1	
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
3	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
4	
5	MAIN CAPITOL ROOM 140
6	HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
7	PUBLIC HEARING
8	DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND ROLLED OF EDOCUMENTS
9	BOARD OF PROBATION AND PAROLE
10	TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2012 1:32 P.M.
11	1:32 P.M.
12	BEFORE:
13	HONORABLE WILLIAM F. ADOLPH, JR., Majority Chairman
14	HONORABLE JOHN BEAR HONORABLE MARTIN CAUSER
15	HONORABLE JIM CHRISTIANA HONORABLE GORDON DENLINGER
16	HONORABLE GORDON DENETHGER HONORABLE BRIAN ELLIS HONORABLE MAUREE GINGRICH
17	HONORABLE GLEN GRELL HONORABLE TOM KILLION
18	HONORABLE DAVID MILLARD HONORABLE MARK MUSTIO
19	HONORABLE BERNIE O'NEILL
20	HONORABLE MICHAEL PEIFER HONORABLE SCOTT PERRY HONORABLE SCOTT PETRI
21	HONORABLE TINA PICKETT
22	HONORABLE JEFFREY PYLE HONORABLE MARIO M. SCAVELLO
23	HONORABLE CURT SONNEY
24	BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR P. O. BOX 278
25	MAYTOWN, PA 17550 717-426-1596 PHONE/FAX
	, I , 120 1000 I HOME, I 1111

```
1
     BEFORE: (cont'd)
2
     HONORABLE JOSEPH MARKOSEK, Minority Chairman
     HONORABLE MATT BRADFORD
3
     HONORABLE MICHELLE BROWNLEE
     HONORABLE H. SCOTT CONKLIN
4
     HONORABLE PAUL COSTA
     HONORABLE DEBERAH KULA
5
     HONORABLE TIM MAHONEY
    HONORABLE MICHAEL O'BRIEN
6
     HONORABLE CHERELLE PARKER
     HONORABLE JOHN SABATINA
7
    HONORABLE STEVE SAMUELSON
     HONORABLE MATTHEW SMITH
8
     HONORABLE GREG VITALI
     HONORABLE RONALD WATERS
9
10
    ALSO PRESENT:
11
     HONORABLE PAUL CLYMER
     HONORABLE MARK GILLEN
12
     HONORABLE SCOTT HUTCHINSON
     HONORABLE RICK SACCONE
13
     HONORABLE RICHARD STEVENSON
     HONORABLE MIKE TOBASH
14
     HONORABLE VANESSA LOWERY BROWN
     HONORABLE TOM CALTAGIRONE
15
     HONORABLE DOM COSTA
     HONORABLE PAMELA DELISSIO
16
     HONORABLE BILL DEWEESE
     HONORABLE DAN FRANKEL
17
    HONORABLE BILL KORTZ
     HONORABLE MARK LONGIETTE
18
    HONORABLE HARRY READSHAW
     HONORABLE CHRIS SAINATO
19
20
     ED NOLAN, MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
     MIRIAM FOX, MINORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
21
     DAN CLARK, COMMITTEE CHIEF COUNSEL
22
                            BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR
23
                            REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC
24
25
```

1	INDEX		
2	NAME	PAGE	
3	OPENING REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH	4	
4	MICHAEL POTTEIGER	4	
5	CHAIRMAN BOARD OF PROBATION AND PAROLE		
6 JOHN WETZEL		7	
7	SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS		
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Good afternoon,
3	everyone. Like to call to order House
4	Appropriations Committee budget hearing on the
5	Department of Corrections.
6	Good afternoon.
7	SECRETARY WETZEL: Good afternoon.
8	MR. POTTEIGER: Good afternoon.
9	CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: With us today is Mike
LO	Potteiger
L1	MR. POTTEIGER: Michael Potteiger.
L2	CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Chairman of
L3	the Board of Probation and Parole. And also with
L 4	us is John E. Wetzel, secretary, Department of
L5	Corrections.
L6	SECRETARY WETZEL: Good afternoon.
L 7	CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Welcome, gentlemen.
L 8	SECRETARY WETZEL: Thank you.
L 9	MR. POTTEIGER: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Would either of you
21	like to make some opening brief comments?
22	MR. POTTEIGER: Good afternoon,
23	Chairman Adolph and Chairman Markosek and members
24	of the House Appropriations Committee.
25	I would like to begin by thanking you

for the opportunity to meet with you to today to discuss the board's 2012-2013 budget. I look forward to answering your questions about how the board will continue to protect the safety of the public by bringing about much needed government reform so we can continue to make the board more efficient. I think this is good not only for the taxpayers but for the community of the Commonwealth.

1.3

1.5

2.3

The board recognizes that the Commonwealth has big challenges this fiscal year, as it did last year, but one of the most basic fundamental responsibilities of government is to protect its people. This budget helps us do that.

The board is one of the few agencies in the Commonwealth to have an increase over the last two years. We are very grateful for the additional resources and the governor's recognition of the importance of the board's mission on the public safety.

Our proposed budget allows the board to continue to fund positions and the parole agents who are out in the community, doing day-to-day jobs, engaging in the communities to change criminal behavior and reduce recidivism. Our

priority for the funding continues to be our field agents while at the same time we continue to seek ways to reduce operating costs.

1.3

1.5

2.3

I'd like to point out, but I think it's pretty obvious, but should be stated, the board does not make decisions to grant individual offenders to be paroled based upon the size of the population. The board's job is to determine if the offender's risk has been reduced and they are a suitable candidate for parole.

However, having said that, we continue to work with and collaborate with the Department of Corrections to look at the whole process in itself. We have seen improvements over the last few years. We have a decreased median number of days for the offender to be released by a minimum of six days. We have decreased the number of technical parole violators being returned to the prison by 36 percent from fiscal year 2005-2006. And we utilize that date is because the board started utilizing evidence-based practices in our efforts.

The number of offenders who have successfully completed parole has increased over that five-year period, while, at the same time, our three-year recidivism rate has decreased almost 6

percent over the past five years. Currently our recidivism rate is 42 percent, which is lower than the national average.

1.3

1.5

2.3

All this is good news, and I'm proud to be leading this agency on the cutting edge of using improved research techniques and measures of performance, but we understand that we need to continue to collaborate with the Department of Corrections to look at the fiscal means that we can reduce the prison population safely in the community by reducing costs.

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to answering your questions.

CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, would you like some opening comments?

SECRETARY WETZEL: You know, I submitted testimony, so that's fine for me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, it's been some time since I've seen a budget proposal for the Department of Corrections that has actually a decrease in total spending from the previous year. And obviously there's one large line item

responsible for this in your --in your budget.

2.3

You want to talk about that?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Yeah. What this budget is predicated on, and you can really view this budget as the administration's kind of pathway to how we reduce spending in corrections. We certainly talked about reducing spending in corrections long enough. This takes a first step. And, really, it's identifying pockets of our population who we can get out, get out into the community.

And one of the things with the increase to parole that you should think of, is that they're getting out, and we're talking about making our system more efficient and processing people through quicker, that gets them out in the community. They still need oversight, the vast majority of them, in the community. So the slight increase in the board's budget is consistent with this approach, where we're identifying processes that lead to delays in the parole process and getting better at that, and also, through legislation, specifically Senate Bill 100 and the justice reinvestment initiative, identifying legislative augments to things like that the state intermediate punishment

program and other existing successful programs to make better decisions and placement of people.

1.3

So this is predicated on our ability to reduce population, and then, subsequently, close housing units to redeploy that staff to reduce overtime.

CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Let's talk about this \$21-million reduction for the medical care costs.

Could you explain how the savings is going to take place?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Yeah. A big part of that was passed last year with the budget. Act 22 was passed. That charges Medicare rate and Medicaid rate for inmates and inpatient and outpatient. Last year, we put some money into that, but we really had no idea to get a fair projection. So a big piece of that is, now that we have half a year under Act 22, we have a reasonable expectation the money we'll save, including federal matching funds that we got that we didn't necessarily anticipate, coupled with the fact that we rebid the medical contract.

Now, the medical contract had not been bid for eight years. It was just a cost of living rollover for eight years. So by bidding it, we had

several bidders, more than a handful of bidders, we 1 2 anticipate lower cost through that. So that's really where that 21 million comes from. 3 CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you for that 4 5 explanation. Is there any future constructions of 6 7 state prisons in the Commonwealth of PA? SECRETARY WETZEL: Yes. There's 8 currently a couple projects. The Benner Township 9 10 project, which should be completed in January of 11 '13, although we pushed back the occupancy date to 12 September. And by pushing it back that far, we saved 15 million in next year's budget, by delaying 1.3 14 that for the following year. And then we have a 15 replacement of SCI Graterford, which is called 16 SCI Phoenix, which is on the same site as 17 Graterford. And that's replacing old Graterford 18 and adding about five hundred beds, for a total of forty-one hundred beds on the site, including a 19 20 female housing unit. Those are the only two major 21 projects going on. 22 CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okav. 2.3 Chairman Markosek. 24 REP. MARKOSEK: Thank you, Chairman. 25 First of all, for the information of

the members, Rep. Matt Bradford has arrived, and we 1 2 do have a guest, Rep. Tom Caltagirone, the Democratic chair of the House Judiciary Committee 3 is with us also. 4 Secretary Wetzel, Mr. Pettinger (sic), 5 welcome -- Chairman Pettinger, welcome. 6 Secretary Wetzel, I just -- maybe a 7 brief rundown, if you will, of bringing prisoners 8 back from other states. 9 10 Last year, I believe, when you 11 testified, if my memory serves, there was about 12 two thousand prisoners that were housed in other states. And you had a goal to retrieve those, for 1.3 14 lack of a better phrase. 1.5 Can you give us an update on the efforts there to do that? 16 SECRETARY WETZEL: Correct. 17 18 eleven hundred inmates in Michigan and another thousand inmates in Virginia at this time last 19 20 vear. The inmates from Michigan were returned, I believe, by the end of June. They were returned 21 22 last fiscal year, the eleven hundred. 2.3 We're in the process of returning the

other thousand inmates from Virginia. So they'll

all be back by the end of March.

