

**Report on the Business of the Court of Common Pleas
Of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania**

2015

**Court of Common Pleas
Of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania**

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

President Judge: **Honorable Richard E. McCormick, Jr.**
Associate Judges: **Honorable Debra A. Pezze**
 Honorable Rita D. Hathaway
 Honorable Anthony G. Marsili
 Honorable Christopher A. Feliciani
 Honorable Michele G. Bononi
 Honorable Christian F. Scherer
 Honorable Meagan Bilik-DeFazio
 Honorable David A. Regoli
 Honorable Harry F. Smail, Jr.

Senior Judges: **Honorable Daniel J. Ackerman**
 Honorable William J. Ober
 Honorable John J. Driscoll
 Honorable John E. Blahovec
 Honorable Alfred B. Bell

OFFICE OF THE COURT ADMINISTRATOR

District Court Administrator: **Amy Mears DeMatt, Esq.**
Deputy Court Administrator: **Tami Silvis, MSJA**

MISSION STATEMENTS

COURTS

To provide judicial services to the citizens of Westmoreland County in all areas of the law including civil, criminal, family, juvenile, and orphans' court and to respond to changing societal needs by an appropriate allocation of resources.

COURT ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE

To support the Westmoreland County courts and court departments in all administrative areas, and to coordinate Judicial Branch operations in the Tenth Judicial District of Pennsylvania.

TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

This report covers the operations of the Tenth Judicial District of Pennsylvania, the local operation of the Unified Judicial System located in Westmoreland County consisting of:

1. The Court of Common Pleas of Westmoreland County with Eleven Court of Common Pleas Judges and Staff
2. Seventeen Magisterial District Courts and Judges
3. The Office of the Court Administrator
4. The Westmoreland County Adult Probation and Parole Department
5. The Westmoreland County Domestic Relations Section
6. The Westmoreland County Juvenile Probation Department
7. The Westmoreland County Citizens' Law Library

CIVIL COURT

President Judge Richard E. McCormick, Jr.

Judge Anthony G. Marsili

Judge David A. Regoli

Civil cases, estates, and guardianship cases are assigned on a rotational basis. Each judge maintains an individual calendar. The judge's personal staff schedules most case events; the Deputy Court Administrators schedule civil trials, estate audits, and arbitration; assist with the administration of all Orphans' Court matters; and purge civil cases. The following are key statistical indicators:

CIVIL STATISTICS

CIVIL STATISTICS	2013	2014	2015
New Civil Cases Docketed	1572	1553	1727
Arbitration Awards	76	86	63
Beginning Year Balance of Civil Cases	4229	4396	1871
Civil Cases Disposed	1038	4578	1568
Total Civil Pending at End of Year	4763	1371	2289

In the Spring of 2014, the Chief Justice of Pennsylvania asked Court Administrators across the state to review the pending civil caseload and conclude data clean-up efforts including administrative purges pursuant to Rule of Judicial Administration 1901 by June, 2014. The civil division of the Court Administrator's office continues to work diligently to review and dispose of civil cases due to inactivity. The new computer program developed to help track cases that are two years and older from the date of filing has assisted the Civil Judicial Law clerks in

coordination with the Civil Court Administrator a monthly review of cases for inactivity. This process ensures that cases progress to their conclusion in a timely manner.

ESTATE AND GUARDIANSHIP STATISTICS

ORPHANS' COURT ESTATES	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	101	114	110	103	117
New cases	278	267	244	243	219
Cases Disposed	265	271	251	229	226
End of Year Balance of Cases	114	110	103	117	110

ORPHANS' COURT GUARDIAN	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	69	80	83	85	57	48
New cases	72	85	67	88	69	73
Cases Disposed	61	82	65	116	78	74
End of Year Balance of Cases	80	83	85	57	48	47

The Estate and Guardianship statistics have remained fairly consistent over the past five years.

CRIMINAL COURT:

- Judge Debra A. Pezze**
- Judge Rita D. Hathaway**
- Judge Christopher A. Feliciani**
- Judge Meagan Bilik-DeFazio**

Judges assigned to hear criminal matters are scheduled cases geographically. Trial-ready cases are assigned from a pool of available cases. Homicides are assigned individually on a rotational basis. Court arraignments, and fast track pleas and ARD's are scheduled by the magisterial district judges. Other events are scheduled by the court administrator.

