming in, you know, it is Highmark or any other larger employer in south-central PA here or anywhere throughout the Commonwealth, we feel that there should be a carve-out for legitimate businesses making these commercial transactions.

But somebody coming in that is questionable or as a business that nobody has ever heard of or cannot produce documentation that wants to purchase 100 of these phones, what you are driving at is a legitimate concern and I think a legitimate request.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Okay; that is

1 good. 2 But, I mean, if IBM buys it, they know that everybody that is involved in that transaction is 3 4 going to know the number and they are also going to have the codes, so they will know if any of those 5 6 phones are involved in a nefarious act---7 MR. RIDER: Correct. REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: ---that came from 8 IBM. 9 10 MR. RIDER: Correct. But what we are saying 11 is that the retailer should not have to get the information out---12 13 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Every person that is---14 15 MR. RIDER: Everybody that is going to be 16 possessing one of the prepaid cell phones. REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Does IBM get all 17 the information when they sell their products? 18 MR. RIDER: I don't know. We would have to 19 20 speak to some larger commercial businesses, how they 21 handle that once these phones are then distributed to 22 their employees and associates. 23 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Okay. That is a 24 good concern. Thank you. 25 MR. RIDER: You are welcome.

1 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Jay.

mentioned a carve-out for legitimate businesses. I mean, could you expand on that? Because basically, wouldn't that just exempt all the known legitimate businesses of the United States, and the only ones that we would be concerned about then would be the illegitimate businesses? I mean, can you expand on that a little bit?

MR. RIDER: Well, we may want to consider, or in future discussions, having a number in there, say legitimate established businesses purchasing -- and I am throwing this number out off the top of my head -- 25 or more prepaid cell phones are not required to or the stores are not required to then collect this information.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: For example, let us just use as an example Walmart. In other words, if I am Walmart and I purchase, let us say, 100 phones for retail business, I would be exempt from this law? Is that what you are saying?

MR. RIDER: Yes, or Walmart is probably going to purchase them from themselves.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Well, then that would basically, unless I misunderstand what you are

saying, Mr. Rider, that would defeat the intent of this bill.

MR. RIDER: Oh, I do not believe so, not at all, because you are nonlegitimate businesses. You are individuals who are obtaining these prepaid phones, whether they are purchasing them in bulk or they are stealing them, and have access to these. Those are the people.

If somebody comes in off the street and cannot produce some type of documentation that he or she is representing a legitimate business and wants to buy a hundred of these, well, that is going to throw up a red flag if your legislation becomes law. And the sales associates will be trained by their employers at the point, well, this isn't IBM, this isn't Highmark coming in here, this isn't the Bon-Ton Department Store coming in here to purchase a hundred of these for their sales associates or their corporate employees, and then, therefore, that information would be required to be obtained by the purchaser.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Okay. Well again, let me see if I understand this. Maybe I do not understand your point.

I'm Walmart and I buy a thousand of these

```
1
    phones on delivery for my stores in, let us say, the
2
    southeastern region of Pennsylvania. Do I understand
    you to say that those phones then would not be
3
    subject to this law?
4
            MR. RIDER: No; no.
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
                                    In other words, now
6
7
    when the bad guys come in, the bad guys come in and
    they are exempt from showing any form of ID, do I
8
    understand---
10
            MR. RIDER: No; I apologize. I was unclear.
11
    I was talking about these stores selling them to a
12
    legitimate business.
13
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
                                    Okay.
            MR. RIDER: Not just because you are a
14
    legitimate business buying these for resale; I'm
15
    talking about the individual or company that is
16
    coming in to purchase them from the retailer.
17
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Okay. I understand
18
19
    that then. Okay; fine.
2.0
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Certainly.
22
            We have had another Representative join us.
23
    If you could please introduce yourself for the
24
    record, John.
25
            REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:
                                    Yes; thank you,
```

```
1
    Mr. Chairman.
2
            Representative John Evans from Erie County.
3
    Thank you.
 4
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Thank you, John.
            Questions? John, do you have a question?
 5
6
    And then Counsel Andring.
7
            John.
8
            REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
9
            Thank you, Mr. Rider, for your testimony.
10
11
            MR. RIDER: You are welcome.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: I may have missed
    this earlier, but I am curious about the violations
13
    here for the clerks and so on who would be selling
14
    these cell phones.
15
16
            What would the companies, say, for example,
    if a Target sells these types of phones, would they
17
    be required to have training programs for their
18
19
    employees who may work in that department to
2.0
    understand the nuance of the law?
21
            MR. RIDER: They are going to have to in
22
    best efforts of not violating this should it become
23
    law, because again, you are talking about a summary
24
    offense per violation, and it could get quite costly
25
    for stores that have hundreds of employees and
```

literally thousands throughout the Commonwealth. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Is it commonplace for many large retailers to have employees who move from 3 4 department to department? For example, one could be selling furniture one day; one could be selling 5 6 electronics another day; toys another day. I am just 7 wondering, from a management standpoint, is that something that would be very difficult to put 8 together in a training aspect? 9 10 MR. RIDER: It varies upon stores and 11 departments, and it is store policy that varies from 12 company to company as opposed to if our sales 13 associates are interchangeable in different 14 departments. 15 But it is something, again, that the stores 16 would have to take very seriously and make sure that their sales associates are trained in complying with 17 the new law, which is time-consuming and costly 18 19 initially. But again, if it is something that they 20 must comply with, then they will comply. 21 REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: And this is not being 22 done in any other State to your knowledge? 23 MR. RIDER: To our knowledge, no. 24 REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:

MR. RIDER: And if I am incorrect, please

25

correct me.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: And the other

question I have, if an employee was to be cited for a

violation, would the company also be party to a

lawsuit on a larger scale?

MR. RIDER: I would defer to the committee's

counsel on that, not being an attorney myself, that

counsel on that, not being an attorney myself, that not only would the sales associate violate the act, and/or would his or her employer? I'm not sure -- or to the prime sponsors.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Okay. That concludes my questions. Thank you.

MR. RIDER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

Counsel Andring.

MR. ANDRING: Brian, one of the questions I have, the bill does not cover somebody who walks into a store and buys a couple of phones and uses a credit card.

Now, if we have a retailer who maybe in a day sells 30 of these, and you go back and you look at those purchases, the store is going to know who purchased a phone that day by going through the credit records. Are they going to be able to identify which purchaser purchased which phone?

```
1
            MR. RIDER: If they are using a credit card,
2
    they may not know, unless -- and I have just started
    learning about the sale of prepaid phones with the
3
 4
    introduction of this legislation, so I'm by no means
    an expert. But unless there is some item through the
 5
    UPC scanning system when the product itself is
6
7
    scanned and some type of number to identify that
    phone itself, then I don't know if you will be able
8
    to know that Bill Andring came into Boscov's, used
9
10
    his Boscov's proprietary card, and purchased two
11
    prepaid cell phones. I don't know.
12
            MR. ANDRING: But you don't know that there
13
    is any way you are going to be able to pin down
    specific numbers to a specific purchaser?
14
15
            MR. RIDER: Well, if you are recording the
    information that is being requested ---
16
17
            MR. ANDRING: Yeah, but I'm talking about
    the situations where we are not recording
18
    information.
19
2.0
            MR. RIDER: Then you may not know---
            MR. ANDRING: If I just buy two phones with
21
22
    a debit card or a credit card, like I said---
23
            MR. RIDER: Then you may not know who
24
    purchased those two phones.
25
            MR. ANDRING: Which specific phones.
                                                   So in
```

```
1
    fact if we really want to be able to trace everything
2
    back, every phone number back, every purchaser, then
    we are going to have to start doing this for every
3
4
    cell phone purchase of one of these.
            MR. RIDER: Well, I would hope not, but that
 5
    is a possible scenario.
6
7
            MR. ANDRING: And there is no limitation on
    age in terms of who purchases cell phones, is there?
8
            MR. RIDER: Representative Pashinski, I do
9
10
    not believe you addressed an age limitation, did you?
11
            MR. ANDRING: It is not addressed in this
12
    bill. I was wondering if you were aware of any other
13
    limitations that your retailers have?
14
            MR. RIDER: Limitations on purchasing
15
    firearms.
16
            MR. ANDRING: But not on cell phones.
            MR. RIDER: No, and I believe the Federal
17
    law is on pseudoephedrine products, too.
18
19
            MR. ANDRING:
                          Right.
20
            MR. RIDER: I believe you must be 18 or
    older.
21
22
            MR. ANDRING:
                          Right.
            MR. RIDER: But on cellular phone products,
23
24
    no.
25
            MR. ANDRING: And there is no limitation on
```

reselling cell phones? I mean, and again, my questions are going to the issue of whether we accomplish anything by passing this bill.

As I understand it, the idea is somehow we are going to trace drug dealers because they will have to fill out forms if they are buying multiple phones. Well, if they buy fewer phones, we may not know exactly which number is attributable to some specific person.

In addition to that, it seems to me the drug dealers, once this would pass, are simply going to have somebody go down to the store, buy 50 phones who has a clean record, like they do with guns right now, and then that person is just going to have a little secondary business reselling cell phones in the neighborhood. You are simply going to inject the middleman into the whole process, but I do not see where you are really going to be accomplishing much.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Just a follow-up on that.

We were kicking this around in the office the other week and we were saying, well, you know, even if this were to become law in Pennsylvania, with the bordering States that we have, you know, that

enterprising drug dealer, could he not just go across one of our borders and purchase the phones? If they don't have any kind of similar legislation, how do you control that? See, that was one of my concerns.

The other concern was--- Go ahead.

MR. RIDER: Well, hopefully if that occurs,
Mr. Chairman, and the product is subject to the
sales and use tax, they are remitting the use tax to
the Department of Revenue.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Good point. The Governor would like to know that.

You know, we have thought about this long and hard. As you know, we have had some serious discussions about trying to do the right thing without creating an additional burden on our businesses in the Commonwealth.

And just as an aside, you know, many of us that have young children -- or grandchildren, in my case -- getting cell phones for them is a matter of safety and giving them to them so that they know how to communicate whenever, God knows, in any type situation. So there are a lot of younger kids that have cell phones provided by their parents or loved ones just to guarantee their safety, and especially many of the women that have the throw-away cell

phones that use up the time and then get rid of them.

But you had some other questions, and then I have another thing to come back to. But go ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.0

Let us see if we can take these in order here.

First of all, as far as the young children,

I totally agree. You know, they should have them,
especially when they are away or they are going to go
on a trip. And some of the senior citizens are
purchasing them because they do not want to have a
monthly bill and not use the phone. This would be
something for extra safety for them.

House Bill 2371 does not prevent any of that, though. You know, if you are a law-abiding citizen and you use your credit card, you can buy two, and the next day you can buy two, and the next day you can buy two.

But what I'm having the problem with here is that some of you are saying that there is no way to identify who purchased that phone, yet in this age of computers, and if we are talking about Walmart, Walmart knows exactly how many phones they have

```
1
    received because there is a number on each one.
2
            MR. RIDER: No; I understand that. My only
    question was, when asked that question,
3
4
    Representative, is that when that phone is scanned at
    the UPC scanning system -- and maybe, I do not have
5
    the agenda here, if somebody from Verizon or AT&T
6
7
    maybe can attest to this -- that number on there,
    does that directly identify that phone when it is
8
    activated? I do not know. Maybe it does, and maybe
9
10
    then when that phone is scanned, then they know whom
    it was sold to if it was purchased with a credit
11
12
    card. Maybe they do that. I do not know.
13
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:
                                       It is my
    understanding that each phone has a chip, okay?
14
    therefore, you would identify that phone. You could
15
    identify a phone 0001 as opposed to phone 1,090.
16
            MR. SNOWDEN: After activation.
17
18
            MR. PASHINSKI: Okay.
19
            MR. ANDRING: But the question is the
20
    purchaser. The purchaser cannot identify a specific
    phone to a specific purchaser.
21
22
            MR. SNOWDEN: Not at time of sale.
23
            MR. ANDRING: Not at time of sale.
24
    you.
25
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:
                                        Okay. All right.
```

Well, we have just decided something here then.

First of all, we have to decide whether or not the phones are being used for nefarious things.

We have to find out whether or not the phones create a threat to society, okay?

I think we are creating the fact that these phones are being used illicitly. Now, if it means that we have to try to get a number that matches the phone or some kind of identification that matches the phone, then maybe that is the way we will have to go.

But just because the system right now will not allow for that to take place does not mean it is an open and shut case. What I'm saying is, it is 2008. We have just discovered something that is a major problem, and we now have also discovered that if law enforcement had a way to deal with that, they could minimize and help curtail the illicit use of these instruments.

When we had our discussion with all the folks in the room just a few weeks ago, I think it is incumbent upon all of us to use our ingenuity and the technology that is available to help law enforcement prevent this kind of stuff from going on. That is what I am asking for here.

If House Bill 2371 does not do enough to

help law enforcement, then let us try to find something else that will. The reason we have forged ahead is because law enforcement has indicated to us it will help them. It may not help as much as we want, but it will give them another tool. So that is the reason why Representative Moyer and myself and others that understand the problem are forging ahead on this.

Now that a new development has taken place, maybe there is something else that can be added to make the change. But we all agree here that whatever product comes into Walmart, Walmart knows they have a record of it and they know that it goes back out or it goes back into inventory, because that is the only way you can manage your products, so you know whether you have a profit, you know what is selling and what is not selling.

All right. I also felt that in our discussion, that because of what is happening with these phones, you know, they should be treated almost like a firearm, because it is being used for those kinds of nefarious activities.