24

25

And that was, really, the plan of the last administration. There was a lot of housing units that were constructed across the state when the parole moratorium kicked in and the population increased by the forty-two hundred beds, an increase because of that couple-month moratorium.

1.3

1.5

2.3

So now those housing units are complete. We were able to bring the inmates back.

REP. MARKOSEK: And the budget question, then, relative to that is, how does that affect your budget? Does that save you money, cost you more money? What's the ultimate effect on your budget relative to having those prisoners housed here instead of paying somebody else to house them?

SECRETARY WETZEL: It saved up, in this year's budget, in 2011-2012's budget, and some of our making our budget last year is predicated on savings from returning everybody, because a lot of those folks didn't -- we didn't have to put them in new housing units. We had space in existing housing units.

So, then, when you look at those, that marginal cost for us for an inmate per day is about \$14. When we add them to an additional housing unit, assuming they don't have big medical costs --

and, really, that was one of the criteria, was 1 2 sending people out of state. So we sent relatively 3 well-behaved and low medical needs and low behavior, low mental health needs inmates out of 4 state. Those inmates coming back, plug into 5 existing units, are relatively cheap. So that's 6 really how we achieved our savings. 7 REP. MARKOSEK: 8 Okay. 9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 SECRETARY WETZEL: Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 12 Next question will be asked by Rep. Dave Millard. 1.3 14 REP. MILLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 15 Thank you, gentlemen, for appearing 16 before us today. 17 My questions will be directed towards 18 you, Secretary Wetzel. First question -- I do not have -- a comment first. I don't have a 19 20 correctional facility located, per se, in Columbia County, but I do have a number of constituents who 21 22 work at either Dallas, Retreat, or Coal Township. 2.3 And the questions that I've received from them 24 lately has been pretty much about the privatization 25 of nurses.

Would you give us an update on that, where are we going with this, if a decision, in fact, is going to be made concerning that?

1.3

SECRETARY WETZEL: Sure. We have -- as I said earlier, we bid medical services, and the RFP was structured in two lots. Lot number one is business as usual. Lot number two of that bid asked the vendors to submit a plan to privatize all the medical staff.

Currently, we have all the medical staff, except nurses and medical records staff, privatized. We have two facilities that all the medical staff, including those categories, are privatized.

So the bid basically says business as usual or privatization of all staff. Both bids came in. A team of department staff members, along with DGS, went through a scoring process. We're at the relative end of that process. So we hope, within the next two months, we'll make a decision as to which lot and which direction and which vendor and all those things.

REP. MILLARD: What protections will you offer to the employees who are currently nurses?

SECRETARY WETZEL: There's some protections built into the collective bargaining agreement, protection such as bumping and those kinds of things. But, also, in the RFP, we specifically stated that our existing nursing staff be given first consideration for jobs.

1.3

2.3

So if -- if we would go that route with privatization, that would really be the first pool they'd look for. And, also, because of the number of staff involved, their bargaining units are also recognized because of that scope. So that's a protection in itself.

REP. MILLARD: And if they transition in, is that at their current rate of pay, current benefit package?

SECRETARY WETZEL: I don't know that.

I don't know that.

REP. MILLARD: All right.

The other question that I have here is that, recently, at Camp Hill, an inmate was caught in the act of drug distribution. And I'd like to know, is that rampant throughout the penal system here in Pennsylvania? What measures do you take to oversee it, to catch it, to prevent it? Any comments?

actually, we were part of the process that led to the apprehension of this individual and the other individuals, through our internal affairs department as well as our local folks who monitor phone calls. We have the ability to record and monitor phone calls, and that takes place a regular basis. Although, quite honestly, with 52,000 inmates, and most of them in general population are able to make, you know, fifteen-minute calls, that's a lot of phone calls to monitor.

So, is it rampant? I don't believe so.

We do a pretty good job with monitoring. Does it
occur? I absolutely believe that it occurs. And

I'm not sure that you can completely eliminate it.

And I think it brings up the point that just because you lock somebody up, it doesn't change their behavior. And, so, they can be locked up for twenty years, but if they're still somebody who's going to be a drug dealer, unless we do something to intercede and they do something to make a choice to change their behavior, they're still going to be drug dealer, even though they're locked up.

REP. MILLARD: We certainly appreciate

the efforts of your employees and service that they 1 2 perform in this Commonwealth. 3 And my final comment here is the fact that, you know, I had an opportunity to visit 4 Retreat, which was a remodeled facility from its 5 original use. And I look forward to some day 6 7 visiting Coal Township, not as a resident, obviously, but just to see a newly constructed 8 9 facility and the difference between. 10 But I leave you with this, when I left 11 Retreat, I was the last one of the legislative 12 committee to drive out of the parking lot, and I 1.3 had my window down in my vehicle. And the last 14 comment that I heard over the loud speaker was, 15 "Main Street is clear." And it took me quite a 16 number of miles to figure that one out. 17 So, thank you. 18 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 19 SECRETARY WETZEL: All right. 20 you. 21 CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 22 Rep. Deb Kula. 2.3 REP. KULA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 24 Good afternoon. 25 SECRETARY WETZEL: Good afternoon.

REP. KULA: I want to deal a little bit with just the last questioning as far as the medical services and the outsourcing or privatization of the nursing staff.

1.3

2.3

Can you just kind of give me some rationale behind why this is being projected? I mean, is it a cost savings? I mean, was public safety issue looked into? Were there any public hearings on this? Or any input from anyone other than -- or before this decision was made?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Okay. I apologize, if I wasn't clear in my previous answer. There's no decision that's been made.

REP. KULA: No. I don't mean decision,

I meant the decision to seek the RFP for the

privatization of the nursing services.

SECRETARY WETZEL: No. There was no -
I mean, there was discussion within the

administration, certainly with the governor's

office, and to bid -- and money is the driving

force behind this. And the thought to bid it

private versus nonprivate gave us an opportunity to

get true -- a true apples-to-apples comparison, and

part of the ranking system or scoring system to

identify this factors in things such as operational

considerations.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Obviously, if we don't have a good medical department and we're not delivering services at the level we need to, it may save us \$5 a day, but we spend \$50 down the road. And we set up a process that I'm very confident will ensure that we have the proper level of services at the same time at the best price.

REP. KULA: Okay. And also, within that consideration, not just looking at price, but, within that RFP, was this consideration of the kind of in-house training that the current employees or staff need to go through in order to be employed in that facility? Was that part of the whole RFP, that they would have to be -- go through the training process?

SECRETARY WETZEL: That would be part of the negotiations, the best-and-final-offer kind of negotiations at the end. But, yes, our expectation would be that we would train staff, because they're still working in direct contact with the inmates. And we know that having people who aren't trained in that sets them up for failure and, ultimately, sets the department up for failure. So we --

REP. KULA: And I'm also trying to understand that, if it was outsourced, would this be where's someone that -- say a company provides you with your nursing staff, would those be dedicated employees just to that facility, your facility? Or would they be able to -- say they work three days at your facility, would they, then, be able to work, say, two days at local hospital? I mean, has that been vetted in any way?

1.3

2.3

SECRETARY WETZEL: Well, we already do this at two of our prisons, so we've already been down this road and dealt with those issues. Just like Commonwealth employees, Commonwealth employees are able to get a second job and there's an approval process for that. So it would be the same kind of mechanism.

REP. KULA: But -- well, and I said, the thing that crossed my mind in all of that is the fact that -- I mean, we've sat in these hearings. We've talked about, you know, the cost savings that -- that could be accomplished by hospitals being much more cautious in the hospital-acquired infections and things such as that. So you would have someone that could be going from a hospital setting and then coming into the

```
correctional facility setting. So you're kind of
1
2
     mixing everyone back and forth. I mean, I just
     seem to think that could somewhat pose a problem.
3
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: I mean, that's no
 4
5
     different than today. I mean, we -- as long as a
6
     nurse who works for us today gets -- goes through
7
     the proper process, they're allowed to have
8
     secondary employment. So the circumstance you
     described, could exist today. Whether we privatize
9
10
     or not does not increase or decrease the likelihood
11
     of that happening.
12
                  REP. KULA:
                             And are there other states
1.3
     that have gone to this?
14
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: Yes.
15
                 REP. KULA: And are you -- I mean, do
     you have, you know, some record that you could send
16
17
     to us as far as what their outcome has been along
     those lines?
18
19
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: Potentially.
20
     certainly could send you -- again, we have two
21
     prisons that are operated just like the RFP is laid
22
     out already, with nurses and --
23
                 REP. KULA: And what two prisons are
     those?
24
25
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: It's Chester and
```

Pine Grove.