CRIMINAL COURT STATISTICS

CRIMINAL FILINGS	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
New cases bound over to C.P.	4882	5013	5219	5815	5893
Fast Track Pleas and ARDs Disposed	3538	2367	3372	3966	3914
Fast Track DUIs Scheduled	568	575	569	643	790

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Jury Trial	31	34	20	22	31
Non-Jury Trial	23	27	19	32	28
Guilty Plea	3464	3548	3585	4177	3923
Dismissal Rule 586	30	38	63	60	56
Dismissed	106	128	128	118	120
Dismissed Speedy Trial	1	0	1	2	0
Nolle Pros	266	241	169	176	154
ARD	806	1027	975	1239	867
Declared Inactive	415	430	444	603	671
Other/Uncategorized Dispositions ¹	470	67	63	35	160
Summary Appeals Disposed	484	498	590	495	511
Total Cases Disposed	5661	5540	5467	5866	5420
End of Year Cases Pending	1997	2241	2505	2439	2899

In the face of a minimal increase in filings, the number of cases pending at the end of the year increased minimally over the 5 year period between 2011 and 2015. There has also been a shift in dispositions away from trials and relying more heavily on negotiated pleas.

¹ “Uncategorized” dispositions are cases that have been disposed where there has been a case processing error in categorizing the disposition. For report and caseload purposes, these cases are disposed and are no longer included in the pending Common Pleas criminal caseload.

COLLECTIONS

The Clerk of Courts is responsible in Westmoreland County for collecting Restitution, Fines, Fees, Costs, and other revenues associated with criminal cases. The following table includes most collections by the Clerk of Courts in 2014 and 2015.

CLERK OF COURTS' COLLECTIONS

	2014	2015
Restitution	1,196,238	1,326,901
Fines	462,389	564,209
Electronic Monitoring Fees	564,904	570,532
Supervision Fees (State)	552,445	604,514
Supervision Fees (County)	536,172	699,979
ARD Fees	188,357	192,298
Drug Education Fee	107,695	123,781
Sheriff Costs	30,307	34,120
MDJ Costs	71,829	76,474
Constable Costs	11,521	4,490
Appeals	20,028	20,512
Local Computer Surcharge Fee	14,702	14,962
Judgment Filing Fee	29,001	38,980
Expungements	17,017	17,355
Licenses	5,963	4,200
Pre-Trial Services Fees	12,248	6,933
Judgment Satisfactions	6,493	8,250
Extradition Fees	4,672	6,831
Juvenile EM Fees	3,596	2,477
District Attorney Costs	1,510	1,267
Witness Fees	1,318	1,738
Miscellaneous Revenues	3,496	2,999
Interest	0	1.40
Record Checks	642	1,027
Domestic Violence Fee	508	386
TOTAL COLLECTIONS	3,843,051	4,325,223

A Committee, under the Criminal Justice Advisory Board, Chaired by Bryan Kline, the Westmoreland County Clerk of Courts, recommended a program to improve collections. Collection hearings were held monthly in 2015. The increased emphasis on collection has resulted in a significant increase in overall collections and specifically in the area of restitution.

FAMILY COURT

Judge Michele G. Bononi
Judge Chris Scherer
Judge Harry F. Smail, Jr.
Senior Judge John J. Driscoll

2015 Family Court Assignments included the following: Judge Bononi heard delinquency cases; Judges Scherer and Smail heard dependency, termination of parental rights, and adoptions; Judge Smail and Sr. Judge Driscoll heard Protection From Abuse matters; and all Family Assignment Judges, including Senior Judge Driscoll, heard divorce, child custody, and child support matters. Westmoreland County employs a one-judge/one-family assignment system for divorce, child custody, and child support matters. Cases are assigned alphabetically based on the defendant's last name. Dependency cases heard by a Master are assigned to a judge based on the last name of the oldest child on the petition. The following was the alphabetical distributions for divorce, custody, support, and adoption matters:

A – Fa	Judge Scherer
Fb – K	Judge Bononi
L-Ri	Judge Smail
Rj – Z	Senior Judge Driscoll

Family Court hearings are scheduled by a variety of departments: delinquency cases by the juvenile probation department; abuse, neglect, and juvenile status offenses by the children's bureau; termination of parental rights and adoptions by the court administrator; child support hearings by the domestic relations section and chambers; and custody hearings by the court administrator and judicial chambers. In addition to judges, the family court uses a variety of masters, hearing officers, and conciliators. The court will also appoint private counsel as divorce masters when requested. The following are key family court statistics:

FAMILY COURT DELINQUENCY	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	91	125	127	148	159
New cases	532	514	502	499	462
Cases Disposed	498	512	481	488	481
End of Year Balance of Cases	125	127	148	159	140

The above figures show that the numbers of new and disposed delinquency cases have stayed relatively constant in the past 5 years. The delinquency caseload is managed through the state common pleas case management system (CPCMS) with a delinquency module that was

rolled out in early 2014 to counties. This allows for standardized tracking and processing of the delinquency caseload.