And when Attorney Andring had mentioned about the fact that a law-abiding person could buy something and then sell it to somebody else, well,

```
1
    that is against the law, so they are not a
2
    law-abiding person. They are doing something against
    the law.
3
            We have identified that these phones are
 4
    being used in countless activities that are creating
5
6
    havoc. It is costing billions of dollars in the drug
    trade for law enforcement. So I think that these
7
8
    hearings are fantastic in the sense that we are going
    to develop a little better understanding and see if
9
10
    there is another way that we can come up with
11
    something.
12
            But I do appreciate your time on that.
13
    Thank you.
            MR. RIDER: You are welcome, Representative.
14
15
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Jay.
16
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Yeah; Mr. Chairman,
    just two comments.
17
            One, to your concern about crossing State
18
19
    lines, I personally, you know, I thought that through
2.0
    as well, and I had an opportunity, I bumped into the
    Attorney General last year and I personally asked him
21
22
    about that, and I remember his response to me was,
    General Corbett, he said, "Jay, I can only be
23
24
    responsible for what happens in Pennsylvania." And
25
    his other comment was that generally the bad guys
```

```
aren't very bright and they generally don't think
1
2
    through those situations. I am not saying that won't
    happen, but that was his response.
3
 4
            And also to Solicitor Andring's question,
    you know, Mr. Solicitor, this will, I believe, firmly
5
6
    believe, and Representative Pashinski believes, that
7
    this bill as enacted, it will provide a paper trail
    for law enforcement that is nonexistent at this
8
9
    point.
10
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: The other question I
12
    had, Brian, was---
13
            MR. RIDER: Yes, sir?
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: ---do you have a
14
    number as to how many throw-away cell phones are
15
16
    purchased each year in the Commonwealth? And if you
17
    don't, if you can provide this. I'm just curious.
            MR. RIDER: No, I do not. We can work with
18
19
    the manufacturers and see if we can ascertain a
20
    number for the committee, but right now, I do not
    have that information.
21
22
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay.
23
            Any other questions? Representative Mantz.
24
    Carl.
25
            REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: Brian, I'm not sure
```

```
whether you will know this, this question, but I
1
2
    wonder how pervasive, is there any information that
    might indicate how pervasive the use of cell phones,
3
4
    these disposable prepaid cell phones, are used in the
    perpetration of a crime? How frequently?
5
6
    pervasive this practice is?
7
            MR. RIDER: I can't answer that,
    Representative. I would respectfully defer.
8
    believe there are some representatives from
9
10
    law enforcement that will be testifying later in the
11
    hearing that may be able to provide that information.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: Okay. Thank you.
13
    will redirect my question to one of those witnesses.
    Thank you.
14
15
            MR. RIDER: You are welcome.
16
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Thank you, Brian.
17
    appreciate your testimony.
18
            MR. RIDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
                                                   Thank
19
    you.
20
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We will next hear
    from one of those law enforcement officers,
21
22
    Joe Coffay, Detective from the Wilkes-Barre Police
23
    Department.
24
            DETECTIVE COFFAY:
                                Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25
            I would first like to thank Representatives
```

Pashinski and Moyer for listening to our concerns in law enforcement and proposing this bill, because I believe it is an important issue that has to be addressed based on the concerns that we have.

I work in Luzerne County. I work in the city of Wilkes-Barre as a narcotics detective, and I have done so for the past 19 years.

In the beginning, in the eighties, you used to have, one of the major tools that drug dealers used to use would be pagers. With the emergence of cell phones, the primary tool that they use is cell phones.

Pretty much if you are not a street dealer out on the streets, the corners of Philadelphia, dealing on a corner, most dealers, I would say all dealers I have run into in the past 10 years, have utilized cell phones or cellular facilities to facilitate their drug trafficking.

So I think it is important for the committee to understand a little bit on the role the cell phone has in the commission of this criminal activity such as drug trafficking.

For the most part, they play a major role.

A drug dealer cannot operate his drug business

without a cell phone. Drugs are not just local, they

are worldwide. The drugs have to come from -- we do not grow heroin poppies in Pennsylvania, we do not grow cocoa leaves in Pennsylvania, and those drugs have to come from other countries, usually into source cities such as New York or Philadelphia and then into the local areas and our local streets. That is usually accomplished by the retail people contacting the wholesale people in reference to getting the drugs here so they can be sold on the streets.

The wholesale people, usually what we are finding is that they use multiple phones to conduct their business. They will have phones that they talk to just their supply and then they have phones that they talk to their dealers. And in past investigations, we have encountered several individuals that have been arrested with multiple phones. Usually it is a TracFone and usually it is a phone that is pretty much untraceable.

The retail people, they usually use the phones to conduct their business where we have come across a drug dealer that will have a phone and he puts that phone number out -- what they will do is they will put their number on a piece of paper and they will just hand it out on the streets that they

have product, and those people are then contacted and they provide the drugs. Usually that is how they get the word out when they are dealing at the retail level.

Usually what they will do is contact their supplier, and the supplier would then supply the drugs to the retail person. In an investigation like that, when you identify that happening, you usually try to do an investigation that involves a conspiracy.

When you have a drug dealer contacting a source, usually you try to identify the retail dealer by the sales or being able to buy drugs. Once you have that phone number, then you try to trace those numbers back to the supply.

Usually you have to do that through the subpoena process. You send a subpoena to the phone company, and they will send you back the subscriber information. Many times, it will come back with no information. Many times it will come back with a fictitious name, just as Representative Pashinski had alluded to the fact that, you know, a character had purchased that cell phone.

That in itself does not help us identify the supply or sometimes even the retailer. The lack of

accountability allows these dealers to avoid detection. That is the main reason that they are able to do that, because they don't have to go and they do not have to show ID.

We actually have to have insurance on a vehicle and we have to have a driver's license to drive a vehicle. If we didn't have that, people would be smashing cars all over and they would just leave the scene. There is a way of investigating and tracking that information in an accident like that.

It is illegal in Pennsylvania to utilize a cellular facility to commit a felony. So if a customer -- or we -- call a drug dealer on his cellular telephone, then the customer and the dealer can be charged with criminal use of a communication facility, which is a felony.

Usually when we identify these conspiracies through subpoena and the records for the phones and records for the suspected dealers, we usually subpoena those records, and a lot of times when we can't go any further with that case or we run out of means of investigation, we usually use wiretaps, which are costly, they are manpower exhaustive, and what usually happens is we identify a lot of resources or sources of supply through investigations

like that or it gives us the whole conspiracy.

For example, in one case, we identified several local dealers in the city of Wilkes-Barre, and upon doing so, we attempted to identify the supply or show that that supply was involved in that conspiracy. When we sent the subpoena to the phone company, we actually received the information back and continued our wiretap investigation.

At the time, the subscriber was Santa Claus. So we actually did a wiretap on Santa Claus. Fortunately, we were able to identify that person through surveillance that that is the person utilizing that phone, but those phone records were of no help to us.

More recently, we had a homicide in the city of Wilkes-Barre whereupon detectives attempted to subpoena the records to the cell phone company, and those phones, those block of phones were sold to another company. So now the detective has to go back and subpoena that company so they can get the records.

Nine times out of ten, in a drug-related homicide and/or our drug traffic investigations, it comes back with no subscriber or something ridiculous. Sometimes I have seen them where they

have come back with just numbers or letters. kind of slows us down. We have to find other means then to actually go out and identify who is utilizing that phone, which costs us time. And in an investigation such as a wiretap investigation, time is of the essence, because those types of investigations, like I said, are costly and manpower intensive. 

For the most part, there is a definite need for accountability with the phone companies in reference to these cell phones, because for the most part, we in law enforcement are kind of hampered and slowed down in our investigations when we cannot get the information that is provided.

That is the major tool utilized by them, and most of the time there is no accountability and/or any way of tracking them down other than to physically do surveillance.

Sometimes you have to go out and actually see the individual you suspect of having that phone and you have to actually call the phone, and if he picks it up, then you can actually testify to the fact that that is the phone that is being utilized. Otherwise, there is no other way to track it.

It just slows us down, and it causes us

1 problems. 2 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay. One of the things I was wondering about --3 4 maybe you could answer this -- does your police department have the ability to do intercepts, 5 6 telecommunications intercepts? On cell phones. 7 DETECTIVE COFFAY: Yes; yes, we do. 8 The police department, specifically my police department, the Wilkes-Barre Police 9 10 Department, locally we work in conjunction with the 11 Attorney General's Office. And me, myself, I am 12 assigned to the Drug Enforcement Administration, and 13 we are able to do intercept investigations through the State Attorney General's Office and with Federal 14 assistance. 15 16 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Do you then, of course, go through the same procedures as far as 17 getting a court-ordered approval for a wiretap? 18 DETECTIVE COFFAY: 19 Yes. 20 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay. Because the 21 report, I just got it this past Friday from the 22 Attorney General on the wiretaps conducted in the 23 last year, and I was just wondering how this plays 24 out with problems that you have.

And in smaller police departments, I am

25

sure, it is probably even more difficult, unless they work through the Attorney General's Office, to get some help from them on the intercepts with cell phones.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DETECTIVE COFFAY: Well, in that type of investigation, an intercept investigation, the problem is magnified, because you are actually doing an investigation -- you have exhausted all investigative means, and you know that phones are being utilized to facilitate the drug trafficking. So your investigation leads to an intercept investigation, which at that point in time, one of the steps that you would take is to utilize a trap and trace, where you would identify a target phone being used, and then you would have to do a trap and trace to see what numbers are calling that phone or what numbers that phone is calling. That helps you identify other players and coconspirators in that investigation.

The problem with that is, a lot of times when you send the subpoenas out for the cell phones, a lot of times they are coming back as prepaid or TracFones, and there is no way to identify that person. So when you do your investigation, sometimes you have to know a little more. That would help us

identify at least who bought the phone.

Now, somebody can buy, if I'm a drug dealer, somebody can buy me a phone, but then again, that still gives us a trail for us to go and speak to that person and find out who, they bought the phone, now who did you give that phone to?

I mean, sometimes a drug dealer will get an individual, somebody that is a drug user, for drugs, they would get that drug user to do things for them -- rent them cars, rent them hotel rooms -- so that they do not have to put anything in their name, because their job, in their mind, is to avoid us.

So they usually do do that, but then again, this also gives me the opportunity to go back and interview that person and possibly get them to testify against the drug dealer. It actually provides me with more witnesses against the drug dealer itself, and it also rounds out the conspiracy. I would have more of an idea of the scope of the conspiracy.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, let me ask you this also about your years of experience and with the evolution of the cell phones.

Has it been your experience that more than a handful of phones are purchased at one time by some

of these drug operations in your community?

2 DETECTIVE COFFAY: Yes. Actually---

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: What is the number that you usually find that they purchase these phones?

DETECTIVE COFFAY: I had recently done a case in the past 2 years where they purchased like 12 or 13 phones, and that drug dealer would hand them out to his retail people, kind of what I was trying to explain before. He buys the phones, and then he hands them out to his retail people.

A lot of times, it is the phone itself that is worth the money. If we turn around and arrest the drug dealer and he is in jail, then sometimes, if you do not confiscate that phone, sometimes other drug dealers will want to buy that phone, they will offer money for that phone, because they know it is a money phone: Hey, I want his phone because he was making a lot of money off that phone; a lot of customers call that phone.

So they have actually gotten to the point where they actually buy the phone, you know, and then there is no way of tracking that at that point in time. You know, you arrested one drug dealer, and then that phone goes to another one. Or sometimes

the phones are distributed out, and then they are mixed between dealers. But you are still showing that these phones belong in that specific conspiracy.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: You are close to the New York border, okay?

DETECTIVE COFFAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And the problem that I foresee with the legislation, and I know that, you know, we would have this problem no matter what, I guess, with just about anything we deal with in the Commonwealth. A drug dealer goes across the border -- we enact the legislation and it becomes law -- goes across the border and buys a cell phone. You know, if New York or New Jersey or Ohio, if they do not have similar legislation on their books, how do we control that? They go over the border; they buy the cells; they come back; they distribute it -- bingo, we are in the same jackpot.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: I'm not sure if you can control it, but at least in Pennsylvania, we are doing what we have to do to try to just end the tide, just to try to stop what is going on as far as the phones go.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: Besides, most drug

```
1
    dealers, for the most part, when they come here,
2
    usually they will go back to their source city to
    pick up drugs and bring back here. A lot of times,
3
    they are staying here. And quite honestly, they are
4
    lazy. Otherwise, they would probably be out with a
 5
    legitimate job.
6
7
            But most of them, you know, I would say most
    of them would either try to have somebody get them a
8
    phone or they would actually just continue.
9
10
    really don't think of those things.
11
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Thank you.
12
            Questions? Jay.
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Yes; thank you, Mr.
13
    Chairman.
14
            For Detective Coffay, thank you again for
15
    being here and taking the time to come up from
16
    Wilkes-Barre this morning. I really appreciate it.
17
    I know that I am speaking for Representative
18
    Pashinski as well.
19
20
            Let me ask you this: You mentioned about
    obtaining records. How helpful -- and I'm not
21
22
    picking on anybody in this room here, but there are a
23
    lot of different phone companies out there,
    manufacturers of these phones -- how helpful, when
24
25
    you are trying to investigate a crime and you make a
```

phone call to that particular company for records,
how helpful do you find those companies are in
trying to furnish you with the records? Does it take
a long time? Are they being helpful? I'm just
curious.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: I probably could answer that quickly and say it is a problem, but there are a lot of factors that go into it.

I'm sure that the cell phone companies, it is such a big business, that there is so much of it and that they receive so many requests from law enforcement as far as subpoenas, that things do take a long time.

It depends. Sometimes I have sent a subpoena to one company and they will have the information back within a day or two, and I have had other companies where it takes a month. That in itself hinders our investigation.

But you send a subpoena to them and then they comply with that subpoena, so they are being helpful in that respect. Sometimes in an emergency situation, you can call and advise them it is an emergency situation and you get the information immediately, such as a homicide or something like that, or if you are actually looking for somebody or

a kidnapping.

But the phone companies generally are helpful, but it is a process. It is a process that takes time.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Okay.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: So in my mind, it takes too long. But for the most part, they comply with the subpoenas.

A lot of times, what is happening now, I did have an example there. On that homicide, they sent the information to one cell phone company--- I will have to look and see which one it was.

They sent the phone records to Sprint, but they were notified back after about a week that that block of numbers was sold to Virgin Mobile, which is a resaler for Sprint, and that is starting to happen a lot more, where you send the subpoena to a company, you plug in and find which number that that phone belongs to, and then when you send the subpoena, it was actually sold to another company. So now you have to restart the process and send that subpoena to that company.

A lot of these smaller companies, it is very difficult, because it takes a long time for that information to get back. And like I said, in some

types of investigations, such as intercept 1 2 investigations, time is kind of of the essence. Not to mention that drug dealers, it is very 3 easy. You know, I have seen drug dealers turn around 4 and they will do this: They will have a phone, and 5 they understand how law enforcement works or they 6 7 have been through this before, so they will wait 8 29 days and go get a new one, throw that one away, and then they will continue to do that to avoid us. 9 10 So that is a problem also, where if they know about how we work and what we do, at times it is 11 12 easy for them to just go buy one phone and throw it 13 away, and get another one and throw that away, and 14 continually change phones. It is not uncommon for us to see seven or eight phones on one dealer, so that 15 16 gets to be a problem. 17 REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you, Detective. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 18 Thank you. Go ahead, Eddie. 19 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you, Mr. 20 Chairman. 21 22 Just a couple of things here. 23 I want to try to establish that even though 24 you may not be able to identify the specific phone 25 that is purchased by that specific person, having the

list of those people purchasing the phones, especially for cash or in larger numbers, would that help you in your investigation since you may recognize a name or two that are within the criminal society?