1.3

2.3

REP. KULA: Okay. And those are private facilities, basically.

SECRETARY WETZEL: And we could certainly -- well, the nursing staff is private at those facilities. We don't have any private facilities as it relates to the security function in PA, nor is that on the table. But as far as the medical privatization and what it looks like and what it could potentially look like should we decide to go down that road, I think right here in PA, we have Pine Grove and Chester that we could look at.

REP. KULA: And the RFPs that you already received -- and I'm particularly interested in the ones that have submitted an RFP for nursing staff. Could you provide us with a list of who has responded?

SECRETARY WETZEL: I'm not sure if that's allowed or not under DGS's rules for the RFP process. We'll certainly reach out to DGS and let you know one way or the other, and as soon as we can provide it, provide it.

REP. KULA: And would these all be PA companies?

```
SECRETARY WETZEL:
                                     That's not likely.
1
2
                  REP. KULA: Okay. If you could provide
3
     that to the committee, to Chairman Markosek and
     Adolph, so that we could get that information to
 4
     the other members.
5
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: Again, that would be
 6
7
     based on the RFP rules. If we're allowed to, we
     certainly will.
8
9
                  REP. KULA: Okay. And, then, also,
10
     what other states have experienced along these
     lines.
11
12
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: Okay. And perhaps
13
     John Coyne can follow up with you and get more
     specific at what your specifically looking for, and
14
     we'll do that.
1.5
16
                  REP. KULA: Okay. I thank you.
17
                                     Thank you.
                  SECRETARY WETZEL:
18
                  Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19
                  CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
20
     Representative.
21
                  I'd like to acknowledge the presence of
22
     Rep. Dick Stevenson, who's joined us.
2.3
                  The next question will be asked by Rep.
24
     Mauree Gingrich.
25
                  REP. GINGRICH:
                                  Thank you,
```

Mr. Chairman.

1.3

2.3

Welcome, gentlemen. Appreciate you being here with us today.

You know, together, we're making every effort to ultimately create a sustainable budget. And I really appreciate your interest in doing so. And every effort that you've made with fiscal prudence and the health care, medical care issue is one of them, I know we're talking a lot about that, but that's a significant expense. And we touched on the effort to do so, working with the Department of Welfare, based on some legislative changes we made last year, and we're talking about you experiencing some savings there.

I'd like to know more about the -- your initial thoughts on what those savings might be, but, also, how you're working with the Department of Welfare. How is that going? And, then, tell me your thoughts about savings and what they actually might be with what we've done so far.

SECRETARY WETZEL: Specifically, with the Act 22, we've worked very well with the Department of Public Welfare. The head of our bureau of health care services, Rich Ellers, worked with their staff, because what was required is we

had to develop a memorandum of understanding between Department of Corrections and the Department of Public Welfare in order to initiate that. It was passed July 1st -- June 30, effective July 1st.

1.3

2.3

REP. GINGRICH: I remember that. Yes SECRETARY WETZEL: Yes. By September we had the MOU in place, which is light speed for our department. We generally don't move that fast.

But the second piece of it, and one of the pieces that really hasn't gotten a whole lot of coverage, is the fact that every county that operates a county jail benefited from that also. So the next step was to develop an MOU so counties could access it without having -- there's sixty-three county jails in PA -- without having sixty-three MOUs with the Department of Public Welfare.

So the Department of Corrections is kind of playing the middle person, along with the county commissioners' association, to allow the counties to avail themselves of it.

The department -- I'm not sure -- Tim, do we know how much we saved from -- we have 16 million of that 21 million in savings next year can

be directly attributed --

1.3

2.3

REP. GINGRICH: Sixteen million.

SECRETARY WETZEL: -- to Act 22, but, also, I think counties are saving, we've heard anywhere between 300,000 a year, and some county's saving nearly a million a year on that. So it's been a very successful -- and I think that's an example of a partnership between two state agencies, but, also, not forgetting our partners in the county. Because it's all the same taxpayers at the end of the day. So that, in particular, was -- we certainly appreciate that piece of legislation, both at the department and also at the county level.

REP. GINGRICH: Can't tell how glad I am to hear that, since I played a role in that particular bill. And I have heard from the counties, so I'm happy you brought that up as well.

Putting your creative hat on, which I know you wear most of the time, what else can we do? Can we offer you any other assistance in -- I'm talking about medical care now; there's a lot of ways that we can look at efficiencies. But is there any way we can play on what we've done here

that comes to your mind in a most timely fashion? 1 2 SECRETARY WETZEL: You know, not 3 I guess I left that creative hat back at offhand. the office. 4 5 REP. GINGRICH: That's all right. You're working hard and I get that. 6 7 SECRETARY WETZEL: You know, we'll certainly get together and --8 REP. GINGRICH: Continue to work --9 10 SECRETARY WETZEL: -- if there's things 11 I know we're putting a lot of along those lines. 12 emphasis on reentry and the pass-off between the 1.3 department of corrections and the board, and, 14 certainly, looking at offenders getting access. 1.5 And we've actually benefited. We've 16 had offenders, the Halfway Back, which is a program 17 that the board initiated, where someone who's on 18 parole supervision and is starting to screw up and 19 have hot urines and starts using drugs or alcohol, 20 gets put back in a community corrections center. 21 We've required our vendors for community 22 corrections to bill MA, if they're able to, for 2.3 those. 24 And I think that was initiated in 25 January of '11. I think the first year we saved

about \$3 million doing that.

1.3

2.3

So, really, in looking at reentry, and when we meet with our partners at parole, we'll look especially at that reentry layer and see if there's anything similar along the line of -- of medical that may avail -- we avail ourselves of.

And we can certainly get back to you on that.

REP. GINGRICH: Appreciate that.

And that leads me to my question about drug and alcohol treatment. How many facilities do you operate that provide drug treatment?

SECRETARY WETZEL: The -- all our prisons have drug and alcohol in it.

REP. GINGRICH: Each one.

SECRETARY WETZEL: And then, also, many of our community correction centers also have a drug and alcohol component.

REP. GINGRICH: Does that factor in -or how does that factor in to probation and parole
or, really, early release and so on? Is that a
factor?

MR. POTTEIGER: Well, in looking at that, where we focus on is our technical parole violators. And since 2002 -- 2005-2006, we had a 36 percent decrease of offenders going from

institution where we sent them to our technical parole violator centers. And that's a reduction of almost nine hundred thirty offenders per year. And what that does is, they go to their — they spend anywhere between sixty and ninety days, where in the past, they went to the Department of Corrections and spent anywhere up to fourteen months for violations.

1.3

1.5

2.3

So we return them, and then we assess them, and then we put them in our centers, who then streamline them for either alcohol or drug issues, mental health issues. And then we get them -- reintegrate them back into our communities.

REP. GINGRICH: What percentage, if you have one, what percentage of our inmates are involved in some level of treatment for drug use?

SECRETARY WETZEL: I know about threequarters of the inmates that come in have some drug or alcohol needs. As far as specific percentage on how many are -- actually have programs delivered, I can get to that you.

REP. GINGRICH: I would like -- I would really like to know that. That's a large percentage of the population somewhere in that

dynamic, but where are they? Are they in need of 1 2 treatment? Are we providing treatment? Is it 3 something that's handled another way? All of those are cost factors, and I really appreciate what 4 you're doing to help us try to be the most 5 6 efficient so we can manage a budget that's feasible 7 and sustainable. Thank you both. 8 9 SECRETARY WETZEL: Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 11 Rep. Scott Conklin. 12 REP. CONKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1.3 Secretary, it's always a pleasure to 14 see you. 1.5 SECRETARY WETZEL: Good to see you. 16 REP. CONKLIN: Before I go to my line 17 of questioning, it's intriguing me about the nurses 18 and the privatization. Is there a -- was there a 19 problem with the nurses why we -- why there was a 20 decision to look at this? 21 SECRETARY WETZEL: Not at all. It's 22 monev. Money is -- the sole driving factor to look 2.3 at this is money. Period. 24 REP. CONKLIN: So there's been no 25 problem with correctional officers' relationship

It's -- there's -- it's still a with the nurses? 1 2 good relationship between the two? 3 SECRETARY WETZEL: I mean, certainly I wouldn't say that we have perfect relationships all 4 5 over the place, but what specifically drove this approach is money. Period. 6 7 REP. CONKLIN: You can't give us the names of where the folks are from, but can you tell 8 us how many companies have actually submitted to 9 the RFP? 10 11 SECRETARY WETZEL: I -- any information 12 I can provide you along those lines, I'll certainly 1.3 provide you afterwards. I just don't want to jump 14 out of what I'm not supposed to do. 15 REP. CONKLIN: You don't know whether 16 it is one, three, five companies that have shown an interest? 17 SECRETARY WETZEL: I know it's more 18 than three and less than ten. That's about as 19 20 close as you're going to get me. 21 REP. CONKLIN: That's fair enough. 22 We're -- and I do appreciate that, 2.3 because it piqued my interest a little bit, and I'm 24 looking forward to the information. Even if you

can't give us the names, what I'd like to know,

25

1 like everyone, are these in-state companies? Are
2 these -- you know, those type of --

1.3

1.5

2.3

SECRETARY WETZEL: Um-hum. We'll get you all the information we can.