FAMILY COURT – DEPENDENCY (ABUSE & NEGLECT)	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	6	32	12	4	8
New cases	201	149	153	134	157
Cases Disposed	180	169	161	130	151
End of Year Balance (cases)	27	12	4	8	14

FAMILY COURT – DEPENDENCY (STATUS OFFENSES ²)	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	0	9	7	1	22
New cases	52	39	50	59	46
Cases Disposed	48	41	56	38	60
End of Year Balance of Cases	4	7	1	22	8

FAMILY COURT – DIVORCE	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	3433	2644	2700	2770	2766
New cases	1041	1002	970	906	1013
Cases Disposed	1830	946	900	910	934
End of Year Balance of Cases	2644	2700	2770	2766	2845

FAMILY COURT – CUSTODY	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	682	745	767	847	367
New cases	1243	1371	1383	1161	957
Cases Disposed	1180	1349	1303	1641	977
End of Year Balance of Cases	745	767	847	367	347

All disputed custody claims first pass through a custody conciliator who prepares either a consent or temporary order. Appeals are scheduled for a judicial conference. The judge schedules any custody matter not resolved at the judicial conference for a bench trial We

² Status offenses include truancy and incorrigibility.

schedule "Pro Se Days" to screen and provide conciliation to self-represented litigants. Pro Se Day provides more scheduling certainty and resolves cases proceeding without attorneys.

FAMILY COURT – PROTECTION FROM ABUSE	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	158	40	5	41	133
New cases	860	976	928	832	810
Cases Disposed	978	1011	892	740	843
End of Year Balance of Cases	40	5	41	133	100

Besides temporary orders, permanent orders, and indirect criminal contempt proceedings presided over by a common pleas judge, protection from abuse can also involve emergency action before a magisterial district judge. Protection from abuse cases were heard in 2015 by Judge Smail and Senior Judge Driscoll. New case filings have remained consistently in the upper 800-900 case range. The AOPC PFA report generated by the Prothonotary's JEMs computer system has resulted in greater accountability in caseload statistics.

ORPHANS' COURT – TERMINATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	59	49	55	48	59
New cases	178	232	212	171	166
Cases Disposed	188	226	219	160	126
End of Year Balance of Cases	49	55	48	59	99

ORPHANS' COURT – ADOPTIONS	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	21	6	15	10	9
New cases	125	149	144	99	109
Cases Disposed	140	140	149	100	107
End of Year Balance of Cases	6	15	10	9	11

COURT AND COURT ADMINISTRATOR BUDGET

Most revenues generated by the court, such as fines, costs, and fees pass through and are accounted in the court's records 'offices. The following are the combined expenses and revenues attributable to the court and court administrator's office cost centers for the past five years.

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
EXPENSES	\$5,372,275	5,581,590	5,683,624	5,765,638.63	
REVENUES	\$968,258	1,029,917	1,083,432	1,109,816.73	
NET COST	4,404,017	4,551,673	4,600,192	4,655,821.90	

CRIMINAL JUSTICE ADVISORY BOARD

Currently chaired by Judge Debra Pezze, the Board membership includes each common pleas criminal and juvenile assignment judge, each county commissioner, the district attorney, the sheriff, the chair of the county's magisterial district judge association, the public defender, the district court administrator, the deputy court administrator, the special courts administrator, the chief probation officer, representatives of service providers, the president of the county's chief of police association, the JNET point of contact, county information representatives, service providers, representatives from the University of Pittsburgh (Greensburg), and various others. The CJAB operates under adopted bylaws, and maintains an operational plan. CJAB meets quarterly and operates through various subcommittees. CJAB has recently accomplished a goal of expanding electronic booking to transmit defendants' identification to the Pennsylvania State Police Central Repository. The committee's goal was to improve the identification process in order to increase officer safety and to ensure compliance with Pennsylvania law.

**WESTMORELAND COUNTY
ADULT PROBATION AND PAROLE DEPARTMENT
2015 ANNUAL REPORT**

President Judge:	Honorable Richard E. McCormick, Jr.
Administrative Judge:	Honorable Debra A. Pezze
Chief:	Sharon L. Bold
Deputy Chief:	Eric Alwine

RESPONSIBILITIES

The Westmoreland County Adult Probation and Parole Department is a department of the County Court of Common Pleas (Tenth Judicial District). The Chief Probation Officer is appointed by and responsible to the President Judge, the Administrative Judge, and administratively to the District Court Administrator. As Chief, she is charged with the operation of the department. The Deputy Chief and Supervisors help manage the operation and have primary responsibility for training. Probation Officers have the major responsibility of carrying out the day-to-day activities to meet the department's mission. Support staff provides clerical support for all activities. In 2015, the Westmoreland County Adult Probation/Parole Office consisted of eighty five (85) full-time employees. More specifically, in addition to the Chief and Deputy Chief, there were eight (8) Supervisors, one (1) Office Supervisor, one (1) Fiscal Assistant, twenty nine (29) Probation Officer IIs, twenty four (24) Probation Officer Is, twelve (12) Probation Officer Aides, six (6) Legal Secretaries and two (2) Department Clerks. As of December 31, 2015, the total number of offenders under the supervision of the Westmoreland County Adult Probation/Parole Office was 7,981. Of that total, 5,760 were male and 2,221 were female.