DETECTIVE COFFAY: I would have to answer that yes, that would help, and for the most part, anything is better than nothing.

When you have something to work with, it is better than not having anything to work with and not having a lead. When you send a subpoena for a cell phone record and there is nothing there, you know, like I gave the example Santa Claus, I can't go to the North Pole and interview Santa Claus, so we just have to try to continue to investigate Santa Claus and identify him and arrest him.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Okay.

And you have also indicated that if you do have a contact, you have a chance, at least, to roll that person, to find other names and possibly put them into a position where they would testimony.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: I would say so, because in my mind, if they buy that phone for that individual knowing what that individual does -- most of the time, it is going to be a customer of theirs

-- then as far as I'm concerned, they are involved in the conspiracy. They are facilitating that drug trafficking also.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: That is correct.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: It is not just the phone facilitating the drug trafficking; it is that individual that can be charged and put in the conspiracy, because once they do something to, you know, facilitate that crime, then they are just as culpable.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: You also indicated that relative to border situations, there are some States that sell liquor for less money than maybe Pennsylvania or will sell other products. You indicated that as long as we are doing our job here in Pennsylvania, we should continue to do that.

I personally feel that that is the same.

Just because other States do not have whatever we feel is necessary, that does not mean that we as Pennsylvania should not take the lead on it, and I think you confer with that. At least here in Pennsylvania, we would have those laws that would allow you at least some latitude in order to carry out your duties.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: Yes.

```
1
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:
2
            All right. Thank you very much.
3
    appreciate your time.
 4
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
 5
                                    Thank you.
            I want to recognize Representative Dally,
6
7
    who has joined the panel.
8
            John. Representative Evans.
            REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Thank you, Mr.
9
10
    Chairman.
11
            Thank you, Detective, for your testimony
    this morning -- this afternoon, I should say. It is
12
13
    getting close to the noon hour.
            I wanted to ask as far as the collection is
14
    concerned of the data. At the point of sale, the ID
15
    would be required, that information would be required
16
    of the purchaser. I'm just wondering where that data
17
    goes. Is there a clearinghouse that would handle
18
    this? Would this be an arm of law enforcement?
19
20
    Would this be something in Harrisburg? Where would
21
    that information go that is collected at the time of
22
    sale?
23
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: May I answer,
24
    sir?
25
            REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:
                                    Sure.
```

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: It is quarterly 1 2 to the Pennsylvania State Police. REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: It is sent---3 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Every quarter of 4 5 the year. Four times a year, it would be sent to the 6 State Police. 7 REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: By every retailer. REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Yes. 8 REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: 9 Okay. 10 And the other question I had concerns, you know, we are seeking changes in technology all the 11 time, and unfortunately, many times when we try to 12 13 legislate technology, it is changed before the legislation becomes a reality. So that has to be a 14 concern. 15 16 But, I mean, going back, how is this different from a drug dealer using a pay phone? 17 DETECTIVE COFFAY: Well, a pay phone, they 18 19 actually have to physically go there and utilize that 20 pay phone. That is a much easier investigation than 21 somebody having a cell phone. They could be anywhere 22 utilizing that cell phone, but tying that activity to 23 the cell phone is what you are trying to do and tying that cell phone to a specific individual. 24

If somebody was utilizing a -- back in the

25

early eighties, they used to use pagers. Now, most drug dealers utilized -- that was their tool. They would use pagers, and then they would utilize pay phones, but now it is all cell phones. Sometimes, a lot of towns, such as mine in the city of Wilkes-Barre, they were getting rid of the pay phones due to that reason, because it was becoming a nuisance in the neighborhood, because the customers were constantly going and using the pay phone to call the drug dealer on his cell phone and then they would meet. So that was the problem there. 

But for the most part, they are mobile.

They are easier to be, you know, anywhere. Actually, you can be anywhere utilizing that cell phone.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: It is a different set of technology, but isn't the anonymity still the common variable there? I mean, are you able to tap into a pay phone if you have suspicion that it is being used for drug activity?

DETECTIVE COFFAY: I have never been involved in a case like that, but I'm sure you can. You would just have to minimize everybody that was not, you know, suspect or a target of that investigation.

1 REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 DETECTIVE COFFAY: Thank you, sir. 3 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative Mantz, 4 and then Moyer and Counselor Andring. 5 REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: Thank you, sir. 6 Detective Coffay, thank you for your 7 8 testimony. Could you tell us how, in your own law 9 10 enforcement experience, how frequently has the lack of such prepaid cell phone purchasers, the identity 11 of a prepaid cell phone, been crucial to the 12 13 charging, your charging, let alone successful prosecution of a suspected drug dealer? 14 DETECTIVE COFFAY: It has been constant. 15 do not have a specific number, but in most cases that 16 I have been involved in as of recently, in the past 17 7 or 8 years, there have been instances of me not 18 19 being able to identify somebody in that conspiracy 2.0 because of not being able to trace the phone. I mean, there are also other ways and means 21 22 to do that and they just didn't pan out, so to speak. 23 But for the most part, the cell phone is a start, 24 especially in an intercept investigation where a lot 25 of your information is based on phone and phone

1 information. 2 But in the past years, there have been numerous cases where this has hampered the 3 4 investigation. REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: I mean, I am saying 5 crucial, not just tampering but crucial to the 6 7 successful ID-ing of a suspect. DETECTIVE COFFAY: I mean, it has happened. 8 It has happened. There have been people I 9 10 have not been able to identify that I might have been able to identify, or had a lead if this was passed. 11 12 REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: Okay. Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Jay. 14 REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 15 16 Detective, just a question. 17 Actually, you know, Representative Evans 18 brought up the pay-phone aspect, and it is my 19 understanding -- correct me if I am wrong, and maybe 20 you are the wrong person to ask this question -- but prior to 9/11, drug dealers, criminals, loved to use 21 22 the pay phones, because in many instances, they were 23 not traceable, is my understanding of that. 24 I know that when I was the regional director

for Revenue and I had the southeastern region, which

25

spanned from the Philadelphia area all the way up to Reading, I remember in my Lancaster office it was pointed out to me that just, you know, "Mr. Moyer, just down the street, that is the pay phone of choice" -- this was in 1999 -- "of the drug dealers," and they would just, one after another, just would go back to that pay phone.

My understanding is now, if you use a pay phone and I call you, my number shows up. That is my understanding. Is that correct?

DETECTIVE COFFAY: That I'm not sure, but going back to that, and, you know, the pay phone, at least you can do surveillance.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Right.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: It will identify where the pay phone is at if you had that information, that that is the pay phone calling in, and then you would have to actually physically do surveillance to identify the people that are utilizing the phone at that specific time.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Right.

In your opinion, Detective, if we passed this law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I mean, obviously the criminals are not using the pay phone and they are not using, unless they are stupid,

totally stupid, they are not using a regular cell phone because they know it could be traced. In your opinion, Detective, if we in the Legislature were to pass this law, what impact will it have on the interdiction of drug dealers and drug dealing in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?

DETECTIVE COFFAY: Well, that is just one step and one more tool to help us do our job. And not so much to do our job; we can do our job possibly without the bill, but it just helps us and it gives us another tool to do it more efficiently. That is my opinion.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Counsel.

MR. ANDRING: You mentioned subpoenas that you have issued in connection with drug cases. Now, those subpoenas, how exactly did you issue those? Were they for a specific number that you intercepted or numbers that you came up with on phones? How would you initially obtain the information to even issue the subpoena?

DETECTIVE COFFAY: Just for example, a case a few years ago, we identified a drug dealer through interviews with drug customers.

MR. ANDRING: Right.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: All of those customers would say, Joe Blow, this is his phone number; he is the one who is dealing. So you would have to then try to identify that individual who has been dealing. A lot of times, you would get that phone number, find out what company issued that phone number, and then you would get a subpoena for the subscriber information.

At that point in time, what you would like to do is then run toll records to look at all the different numbers that this individual is calling, and then you take those numbers and you send subpoenas out for subscribers of those numbers, and then you take those numbers and send subpoenas out for those.

So you continually send out subpoenas to identify who is calling that individual phone, and then a lot of times you already have a list of numbers that you look at anyway of different dealers, and you see who is calling who or what numbers are associated with what, and then you take those and subpoena those.

MR. ANDRING: Okay. Now, in the first instance, you knew the name of the person who was using the phone.

```
1
            DETECTIVE COFFAY: In that case, no.
2
    is the case I was talking about. When I subpoenaed
    that drug dealer's phone, the subscriber information?
3
            MR. ANDRING:
                          Right.
 4
            DETECTIVE COFFAY: It came back to Santa
 5
6
    Claus.
7
                          Okay. And what you are
            MR. ANDRING:
    subpoenaing then is the subscriber information that
8
    the cell phone company has.
9
                               That is correct.
10
            DETECTIVE COFFAY:
            MR. ANDRING: And you are not aware of them
11
12
    being able to trace that back to buyer information at
    the retail level?
13
            DETECTIVE COFFAY: Well, no, because this
14
    law is not enacted yet, if it is going to be enacted.
15
16
    But no, there is no way of telling that phone company
17
    -- all they know is that this person came in and
18
    bought this prepaid phone and this is the information
19
    that they gave. This is all that they could provide.
20
    That is in reference, when you subpoena that number,
    that they have a record of ---
21
22
            MR. ANDRING: No; actually, it is my
23
    understanding that these things are usually activated
24
    by the phone. You buy the phone; you take it home;
25
    you dial some numbers, and that is how it is
```

activated, and the only information that the phone company has is the information that is punched into that phone, be it Mickey Mouse or Donald Duck or anything else.

And that is, again, one of the points I am making. There seems to be an assumption that if we pass this law, law enforcement is going to have a list of the phone numbers of every drug dealer in the State, and I am having trouble picturing how that is going to happen.

Number one, if you do not have this registration information, if you are using a credit card or, you know, using those things, that phone is still not going to be traceable for the most part.

And if you send your subpoena to the phone company, you are still not going to get any information if, when they activated the phone, they put in false information.

And you yourself said that often these drug dealers go out and buy phones every 30 days because they know how you operate. And, I mean, if drug dealers are able to obtain illegal weapons, I do not think they are going to have a real problem with circumventing the requirements as to the traceability of these portable cell phones.

I guess my point is, if you are serious about doing this and you actually want to accomplish a law enforcement purpose, you are going to have to have a far more draconian piece of legislation than what this bill encompasses. You are going to have to require every one of these cell phones to be registered when it is purchased. You are going to have to require every single purchaser to show ID. You are going to have to prohibit the resale of them. You are going to have to prohibit multiple purchases of them.

Frankly, you are almost going to have to treat them just like handguns. And short of that, I just have serious questions as to whether you accomplish much with this legislation.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: Well, to go back to the beginning of what you were saying, when I do subpoena a phone number and, like I said, it comes back to something fictitious, it is not kind of the cell phone that you are getting the information. You are asking for toll records on that phone number, okay? The phone company does keep a record of that.

MR. ANDRING: Right.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: So when you get those toll records, they will send you the subscriber

information and then they will send you the toll records on what number is called to and from that phone.

MR. ANDRING: But if those people want to have a mobile phone that is not traceable, they are going to be able to get one, I think, regardless of what you do here.

Again, you know, if it is one drug dealer calling another drug dealer, they are going to do what they have to do to have phones that can't be traced, and it is not going to be that hard to do that.

And as far as the average person calling in on one of these phones, you know, if it is traceable, it is traceable; if it is not, it is not. It all depends on what they put into the system whenever they activate the phone.

And again, I'm just trying to make the point that we have talked to a lot of people about these provisions, and I'm still trying to see how it is going to be effective. That is the one thing I just can't quite get clear in my mind, how this is really going to be a substantial tool in fighting crime.

DETECTIVE COFFAY: Well, to me, it is going to make the phone companies and the retailers have

1 accountability for an item that is being used to 2 facilitate drug trafficking. Right now, there is no accountability. 3 4 There is no way of tracing that information. At least if somebody comes to buy the phone and they 5 have to show identification and I have a record of 6 7 that, and then I can show that that number is dealing 8 drugs, at least I can go back to the retailer and then I can find out who actually bought that phone. 9 10 If it is not the drug dealer him or herself, then at least it could be somebody that they had do that. 11 There is some kind of record. Even at the retail 12 13 level, there will be a record of that phone number being bought. 14 15 MR. ANDRING: For some of the phones. 16 again, you are going to know which ones require the records and which ones do not. 17 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: If I could jump in 18 19 here. 20 Detective, the issue and I think the point 21 he is making is that these drug dealers are not 22 stupid, number one, or they would not be in the 23 business. 24 Number two, they are certainly not going to

give identifiable information. They can come up with

25

phony documentation on name, address, whatever. So you go back and you do the trace only to find out that there is no address that is identifiable. That person, for all intents and purposes, does not exist. Then you run into a dead end.

2.0

And the problem that I have in dealing with the legislation is, are we putting excessive requirements on our retailers and the phone companies for something that we know just will not be enforceable? And I'm not saying it is bad legislation; do not misunderstand me. I think the point that you are making is well taken, and we know that they are operating out there. But putting excessive burdens on the sale of these phones, does it really accomplish what we are setting out to do, and that is the nagging question that I have.

I understand where you are coming from, and I know that this is a problem. In my city in Reading, it is no different than in your city in Wilkes-Barre.

And the State Police, which we have not heard from yet as far as how they are going to handle that information and the excess man-hours and compilation of all that information -- where you are going to store it and how you are going to deal with

it -- you know, it gets be a layer cake, and if we can come up with some solutions in working with the industry in trying to figure out a methodology in trying to curb this kind of activity, that is the real challenge that we face.

And I'm not saying we are not interested in helping you; I think we have to do something, but what that something is right now, it is just a little bit elusive.

So do not go away here feeling that, you know, these guys are not listening, and ladies. We are, but we do not want to create an extra burden on the administration of this and whether or not it would really be helpful if we can actually get some results and nail some of these drug dealers.