REP. CONKLIN: On the -- how many inmates do you expect to be released early through this initiative?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Well, I wouldn't call it early. Okay. Because what we're really focusing on is making sure inmates who are likely to parole actually get hearings.

REP. CONKLIN: Okay.

SECRETARY WETZEL: And, currently, we have about twenty-four hundred a month scheduled for hearings. The board is able to deliver about eighteen hundred a month. So there's a sixteen -- or six hundred inmate discrepancy between how many are ready for -- able to get a hearing and who actually get a hearing.

And what we're focusing on, again, working jointly with our partners at the board, is making sure that if someone has done what we asked them do to, they've been well-behaved inmates.

They've completed their programming. They've done all the things they've been asked to do, they're

not the people who are skipped or rolled over to the next month. So we're trying to do a better job of making decisions. What that will do is get more people who are likely to parole actually get a hearing. So that's not changing — that's not changing our early release. That's just making our system work better.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

The second area we're looking at is the process it takes from the time the parole board says, go, you can get out, until they actually get A portion of that would be before their minimum, so that's not a time frame we're ever going to affect. But there's a portion of that that is beyond their minimum and the only reason someone's sitting in there is because of -- there's a lot of redundancy between the two systems. one of the -- perhaps the best processes we've gone through with the board is really looking at what our staff is doing and what the board staff is doing, and there's a lot of redundancy. And beyond that, we collect information in one system and they have it another, so we have to hand it to them. And there's just a bunch of things that make you scratch your head, but when you add all those up, it adds to days.

So when you talk about early release, it's not early release, it's just a more effective release and getting people closer to their -- released on their minimum, if that's the intent of the board.

1.3

2.3

REP. CONKLIN: As you're aware, I chaired the prison board for many years, and the hundred day lag always drove us crazy.

Is there any talk of bringing inmates into communities to finish their time? So inmates that are at the end of their sentence are put into the community to finish their time in a less secure setting.

SECRETARY WETZEL: Yes. We do that now through our community corrections system, and we have fourteen state-run, another forty contracted community corrections centers.

REP. CONKLIN: I'm sorry. I misworded that. Is there any talk about increasing those numbers? That's what I meant.

SECRETARY WETZEL: Our budget isn't predicated on that, but there's an area that we are looking to increase, and that's specifically through county work release programs.

We have a grant for \$1.5 million for

that. And what we're specifically looking at doing, is in rural areas, in particular, we don't have community corrections centers. We also know that county work release — county jail work release programs generally have good relationships with employers and they have access to housing assets that, frankly, the department doesn't have. So we're trying to avail ourselves of those options, so the county work release initiative, we have about seventeen contracts in different process of negotiating. We have four contracts we've signed. So in that aspect, we are trying to push more people back through county work release into their communities.

1.3

REP. CONKLIN: And just to finish up, one, has the recidivism rate changed in PA?

Because I know we just -- we started a few years back to track it. Can you tell us what the rate is? Two, are we still looking about 90 percent of the folks who are entering the state are -- one day will be back in? And have we looked at any long term, to get these folks ready to go back into the community again by giving them some type of tools to use once we release them?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Yes.

1 MR. POTTEIGER: Can I -- sorry about 2 that, Mr. Secretary.

1.3

2.3

SECRETARY WETZEL: Let me hit on the first part.

MR. POTTEIGER: All right.

SECRETARY WETZEL: Yeah. First of all, our recidivism rate is 44 percent. We do do a significant amount of programing, and 90 percent of the offenders who come in, do go out the back door, but we're always working to identify and deliver programs and approaches, like education, vocational training, that specifically make people less likely to come back.

And when we say -- I think, sometimes, we get lost in the term recidivism. We're talking about people getting out and going from being, you know, tax burdens to taxpayers. So we're talking about things like employment. We've worked with Labor and Industry over the past year where Labor and Industry is reviewing the vocational training programs we're offering, to ensure that there's markets for those things.

Now, we'll always make license plates, because we need license plates. And we'll always have people, you know, cleaning up the compound,

because you always need that. But we are getting better at delivering programs that people can actually get a job.

1.3

2.3

And I'll turn it over to Mike.

MR. POTTEIGER: And what we're trying to do is that, we don't create a bridge, a gap between the services that -- when they get released from the DOC until they come under supervision and reintegrate back into the community. Because sometimes the gap in those services sometimes leads to recidivism. And we've been working in collaboration with the DOC through our evidence-based practices, utilizing cognitive behavior trainings, motivational interviewing, offender workshop development specialists, those type of things that are positive influences on our offenders to try to help them reintegrate.

Five years ago, our one-year recidivism rate was 26 percent. Last year, it was 17 percent. So we look to identify those through our risk needs assessments, and we identify those individuals who have higher risk and needs, and we supervise those according to their needs. So that we're trying to do a more effective and efficient job in streamlining the process from when they're

released to when they're under supervision to when 1 2 they're actually discharged. Which, then, if we do it properly, then that creates less recidivism 3 going back through the system itself. 4 5 REP. CONKLIN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. 6 7 CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 8 Rep. Bear. REP. BEAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 9 10 Mr. Secretary, thank you for joining 11 us. 12 Actually want to go back to the medical 13 contract real briefly. So when you said you 14 rebidded, and it's the first time, you said, in 15 eight years that you actually bid the contract, 16 what exactly are you talking about? What kind of services? 17 SECRETARY WETZEL: All our medical 18 19 services. 20 REP. BEAR: So is that, like, for 21 physicians or --22 SECRETARY WETZEL: Yes. It starts at 23 the physician level, so upper-level providers and -- yeah, all the delivery of those medical. 24 25 And in this case, we bidded two ways, one with us

operating the -- us employing the nurses, and also, 1 2 lot two, is potential privatizing the nurses. we're talking -- we're not talking about dental. 3 We're not talking about mental health. We're not 4 talking about pharmacy. All those are different 5 This is specifically the medical. 6 contracts. 7 REP. BEAR: But for physicians, that's always been outsourced, right? There's never 8 9 been -- it's always been privatized in that regard? 10 SECRETARY WETZEL: I don't know about 11 forever, but in the recent past, yes, that piece 12 has always been part of this. 1.3 REP. BEAR: What I want to ask you is, like, in terms of some of the savings that you came 14 15 up with, in terms of how they treat the patients, 16 is that changed at all, the delivery? Like, at 17 least for the initial diagnosis? 18 The reason I'm asking is, I want to get to the issue of telemedicine, and I didn't know if 19 20 that was something that was worked in for initial 21 screening of the patients to help reduce the cost 22 of the physician going to the facility to, you 2.3 know, check the patient out, that kind of thing. 24 SECRETARY WETZEL: Yeah. We're looking

at telemedicine we're using in psychiatry. That's

25

the primary place we're using telemedicine at this
point.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Our technology infrastructure isn't exactly the most robust. So we're in the process of trying to utilize things like video conferencing for more and more things. We're using it more for court, so counties don't have to transport inmates back. That benefits us and it benefits them.

We're also significantly expanding the use for psychiatrists, because some of our -- some of our prisons are in pretty rural areas, and finding psychiatrists for those areas, even in the community, is a challenge; it's certainly a challenge for us.

We have not yet looked at expanding it to telemedicine, because, frankly, I don't think we have the infrastructure to do that at this point.

It's certainly on the table, and as we further develop our infrastructure, I would hope to continue to move in that direction.

REP. BEAR: Yeah. The reason I was asking is, some corporations are going that route, to do initial -- just an initial diagnosis.

kind of gaming the system? Because I've heard, from talking to people, that they know when to get sick, is there a certain time when, you know, you have to bring someone in and how to get out of the facility if they're faking a certain illness. I didn't know if that would help cut down on some of that.

1.3

1.5

2.3

SECRETARY WETZEL: Well, it's one of the key reasons why it makes sense for us to have physicians in the facility, because that screening, whether they need to go out to the hospital or not, that piece, where they can lay their hands on, is certainly done better in person. But, yeah, absolutely. Again, we have 52,000 individuals, and none of them are in the DOC for jaywalking. So we have a lot of people who try to beat the system in all kinds of ways.

We have a lot of checks and balances in place that try to prevent that, but it's constant, and it's, again, why it's important that we have medical staff that are qualified and they know what they're doing and properly trained in not just medical aspects but in dealing with this challenging population.

REP. BEAR: Yeah. Just because the

```
reason I was asking, because, again, every time
1
2
     something like that happens, I'm sure there's a
3
     contractual cost for the visitor -- you know, for
     the visit of the doctor to the patient.
 4
5
                  So, anyway, thank you very much.
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: Thank you.
 6
7
                  CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Rep. Mahoney.
                  REP. MAHONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
8
9
                  Welcome, Mr. Secretary.
10
                  Just a couple brief updates.
11
     Waynesburg prison that you all were working on for
12
     a few years, what's the status with that?
1.3
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: We are not going to
14
     put inmates in there, because our population has
1.5
     flattened out and we're projecting it to be
16
     reduced. And DGS is in the process of negotiating
17
     with the leasor or the owner.
18
                  REP. MAHONEY: How much money did we
19
     spend over there in the last three years, I
20
     would --
21
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: I think it's in the
22
     $2-million range. I'll get you the specific after
2.3
     this.
24
                  REP. MAHONEY: All right.
25
                  And I took a tour of the Laurel
```

Highlands prison, and I was very impressed on how 1 2 clean and how well run it was. And they were telling me that you were trying to do something 3 with the gas, bringing the gas up from -- where you 4 would you eliminate the gas bill. Where's that? 5 SECRETARY WETZEL: It's an ESCO project 6 7 it's called. It's kind of the new wave of energy efficiency, where we're capturing and reusing gas 8 and also producing electric, I believe. 9 10 Is that one that's producing electric? 11 And also producing electric. Yeah. 12 hopefully, we'll get to a point where it's run and that you can actually sell some electric back to 1.3 14 the grid. 15 REP. MAHONEY: How much money is that going to save you on a yearly basis just at that 16 Do you have an estimate? 17 facility? 18 SECRETARY WETZEL: I don't have an 19 estimate offhand. I can send you a projection. Wе 20 are also doing it at Greensburg. And we're 21 exploring that at a couple facilities. 22 REP. MAHONEY: That's good. 23 But, now, the next thing is, I get a lot of calls, and I think you answered this a 24 25 little bit, but their release dates, you know, some

of these mothers call me about their son was released, his release date was a hundred days ago.