Adult Probation Officers are responsible for the following:

- Supervising ARD, Probation Without Verdict (PWV), probation, parole, Intermediate Punishment and pretrial cases.
- Conducting investigations and reports, such as: pre-sentence investigations, sentencing guideline computations, parole applications, Intermediate Punishment and pretrial assessments, and violation reports.
- Aid in sentencing and release decisions.
- Issuing conditions of supervision.
- Conducting risk and needs assessments and developing case plans.
- Monitoring and facilitating compliance with the conditions of supervision.
- Making referrals for evaluation, treatment, employment, and education.
- Preparing victim impact statements in pre-sentence investigations.
- Enforcing the collection of restitution, fees, fines, and costs.
- Providing for DNA and Megan's Law registration.
- Responding to complaints and requests for assistance and information.

SERVICES/SUPERVISION TYPES/PROGRAMS

1. Pre-sentence Investigations and Sentencing Guidelines
2. ARD, PWV, Probation and Parole Supervision
3. Administrative Cases
4. Intermediate Punishment (including electronic monitoring)
5. Pretrial Services and Institutional Parole Program
6. Day Reporting Center
7. Megan's Law Registration
8. Drug Treatment Court
9. Alcohol Highway Safety School (AHSS)

PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATIONS AND SENTENCING GUIDELINES

A presentence investigation report (PSI) includes the following: information regarding the circumstances of the offense; the defendant's prior criminal history; the defendant's family and marital history; education and employment information; drug and alcohol history; emotional and physical health status; financial information, and; a victim impact statement. Eighty nine (89) presentence investigations were ordered by the Court in 2015.

The sentencing judge is required to consider the sentencing guidelines in determining the appropriate sentence for offenders convicted of felonies and misdemeanors. During 2015, 4,111 sentencing guideline requests were received from the District Attorney's Office. All sentences were reported electronically to the Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing via SGS Web.

ARD, PWV, PROBATION AND PAROLE SUPERVISION

2015 STATISTICS

TYPES OF CASELOADS	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS
ARD	1095
General Field – North Region	657
General Field – South Region	614
General Field – East Region	783
General Field – West Region	707
General Field – Central Region	600
Sex Offenders	101
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENDERS	4557

As of December 31, 2015, there were 1,044 offenders in Bench Warrant status.

2015 OFFENDER REPORTING

Report Place	In Person	By Mail	Pretrial	TOTAL
Main Office	7,339	11,374	1,136	19,849
DRC (Greensburg)	12,414	0	0	12,414
New Ken. Sub-Office	3,608	0	416	4,024
Monessen Sub-Office	1,809	0	169	1,978
TOTALS	25,170	11,374	1,721	38,265

2015 EXPUNGEMENTS

ARD	457
PWV	126
TOTAL	583

2015 EARLY RELEASES

ARD	183
PWV	10
IP	37
TOTAL	230

2015 DRUG TESTING

Location	Drug Tests Conducted
DRC and RIP/ATS	6,500
Field	1,213
Greensburg (Main Office)	1,774
Monessen Sub-Office	512
New Kensington Sub-Office	1,016
Westmoreland County Prison	27
Pretrial	399
TOTAL	11,441

Adult Probation also conducted 374 drug tests for Family Court.

DNA TESTING

Offenders incarcerated or under supervision for felonies and other specified offenses are required to provide a DNA sample prior to release from prison or county supervision.

DNA Samples Drawn	2015
Adult Probation Office	195
County Prison	91
Field	0
New Kensington Sub-office	42
Monessen Sub-office	10
DRC	0
Total	338

ADMINISTRATIVE CASES

The administrative unit supervises offenders who are sentenced in Westmoreland County but reside in other counties or states. Felony and some misdemeanor cases may be transferred to other states through the interstate compact, but ARD cases cannot be transferred to another state. Felony and misdemeanor cases may be transferred to other counties through the inter-county transfer process with the approval of the receiving county. (ARD cases are not transferred to other counties.) The number of active administrative cases as of December 31, 2015 was 1,950.

2015 TRANSFER CASES

New Cases Transferred to County of Residence	566
New Cases Transferred to State of Residence	4

2015 CO-OP CASES

Requests Received to Supervise Cases from Other Counties	405
---	------------

COUNTIES MAKING THE MOST REQUESTS:

Allegheny	169
Fayette	40
Washington	40
Indiana	34
Armstrong	18

INTERMEDIATE PUNISHMENT

Intermediate Punishment (IP) is a community-based sentencing alternative available to the court for eligible offenders who would otherwise be sentenced to confinement in a county correctional facility. Most offenders sentenced to Intermediate Punishment are ordered to serve a period of time on electronic monitoring. In 2015, the equipment used to monitor those offenders was leased or rented through BI, Incorporated.