I'm sorry; go ahead. Questions from any of the panelists? Go ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, just a comment. I mean, obviously something is better than nothing, and I guess one of the problems I have been having since Representative Pashinski and I have been working on this since February last year is the push-back we have been getting. And I am not saying that, Mr. Chairman,

with respect to anybody in this room, but when you have groups, organizations, like the District Attorneys Association of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania supporting this legislation and saying this is a serious problem, drug trafficking in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is a serious problem, when we have the Chiefs of Police Association supporting this legislation, when we have our own Pennsylvania State Police saying we need this legislation, I just do not understand the push-back.

We have, right now, legislation working with respect to the sale of pseudopheds. I have not heard, I have not read since I have been in this office, of any complaints from the retail industry regarding how terrible it is. We have been able to get a handle on the use of pseudopheds by the bad guys, and I just, quite frankly, do not understand why we are having the push-back we are having on this legislation.

And law enforcement says, my former district attorney, Bruce Castor, told me that this is a serious issue. It has been a serious issue. We need to get a handle on it. The Attorney General himself said this is a serious issue.

And yes, there are a lot of imperfections in

1 it, and yes, we could be very draconian, and we may 2 have to get to that point. If we pass this legislation, it may very well be that we will have to 3 go to step two and step three, but at least we need 4 to get to step one. We need to get a handle on this. 5 Just to close our eyes and not do anything 6 7 and bury our heads in the sand is not the direction that we need to go, and that is just a comment. 8 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Eddie. 10 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: If I could just 11 piggyback on what Representative Moyer said. Just because it is too hard, we do not do 12 You know, I take the same view that 13 it? Representative Moyer takes, and that is, look, we 14 have identified a problem; now let's all work 15 16 together so that we can begin to eliminate this problem. 17 We also know that in any wartime situation, 18 in any kind of law enforcement situation, 19 2.0 communication is a vital source for whatever side is involved in a conflict. And we have identified here 21 22 that just about every drug dealer is using these 23 TracFones because they are untraceable, you know, 24 and we cannot deny that fact. That is why 25

law enforcement wants us to try to move forward on

this.

On behalf of Representative Moyer and myself, we said it before and we will say it again, that door is open, the table is open, for us to figure out a way that is going to allow our law-abiding retailers and producers of these instruments to continue, you know, to sell them, profit by it, et cetera. But I'm looking for, I think we are both looking for a way that we can help law enforcement. That is the whole key thing here.

And again, just because it is hard, just because this thing isn't maybe perfect, let us try to improve upon it so that it becomes a viable product, a viable instrument, for law enforcement to help protect the citizens of Pennsylvania, and that is why I think we are all here.

We are all Americans; we want the same thing. I think we want the same thing.

And again, I would encourage all of us to be honest and forthright in this situation so that we can come up with a solution that is going to help in this crazy thing, the drugs.

The drugs are costing us billions of dollars, incarceration, incredible man-hours in law enforcement. We have got to do something about it.

```
1
    We just cannot sit back and say it can't be done.
2
            Thank you.
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Any other questions?
3
 4
            Thank you, Detective. We appreciate your
    time.
5
6
            DETECTIVE COFFAY:
                                Thank you.
7
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We will next hear
    from Kevin Lutkins, Esq., Pennsylvania Convenience
8
    Store Council.
9
10
            MR. LUTKINS: Good morning.
11
            First, I would like to thank Mr. Chairman
    and the committee for allowing us to come here today
12
13
    and testify on this matter.
            We have already heard a lot of testimony
14
    about what the phones are used for. We would echo
15
16
    that. I mean, many of the phones are purchased for
    perfectly legitimate reasons, including parents
17
    trying to limit high phone bills caused by their
18
    children and the elderly who use it to call for
19
2.0
    assistance.
            Many of the phones are sold at convenience
21
22
    stores.
23
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Could you pull the
24
    mike closer?
25
            MR. LUTKINS: Sorry about that.
                                              I'm new at
```

this. This is my first one, so I apologize.

2.0

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: No problem.

MR. LUTKINS: Many of the phones are purchased at convenience stores, whose main selling point is the speed of transactions.

The requirements identified in the bills are unduly burdensome on retailers who will be forced to expend significant resources to train their employees, create the necessary forms to record the required information, and modify their information technology systems to encrypt and transfer the information to the Pennsylvania State Police.

These requirements will also harm convenience stores selling such phones by slowing transactions to a crawl. We ask the Legislature to weigh the benefit to law enforcement against the enormous burden this will place on retailers.

And again, in terms of the record retention in the bill, some of the things were discussed earlier, so I feel I want to comment on that.

In the bill, there really is no time limit for keeping these records by the retailer. So of course the longer the retailer is required to retain these records, the more expensive it is going to be for the retailer.

If the retailer transfers the records to the Pennsylvania State Police on a quarterly basis, and therefore they are released, they do not have to retain them after the court order, well, then that sort of raises a legal question, from my standpoint, of who is going to be subpoenaed? Is the Pennsylvania State Police going to be subpoenaed or is the retailer going to be subpoenaed?

I do not see any reason why you would subpoena a retailer who no longer has the records because they have already transferred them to the Pennsylvania State Police. And again, the whole point of a subpoena is to protect rights, so I do not know that the Pennsylvania State Police, as honorable as they are, really have an incentive to challenge any subpoena from a fellow law enforcement agency.

I think those are some issues that probably should be addressed in the legislation if it moves forward.

Other issues are that the bill allows for selective enforcement against those stores who happen to sell phones to an individual who is the subject of a criminal investigation. The violation of the proposed statute will only be discovered during a criminal investigation of a person or entity

unrelated to the selling store.

2.0

There is no enforcement mechanism in place to test general compliance with the bills or the proposed statute, similar to cigarettes, whereas with cigarettes, you know, you would send out teams to verify that stores are not selling them to people under 18 years of age.

The result is that some stores that are not compliant with the proposed statute will not be prosecuted for violations if they are lucky enough not to have sold a prepaid phone to an individual that is the subject of a criminal investigation.

Additionally, it places the employees of the store in greater legal jeopardy than set forth in the bill. The employees of the store may face obstruction charges; facilitating criminal activity, as the detective mentioned earlier. The penalties for these charges are much more severe than the fines that are identified in the bills.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Questions? Jay.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

A question for Mr. Lutkins.

25 Would you explain to me how the sale of

```
pseudopheds is handled at the retail point of sale?
1
2
            MR. LUTKINS: I couldn't comment on that.
3
    don't know.
 4
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: I'm sorry?
            MR. LUTKINS: I couldn't comment on that.
 5
6
    don't know.
            My understanding, I believe, is that it
7
    is--- Well, I couldn't comment on that.
8
    apologize.
9
10
            I'm actually -- and I guess I should have
    made this clear in the beginning -- I am actually
11
    filling in for someone else who couldn't make it
12
13
    today from the Pennsylvania Convenience Store
    Council. They would have greater expertise on that
14
    than I would.
15
16
           REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Okay. Thank you.
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
17
                                    Eddie.
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you,
18
    Mr. Chairman.
19
20
            Thank you very much for coming here today
21
    and testifying, Kevin.
            You talked about training. How do you train
22
23
    your employees relative to a check transaction?
24
            MR. LUTKINS: Well, the training, generally
25
    the training at a convenience store is done when you
```

initially hire someone. But, of course, what you have to remember is that when you hire someone at a convenience store, you are really already kind of in the hole with them. You have expended a lot of money setting up the training programs, sending them through the training, and they really have not even worked a day at a convenience store.

And convenience stores have a high employee turnover as well. So generally, I would believe, that the training relating to check cashing or anything else would be done upon hire.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Okay. So in this initial training, which may take how long, a day?

MR. LUTKINS: It depends on the particular convenience store. For example, a large chain may have a longer, more extensive training program than your neighborhood mom-and-pop store.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Okay.

Could you tell us about what are the different categories of training?

MR. LUTKINS: Well, you would train on, you know, how to run the register; how to, you know, ring up the sale, the sales of anything. You know, the cigarettes, you would train them on that. You would train them on, you know, if there are any other

products that require specific, that have specific requirements other than just running it through the cash register, you would have to train them on that.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: That is indeed the very point that I'm coming to, because if the cell phone, let us say, went through, the various employees would have to be aware of the safeguards, the reason why, et cetera, in order to follow through on the orientation to make sure you follow the law.

Could you tell us, coming back to the check, what does your employee have to do when someone gives them a check for their purchases?

MR. LUTKINS: Well, every store is different. You know, some stores may require -- I'm sure every store requires ID, but, you know, to the extent to which, you know, other policies are in place relating to that, I couldn't comment. I mean, every store is going to be different.

Some stores may not require ID because they know the individual, because the individual lives around the corner. Or they frequent the store so often that, you know -- I honestly couldn't comment as to what every store's policy is or what the general policy is relating to cashing one check

```
1
    versus another.
2
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Okay. All right.
3
    Thank you.
 4
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Thank you.
            Ouestions from members?
 5
            I do want to recognize James Casorio, who
6
7
    has joined our panel today. Thank you, Jimmy.
8
            Jay.
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
9
                                    Thank you,
10
    Mr. Chairman. Just one other question.
11
            How many convenience stores do we have in
    the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?
12
13
            MR. LUTKINS: Probably tens of thousands, if
    not hundreds of thousands.
14
15
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Okay.
16
            MR. LUTKINS: And I couldn't give you a
    specific number if that is what you are looking for.
17
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: And you are obviously
18
19
    here this morning because you have an interest in the
2.0
    sale of these phones, correct?
            MR. LUTKINS: Yes.
21
                                 The Pennsylvania
22
    Convenience Store Council represents some of them.
23
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Could you name some
24
    of the convenience stores that sell these phones?
25
            MR. LUTKINS: You are probably looking at --
```

```
1
    you know, it actually would be easier for me to
2
    identify the ones that sell the cards as opposed to
    the actual phones. But the phones, you know, you are
3
4
    probably looking at a Sheetz or a Wawa. They may
    sell the phones.
5
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
                                    They may sell them.
6
7
            MR. LUTKINS: They may sell the phones.
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: How about a 7-Eleven?
8
            MR. LUTKINS: You know, I have not checked
9
10
    specifically those stores to verify if they do or
11
    they do not.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: And since you are
13
    here, you probably know the question, I mean, what
    percentage of sales do these phones represent in the
14
    convenience stores of Pennsylvania?
15
            MR. LUTKINS: I wouldn't know.
16
17
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: I would very much
    like if you could get back to us with some of that
18
    information.
19
2.0
            MR. LUTKINS:
                          Sure.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
                                    The questions that I
22
    asked you?
23
            I would like to know which convenience
24
    stores in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania sell these
25
    phones, and I would like to know the percentage of
```

```
sales of these phones to the convenience store
1
2
    industry in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
    would like to know the names of the stores that sell
3
4
    these phones.
            MR. LUTKINS: Certainly.
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
                                    Thank you,
 6
    Mr. Chairman.
7
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
8
                                    Counsel Andring.
            MR. ANDRING: Just briefly, does your
9
10
    organization represent independent neighborhood-type
11
    stores or are you primarily representing the chain
    convenience stores?
12
            MR. LUTKINS: We have a combination.
13
                                                   Wе
    have some chains that are members and some
14
    independent neighborhood convenience stores.
15
16
            MR. ANDRING:
                          Because especially in a lot of
    urban neighborhoods and, frankly, poorer
17
    neighborhoods, small independent stores, as I
18
19
    understand it, sell these things.
20
            MR. LUTKINS: That is my understanding as
    well.
21
22
            MR. ANDRING: And that in fact it is a
23
    relatively common way for people in a lot of
24
    neighborhoods to obtain their phone service.
25
            MR. LUTKINS:
                          Yes.
                                 I mean, that is my
```

```
understanding; there are a lot of convenience stores
1
2
    that sell them.
            MR. ANDRING: Okay. Thank you.
 3
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Thank you for your
 4
    testimony. We appreciate it.
5
            We will next hear from Captain Dante
6
7
    Orlandi, Director of the Drug Law Enforcement
8
    Division, the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of
    Criminal Investigation.
10
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Good morning.
11
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Good morning, sir.
12
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Good morning. I am
13
    Captain Dante Orlandi, Director of the Drug Law
    Enforcement Division, Bureau of Criminal
14
    Investigation, in the Pennsylvania State Police.
15
            On behalf of Colonel Jeffrey B. Miller,
16
    Commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police, I
17
    would like to take the opportunity to present
18
19
    testimony to the committee.
2.0
            The Bureau of Criminal Investigation is
    tasked with a wide variety of responsibilities
21
22
    that support the unique investigative needs of
23
    16 Pennsylvania State Police troops that protect our
24
    Commonwealth.
25
            One of our responsibilities is to approve
```

and oversee electronic surveillance operations. I would like to take this opportunity to talk to you about a problem currently confronting law enforcement -- the use of high-tech, prepaid wireless telephones.

2.0

When there is probable cause to believe that a specific telephone is used in the furtherance of certain criminal offenses, law enforcement officers can intercept communications on that phone through a court-authorized nonconsensual interception, or a wiretap.

Under current law, however, probable cause must be established for each individual telephone to be intercepted. Every time a criminal changes phones, law enforcement must prove there is probable cause to believe the new phone will be used to continue criminal activity.

Establishing probable cause for the new telephone can take hours and sometimes days. As a result, law enforcement often misses valuable communications.

The problem is compounded by the use of prepaid wireless telephones that allow virtually untraceable communications. These prepaid wireless telephones do not require a contract or credit check. Subsequently, almost anyone can purchase one without

formal proof of identification.

2.0

Unlike a contract for a cellular telephone service plan with a provider, there is no way to link a prepaid wireless phone to its owner.

The low price of prepaid phones allows criminals and terrorists to avoid traditional intercepts by quickly changing telephones. For these reasons, criminal organizations often use prepaid wireless telephones to avoid electronic surveillance by law enforcement.

We have seen a rapid increase in the use of prepaid cellular phones by those engaged in illegal activity. The State Police has encountered the use of prepaid wireless phones in 80 percent of electronic surveillance investigations that it has conducted since 2006.

In fact, prepaid wireless telephones were involved in every single wiretap investigation conducted by Troop L, Reading, since 2005.

Here is how it works. Drug traffickers will provide a prepaid wireless telephone to a customer or distributor. This telephone is used exclusively to call the trafficker.