 $\hbox{ Is there any way of trying to tighten} \\ \\ \hbox{that up or } --$

SECRETARY WETZEL: That's exactly what we're focusing a lot of energy on with the board.

And, frankly, it's -- you know, the department needs to do a better job on some of that end-stage processing, I'll call it. And we've -- you know, we're really trying to hammer down and make that -- again, if someone's supposed to get out and the board says they're okay to get out, and they don't get out simply because we have an inefficient system, that's inexcusable. It's a waste of money, at \$90 a day, and we're really focusing on that.

Mike.

1.3

2.3

MR. POTTEIGER: And we're looking to streamline some of that process in -- one thing that we've focused on in the last year is, we're able to get technology out to our field agents who confirm home plans. So they have mobile laptops to where we can get that information, once they are approved to be released, then we can start working on the home plan, to try to get that process in quicker. So that's one thing that, you know, we

continue to work with the DOC to try to streamline that aspect.

1.3

1.5

2.3

REP. MAHONEY: Thank you.

And one more question that's about the nurses. I mean, this isn't the first step of trying to privatize prisons in PA in your process.

SECRETARY WETZEL: Well, I know, specifically, the governor said the security function is a function of government and it's not on the table.

REP. MAHONEY: And you're not looking at any other privatization in that prison at all?

SECRETARY WETZEL: That's not accurate, either. No. Everything else is on the table. And we're going to explore it as we move forward.

We're not in a hurry to privatize a bunch of things. It's always going to be a very deliberative process. It's never just going to be about the money, but the money's a piece of it.

REP. MAHONEY: It's just amazing to me, if the governor is worried about the protection of people and we keep bringing different contractors into these prisons at different times, I mean, I toured a lot of those prisons, and it's a different environment. And it takes a different type of a

person to work in these facilities. I just don't think it's a good idea at all to privatize anything in the prison.

1.3

2.3

SECRETARY WETZEL: Well, we have a bunch privatized already, and the ones that you expressed that are working out real well have some of our more privatized staff.

REP. MAHONEY: The energy one?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Well, yes, Laurel Highlands, because we have a lot of nurses and we have a lot of medical staff, and a lot of our medical staff are currently privatized.

I mean, listen, I'm with you. You know, our number one job is to protect the community, but also to protect our staff, and bringing in the right people through the door is a very important part of that. And that will be factored in as we explore these things. But when you're looking at an operation that spends \$1.9 billion, you have to look and make sure that you're delivering services in a responsible manner but also in a fiscally responsible manner.

So I think we have a duty to look at this. And I hope and I expect that as we look at different aspects, we'll be able to find ways to

```
streamline our own aspect so we can compete with
1
2
     that, but we should have to compete outside of the
3
     core function of the department.
                  REP. MAHONEY: Thank you very much.
 4
                  And one more question.
 5
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: I've heard that
6
7
     before. Right?
                  REP. MAHONEY: I didn't want to bring
8
9
     up Germantown.
10
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: I appreciate that.
11
                  REP. MAHONEY:
                                 But Senate Bill 100, how
12
     much money could that save you, if you have the
1.3
     boot camps go up to forty-eight years old?
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: We're projecting, if
14
15
     the boot camp goes up to forty, it adds about
16
     another ninety -- it reduces our overall population
     in the department by about ninety-seven a day,
17
18
     which is pretty significant.
19
                  REP. MAHONEY: And how many boot camps
20
     do you have running right now?
21
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: We have one boot
22
                   We have for males and females.
     camp program.
                  REP. MAHONEY: And where are they
2.3
24
     located at?
25
                  SECRETARY WETZEL:
                                     It's both at
```

Quehanna boot camp. 1 2 REP. MAHONEY: Okay. Thank you very 3 much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4 SECRETARY WETZEL: Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: 6 Thank you. 7 Rep. Ron Waters. REP. WATERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 9 I hope you all can hear me. I'm on 10 this mic that doesn't cooperate. But thank you, 11 Mr. Secretary, for being here. And to probation 12 and parole -- I can't see your name from where I 1.3 sit. 14 MR. POTTEIGER: Mr. Potteiger. 15 good. 16 REP. WATERS: Mr. --17 MR. POTTEIGER: Potteiger. 18 REP. WATERS: Okay. Thank you, too, 19 for being here. 20 And I'm happy that you're -- both departments are being represented at the same 21 22 As my office receives, and I've heard so 2.3 many of my colleagues also talk about this, so this always seems to be a problem, in terms of -- it 24 25 comes down to paperwork for people who are

incarcerated, and pretty much, most of the stuff has already been addressed.

1.3

2.3

And I can't help but just wondering, you know, in the 21st century, why we still have a system that has so many gaps and problems and deficiencies that, with this technology, it seems as though it's not being utilized in a way that would be cost savings, and — because I've had a chance to visit many of the SCIs, too, as my friend, as a visitor, and go in and talk and to talk to many of the wardens or superintendents in the facilities.

And many of them say pretty much the same thing, that inside the institution, there are people who are there that they don't need to be there, by their opinion, their assessment. They just don't need to be there. Some of it, I know, is because of legislation, and some of it is because of paperwork or technical parole violators that have been sent back to the department as a result of someone making an error in what they were supposed to be doing while on probation or parole, and they end up going back into the system and losing everything that they had already started to work on and build.

```
And I'm happy to see that the probation
1
2
     and parole is here, because many times the
     department's argument has been -- and this is even
3
     prior to Secretary Wetzel -- that the department
 4
     doesn't have a choice in the matter when someone
5
     gets a technical violation. They send them back
6
7
     there. And they just can't say, well, we can't
     take them back because I know this person and they
8
     was here before. They just have to open the door
9
10
     and take them.
11
                 And the philosophy, which I hope that
12
     maybe you can address some, is about -- I know
1.3
     there used to be a philosophy of trail them, nail
14
     them, and jail them with probation.
15
                 MR. POTTEIGER: Representative, you're
16
     correct.
                  REP. WATERS: Is that correct?
17
18
                 MR. POTTEIGER: You're correct.
19
                 REP. WATERS: Trail them, nail them,
20
     and jail them.
21
                 MR. POTTEIGER:
                                  That's one term, yeah.
22
                 REP. WATERS: You can tell me the other
23
     one if you want to.
24
                 MR. POTTEIGER: You know -- but, no,
25
     that used to be a philosophy. I think I've been in
```

probation and parole -- I have been in probation and parole for over twenty-four years. I think when I came into the system, unfortunately, that's the way it was. It was how can we build more prisons, how can we institutionalize more offenders by locking them up, throw away the key, so to say, and not doing a better job of transitioning them from the Department of Corrections or county prison back into the communities successfully.

1.3

I think the board, since -- and most county agencies have looked at changing that philosophy, because, right now, we have fiscal challenges, obviously. We have to look at doing things smarter, more efficient.

And in 2005, 2006, the board started utilizing evidence-based practices, and we started focusing on individuals in not only breaking the recidivism but breaking the family cycle of recidivism. Because so many times, in our field, do we not only supervise the father, we supervise the son, and then the grandfather. And then what happens, unfortunately, then you have grandparents raising their children because they're incarcerated.

REP. WATERS: In jail.

MR. POTTEIGER: So we have refocused our efforts through evidence-based practices, and I can respect -- before it used to be one violation, incarcerate them, let them spend between fourteen months to two years in the institution before they're released again. But now, under the board's direction, with evidence-based practices, there has been an average of up to five violations before we take them back.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And even before we take them back, we have the Halfway Back that we utilize. We created our technical parole violator center in 2010. We just expanded that. Wernersville is going to be opened up by the end of this month.

Correct, Secretary?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Yes.

MR. POTTEIGER: So we went from five technical parole violation centers now to six.

That can house up to three hundred seventy-five more offenders in those type of settings, which is more of an alcohol and drug rehabilitative position while institutionalized, in trying to keep them in their communities and doing a more effective and efficient job of reintegrating them back into their communities.

So, we understand the needs -- I mean, the concerns, but we are addressing those through our evidence-based practice techniques and through our new philosophy.

1.3

2.3

SECRETARY WETZEL: And I would just add, that since -- especially since Acting Chairman White took over in July and then Mike took over a month ago, I have utmost faith. We've made significant progress. A lot of what you're talking about, frankly, came down to the fact that the board and the Department of Corrections was unable to work together or unwilling to work together. And that's not the case.