2015 INTERMEDIATE PUNISHMENT SUMMARY

Number of Offenders Placed on Electronic Monitoring as a Result of Direct Sentences to IP, Sentences of Intensive Supervision with Electronic Monitoring and Parole/ Re-parole to Electronic Monitoring.	637
Number of Offenders who were Ineligible for IP	48
Average Length of Stay on Electronic Monitoring (Days)	107
Number of IP Cases Transferred to Other Counties for Supervision	73
Number of Offenders who Successfully Completed Electronic Monitoring	645
Number of Offenders who were Unsuccessfully Discharged from Electronic Monitoring	61
Total Jail Days Saved	65,396
Electronic Monitoring Fees Collected	\$627,459.60

IP PROGRAM TRENDS

	2012	2013	2014	2015
Pending	155	140	148	183
Average Length of Stay (Days)	145	144	141	107
Number of Offenders Placed on Electronic Monitoring	660	643	656	637
Average Total Caseload	386	394	328	285
Monthly Average – Electronic Monitoring Cases	267	251	223	261

RESTRICTIVE INTERMEDIATE PUNISHMENT ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT SERVICES PROGRAM (RIP/ATS)

The RIP/ATS Program provides a sentencing alternative for the Court for offenders who would otherwise be sentenced to the county jail or state prison under Levels 3 and 4 of the Sentencing Guidelines. Offenders, who are placed on house arrest with electronic monitoring, undergo intensive treatment while involved in a partial hospitalization program. After completing the partial program, Offenders receive intensive outpatient therapy (and other services) through the Day Reporting Center.

RIP/ATS SUMMARY

	2012	2013	2014	2015
Sentenced to RIP/ATS	19	24	17	9
Successful Completions	27	12	16	5
Unsuccessful Discharges/Revocations	4	6	3	2
Total Jail Days Saved	3,846	2,886	2,948	941

2015 OVERALL STATISTICS

3,384 new offenders and 4,250 new cases were added to Adult Probation's system during the 2015 calendar year. During that same time period, 3,682 offenders were released from supervision.

2015	NEW OFFENDERS	NEW CASES	← Program of these new cases.						RELEASED OFFENDERS
			ARD	INC	PAR	PRO	PWV	IP	
JAN	309	377	96	19	54	134	23	51	362
FEB	212	275	54	25	30	107	17	42	226
MAR	291	395	74	35	54	168	29	35	320
APR	311	387	94	27	43	165	29	29	359
MAY	259	324	84	33	38	120	12	37	297
JUN	275	351	80	34	41	146	21	29	268
JUL	297	373	77	26	44	166	22	38	299
AUG	253	336	86	17	51	135	16	31	294
SEP	311	368	85	29	30	155	22	47	298
OCT-NOV	555	682	161	46	79	263	44	89	588
DEC	311	382	80	17	46	163	28	48	371
TOTALS:	3384	4250	971	308	510	1722	263	476	3682

VIOLATIONS FILED IN 2015

ARD Violations Filed	743
Probation, Parole and Intermediate Punishment Violations Filed	4443
TOTAL	5186

OFFENDER REFERRALS FOR TREATMENT

Most referrals for treatment and human services are made to the following:

Referral Type	Number of Referrals in 2015
Drug and Alcohol	4128
Alcohol Highway Safety School	2629
Mental Health	525
Community Service	39

PRETRIAL SERVICES AND INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE PROGRAM

Pretrial cases involve offenders released on bail. Approximately three-fourths of all pretrial cases are supervised by one Probation Officer II. Some pretrial cases that include electronic monitoring are supervised by Intermediate Punishment Officers and the remaining one-fourth of the pretrial cases are supervised by general Probation Officers throughout the office because the offender already has existing cases.

Westmoreland County Adult Probation has one Institutional Parole Officer who is responsible for verifying parole release plans, processing parole applications, investigating requests for re-parole, and coordinating the placement of inmates into inpatient drug and alcohol treatment.