At the next meeting, the trafficker will provide the customer or distributor a new telephone.

In some cases, criminal organizations purchase telephones and continually replace them after prepaid minutes are used. It is not uncommon to find a half a dozen discarded prepaid wireless telephones inside traffickers' homes.

Nonconsensual wiretaps are an essential tool in gathering the information necessary to build a picture of a criminal organization, identify the individual members, and obtain evidence necessary to dismantle them.

Allowing criminal organizations to purchase prepaid wireless telephones without verifying their identity complicates the efforts of law enforcement. Unless this situation is quickly addressed, our ability to keep pace with criminal organizations will be seriously impeded.

So what can we do? First, customers should be required to produce photo identification when purchasing the telephone.

Second, anyone who pays cash for a prepaid wireless telephone or purchases three or more phones should be subject to registration requirements.

To be most effective, the legislation should require retailers to electronically record this information into a database, which would be

immediately accessible to law enforcement. These measures would remove the anonymity criminals currently enjoy using prepaid cellular telephones.

In closing, we appreciate Representative Pashinski's willingness to examine this law enforcement issue and look forward to continuing working with him on effective legislation.

On behalf of Colonel Jeffrey B. Miller, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today, and I would be happy to answer any of your questions.

12 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Captain.

Questions? Yes; go ahead, John.

14 REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Thank you very much,
15 Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Captain, for your testimony.

Just to cite an example, a hypothetical, I guess. If I went to a store and purchased three cell phones and distributed them to members of my family for safety reasons or other considerations, perhaps a young child would lose the phone at a school bus stop. A drug dealer would grab that phone and start using it for drug transactions. If that phone is traced, could I possibly have a State trooper knocking on my door in the middle of the night

because that phone was purchased by me?

CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Well, it is a lot more complicated than that. You need to have enough probable cause to apply for the nonconsensual wiretap intercept on that particular phone.

It is not just -- you just do not pick it out of thin air that there are phone calls. In that example, your child's lost phone, they would have to start calling, that person would start calling different drug dealers that we would have to build probable cause out. In all likelihood, the time would expire on that phone before we would ever get the information approved to go open that wiretap.

So yeah, could that possibly happen that we would at some point knock on your door to say this phone was registered to you? Certainly. That would be no different than a handgun purchase.

You purchase a handgun -- I am sorry; excuse me -- a long gun, you are required to register that first one. If that exchanges hands 10 times, we would then go to that first person and say, what happened to that gun? They would say, well, I sold that to person A, and then we would go from A to B and slowly track that down. But yes, that could be a

possibility.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Following up on what Attorney Andring had mentioned earlier, are you concerned that the data that you are collecting may not be worth that much?

If these criminals are using false IDs and making these purchases under assumed names and so on and so forth, I mean, with data in and data out, I mean, if it is bad data going in, I do not see how it is going to serve you as a very useful tool.

CAPTAIN ORLANDI: But it gives us a starting point. It gives us something -- right now, the subscriber information will come back as cellular phone. That is all we have, so we know somebody that has a wireless cellular phone is making phone calls and is connected to terrorism, drug dealings, whatever type of crime it would be, but we have nowhere to go. There is nothing to go further on that.

At least in this situation, we at least have a contact place. We could at least say that it was purchased, even if it was a straw purchase where the girlfriend or the boyfriend bought it for the drug dealer, at least we have it narrowed down to a town. Right now, there is nothing; there is nothing for us

1 to go on.

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: But certainly I don't want to sound as though I am not supporting law enforcement in this effort. I mean, we have a severe problem with these drug dealers and with illegal activities, but it seems as though the cat is already out of the bag to a degree. And short of making these types of purchases illegal across the board, I do not know how effective this type of a program or that this legislation calls for would be.

As far as collecting the data, how many people do you think in the State Police Headquarters would it take to manage these quarterly filings by every retail outlet in Pennsylvania?

CAPTAIN ORLANDI: I don't know. I'm not an information technology expert, so I couldn't tell you what would occur. I just know that if we are mandated to do it, we will certainly do it and we will give it 100 percent. But I could not answer on as far as how many personnel it will take to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: And going back to the charges in this legislation against the clerks who would violate the terms of the law, what kinds of fines and penalties would they be facing? How severe

would that be? 1 2 CAPTAIN ORLANDI: My understanding, it would be a summary offense. It is all in the bill. 3 4 subsequent offense, I believe, is a misdemeanor 3, and I think at some point it can go up to a 5 6 misdemeanor 2. 7 REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Would those clerks have to be over a certain age to sell a phone? 8 mean, if an employee is 16, 17 years of age, would 9 10 they be restricted from selling that type of a phone? 11 CAPTAIN ORLANDI: That would be a labor and industry question. I do not know. 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 14 15 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. 16 Ed. 17 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you very much, Captain. 18 19 And to my colleague, first of all, it is a 20 \$500 fine, a summary offense, and if it were any subsequent, it would be a third-degree misdemeanor, a 21 22 thousand dollar fine. 23 Now, to answer the answer about the age of 24 the employee, once again, we are identifying 25 something that is being used throughout a tremendous

amount of the crime industry, if we could use that 1 2 So possibly these phones need to be sold in a different manner, like we would liquor or like we 3 4 would some medication. That is just a consideration. Captain, I wonder if you could just bear 5 with us for a minute. If I buy the phone with a 6 7 credit card and the phone is now used for nefarious 8 acts of whatever degree, you confiscate the phone, now what do you do? 9 10 CAPTAIN ORLANDI: We confiscate the phone ---REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Let's say you 11 find the phone. The phone is involved in these 12 13 various nefarious effects. What is your process? 14 Somebody is arrested; you have the phone; the phone was purchased with a credit card. 15 16 purchased the phone with a credit card. 17 CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Okay. REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: The phone is 18 19 considered used in drug dealing. Now, what would be 20 the process? How would you go through ---21 CAPTAIN ORLANDI: At that point, we would 22 get a search warrant to retrieve the numbers that 23 were stored in that phone. But as far as doing any 24 kind of wiretap---25 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: No, no; I'm not

```
1
    asking about that.
2
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI:
                              Okay.
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: I'm trying to
 3
    show the distinction ---
4
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Then what we can do to
5
6
    prove ownership, at least we can get the credit card
7
    company's information so that we would have somebody
    to link that phone to.
8
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: That's the point.
10
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: I'm not necessarily saying
    that the person that purchased it was the person that
11
    had it, but it gives us that first step to take.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: That's correct.
13
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Where if it were just a
14
    cash phone, there would be no first step.
15
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: You have nothing.
16
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI:
17
                              Correct.
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Okay. Thanks.
18
19
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Jay.
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you,
20
    Mr. Chairman.
21
22
            Captain, thank you again for being here with
23
    us this morning. We really appreciate it.
24
            In your testimony, and I have it in front of
25
    me, I thought it was very telling that you had
```

```
1
    indicated that 80 percent of the investigations have
2
    shown that these phones were used in those crimes?
    Am I right?
3
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI:
                              That is correct.
 4
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: And you mentioned
 5
    Troop L in Reading, that since 2005, these phones
6
7
    were involved in every single wiretap investigation?
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI:
                              That is correct.
8
            And just for a distinction, if a wiretap
9
10
    investigation involved, say, 15 phones or 5 phones,
    out of those 5 phones, some of them would have been
11
12
    prepaid. I'm not saying that all of those phones
13
    were, but in each investigation since 2005, somewhere
14
    in the phones that were tapped it involved those
    wireless cellular phones.
15
16
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Is it fair to say, I
17
    mean, Troop L, does it basically just have the city
    of Reading or does it also---
18
19
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: They cover Lebanon County,
20
    Berks County, and Schuylkill County.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: And how significant
22
    is the drug trafficking in that particular area,
23
    particularly in the Reading and Lebanon area?
24
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Pretty significant.
25
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: It is coming out of
```

```
1
    New York City, I understand. Correct?
2
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: One of the places, yes.
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Again, I was a
 3
4
    revenue director for the southeast region, and I had
    the Reading City office, which I know our
5
6
    distinguished Chairman is from Reading, and I was
7
    told, they pointed out to me the bus company, and the
    bad guys literally come up in buses to traffic drugs,
8
    and that is one of their modes of transportation.
9
            In your opinion, Captain, if we enacted this
10
11
    legislation into law, what impact would it have in
12
    clamping down on drug trafficking in the Commonwealth
13
    of Pennsylvania?
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: I think it gives us
14
    another tool for us in law enforcement. There are
15
    certainly -- it is a step in the right direction.
16
17
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
                                    Right.
18
            Do you think, Captain, this is better than
19
    doing nothing?
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Absolutely.
2.0
21
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
                                    All right.
                                                Thank
22
    you, Captain.
23
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Chris.
24
            REPRESENTATIVE SAINATO:
                                      Thank you, Mr.
    Chairman.
25
```

Thank you, Captain. This, so far, has been very enlightening today, listening to the testimony.

2.0

My question sort of follows up on

Representative Evans a little bit. When you get into
the penalties against those that are selling these
phones in the convenience stores and everything else,
who is going to enforce these penalties? Are the

State Police going to go in and investigate the
convenience stores, such as they do the liquor
establishments and things like that? Is there a cost
involved in that?

CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Well, we certainly will enforce all the laws in Pennsylvania. You know, the costs of enforcing that, I do not have that information. I can provide that to you.

REPRESENTATIVE SAINATO: And I'm just curious, because we are creating another penalty for this, and someone has to enforce it, and it probably would be in the State Police and/or the local law enforcement.

CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE SAINATO: I mean, drugs are a very serious problem in Pennsylvania as well as the whole nation.

CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Right. I mean, we are

there regardless---

REPRESENTATIVE SAINATO: Right.

CAPTAIN ORLANDI: ---so if there is another reported crime, certainly we are going to respond to that. We are already in place. It is not like you are hiring additional law enforcement specifically for that.

It is just like any other law that is enacted. It just becomes another law that we need to enforce. We don't necessarily get more manpower for that; it is just one other law that we enforce.

REPRESENTATIVE SAINATO: What about the black market? Do you think this would cause a black market in the cell phone industry where they would, you know, set that up? Because earlier, I think, the chief legal counsel for the committee brought that up.

For some reason, drug dealers and the criminal element always try to find ways of finding, you know, we stop one thing and it starts somewhere else. They come up with another way to get around the system. They were using the pay phones and then they went to the cell phones, now they are into prepaid cell phones. What is next?

What about the cards? I will let you answer

that, but what about the cards, the prepaid cards?

2.0

CAPTAIN ORLANDI: As far as the black market, there are probably easier ways for them to get around it than a black market.

Like someone had mentioned earlier, just going to a border State and purchasing them, they certainly can do that. But I think if Pennsylvania is the lead here and we are showing other States that we are taking this serious and we are going to support law enforcement in this particular role here, that may cause other States to see what we are doing and maybe they will follow suit, too. I do not know.

I mean, as far as the black market, if it is lucrative enough, I guess criminals will find a way to make money at it. I do not know.

REPRESENTATIVE SAINATO: Just when I think about, you know, sometimes when we do this, and when you talk about cigarettes, you talk about the other things---

CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE SAINATO: ---there is always an element out there that is ready to jump on the bandwagon to, you know, break the law, and I'm sure you have seen it in your profession.

I appreciate your testimony. I think it was

enlightening, and we are here to listen. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Captain, I just, you know, in listening to this -- and you know I certainly respect the work that the State Police do. I have always been there 100 percent to support you guys, and you know that. But I also am concerned that in a free society, as we have in this country, law enforcement must respect the civil rights and constitutional rights that we hold near and dear to our hearts. That is what we are all about.

We know from our country's history that this can be done while simultaneously pursuing and protecting those who break the law. Our Fourth Amendment rights, we have to be very cognizant of that.

Some of the concerns that I have, not just with this legislation, but I have been very, very protective over the years, especially in this position as Chairman of the Judiciary, to make sure that those less fortunate than us, that are law-abiding citizens, to be poor is not a sin, but do we create an additional burden on them and the innocence of those people who are low-income residents in our Commonwealth? And they have budget

considerations, and they buy these type phones for their use; domestic violence victims who absolutely want to maintain anonymity so that their lives are not threatened by the use of the cell phones; and/or parents and grandparents that purchase these for their children and grandchildren for the degree of protection that it provides to them.

And we are in an informational society, and I can accept that and I understand that, and it is probably going to get crazier as the years go by. But all the gathering of the personal information about each and every one of us and the use and/or abuse of that information gets a little scary at times, because government, do we know best? I do not think so. Do we know a lot about our people? Oh, yeah. Are there chances that information can be abused at times? I know from our history that we know that that is the case; it has been.

I just want a guarantee that we have the right protections, you know, in entering these areas that that kind of information is not abused or accessed in a way that it could hurt those that we are trying to protect, and I think you would share that same concern, I believe.

CAPTAIN ORLANDI: And you are absolutely

right, and I am sworn to uphold the Constitution.

Part of being a police officer is to swear to the

Constitution and to uphold it, and I take that very seriously.

And nobody is saying that wireless cell phones are bad; they are an excellent thing, and you made some excellent points -- victims of domestic violence; you want to keep track of your children without having them run up a phone bill. It is not a bad thing at all; it is an excellent thing.

This is just merely saying, let us document it. Let us know who has these telephones as far as -- and it has nothing to do with what they are saying, who they are calling. All of that is private information, and their rights cannot be violated and they won't be violated, and that is not what this is about. It is merely saying who purchased that telephone, no different than many of the other things that we provide retailers when we purchase things.

I mean, I'm sure you have been there where you have gone to a hardware store buying nails and they are asking you for your home phone number and your zip code. All we are asking for is, if you are paying cash for this, that we have some way of tracking this, and there is a reason behind it,

```
because of terrorism, because of the drug trafficking
1
2
    organizations.
            And again, there is nothing wrong with these
 3
    phones; they are excellent. I mean, they are a good
4
    thing. It is just that this legislation will support
5
    law enforcement in our efforts to take down criminal
6
7
    organizations.
8
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Thank you, Captain.
    Thank you for your testimony.
9
10
            Any other questions? No?
11
            Thank you, sir.
12
            CAPTAIN ORLANDI: Thank you.
13
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We will next hear
    from K. Dane Snowden, Vice President of External and
14
    State Affairs, CTIA -- The Wireless Association.
15
            MR. SNOWDEN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.
16
17
            I understand I am between you and lunch, so
    I will quickly go through---
18
19
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Take your time.
20
            MR. SNOWDEN: I will quickly go through my
    oral testimony, and then I'll leave some time for
21
22
    questions.
23
            Thank you very much for having this hearing
24
    and for allowing all the panelists, including the
25
    wireless industry, to come and be before you to talk
```

about this important issue.