And I've also specifically seen, and certainly I complain as much as anybody, at times, about parole violators. We've seen significant progress, especially in the past several months at just trying to find a way to process them better and put them in the parole violation centers, which are very successful.

But, again, when they get brought back to us, some of our processes kick in, and it's only ninety days there, but it takes us two months to get them there or three months to get them there.

So that -- what could be ninety days takes six

months. And we own part of that and so does the board.

1.3

1.5

2.3

So I'll certainly vouch for Mike and for the board that we've made progress. There's a commitment, certainly a new direction, and there's a commitment from the board, and we've seen that. And a lot of the department's budget is predicated on a reduction in population, and that is quite specifically a leap of faith with the board of probation and parole.

REP. WATERS: And I'm so happy to hear that, that the two departments are working together. They service the same population of people, for the most part. And for them to work separately as a divorced couple almost, you know, it doesn't make sense, because taxpayers will end up having to bear the financial cost of the decisions that are made because of the lack of communications.

And this is -- I even had a legislation that would combine the two. I know in some states the Department of Correction and probation and parole are combined. They still have their separate independence, but because of their relationship, they have better outcomes in terms of

what kind of people are we turning back to society and monitoring and supervising, to make sure that you -- you try to keep them on track, which I believe would be a great way for probation and parole to handle them, to handle people. Because, I believe, if you are being measured on your success with reintegrating people back into society and back into law-abiding society, and for them to be productive, law-abiding citizens who we won't mind having as neighbors, I believe will be the outcome, plus they're productive citizens, as you said earlier, Mr. Secretary, and no longer tax burdens but tax producers.

1.3

2.3

And so the probation and parole officers, how often are they trained or retrained or evaluated in terms of how they are handling their job performance?

MR. POTTEIGER: We have forty hours of annual training to upgrade. We have an eight-week BTA for new agents that are hired; they go through training process. But through the everyday type of supervision, we have supervisors who evaluate their job perform almost on a daily basis, to ensure that the agents are carrying out the philosophy and the mission of the board.

REP. WATERS: And with the Department 1 2 of Corrections, Mr. Secretary, how often are the 3 correctional officers trained? I know that we've had some -- some isolated cases that came up on the 4 radar screen, for instance, SCI Pittsburgh, which 5 was -- but we hear inmates all the time complain 6 7 about the way that the correctional officers, not 8 all of them -- I see you got a couple guys over I'm sure you --9 there. 10 SECRETARY WETZEL: Yeah. Watch 11 yourself. 12 REP. WATERS: I don't plan on -- what 13 prisons do you guys work at? I don't plan going to 14 visit that prison anytime soon. 1.5 But the -- but they have complained 16 about the -- for instance, when they file a 17 complaint about how they're being treated, the --SECRETARY WETZEL: Grievance system. 18 19 REP. WATERS: Grievances is given to a 20 correctional officer, who might be the one the 21 grievance is being filed against, and good luck 22 with that getting to where it needs go to. 2.3 SECRETARY WETZEL: Actually, that's not 24 accurate. And one of things we've ensured is that

we have grievance boxes everywhere. So inmates

25

have the ability to put the grievance in the box themselves, even in our RHUs, and beyond that, the only person with a key to that is the superintendent's assistant, who physically goes around and collects it.

1.3

2.3

So I heard that complaint, too. And we've taken steps to ensure that.

When you talk about this, training is a big piece of that. And we will continue to focus on training, which we offer yearly training, also similar to our partners at the board. But, also, we have a -- our office of special intelligence and investigation, who investigates, and we're really looking and, I believe, have improved our process to be responsive to abuse allegations. Every abuse allegation is fully investigated.

Beyond that, we've instituted a 1-800 number for -- inmates can call from the phones on the housing unit anonymously. We've issued -- instituted a number that the public can call. They can easily --

REP. WATERS: Excuse me. I'm sorry,
Mr. Secretary. Did this happen during your
leadership?

SECRETARY WETZEL: We've re-instituted

some of this stuff in the past year, certainly.

Some of this stuff was preexisting and we just, I

felt like, needed to remarket it. We have a 1-800

number that the public can call. We also have a

1-800 number that staff can call and anonymously

report things. We also get e-mails to the website,

and every complaint is fully investigated. We have

a tracking system that's centrally located in

OSII.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And so I feel like we have the checks and balances in place, and they make the decision whether it's the type of allegation that should be investigated locally or the type of investigation that should be investigated centrally by people who aren't working at those facilities.

So while we certainly need to improve,

I think we've moved significantly forward in how

that grievance system and also making sure every

individual incarcerated in the Department of

Corrections has access to report abuse, because

it's something we don't tolerate.

These guys back here feel the same way that you feel. If we have a staff member behaving inappropriately, it puts everybody in jeopardy. We don't tolerate it. And I think you brought SCI

Pittsburgh, I think our actions speaking very loudly, that the department was the one who discovered it. The department is one who investigated it, and we certainly responded swiftly and harshly.

1.3

1.5

2.3

REP. WATERS: And you absolutely did.

And I even noticed it in this year's budget

proposal, the governor did not offer any increase

for the Department of Corrections, which is a rare

sight for budget proposals.

I believe that, under your leadership, that changes have already taken place as with what has been said earlier. This is about public safety. This is not about protecting somebody who is — who belongs in jail. This is not the argument. The argument is that 90 percent or better of the people incarcerated will be coming back to society. And what kind of person is going to move back to my neighborhood is of severe interest to me.

And if we get could get, for the costs that it takes to lock a person up, which is pretty close to a college education tuition, I believe that the least the taxpayers should be expecting is some positive outcome returning back, because we

1 | all want our streets to be safe places.

1.3

2.3

And I know that you have already demonstrated some cost savings already, including making sure that people don't get to go and eat two or three times at -- I believe you say, \$20,000 the first month at one place you instituted it.

SECRETARY WETZEL: Correct.

REP. WATERS: And you're going to do it at other places.

SECRETARY WETZEL: We're doing it system-wide.

And what the Representative's referring to is, we had inmates -- some of our new prototypical facilities will have two or three chow halls, so they'll go to one and then go to another. And -- so we issued meal tickets, as of January 2nd. It was an idea that came from one of our facilities, Superintendent Harlow at CSI Albion.

In many places, we saved as much as 20,000 a month, and seven hundred meals a day by just accounting for -- making sure we know that only we're going to serve the number of meals of the inmate we have, and what -- where you save money is that we're producing less meals. Because

the last thing you want to do in a prison is run out of food. So the kitchen staff is responsible and makes more food, so we've instituted that.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And, again, listen, we have a good team at the Department of Corrections. And I think when you talk about increasing public safety, certainly that leadership comes from the governor on down.

And it's consistent with parole and with us, that we're all committed to have better outcomes.

One of the better outcomes is spending less money. But one of the better outcomes is reducing that recidivism rate, making people more likely to succeed when they get out. And that's where -- that's what this administration is committed to, and I think this budget backs that up.

REP. WATERS: I think with this -- with your installation as superintendent -- or secretary -- I'm sorry -- secretary of Corrections speaks volumes in terms of the statements that you just made. And I look forward to continually working with you in your efforts in -- for public safety and with the new -- Mike -- I'll just say Mike right now -- in terms of how we can better supervise people who are under your care.

1 Thank you. 2 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 SECRETARY WETZEL: Thank you. CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 4 Rep. John Sabatina. 5 REP. SABATINA: 6 Thank you, 7 Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Secretary, thank you, 8 9 Chairman, for your testimony today. 10 I have a couple of brief questions. 11 First of all, the idea of deporting nonviolent 12 offenders, is that something you can do now or is 1.3 that something that requires legislation for the --14 SECRETARY WETZEL: Requires 15 legislation. 16 REP. SABATINA: Okav. SECRETARY WETZEL: And we're, along 17 18 with our partners at parole, we're drafting up what 19 we think the language is. Again, the 20 administration really sees Senate Bill 100 as the vehicle that we can insert whatever comes out of 21 22 the justice reinvestment initiative and this, also, 2.3 into a nice, cogent piece of legislation that addresses a myriad of things, including deporting 24 25 nonviolent illegal immigrants.

And how the process currently works is, if we get a nonviolent illegal immigrant into our system, they serve whatever time they're supposed to serve, and then they're eventually paroled to their detainer. We're just looking to front end that process and parole -- give them a conditional parole to a detainer. The condition would be that they get deported. Right? So if they don't get deported, if something gets sidetracked with that process, they come back to us.

1.3

2.3

And, also, we would suggest that there's some enhancement on the back end, that if they sneak back in, which we know happens from time to time, and they get rearrested in the state of PA, we enhance those sentences. And we're talking about a relatively small number of inmates. We're talking about two hundred sixty-five inmates sitting in the department today. We're talking about sixty-five additional a year. But two hundred sixty-five inmates is a housing unit, which generally means six officers and somewhere between a million and a half and two and a half million dollars.