PRETRIAL SUMMARY

	2013	2014	2015
Average Monthly Caseload – Non Electronic Monitoring	145	168	166
Average Monthly Caseload – Electronic Monitoring	24	27	35
New Pretrial Cases Received – Electronic Monitoring and Non Electronic Monitoring	253	258	293
Pretrial Electronic Monitoring Fees Collected	\$12,244.54	\$12,244.68	\$6,965.00

INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE OFFICER STATISTICS

	2013	2014	2015
Parole Applications Processed/Release Plans Verified	266	258	201
Re-Parole Investigations/Special Investigations	90	148	33
Inpatient Drug and Alcohol Evaluations and Treatment Coordination	198	91	254
Nominal Bond Investigations	44	63	62

DRIVING UNDER SUSPENSION – 1543(b)

2015 DRIVING UNDER SUSPENSION (DUS) SUMMARY

Number of Offenders Sentenced to IP for DUS	104
Number of Offenders Placed on Electronic Monitoring for DUS	74
Number of Offenders found Ineligible	8
Number of Offenders on the Pending List as of 12-31-15	22

DAY REPORTING CENTER

The Day Reporting Center (DRC) is a joint effort between the Westmoreland County Adult Probation Office and SPHS Behavioral Health. The DRC is located at 203 South Maple Avenue in Greensburg, Pennsylvania. Eligible individuals are those who are involved with the Westmoreland County Court System and the Westmoreland County Adult Probation Office. Furthermore, individuals must be at least eighteen years old and have a substance abuse, mental health or co-occurring disorder.

In 2015, the DRC was staffed by two full-time Probation Officer IIs and two Probation Officer Aides. Also on site was one full-time Deputy Sheriff. SPHS staff included one Supervisor to oversee the DRC, several therapists and one case manager. The canine officer from the Westmoreland County Sheriff's Office continued to conduct random searches of the DRC.

Probation staff provided intensive supervision and monitoring. The Officers and Aides conducted random but frequent drug tests, breathalyzer tests and offender searches. The Deputy Sheriff focused on safety and surveillance. It should be noted that in addition to on-going drug/alcohol treatment and mental health counseling, some support services such as life skills, parenting classes and employment continued.

2015 STATISTICS

Number of Individuals Admitted into the Program	205
Number of Successful Completions	167
Number of Unsuccessful Completions	136

MEGAN’S LAW REGISTRATION

The Westmoreland County Adult Probation and Parole Office is an official Megan’s Law registration site.

2015 STATISTICS

New Registrations	26
In person appearances to update information	107
In person appearances to verify information	199

WESTMORELAND COUNTY DRUG TREATMENT COURT

The Westmoreland County Drug Treatment Court started accepting referrals on September 28, 2015. Drug Treatment Court is an eighteen month program during which time participants are involved with treatment professionals, undergo intensive supervision and attend bi-weekly court appearances before Drug Treatment Court Judge Meagan Bilik-DeFazio or Drug Treatment Court Judge Christopher A. Feliciani. There are three ways to enter Drug Treatment Court – Diversion, Intermediate Punishment or Re-entry. One Supervisor in the Adult Probation Office handles the duties of Drug Treatment Court Coordinator and two Probation Officer IIs supervise the participants in Drug Court. During the last three months of 2015, there were 43 referrals and 16 individuals admitted into Drug Court. Nine of those individuals are female and seven are male.

ALCOHOL HIGHWAY SAFETY SCHOOL

Since July 2013, Alcohol Highway Safety School (AHSS) has operated out of the Westmoreland County Adult Probation Office. The fee for each AHSS class cycle is \$300.00.

AHSS SUMMARY

	2014	2015
Number of Alcohol Highway Safety School Class Cycles	43	40
Number of Offenders who Completed Classes	958	970
Total AHSS Fees Collected (this Includes Individuals who Paid in Advance and have yet to Enroll/Complete Classes)	\$291,905.40	\$293,628.45
Instructor Wages Paid	\$39,167.04	\$35,641.00
Net Revenue	\$240,478.71	\$249,675.46

BUDGET EXPENSES AND REVENUES

EXPENSES

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Personnel, Fringes	\$4,902,480.60	\$5,048,331.10	\$5,379,411.84	\$5,430,574.95	\$5,396,371.97
Operating Expenses	\$1,205,235.24	\$1,235,220.53	\$1,186,434.27	\$1,444,499.58	\$999,246.71
Capital	\$31,823.53	\$28,409.80	\$26,188.37	\$23,118.26	\$1,609.00
TOTAL	\$6,139,539.37	\$6,311,961.43	\$6,592,034.48	\$6,898,192.79	\$6,397,227.68

REVENUES

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Grant-In-Aid	\$576,184	\$564,500	\$522,363	\$512,603	\$520,000
Supervision Fees	\$840,071	\$968,774	\$991,161	\$1,072,855	\$1,245,729
Electronic Monitoring Fees	\$544,646	\$657,580	\$622,660	\$642,762	\$634,424
Grant (IP, RIP/ATS, DRC)	\$133,254	\$187,563	\$207,864	\$200,726	\$208,912
ARD Administrative Fees	\$47,984	\$50,137	\$50,911	\$58,705	\$54,216
AHSS	0	0	\$51,797	\$240,478	\$249,675
Miscellaneous	0	\$8,502	\$291	\$1,330	\$496
TOTALS	\$2,142,139	\$2,437,056	\$2,447,047	\$2,729,459	\$2,393,972

ELECTRONIC MONITORING FEES

During the past 5 years, Adult Probation has collected and turned over to the county \$3,102,072.00 in electronic monitoring fees.