I represent the wireless industry down in Washington, DC, representing many companies that you are familiar with -- AT&T, Alltel, Sprint, Nextel, Verizon, and T-Mobile -- and I'm here today to talk to you about no-contract wireless service plans that we have and prepaid plans as well.

Just a quick bit of background. I appreciate what this committee is trying to do.

This is a noble effort, and I think the sponsors, I understand where you are going with this.

I spent 4 years working for the Federal Communications Commission on homeland security issues, so I have a bit of understanding and appreciation for some of the efforts and some of the issues and challenges that you are working on here today.

We have in our industry, as has been talked about a lot, many types of offerings for consumers. We have the postpaid, which many of you are familiar with, and we have prepaid, and these prepaid devices are sold through what we call MVNOs, mobile virtual network operators, or resellers, and this is done throughout the country. You may know some of those MVNOs, or resellers, as TracFone, Virgin Mobile, or

1 Cricket.

We also have something called -- excuse me.

And those resellers, they are everything and everyone from a Walmart to a Target to a small independent mom-and-pop shop on the corner of a local neighborhood.

Estimates show that approximately 8 percent of prepaid wireless phones are incurred through third-party retailers. So this is, obviously, a very important market for consumers and for the industry and for retailers writ large.

We also have month-to-month plans as well, and a lot of this is a derivative of what we see from consumers.

It is interesting that in this Legislature last year, there was a bill that had concerns about the wireless industry having contracts for their consumers, and so we are responding in large part to what consumers want, which are no-contract plans. So with those no-contract plans, you have options like prepaid that we have before you today.

When you look at these plans, consumers in the prepaid space, consumers purchase minutes by either buying a card at a retail store, buying minutes on line, or refilling minutes using the

actual wireless device.

So one might ask, why do consumers choose no-contract plans? Quite often -- and this is the largest majority -- quite often, purchasers of prepaid services are low-income consumers. Those consumers either have no credit histories or very poor credit histories, and so this is their vehicle to have communication services. And that is not merely just to talk and gab on the phone; it is also to make sure they can call a future employer or a future employer can call them back. This is a lifeline to many consumers, and this mechanism of having prepaid devices has offered that to consumers.

And simply put, this is all that they can afford, and I think we do not want to lose sight of what consumers are facing today.

I want to emphasis, though, that based on consumer demand, the intent of the wireless prepaid services is to provide services to those who do not want to enter into a fixed-term contract, have no credit or poor credit history, or simply wish to have a product that may simplify the management of their wireless use. It is not intended to provide consumers with anonymity.

I think about my own situation with my

grandmother. She has a wireless device, but she always forgets to put it in her car when she drives, so we made sure she had a prepaid device that is in her glove compartment at all times. That is a great benefit to someone who is a senior who wants to use it on a very casual basis.

And I want to be careful that we don't set up a structure or a mechanism that those consumers are treated differently or more or less like someone like criminals because they have to go behind a different counter or a different mechanism to buy these devices.

So how does the activation process work? We heard a lot today earlier in terms of what happens in this entire process. Consumers usually have two options. The consumer can either call the wireless provider or go on line to activate the account. When a consumer purchases a prepaid device at a company-owned store, they may activate the phone at the register and the provider will assign a phone number at that time. However, many consumers purchasing a prepaid or wireless device at company-owned stores still activate via the Internet or over the phone.

Accordingly, there is no one-size-fits-all

when it comes to prepaid devices. For that reason, the wireless industry has serious concerns with the proposed legislation on the sale of prepaid mobile telephones.

First, I do want to reaffirm our commitment to law enforcement. The wireless industry has a long, and I think most telecommunications services have a long history of working with law enforcement, and we will continue to do that. And that is everything from assisting in, as you heard earlier from the law enforcement community, wiretaps and assisting in call records, in addition to ensuring our devices are used in the 290,000 9-1-1 calls that are made every single day through wireless devices, prepaid and postpaid, to stop a crime, to report an accident, or to participate in a wireless AMBER Alert Program.

Our concern is that the legislation may not enhance our effectiveness in providing law enforcement agencies with the tools that will bear the most fruit in apprehending the criminals.

Specifically, it should be noted that the real focus of law enforcement is not on who owns the phone but rather who is using the phone. We have already set up exigent circumstances that are handled

immediately, and all other requests are handled as expeditiously as possible, and the same is the case with postpaid phones as well.

Wireless providers work each day with State and local and Federal government and law enforcement agencies to respond to subpoena requests for call records to carry out court-ordered wiretaps and to respond to emergency requests.

Wireless providers also comply with all Federal laws in this area and have dedicated centralized teams in place to ensure that the requests and orders are expedited as quickly as possible.

Although well intentioned, the industry believes that the proposed legislation might have unintended consequences of hampering law-abiding citizens from purchasing prepaid and no-contract plans.

If administrative and compliance costs were to increase, our concern is that small retailers may stop selling prepaid or no-contract plans in the communities where the consumers need it the most, while providers may be forced to either increase the costs of these plans or stop offering them altogether.

Consumers using prepaid or no-contract plans for lawful activities may be discouraged from purchasing these plans, because either they do not want to provide personal identification information to retail sales clerks for privacy reasons, which are legitimate, or because they might be led to believe that the proposed legislation has some type of Big Brother aspect to that. And if you just take any solace in what has been going on in Washington, DC, over the FISA issue right now, no matter where you stand on that, this is an issue, privacy is a huge issue with Americans, and we have to be very cautious of what our consumers want as we go forward.

By requiring no-contract wireless consumers to provide personal information to retail store clerks and the retail establishment maintain such information, the wireless industry believes that the proposed legislation would provide another avenue for identity thieves to access consumer information. And this is a major concern, not just for the Commonwealth here but for all Americans across the country.

If the proposal is enacted, criminals who use prepaid devices will either turn to other communications methods, as we have seen over time

through history, or will find a way around the proposed identification requirements, whether it is through producing bogus or stolen identification documents; stealing prepaid devices outright, either from retail stores or from consumers themselves or intimidating retail sales clerks; or as it has been pointed out, merely driving to a border city like Trenton, Youngstown, and New York City.

Additionally, to get around certain aspects of the proposed law, Pennsylvania criminals may use caller ID spoofing to hide the identity of the real user, or they may just swap out the SIM card to take care of their issue as well.

In turn, the proposal might only harm those who can least afford it -- law-abiding, low-income users, limited cell phone users, and senior citizens who rely on prepaid or no-contract plans for accessible, affordable wireless services.

One possible approach to this issue and lessons learned, I might add, can be found in what the Georgia State Legislature did, by passing a resolution to study this issue further.

It was interesting. In their study they found that, and I quote, "Placing extra burdens on resellers of prepaid phones only within the State of

```
Georgia would do little to prevent their use in
1
2
    organized crime but would have adverse effects on
    retailers," end quote.
3
 4
            Again, the wireless industry stands ready to
    work with the sponsors, stands ready to work with
5
6
    this committee, and we look forward to any
7
    opportunity we have to help explain our process and
    how this bill could affect the consumers that use our
8
    services.
9
10
            I thank you.
11
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.
12
            Jay.
13
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Thank you, Mr.
    Chairman.
14
            Thank you, Mr. Snowden, for being with us
15
    this afternoon. A few questions.
16
            You mentioned you were involved with
17
    homeland security, correct?
18
            MR. SNOWDEN: For the Federal Communications
19
20
    Commission; correct.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
                                    Okay.
22
            Now, it is my understanding, although I have
    not corroborated this, but it is my understanding
23
24
    that those terrorists that flew those airplanes into
25
    the buildings on 9/11 -- the World Trade Center, the
```

```
1
    Pentagon, and also here in Pennsylvania in Somerset
2
    County -- used these phones. Is that correct?
            MR. SNOWDEN: I believe they used wireless
 3
4
    phones, but I'm not sure if they were prepaid or
5
    postpaid.
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Okay. I could be
6
    wrong, but I was told that they used these phones
7
    because they knew of their anonymity.
8
            The other question I have is, in terms of
10
    the dollar amount of this industry, what market share
11
    does -- and I understand and I heard the argument
    about the credit challenge, and obviously we do not
12
13
    want to hurt our citizens who are using these phones
    honestly. That is not Representative Pashinski and
14
    my intent. Our intent is to go after the bad guys.
15
16
            MR. SNOWDEN: Absolutely.
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: What market share
17
    does this represent in the wireless industry?
18
19
            MR. SNOWDEN: It is approximately 10 to
20
    15 percent of the overall wireless market. We have
21
    about 255, 260 million consumers right now, so it is
22
    about 15 percent.
23
            Let me actually go back to your question
24
    about the terrorist issue of September 11. Those
25
    terrorists also used their real names when they
```

```
boarded those flights, and so they would have used
1
2
    their real names when they actually, if this law were
    in effect, to buy their cell phone use as well, no
3
    matter if it was prepaid or postpaid. So I'm not
4
    sure if that would have changed anything, sir.
 5
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Yeah.
6
7
    understanding in talking to people in this industry,
8
    getting back to my question, it is about $4 billion.
    Is that correct?
9
10
            MR. SNOWDEN: Give or take, yes.
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
                                    That's a lot of
11
    money, right?
12
13
            MR. SNOWDEN:
                          It is.
                                   It shows you the
    demand, and it is out there for consumers, the
14
    law-abiding consumers that are using these services.
15
16
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER:
                                    I guess one of the
    concerns that I have as a legislator, and my job is
17
    to look out not just for my constituents.
18
                                                I tell
19
    people that I represent over 60,000 people in my
20
    district, but when I push that green or red button on
21
    the House floor along with my colleagues here, I am
22
    looking out for about 12.3 million people in the
23
    State of Pennsylvania.
24
            So I want to do the right thing, and the
25
    concern that I have been hearing, the concern that I
```

have ever since the Representative and I have been working on this, is that it seems like there is more concern about the bottom line -- and I'm not picking on anybody here, but I'm going to lay it out -- that there is more concern about the bottom line at retail than there is the safety of our people.

I mean, there is a scourge called drugs in this country. It is killing us. It is killing our kids, particularly in the inner cities, and we have got to get a handle on it. And I just in my heart of hearts kind of feel that there is more concern about how is it going to impact our bottom line than how is it going to protect the children, and I particularly care about the children in our State that drug dealers prey on, and they use these phones.

The other question I have is, and I do not understand this and maybe you can tell me because you represent the industry, why are these phones manufactured to be anonymous?

I mean, we have the technology, so why -and I am not an expert in this at all; I'm just a
legislator -- but why are these phones made to be not
traceable? We don't they have -- we have the
technology out there to make sure that they have the
chips in there that would be traceable. Can you

answer me, why is that?

MR. SNOWDEN: I guess I would respectfully disagree that these phones are not designed to be as you described. These phones are designed for what consumers want. Consumers asked to not have phones that do not require contracts. That is exactly what we have—— Let me finish, sir. That is exactly what we have provided for them.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Yeah, but do you understand what I'm saying? I mean, I'm saying in the manufacture of that phone, that chip, or whatever you call it---

MR. SNOWDEN: SIM card.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: ---makes that phone not traceable, and that is the genesis of what we are doing here. That is why this has been such a huge problem, not just in Pennsylvania but nationwide or worldwide, that the bad guys know that they can't use the pay phones anymore because they could be traced back, and the bad guys know the good guys can trace their normal phones. The bad guys know they can use these phones because they are not traceable.

So I guess my question again is, why isn't

-- this whole conversation would not be necessary, I

guess, if your industry were to make these phones

```
1
    traceable. Can you tell me why? Because people want
2
    anonymity? Is that it?
            MR. SNOWDEN: Well, I guess I challenge the
 3
4
    premise of the question. We are not designing phones
    to make them untraceable.
5
            Law enforcement easily, as you have heard
6
7
    both the Captain and the Detective earlier say, all
    they have to do is contact us and they get the
8
    information that they need when they have the
9
10
    telephone number. So they are in fact traceable
11
    without a problem.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Yeah, and I don't
13
    want to belabor the point; I'm going to pass the mike
14
    on to my colleague, but that is the whole problem.
    They do call the industry, law enforcement does, and
15
16
    then the numbers come back not traceable, and that is
17
    the problem. But thank you. I will pass the mike
18
    on.
19
            MR. SNOWDEN: May I address the question,
20
    sir?
21
            When you say "not traceable," do you mean
22
    that it does not have an exact name and address for
23
    someone?
24
            REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Correct.
25
            MR. SNOWDEN: But it does have information
```

that law enforcement can use, and they have been using it, as was cited by the Captain that just spoke, and 80 percent of the situations that they have done wiretapping, those are done through prepaid phones. So somehow they are tracing something.

And I would also add that, you know, we do have a serious issue with drugs in our country, we do have a major issue with protecting against threats against our homeland, and when you look at this, certainly wireless devices have been used in some of those nefarious situations, as have computers, as have banks, as have credit cards, but we are not going to outlaw them.

If you look at what the typical criminal is going to do, if they are smart enough -- and I agree, some of them are lazy, but they are at least smart enough to know that they should use a wireless prepaid device -- if they are seeking what you are claiming they are, I think they are going to also say that they are not going to go in there and register their name or not going to give their exact name as well.

REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: Of course not.

Thank you, sir.

MR. SNOWDEN: Thank you.

```
1
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Go ahead, Ed.
2
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
3
4
            Thank you, Mr. Snowden. I enjoyed the
    conversation earlier today.
5
            MR. SNOWDEN: I'm not sure if I should say
6
7
    Representative Day or not, from your stage name.
8
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: It is your
    choice, sir.
9
10
            In our quest to try to, you know, help law
    enforcement, let me just try to understand the part
11
    that you mentioned about the low-income folks.
12
13
            How would this work? Now, if I'm a
    low-income folk and I do not want a contract, that is
14
    fine, or my grandfather, they do not want to have a
15
16
    contract, or I want to get these for my children,
    whatever, what does it have to do with the income
17
    part, the low-income part?
18
19
            MR. SNOWDEN: The users, the predominant
20
    users of prepaid devices tend to be low-income
21
    consumers because --- Let me go back for a second.
22
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: But how would
23
    2371 affect that low-income person from purchasing
24
    that noncontract phone?
25
            MR. SNOWDEN: It does not necessarily affect
```

them from -- they can still purchase it, but what you are doing, you are setting up a situation where if you have good credit and you have good income, you are going to go a different route. You don't have to go through the background checks, more or less, that you are setting up through this situation right here.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: But this isn't a background check. This is just a sales---

MR. SNOWDEN: I meant that not as a term of art but in terms of, what you are doing, I think as you had suggested on an earlier question, is that perhaps we should put these behind the counter like we do a pseudoephedrine.