So if we can reduce by that population, close the housing unit, that's \$2 million that's

```
back that can be spent elsewhere. So that's --
1
2
     that's the whole story. Probably more than you
     want to hear.
3
                  REP. SABATINA:
                                  No.
                                       That's good.
 4
5
     Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
                                  If I could just --
                  MR. POTTEIGER:
 6
7
                  REP. SABATINA:
                                  I'm sorry.
                  MR. POTTEIGER: I just wanted to
8
     comment, just one thing that he left out. They
9
10
     were nonviolent offenders. That's what we were
11
     targeting for this Senate bill.
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: Yeah, that's --
12
1.3
                  MR. POTTEIGER: Correct.
14
                  REP. SABATINA: My second question has
1.5
     to do with overtime. And I see the projections for
     overtime is $60 million.
16
                  Can you explain to me how -- how you
17
                     How overtime is incurred in the
18
     incur overtime?
     system, and how you can reduce it?
19
20
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: Yeah.
                                            There's a
21
     couple ways overtime is incurred. One is
22
     unexpected event, and that can be defined a myriad
2.3
     of ways in the Department of Corrections, but think
24
     of something as somebody having an event that
25
     causes them to get sent out to the hospital.
```

the level of offender we have, we don't just send them out and say, Give us a call when you're done. We have to send staff with them. Generally, two staff, sometimes three. So that's something that you don't plan for. So we don't put extra staff on our roster to sit around and wait for someone get to get sent to the hospital.

1.3

2.3

Obviously, there could be more serious unexpected events. That's one thing that drives it.

Another thing that drives it is leave usage. And, generally, planned leave usage doesn't really have a big impact on us, but unplanned leave usage, especially call offs, especially last-minute call offs, those two categories combined are really -- provided the bulk of overtime.

Now, we still have, sometimes, wellplanned events, well-planned shakedowns, and those
kinds of things, where we use overtime, but I
believe that's a good use of overtime.

But especially the call-off level -for instance, when the Commonwealth shifted from

FML to what's in place now, SPF, it expanded

what -- the federal mandate to allow for people to
be eligible for that earlier and give individuals

```
more flexibility. In a twenty-four/seven
1
 2
     operation, that really has an impact on the amount
 3
     of unscheduled leave we have. And, ultimately, it
     leads to that 60 million in overtime.
 4
                  And then, the third thing is, again, a
 5
     lack of technological infrastructure to do a great
6
7
     job of managing it and getting reports and doing
     that. And that's something that's part of this
8
9
     budget, that we're going to do a better job of
10
     centralizing the management of overtime management
11
     to reduce those costs.
12
                  REP. SABATINA: Gentlemen, thank you
1.3
     for your answers. Keep up the good work.
14
                  SECRETARY WETZEL:
                                     Thank you.
1.5
                  MR. POTTEIGER: Thank you.
16
                  CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                    Thank you.
17
                  Rep. Glen Grell.
18
                  REP. GRELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19
                  Chairman Potteiger, welcome.
20
     Congratulations. Best of luck in your new
     position.
21
22
                  MR. POTTEIGER:
                                  Thank you.
23
                  REP. GRELL: I'm pleased -- very
24
     pleased to see that the board and the department
25
     are working so closely to address some of these
```

challenges and problems. My question, however, is for Secretary Wetzel. And it piggybacks on an earlier question where you were talking about food service.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Could you tell us a little more about how the department provides food service and whether there's an opportunity there to do it in a different way or perhaps to partner or privatization or outsource or whatever you want to call it?

I know some other states have done this, and at least in the magazines the legislators get, Indiana seems to have gotten some good press, at least, on their efforts to privatize food service.

Is that something that you're looking at? And if so, what kind of criteria would you use to -- to evaluate whether that's a direction you might want to explore?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Okay. How we deliver food service is -- I mean, we order the food bulk through the DGS ordering process. We have storage, where the food is stored, from cold storage to dry storage and those things.

And, then, the kitchen, actual

operation, is managed by staff, and -- but a lot of the work is done by inmates who are employed to do that.

1.3

2.3

REP. GRELL: Any idea what percentage is staff versus inmate?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Yeah. It would be -- I don't know -- probably three or four staff and probably thirty or forty inmates. It's primarily the labor piece. Staff are entitled supervisors. So they're supervising, directing, and also training, because food service jobs are jobs offenders can get when they get out, so that's a part of working in the kitchen. But that's basically how it's delivered.

There is some talk, and that's an area that we will likely explore at some point. There's a lot of states who have done that with, frankly, mixed results, some better than others. Certainly, a lot of those companies have a good marketing department.

And -- but, you know, again, as I said earlier with privatization, there's things you have to factor in other than costs, and we'll do that.

But, as a department, we should be able to compete, and -- when it comes to financial, and if -- we

should be able to deliver it as good as or at the same cost or similar cost as a vendor, because, really, what the vendors do is they use the same -- generally, close to the same amount of staff and do a better job with portion control and purchasing and how much they keep on storage and those kinds of things.

1.3

We are, as a department, pursuing what's called supply chain transformation. And it's really looking at the entire supply chain process with both -- with food service, laundry, as well as transportation, which is another area where -- you know, we move about nine hundred people a month. So those are all areas that we're looking at, specifically at supply chain, how we can function more like a UPS as opposed to a DOC.

So that's the process we're doing right now. That -- we're going through the RFP process now. We anticipate awarding that this spring and really focusing on how we can deliver food service better.

Michigan, in particular, saved 10 percent on their food service budget by going through this process and doing a better job of delivering food service with their staff this way.

```
But at some point, we'll absolutely -- that's
1
2
     something that's on the table. So at some point
3
     we'll structure an RFP and compare the two.
                 REP. GRELL: The RFP, though, that you
 4
5
     mentioned, that's for the purchasing of the food
     itself?
6
7
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: That's for looking
8
     at the whole supply chain.
9
                 REP. GRELL: Oh, okay. For evaluating
10
     your -- those three areas that you mentioned.
11
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: -- evaluating and
12
     initiating changes.
1.3
                 REP. GRELL: Okay. So that would be
14
     the first step in evaluating whether this is
15
     something that might bring some efficiency to the
16
     department?
17
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: Correct. With --
18
     yes.
19
                 REP. GRELL: Okay. Thanks very much.
20
                 SECRETARY WETZEL: Thank you.
21
                 MR. POTTEIGER: Thank you.
22
                 REP. GRELL: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.
2.3
                 CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                    Thank you.
24
                 Rep. Cherelle Parker.
25
                 REP. PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
```

And Chairman Potteiger and Secretary Wetzel, welcome. And thank you both so much for being here.

1.3

2.3

Mr. Chairman, you, in your response to one of the questions, sort of struck a cord with my frame of questioning. And it was in regards to incarceration being cyclical and generational in nature, and you described that in one of your responses.

And, Secretary Wetzel, thank you, because I know you've been working with the PA Prison Society. Both of your departments have been a part of the joint state government commission, studying effects of incarceration on children, which was worked on in a bipartisan manner; both Senator Greenleaf and I introduced joint resolutions. It was supported by both of our chairmen here in the House, Caltagirone and Marsico, and we finally had received results of that report.

In addition to that, we felt, in the beginning, like we were wolves, crying in the wild, when we first started working on this issue, because it hadn't received a lot of attention. And lo and behold, 2012, Miss America is selected, and

her platform is the need for support for children with incarceration -- incarcerated parents across the United States.

1.3

2.3

And so with that in mind, one of the things that the report did do, along with the committee's recommendations, is come up with ideas that could assist all of the respective stakeholders in supporting this particular constituency. And some of the ideas were, for example, data collections along with a uniform protocol regarding arrests when children are in the household or in the surroundings when a parent is incarcerated.

Is that something that both of your departments will continue working on with us as we work on actually getting some of those legislative initiatives enacted here in the state, along with in our respective counties?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Yes. And we are reviewing the report -- we got a little preview of it. So we're in process of reviewing it, but we've worked with Big Brothers and Big Sisters. We did an initiative with them last year. We've worked with Dr. Goode, Namichi -- Amachi, Philadelphia, and also Amachi, Pittsburgh.

So as an administration, again, from the governor on down, we're committed to -- we're committed to not just look at those incarcerated but the system impacts. Because, understand that there's a cost when someone gets incarcerated throughout the system, and one of those costs is the potential that their family members, and children, especially, dependent children, have the potential of being incarcerated.

1.3

2.3

So we're very committed to that notion and to work with whoever is interested in doing a better job of addressing the needs of children of incarcerated parents.

MR. POTTEIGER: And our agents are doing a very effective and efficient job, and understanding that a number of the offenders that we supervise across systems of care. And that they are not only under supervision with the board, but they also have maybe another family member or child involved with Children and Youth services.

So we have been educating our agents through our evidence-based practices, who are doing an excellent job in the day-to-day supervision of our offenders. I'm up here, but my agents do the day-to-day job every day. And we focus on the

family structure and trying to bring the family structure back through those type of programs, whether it be family group conferencing, truancy initiatives that are going on. So we will remain focused on that and reintegrating them properly as a family structure back into the community.

1.3

1.5

2.3

my second question in regards to the importance of family reunification as it relates to reintegration. And one of the things that the department has done successfully has been this notion of virtual visitation that we have established in the city of Philadelphia. I know the PA Prison Society, they used to administer the program for some time. I think another contractor is working on it now.

But when we had an official release of the report in the city, one of the responses that I received is that when we have these locations established, the children of people who are incarcerated are further branded and ashamed to go into some of these particular locations, because in communities, these locations become known as, this is the place where you go to have virtual visitation with your mother or father or someone

that's in prison.