SUPERVISION FEES

Legislation requires 50% of the offender supervision fees to be deposited in a County Supervision Fee Fund under the control of the President Judge and 50% to be forwarded to the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole. It has been the policy of the Pennsylvania Board to return to each county the exact amount that has been deposited in the State Supervision Fee Fund for that county. It has been the policy of the Westmoreland County Court to transfer all money under the control of the President Judge to the county's general fund to offset the cost of running the department. Westmoreland has been one of only a few counties which turn over 100% of supervision fees to the general fund.

It should be noted that on May 1, 2013, offender supervision fees were increased from \$35.00 per month to \$40.00 per month. Also, in December 2013 an order was signed to increase supervision fees to \$45.00 per month effective January 1, 2014. The fees remain at \$45.00 per month.

5-YEAR SUMMARY OF SUPERVISION FEE COLLECTIONS AND DISBURSEMENT

Total Supervision Fees Collected				
2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
\$840,071.12	\$968,773.67	\$991,161.59	\$1,072,855.68	\$1,245,729.10

County Portion of Supervision Fees Transferred to County General Fund				
\$452,027.61	\$484,141.22	\$497,636.71	\$536,172.26	\$625,012.62

State Portion of Supervision Fees Returned to County General Fund				
\$463,148.50	\$471,706.11	\$493,524.88	\$536,683.42	\$620,716.48

In Summary, during the past 5 years, \$5,118,591.16 in supervision fees was collected. During the same time period, the President Judge released \$2,594,990.42 to the county general fund and the state returned \$2,585,779.39 to the county general fund for a total of \$5,180,769.81 released to the general fund.

NOTE: According to Warden John Walton, in 2015, Westmoreland County earned \$6,721.10 in revenue by renting out space to other facilities at a per diem rate of \$79.50. The space was available as a result of offenders being placed on electronic monitoring, those ordered to the Day Reporting Center, those involved in Drug Treatment Court and other sentencing alternatives.

**WESTMORELAND COUNTY JUVENILE PROBATION
DEPARTMENT**

President Judge:	Honorable Richard E. McCormick, Jr.
Administrative Judge:	Honorable Michele G. Bononi
Judge:	Honorable Scott O. Mears
Master:	John Casario, Esq.
Master:	Monique Mears, Esq.
Department Head:	Adeline Beighley, MSAJ

MISSION

To provide supervision and rehabilitation to youth and families while providing Community Protection, Victim Restoration and Youth Redemption

VISION

We will strive to reduce harm and in doing so will continuously work to create safer and stronger communities, fewer victims, reduce delinquency rates, and improve confidence in the juvenile justice system. We will enhance our juvenile justice system by employing evidence-based practices, collecting and analyzing data to measure these efforts and using the data to continuously improve the quality and cost-effectiveness of the system.

PENNSYLVANIA’S JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

The state’s Juvenile Justice System is governed in its operations by the “Balanced and Restorative Justice” (BARJ) principles adopted through Act 33. At the foundation of this philosophy is the concept that crime victims and the community, as well as juvenile offenders, should receive balanced attention and gain tangible benefits from their interactions with Pennsylvania’s Juvenile Justice System.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

COMMUNITY PROTECTION refers to the right of all Pennsylvania citizens to be and feel safe from crime.

ACCOUNTABILITY emphasizes that, in Pennsylvania, a juvenile who commits a crime harms both the victim of the crime and the community, and thereby incurs an obligation to repair that harm to the greatest extent possible.

COMPETENCY DEVELOPMENT embodies the belief that juvenile offenders in Pennsylvania have strengths, are capable of change, can earn redemption, and can become responsible and productive members of their communities.

BALANCE as appropriate to each individual case, the juvenile justice system should provide balanced attention to the protection of the community, the imposition for accountability for offenses committed, and the development of competencies to enable juveniles to become responsible and productive members of their communities.

2015 OVERVIEW

DAILY OPERATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT

The Westmoreland County Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) accepts delinquent juvenile complaints, and works with children between the ages of ten to eighteen years who are charged with committing a delinquent act.

Once a youth enters the juvenile system, the JPD may be involved with the youth until the age of twenty-one. While the court determines guilt or innocence and then establishes the sanction, it is the responsibility of the JPD to protect the community, develop the offender's competencies, and to assist the victim through the process of restoration. In Westmoreland County, the daily operation of the JPD includes Intake, traditional Probation, School-Based Probation, Community-Based Probation, Aftercare/Reintegration and the Youth Commission Program.