That is setting up a different paradigm for consumers who are already in a situation in our society that they are treated differently than everyone else, and I do not think that is a good way to treat those consumers who are already hitting hard times.

In addition, when you look at who uses these services, they are traditionally low-income consumers because they don't have contracts and they don't have good credit.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: And again, I think that is good, you know, for whatever reason,

```
1
    but I'm trying to see how 2371 plays in this.
2
            So if I'm a low-income individual, right now
    I go to a particular retail store, and how much will
3
4
    it cost me for the phone?
            MR. SNOWDEN: It would be $25.
5
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: $25. I pay $25,
6
7
    I get my phone, and I'm done.
8
            MR. SNOWDEN: Right.
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Okay. Now, 2371
9
10
    is enacted. Now I go there. I don't have a credit
    card; I don't have a checking account; I don't have a
11
12
    debit card, so now I'm going to purchase it with
13
    cash.
14
            MR. SNOWDEN: Right.
15
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Now, under 2371,
16
    they would say, could I see your identification,
    right?
17
18
            MR. SNOWDEN: Correct.
19
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Show your
20
    identification, fill out the form, take your phone,
21
    and you are gone.
22
            MR. SNOWDEN: I would offer that they are
23
    more susceptible now to identity theft as well.
24
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: They have
25
    nothing.
```

MR. SNOWDEN: Well, they have something since they actually had to show some kind of ID.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: So what you are saying then is the retailer has to protect that information. Is that correct?

MR. SNOWDEN: Well, that information, the chain of custody on the information has to be protected throughout the line.

I mean, one of the requirements that the wireless industry or all telephone or telephony providers have is something called Customer Proprietary Network Information, or CPNI, that by Federal law we have to make sure we protect so that people's identities aren't stolen, so that call records are not inadvertently or mistakenly given to someone that does not need that information or should not have that information.

So there is Federal law on the books now to make sure we protect that, and by adding another element from the retailer, and this could be a person at a Wawa or a 7-Eleven all the way through to eventually getting to the State Police database, there are some chances for some hanky-panky going on there, for sure.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Are they selling

```
1
    cigarettes in a Wawa?
2
            MR. SNOWDEN: Are they selling --- Excuse
3
    me?
 4
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Are they selling
    cigarettes in a Wawa?
5
6
            MR. SNOWDEN: I haven't been in a Wawa in a
7
    little while and I don't smoke, but I believe they
8
    probably do.
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: So again, there
10
    are certain things that we have to do in order to
11
    deal with the problem.
12
            MR. SNOWDEN: But with cigarettes, sir, I
13
    don't believe they make you fill out a form. I think
    you just have to show that you are over 18?
14
15
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Yeah. Well, you
16
    got to prove it, right? You got to show something.
17
            MR. SNOWDEN: But no one is retaining your
    personal identification information, and I think
18
19
    that's a big difference between buying a pack of
20
    smokes and actually having to show two forms of ID
21
    that is going to now be put into a database, where
22
    consumers, for legitimate or not legitimate reasons,
23
    are concerned about that.
24
            And again, as I said in the beginning of my
25
    opening statement, we understand completely what you
```

all are trying to do. We understand what law enforcement is trying to do, and we have set up mechanisms to assist in that effort.

We also hear what consumers want as well, and I think the Detective mentioned that he wanted some sense of accountability. We have to have accountability in law enforcement, we have to have accountability to policymakers, and we have to have accountability to consumers as well as we go through this process.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: I agree with you totally. You know, I think all of us should be responsible and accountable.

Maybe then my question to you would be, how would you solve it?

MR. SNOWDEN: The one challenge I think we have in terms of trying to solve this is doing anything on a State-by-State approach, for the various reasons that we had described before.

I live in Washington, DC, so I border

Maryland and Virginia. And much like here, I do not know all the different surrounding cities in Pennsylvania, but I can easily go to Trenton, I know, and I can easily go to Youngstown and I can easily go to New York City.

I think, as Representative Moyer said, something is better than nothing, and I hear you loud and clear on that, sir. However, the something is actually putting a bigger burden on the consumer, not on the criminal, and that is the concern we have.

So if anything needs to be done -- it can't be done, in my opinion, on a State-by-State approach, because say you are the first State that tries to do this and you are successful in doing it. The assumption is that all other States are going to do it exactly the way you are doing it, and if that is the case, then we have a system that we can admit across the board. But if not, which I highly doubt, based on my work in State governments, States like to put their own thumbprint on pieces of legislation.

So now we have Pennsylvania and the Commonwealth doing it one way, New Jersey doing another, New York doing another, and Ohio doing another. Now we have a problem, because now we are having to redo all these systems, and it sounds simple, but it is not, to comply with the various laws.

So I would encourage, one, I think you might want to just study the issue a little bit more, and two, look at this issue from a broader perspective,

```
1
    that as proposed now, the criminals are not going to
2
    sign up and give their right name. The only people
    who are going to give their name are the law-abiding
3
    citizens.
4
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: I agree with
 5
    almost everything until that last statement.
6
7
            MR. SNOWDEN: Almost everything? I thought
8
    I had you.
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: First of all, if
9
10
    we could get a Federal law, that would be great.
    That would be really wonderful. However, let us be
11
12
    honest here. If we wanted to get a Federal law like
13
    this, it has got to start somewhere, and the States
    have been taking the lead because the Federal
14
    government has not been doing much of that lately.
15
16
            The law-abiding citizen, I don't think, is
    going to be affected by this at all, because if I
17
    want to buy my kids a phone, I'm going to use my
18
19
    credit card. I don't have to deal with any of the
2.0
    other stuff.
21
            MR. SNOWDEN: If you have credit.
22
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: If I have credit.
23
            MR. SNOWDEN: Not all consumers have
24
    credit.
25
            REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:
                                        That is correct.
```

I personally think that there could be safeguards here, and my challenge to you and the rest of the people in the industry is, I think we pretty much identified that the nefarious folks out there are using this product.

Now, how can we work together in order to help law enforcement eliminate this activity?

How can we do this in an efficient manner that is not going to cause excess burden to the retailers or to the telephone companies?

What can we do to try to lower the costs of law enforcement when they have to deal with this, especially when the statistics are alarming?

And my statistics are 90 to 95 percent of all of these crimes are taking place with this phone because of the fact that they need to communicate between the distributor, the buyer, the seller, et cetera.

We have a major problem here, and I personally want to, first of all, say thank you very much to the Chairman and to this committee for allowing this to be vetted and aired.

I want to thank all of you that are here today who have honestly and forthrightly brought forth your positions. But I don't want us to leave

here today thinking we can't do anything about it, because if we leave here under those circumstances, we have not done our job. I have not done my job as a legislator to try to help the folks in Pennsylvania or law enforcement; I have not done my job at all, and it is incumbent upon us to do this.

What Representative Moyer said about the bottom line is something that we have talked about and we are talking more about. The bottom line, of course, is important, but sometimes we have to invest a little bit, lose a little bit of that bottom line to correct the problem. In the long run, it will save all of us a heck of a lot.

So that is my few seconds on the soapbox. I want to thank everybody for being here today, and I refer back to the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Eddie.

I do want, for the record, to also submit testimony from Andy Hoover, the Community
Organizer/Legislative Assistant for the American
Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania, and also
Nicole A. Lindemyer, Esq., Policy and Special
Projects Manager for the Pennsylvania Coalition
Against Domestic Violence. So I would like to have that submitted officially for the record.

1 Dear sir, thank you for your testimony. 2 MR. SNOWDEN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We appreciate it. 3 I want to thank everybody that participated 4 here today. I thought it was a very, very good 5 6 hearing. We gathered a lot of good information. 7 And as you had said, I think if we can try 8 to come to some understanding or agreement, you know, I would be more than willing to listen to both sides 9 10 to see if we can work something out to help law enforcement, because I think the ultimate goal is, we 11 12 are trying to control these drug dealers and drive 13 them out of our cities and our State. And, you know, I understand where you all are coming from, and 14 hopefully we can come up with a solution to this 15 16 problem. 17 Jay. REPRESENTATIVE MOYER: 18 Yes. 19 Well, I, too, Mr. Chairman, want to thank 20 you for allowing Representative Pashinski and I to have this hearing this morning. It is something that 21 22 has been near and dear to our hearts. We have been 23 working on this since February, after we were 24 elected.

We are very proud of the fact that we are

25

```
1
    two freshmen, one Republican and one Democrat,
2
    working on a piece of legislation that we think is
    good for all Pennsylvanians.
3
            I am reminded of something I read when I was
 4
    in Syracuse, New York, at Syracuse University.
5
6
    think it was John Milton who wrote, what we want to
7
    do is do the greatest good for the greatest number of
8
    people, and that has been the guiding principle that
    I try to do every time I vote for legislation,
9
10
    responsible legislation. And I think, Mr. Chairman,
    if we could consider this legislation, that it would
11
12
    be doing the greatest good for the greatest number of
13
    people.
            We obviously do not want to hurt those
14
    law-abiding citizens that we have, those who have
15
16
    credit challenges. We just want to make sure that
    those bad guys do not sell drugs to our kids in our
17
    cities, in our boroughs, our towns, our communities,
18
19
    and to give terrorists another tool.
2.0
            So thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Certainly.
22
            This meeting is now adjourned. Thank you
23
    all.
24
            (The hearing concluded at 12:37 p.m.)
25
```

## SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

In a free society, law enforcement must

ANDY HOOVER, Community Organizer/Legislative Assistant, American Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania, submitted the following written testimony:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit

Dear Chairman Caltagirone,

written testimony for the House Judiciary Committee's hearing on House Bills 1371 and 2371, relating to the gathering of personal information of purchasers of prepaid cell phones. If enacted as law, this proposal would continue the downward trend to a total information society, where an increasing amount of information about the personal lives of Pennsylvania residents is held by both private and public entities. The measure outlined in these bills further debases the Fourth Amendment principle that the people have a right to be secure in their persons and property and turns the presumption of innocence on its head for those who purchase prepaid cell phones. For these reasons, the American Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania opposes House Bills 1371 and 2371.

respect the boundaries of civil rights and constitutional protections. We know from our country's history that this can be done while simultaneously pursuing and prosecuting those who break the law.

Unfortunately, under HBs 1371 and 2371, those who purchase prepaid cell phones are presumed guilty, and their personal information will be held in yet another government database, in this case at the Pennsylvania State Police. The purchase of a prepaid cell phone becomes an indication that a person may commit a crime at an undetermined, future time.

In fact, most people who use prepaid cell phones are law-abiding citizens who purchase these types of phones for various innocent reasons. For low-income residents, budget considerations lead them to purchase these phones. Domestic violence victims use prepaid wireless service for the anonymity it provides. Parents purchase prepaid cell phones for teenagers in order to limit their children's phone usage. Persons with poor credit can buy these phones without a credit check.

There is no right to buy a phone, but

Americans hold dear their right to privacy. The

```
1
    right to privacy is "the most comprehensive of rights
2
    and the right most valued.... " Olmstead v. U.S., 277
    U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting).
3
4
    While the right to privacy in one's address is not as
    strong as the right to privacy in one's medical
5
    information, financial information or sexual
6
7
    orientation, for example, (Fraternal Order of Police
8
    v. City of Philadelphia, 812 F.2d 105, (3d. Cir.
    1987)), the courts have clearly recognized the right
9
10
    to privacy in one's address (Paul P. v. Verniero, 170
    F.3d 396, 404 (3d. Cir. 1999)). In order for the
11
12
    government to do away with privacy rights for a
13
    certain class of people -- here disposable cell phone
    purchasers -- it must have a justification that
14
    outweighs the privacy interest.
15
16
            Cell phone purchasers who are, for example,
    victims of domestic violence, LGBT teens or people
17
    living together out of wedlock, have an increased
18
19
    interest in keeping their addresses private.
20
    withstand constitutional scrutiny, the government
21
    must articulate the purpose of this legislation and
22
    how it will protect people, and it must outweigh the
23
    privacy interests. See, e.g., Sterling v. Borough of
24
    Minersville, 232 F.3d 190, 195 (3d. Cir. 2000).
25
            The legislation's limit on the use of the
```

registration information to law enforcement fails to eliminate the fact that sellers maintain the information and could misuse it. The legislation sets forth no consequences for the seller improperly revealing the information. In fact, it explicitly protects them from this.

Security and wireless experts are skeptical about this type of legislation. Bruce Schneier, founder of Counterpane Internet Security and a former cryptographer for the U.S. military, told The Arkansas Democrat Gazette in 2006, "It's like these people have never heard of pay phones. If al-Qaida has this great plan to use a cell phone to call something in and somehow the cell phones are banned, the terrorists are not going to go home and get real jobs. They'll go to a pay phone. They can do something else. It's nutty."

Roger Entner, vice president of the communications sector for Nielsen IAG, wrote on his blog last year, "The sponsors of these bills have claimed that the arrests of people associated with purchasing dozens of phones in connection with terrorism would justify these bills. The problem is that none of the people that purchased these phones have anything to do with terrorism as law enforcement

1 had to admit after the first sensationalized reports.

2 This type of fall out from misinformation and

3 | hysteria is, to word it politely, very unfortunate."

Persons who break the law use numerous tools for committing crime. Knives, box cutters, computers, rope, and duct tape are all used in carrying out criminal activity. One can only conclude that the path we would head down with proposals like HBs 1371 and 2371 only ends when even purchasing duct tape requires our personal information to be sent to the state police.

share a personal story. Last summer the ACLU and more than a dozen other organizations organized a Day of Action to Restore Law and Justice in Washington, D.C. The day included a rally outside the capitol and lobby visits with our Congressional delegation, and the ACLU of Pennsylvania organized three buses of supporters to attend. In order to have instant and affordable communication, three staffers from ACLU-PA, including myself, purchased prepaid cell phones. If HB 1371 or 2371 had been law at the time, the personal information of my two colleagues and me would now be sitting in a database at the Pennsylvania State Police, and the reason it

would be there is because prepaid cell phones were a convenient tool as we exercised our First Amendment rights to free speech and to petition the government.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit this testimony. Please oppose House Bills 1371 and 2371.