2.3

And I wanted to know, are other facilities -- I know there are extreme security rules and regs that you have to abide by in that situation, but is the idea of maybe focusing some attention on using some of our churches or places that have multiple sort of functions, whereupon the stigma that's attached to that consistency may not be there? Is that something we can possibly explore? Or give a little caution, raises red flags?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Well, again, our technology infrastructure is less than robust. So a lot of -- the main limitation on the use of video visitation is just the access, because we generally only have one video visitation unit per facility, and not even every facility has them. So I don't think we're there yet.

I think at some point, if we could put some checks and balances in place that we would be concerned about, I think we are certainly committed to do that.

But I also think that we've taken some significant, proactive steps in the family reunification position, specifically with SCI

Phoenix on the grounds of Graterford, where we're putting, for the first time in the history of the department, a female reentry housing unit on the grounds of Graterford.

1.3

1.5

2.3

We know that nearly a third of our offenders come from the southeast corner of PA.

And the nearest female facility is SCI Muncy, which is above Williamsport. So we have about a two-hundred-bed housing unit outside the fence, obviously, self-contained for females reentering the southeast area. And what we plan to target is the last nine months to a year. And we are very actively out in the faith communities, especially in Philadelphia, trying to engage faith communities, because we'd really like to see a mentor for each female returning to the Philadelphia area.

with things like extended visit hours and extended access to their children in mind, because we understand that if a custodial mother, going back into a household where she's been gone for a while, that brings other dynamics into the mix. We're also making significant progress with that group, in programming them specific to female-need areas.

So we're with you and we're working towards that.

1.3

2.3

REP. PARKER: And, finally,

Mr. Secretary, let me ask, I was just watching a
television show the other day, and I can't remember
what show or what station it was, but there was an
issue regarding telephone service. And it made me
think about the Department of Corrections. But it
was in regards to our military, and I can't
remember which specific branch. But our military
would stop in the safe fly zone, for example, and I
forget what country, but they would actually have
telephones there, and this would be the last stop
before members of this particular unit could
reach — they could reach out to their families.
They could communicate with them.

And one, the telephone that served -company that was providing the services and sort of
owned the phones, they weren't allowing our
military officers to use calling cards. They had
to use credit cards.

In addition to that, they showcased, like, a five-second message that a military officer actually left on his home telephone, cost \$45. And I thought, wow, these are the men and women on the

```
front line, helping to protect our great country.
1
2
     I wonder what happens in the private sector, even
     in our correctional institutions that rely
 3
     extremely heavy as it relates on, as you mentioned,
 4
     the importance of reunification with the family,
5
     they rely heavily on telephone usage.
 6
7
                  Do we sort of monitor and compare,
     nationally, what the cost is? And what do we do to
8
     ensure that that is a vehicle that remains
9
10
     affordable for our Pennsylvanians who,
11
     unfortunately, have a family member who is
12
     incarcerated and they're doing their best to stay
1.3
     connected with that family member?
14
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: Yeah.
                                             We're very, I
15
     would say, vigilant in making sure that our phone
16
     rates do not go through the roof, because we are
17
     committed to that, keeping the connection with the
18
     community, especially for the offenders who are
19
     going to return back home one day. But there is a
20
     cost to those things. And so --
21
                  REP. PARKER: But, Mr. Secretary, you
22
     don't think it's, like, $40 for five seconds, do
2.3
     you?
                  SECRETARY WETZEL: We're no nowhere
24
25
     close to that.
```

Oh, okay. Okay. 1 REP. PARKER: Okav. 2 SECRETARY WETZEL: Our inmates are getting a bargain if our military is paying 45 3 bucks for a five-second phone call. 4 5 REP. PARKER: Okay. Okay. SECRETARY WETZEL: But one of the 6 7 things with our -- the way our phone contract is structured, is that the profits from that get 8 9 reinvested into the inmate general welfare fund, so 10 it's used for things that inmates receive, from 11 recreation equipment to, in some cases, programs. 12 So I think that you're getting a pretty good investment. And we do monitor. 1.3 14 And that most recently, I think a year 15 and a half ago, we negotiated to use debit cards 16 and get a discount for debit calling, if offenders 17 use debit calling. So we're constantly monitoring 18 that. 19 REP. PARKER: Thank you both, and I 20 look forward to working with you. 21 And thank you, Chairman Adolph. 22 CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 23 Rep. Steve Samuelson. 24 REP. SAMUELSON: Thank you, 25 Mr. Chairman.

My question is on personnel costs, a follow-up question on the overtime, and then also your efforts to address salary compression.

1.3

Now, I know you testified that the overall budget for the Department of Corrections is level funded. No change in the overall bottom line for the department.

Within the line items of the department, in your budget presentation, you note that in the Department of Corrections, there's a \$78-million increase in personnel costs, 8.2 million of that set aside for the salary compression issue, and then other associated personnel costs. So, obviously, within the department, other line items are going down as personnel goes up by 78 million.

First question is on the overtime, which I know you've discussed with Rep. Sabatina, the \$60-million figure, is that -- how does that compare to last year and also the last couple of years?

SECRETARY WETZEL: I can't tell you that, offhand. I know it's -- I think it's relatively in the same ballpark, but I'll get you specifically the past five years as a follow-up

document, to give you -- but, keep in mind, that's 1 2 just -- not just correctional officers, that's all overtime for all staff. 3 REP. SAMUELSON: Okay. And that would 4 5 be helpful, any kind of data you have on exactly what the overtime costs have been in recent years. 6 7 SECRETARY WETZEL: Okay. Yeah. REP. SAMUELSON: Now, salary 8 compression, I know you're talking about when 9 10 corrections officers, with overtime, might actually 11 be very close to supervisory personnel within the 12 department. 1.3 SECRETARY WETZEL: Actually, we're talking about correctional officers, without 14 15 overtime, being over supervisory staff. 16 REP. SAMUELSON: Okay. Without even discussing overtime. 17 18 SECRETARY WETZEL: Yeah. 19 REP. SAMUELSON: The salary scale for 20 corrections officers actually goes higher than the 21 salary scale for a supervisor staff? 22 SECRETARY WETZEL: They don't -- they 2.3 have different scales. Correctional officer's a 24 twenty-seven-step scale; the correctional manager's

a twenty-step scale. That, coupled with the freeze

25

for managerial employees over the past eight years,

have created that -- actually not just compression,

decompression, in some cases.

1.3

1.5

2.3

REP. SAMUELSON: So in some cases, the highest step on the salary scale for a corrections officer is actually higher than the supervisory employee.

SECRETARY WETZEL: I wouldn't -- in some cases we have line employees who are making more than the people who are supervising them.

When you say steps at the end of the scale, the problem is that the correctional managers aren't getting -- aren't continuing to move out the scale, so we never get to a point where they're both at the end of scale and are they even or not. We can't even get to that point.

REP. SAMUELSON. In your testimony, you say, We've begun addressing the salary compression. Exactly how have you done that? Are you providing increases to the managers?

SECRETARY WETZEL: Yes.

REP. SAMUELSON: If so, what level of increase? Is it a set figure? Is it a percentage increase? What's the highest increase that you've been giving to a manager to try to address this

issue?

1.3

1.5

2.3

SECRETARY WETZEL: Well, we haven't given any yet. We're in the process, along with OA, of identifying what the need is, and what we'd begun to address it by is to make sure that we structurally fix it. So we're not just going to give a step to a bunch of managers and say, okay, we've addressed it. We're functionally and structurally fixing it, so two pay scales match up, so this isn't recreated again.

And there's only a select group. And it ends up being about two-thirds of our managers, but we're really focused on most of our managers on the CM scale, which is the correctional managers scale, which are basically the boots on the ground in the facilities. And everybody's going to be looked at individually to where they would be on the new scale and where they're currently at, and then we're going to make adjustments based on that.

So once we have that created, I can certainly provide that to you.

REP. SAMUELSON: Okay.

And then how many managers would be involved in this effort? I know you've put a

1	figure of 8.2 million of the amount of money
2	involved. How many managers would that be?
3	SECRETARY WETZEL: It's going
4	somewhere in the ballpark of a thousand, give
5	or take. With the number of employees we
6	have, sometimes we have vacant positions and
7	the like.
8	REP. SAMUELSON: Well, \$8 million,
9	a thousand people, that's about \$8,000 per
10	manager. Is that in the ballpark of what
11	you're looking at?
12	SECRETARY WETZEL: That would be
13	the ballpark, yeah.
14	REP. SAMUELSON: Okay. But you're
15	developing a comprehensive study of the issue.
16	SECRETARY WETZEL: Yep.
17	REP. SAMUELSON: All right. Thank
18	you for your answers.
19	And thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20	SECRETARY WETZEL: Thank you.
21	MR. POTTEIGER: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.
23	Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, I
24	want to thank you for your testimony today and
25	looking forward to working with you over the

	85
1	next several months, as we get through this
2	budget process.
3	And keep up the good work,
4	gentlemen.
5	SECRETARY WETZEL: Thank you.
6	MR. POTTEIGER: Thank you for your
7	time.
8	CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.
9	Well, Appropriations Committee, I just
10	want to let you know that we are on time. And the
11	next meeting will take place at 3 o'clock, and it
12	will be DEP.
13	Thank you.
14	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded
15	at 2:58 p.m.)
16	
17	* * * *
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE I HEREBY CERTIFY that I was present upon the hearing of the above-entitled matter and there reported stenographically the proceedings had and the testimony produced; and I further certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my said stenographic notes. BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR Court Reporter Notary Public