\* \*

NICOLE A. LINDEMYER, ESQ., Policy and Special Projects Manager, Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence, submitted the following written testimony:

Dear Chairman Caltagirone:

On behalf of the Pennsylvania Coalition

Against Domestic Violence (PCADV), our 61 domestic violence programs throughout the Commonwealth, and the thousands of domestic violence victims we serve each year, we thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony for the House Judiciary Committee's hearing on House Bills 1371 and 2371. These bills would require purchasers of prepaid cell phones to show government-issued photo identification and other forms of ID to sellers of the phones, and would require sellers to maintain a registry of this personally identifying information, and to remit it

to the State Police on a quarterly basis.

While we applaud the bills' intent to assist law enforcement officers in the prosecution of perpetrators who may use prepaid cell phones in the course of their criminal acts, we have great concern about the unintended consequences of these bills on crime victims, specifically victims of domestic violence. For domestic violence victims, we believe the value of maintaining the degree of anonymity offered by prepaid cell phones, as used to prevent abusers from tracking and further harming victims, outweighs the potential benefits of this legislation.

Our concerns are primarily three: 1) for many domestic violence victims, prepaid cell phones are one of the safest ways to use a phone after fleeing abusers; 2) collecting identifying information and storing it in a database poses a danger to victims because of the risk of disclosure to those trying to track and harm them; 3) requiring government-issued and other identification will inevitably exclude many victims who were forced to flee abuse without an opportunity to take such important documents -- or even a purse -- with them before they fled.

## Prepaid Cell Phones Offer Safety to Victims Whose Abusers Try to Hunt Them Down

While prepaid cell phones may present difficulties to law enforcement, they are also an important asset to domestic violence victims fleeing abusers who go to great lengths to track them down and harm them. Indeed, the issue of pretexting, data mining, and other misuses of technology and electronic records is a major concern to advocates for domestic violence victims.

Prepaid cell phones are the focus of this hearing. However, this issue is part of a larger problem that victims of abuse face -- the prevalence of information regarding their activities and location and the ease with which that information can be purchased by their perpetrators. Victims are increasingly being tracked and killed through the abuse of data and technology, pretexting, and information brokers. Prepaid cell phones offer a safer alternative for victims most at risk. This legislation would eliminate that option, and for that reason we must oppose it.

There is a staggering amount of data generated and maintained about individuals in our society every day -- far beyond cell phone records.

Personally identifying information like dates of birth, Social Security numbers, frequently visited websites, and even grocery shopping preferences, are now being tracked as never before. We now know that every database, without exception, is breachable.

Data breaches resulting in disclosure of sensitive personal information are only increasing as more and more systems and sectors maintain electronic databases of such revealing information. In its running toll of reported security breaches revealing sensitive personal information, the Privacy Rights Clearinghouse reports a total of 230,575,326 breaches since January 2005.

Likewise, information broking is a growing industry. A quick search of the Internet reveals hundreds of businesses that, for a relatively nominal cost, will provide information including the address of record associated with a post office box; AOL screen names and e-mail addresses; unlisted phone numbers; Social Security numbers; and even photos and floor plans of people's homes.

Pretexters (those who claim to be someone else for the purpose of accessing private information) and information brokers are not just stealing someone's data, they may be endangering

someone's life. Fifty-nine percent of female stalking victims are stalked by current or former intimate partners, and 76% of women killed by their abusers had been stalked prior to their murder. Stalkers are often in a prime position to obtain cell phone and other personal records through pretexting or through information brokers who have used this tactic and then sold the stolen data. Since abusers often know private information about their victims (such as date of birth, mother's maiden name, or commonly chosen computer passwords), they can easily pose as their victims and illegally access their credit, utility, bank, phone, and other accounts as a means of getting information after their victims have fled.

Phone records are a particularly rich source of information for the determined stalker. Through pretexting, a stalker can access records that include whom was called, when the call was made, how long the call lasted, and the location of the calls. By illegally obtaining this information, a stalker can locate his victim without the victim even knowing that she is being tracked until it is too late.

The theft of private information can be devastating for the average individual who may have

her identity stolen and her credit destroyed. For victim of domestic violence or stalking, however, that theft of private information is not just financially or personally devastating -- it can be fatal.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- In January 2003, Peggy Klinke was brutally killed by a former boyfriend, Patrick Kennedy, after he hunted her down with the help of a private investigator. Peggy had worked closely with the Albuquerque police department, obtained a restraining order, and after Patrick burned down her home in New Mexico, she fled to California to try to remain safe until the pending criminal court hearing. Patrick hired a private investigator, located her, flew to San Jose, rented a car, drove to her neighborhood, posed as a private investigator to find her exact apartment location, and chased her around the apartment complex before shooting her and eventually shooting himself.
- In 1999 Amy Boyer, a young woman in
   New Hampshire, was tracked down and
   murdered by a former classmate who had been

Liam Youens, paid Docusearch, an information broker that collects personal information via an array of electronic databases, to obtain Amy's work address.

Docusearch contracted with a pretexter to illegally obtain her work address by pretending to need it for insurance purposes.

 In another case, a woman in rural Virginia was stalked by her ex-husband. couldn't figure out how he kept showing up wherever she was. She had changed her email address, moved, and found a new job. Eventually, a savvy advocate asked her about other "records" such as where she got her car fixed, rented videos, etc. Several businesses she used, including the video store and the local auto repair shop, used her 7-digit cell phone number as her customer identifier. Her ex-husband asked someone he knew to look up her name in one system, which made tracking her movements simple. He discovered that she had rented a video on Monday and that it was due back

on Wednesday. He was lying in wait when she came to return the video.

In yet another, a woman in Hawaii was getting ready to flee to a shelter and was nervous about her abuser recognizing her car in front of the shelter building. parked her own car elsewhere and rented a car to use. Since there are only a few rental places on the island, it was not long before the abuser found the car rental office she used, told the staff his "wife was diabetic and forgot her insulin" but thought she might have rented a car while hers was getting fixed. She had used her sister's identity and paid cash, but had given her own phone number because her sister did not have a phone and the rental agency had insisted on entering a number into the system. After a reverse lookup using the phone number, staff provided him with the make, model, and license plate number of the rented car. The victim was found by the abuser later that day and badly beaten in a parking lot behind the store.

1

Domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking are the most personal of crimes, and the more personal information the perpetrator has about his victim, the more dangerous and damaging the perpetrator can be. Sadly, domestic violence is quite prevalent, and women continue to be the vast majority of victims. The National Institute of Justice reported that 4.9 million intimate partner rapes and physical assaults are perpetrated against U.S. women annually. Here in Pennsylvania, according to a national survey, on a single day, domestic violence programs served 2,535 victims, including emergency shelter, legal advocacy, individual counseling, and children's services.

Leaving the relationship does not stop the violence. In fact, the most dangerous time for a victim of domestic violence is when she takes steps to leave the relationship. Many victims are stalked relentlessly for years after having escaped from their partners. These batterers who stalk their former partners, determined to hunt them down, are the most dangerous and pose the highest lethality risk.

In recent years, there have been concerted efforts at both state and federal levels to create

privacy and confidentiality protections that help shield victims of domestic violence from being found by their perpetrators and from having to reveal private information about their victimizations.

- At least 17 states, including
   Pennsylvania, now offer Address
   Confidentiality Programs, which provide a secure system for receiving mail without revealing a victim's address;
- Twenty-two states provide that voter registration data, including address and other identifying data, can be kept confidential by victims of domestic violence;
- The great majority of states (39) provide for confidentiality of domestic violence or sexual assault program records and communication, including the time, location, and manner by which a victim may have consulted a program for help in escaping the abuse;
- Some states, including Pennsylvania, have provisions that allow an individual to change her name without publishing that name change in the newspaper, as a way

5

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of protecting the identity and location of victims of stalking and domestic violence.

• The Social Security Administration allows domestic violence victims to change their Social Security numbers to help them seek protection.

Despite all of these extraordinary, difficult, and sometimes costly steps that domestic violence victims take to shield their location and identity, and that domestic violence programs take on behalf of victims, there remain instances in which victims' safest option is to avoid leaving any trace, any record through which an abuser can track them. Determined abusers continue to track their victims through phone records and other means, often obtaining their information by pretexting. In these situations, use of prepaid cell phones is a critical means of allowing victims to have telephones without the fear of leaving records that may be used by abusers to track them.

Notably, it is not just the victims of domestic violence who are at risk if her personal information and location is revealed, but also the individuals and programs that help them. Shelter

programs and their employees and volunteers are also vulnerable to being located through pretexting.

Shelters try to protect their location in the same way that individual victims do, by using post office boxes and unlisted phone numbers and addresses for both the shelter and for staff and volunteers.

However, many shelters' emergency response teams use cell phones and pagers for on-call staff, which puts those individual staff and volunteers at risk from abusers who are trying to gain access to the shelter to find their partners. Whether the phone records obtained are those of the domestic violence or sexual assault program or are those of an individual who contacted the program, the harm can be devastating.

In sum, victims of domestic violence, acquaintance rape, and stalking are particularly vulnerable because perpetrators know so much about their victims that they can often predict where their victims may flee, and to whom they may turn for help. For many victims, prepaid cell phones are one of the safest ways to use a phone after fleeing abusers. The relative anonymity afforded by prepaid cell phones allows victims to have a personal telephone but without a record of their location that can be used by abusers to find them and renew their abuse.

This legislation will have a chilling effect on victims: if required to show identification, knowing that information may then be used to track them, victims will be deterred from even using prepaid cell phones, thereby losing a critical safety tool.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

## Government-Issued Identification Requirement

In addition to the safety issues involved, requiring government-issued identification will also prevent domestic violence victims from using prepaid cell phones to keep their abusers from tracking them down. When fleeing abuse -- indeed, many victims come to shelters after an acutely violent assault -it is extremely rare for victims to have the opportunity to pack belongings. Additionally, the process of obtaining the replacement documents necessary to get a government-issued ID is tedious and extremely lengthy. In Pennsylvania, in order to get a driver's license or state-issued ID, one must have a Social Security card, plus a raised-seal official birth certificate or passport, plus mortgage/lease/tax records, plus utility bills. the same reason that victims may not be able to take their driver's licenses with them, they may also lack the documents necessary to replace that

government-issued ID. It takes months, expensive records fees, and a permanent address at which victims can receive mail.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The situation of a battered woman who stayed in a shelter in central Pennsylvania exemplifies the difficulties victims face in re-establishing their identities and rebuilding their lives. This woman fled to Pennsylvania from another state -- in fact had moved around several states because everywhere she went, her abuser tracked her down and tried to kill her. Even after relocating, she was still forced to change both her name and her Social Security number to keep him from finding her again. Her ex-husband went to elaborate lengths to find her again and again through constant surveillance, monitoring records and accounts, and stalking and threatening anyone he thought she would have contact with -- their adult children, the victim's elderly mother, other family and friends. The most recent attack came after he tracked her down by her flight information through an airline. After running for her life multiple times, when she came to Pennsylvania, she had absolutely nothing with her. Because she had changed her name and Social Security number, it took her more than four months to get just her birth certificate; getting her Social Security card took many months longer.

Cases like this demonstrate how difficult it is for victims fleeing abuse to obtain replacement documents necessary to obtain government-issued ID. Battered women's advocates can share story after story of victims fleeing in acute crisis with nothing but the clothes they were wearing -- the victim who jumped from a moving car and ran for her life to escape, or who broke out the bathroom window and fled as her batterer was kicking through the door, or who had nothing and nowhere to go after being discharged from the hospital after an assault. These victims would have no means of providing the government-issued ID and second form of proof of identity that these bills would require. Consequently, they would be prevented from purchasing prepaid cell phones, which may be their only available form of communication that will prevent their abusers from tracking and finding them.

22

23

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

## Law Enforcement Efforts Against Crimes Involving

## 24 | Prepaid Cell Phones

Again, we want to stress that we appreciate

the quandary law enforcement personnel face in situations in which perpetrators use prepaid cell phones to further their criminal conduct. Indeed, abusers may also use prepaid cell phones to perpetrate crimes against their victims, including stalking, harassment, and violating protection orders. However, give the risks to victims by abusers who hunt them down through phone records and other data sources, prepaid cell phones are a critical safety tool used strategically by victims to protect themselves and their children from being found. For domestic violence victims, we believe the value of maintaining the degree of anonymity offered by prepaid cell phones, as used to prevent abusers from tracking and further harming victims, outweighs the potential benefits this legislation may provide.

Importantly, we know that prosecuting those who use prepaid cell phones to facilitate crimes is difficult -- difficult, yet possible. A case in Centre County demonstrates the possibility of successfully proving the identity of a perpetrator who had used a prepaid cell phone to facilitate criminal conduct. In this case, the perpetrator had, among other acts, repeatedly harassed his victim for months, calling her up to 80 times per day and

hanging up. Because he used a prepaid cell phone, law enforcement had difficulty establishing that it was in fact him making the calls. Through a subpoena to the manufacturer of the prepaid cell phone, the detective was able to obtain records of the date, time, and location of purchase of the phone, and of when the perpetrator brought additional use time to "refill" the phone. Using those dates and times, the detective secured video surveillance of the retail store that sold the phone. The surveillance video showed the perpetrator purchasing the phone, and that evidence was sufficient to secure his conviction.

This strategy of using video surveillance to establish the identity of the purchaser of prepaid phones used in the commission of crimes is a routine part of the specialized training provided to law enforcement officers through domestic violence programs such as PCADV. The use of video surveillance and other effective law enforcement techniques is becoming increasingly standardized.

In conclusion, PCADV urges the Committee to seriously consider the unintended consequence to domestic violence victims that this legislation will bring. House Bills 1371 and 2371 will take away a critical safety option for victims fleeing abuse.

Batterers who stalk their former partners, determined to hunt them down, are the most dangerous and pose the highest lethality risk. Their victims are terrorized, forced to go to elaborate lengths to stay safe, to constantly look over their shoulders, and to be acutely aware of every record and transaction that may be used to track them down. For those victims, there are very few options. Prepaid cell phones are one of the few. We urge you to consider their plight and not support this legislation.

We thank you for your consideration of our input, and we welcome any questions or requests for further information.

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. Debra B. Miller, Reporter