REFERRALS TO JUVENILE COURT

The JPD is responsible for allegations of juvenile delinquency. Police, parents, juvenile probation officers, magisterial district judges, and other courts may file charges through the Intake Unit.

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total Referrals	715	655	687	686	645
Delinquency Placements	88	85	61	65	108
Total Placements	88	85	61	65	108
Total Dispositions	2153	2340	2186	2167	2131

COURT ACTIVITY

A master or judge hears juvenile charges. The court adjudicates delinquency and orders the disposition. Court hearings are held each week either by a master at the juvenile center or by a judge at the courthouse.

When a youth is placed in the Juvenile Detention Center, the intake officer schedules a detention hearing within 72 hours. The youth may either remain in the detention center or be released. If the youth is detained, the officer must file a petition within twenty-four hours. After filing the petition, the case is assigned to a probation officer. The adjudication hearing must occur within ten days of the filing of the petition.

Once a delinquent complaint is filed on a juvenile that is not detained, a hearing is scheduled. A hearing is heard approximately 12 weeks from filing. If the youth is adjudicated “delinquent” the court determines the disposition.

JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total No. of Hearings before Judges	522	642	684	708	600
Total No. of Hearings before Masters	556	1099	949	938	983
TOTAL	1,078	1741	1633	1746	1283

SECURE JUVENILE DETENTION

When it is necessary to protect the community from the juvenile, the youth is placed in the Juvenile Detention Center. The JPD’s intake staff is available twenty-four hours a day to accept youths referred to detention. 152 children were detained in the Juvenile Detention Center in 2015. The average length of stay was 20.9 days. The following is a breakdown by race, age and gender and a 10 year comparison of juveniles detained each year.

DETAINED IN 2015 BY RACE (152)													
WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		BIRACIAL		OTHER		NATIVE AMERICAN		ASIAN	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
71	14	38	9	1	0	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0

DETAINED IN 2015 BY AGE (152)										
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	OTHER	
0	0	1	2	17	22	30	35	28	17	

10 YEAR COMPARISON									
2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
303	309	317	266	239	214	208	196	202	152

The average length of stay was 20.9 days.

EMERGENCY SHELTER

The Emergency Shelter is used as a least restrictive alternative to juvenile detention. The following is statistical information for 2015:

DETAINED IN 2015 BY RACE (111)													
WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		BIRACIAL		OTHER		NATIVE AMERICAN		ASIAN	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
50	39	6	4	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0

DETAINED IN 2015 BY AGE (111)										
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	OTHER	
0	1	5	10	14	17	30	26	6	2	

10 YEAR COMPARISON									
2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
-	-	-	-	-	78	115	109	90	111

The average length of stay was 22.3 days.

JUVENILE JUSTICE GOALS

1. **Community Protection:** refers to the right of all Pennsylvania citizens to be and feel safe from crime.

Of the cases closed in 2015:

- 83% of Juvenile Offenders Successfully Completed Supervision
- 79% Complied with their Conditions of Supervision

2. **Accountability:** emphasizes that a delinquent harms both the victim and the community, and thereby incurs an obligation to repair that harm to the greatest extent possible.

Of the cases closed in 2015:

- 96 % of juveniles completed assigned community service obligations
- 5,919 hours of community service were completed
- \$29,838.44 of restitution was paid to victims
- 93% of juveniles made full restitution to their victim(s)

Advancing accountability requires purposeful attention to offender participation in a process whereby juvenile offenders understand and acknowledge:

- The wrongfulness of their actions
- The impact of the crime on the crime victim and the community
- Their responsibility for causing harm

In addition to helping juvenile offenders understand and take action to repair the harm, the JPD has responsibilities to victims including: upholding victims' rights, supplying accurate and timely information, and treating victims with dignity and respect.

- Victim Impact Statements and Victim/Community Awareness Curriculum are tools for increasing awareness and understanding.
- Juvenile offender apologies, crime victims' compensation fund, restitution, meaningful community service, and restorative justice practices are activities that repair harm.

3. **Competency Development:** embodies the belief that juvenile offenders in Pennsylvania have strengths, are capable of change, can earn redemption, and can become responsible and productive members of their communities.

Of the cases closed in 2015:

- 86% of juveniles were employed or in an educational or vocational activity
- 99% of juveniles successfully completed a competency development activity

PROGRAMS

COMMUNITY BASED MONITORING AND RESTORATION PROGRAM

The CBMR program has a capacity of 50 clients and is supervised by two juvenile probation officers. One officer is always on-call for immediate notifications of violations. Since the inception of the program, 863 referrals have been made to the CBMR Program including 22 in 2015. Client referrals can be made at pre-adjudication, pre-disposition, or disposition stages.

Typically pre-adjudication referrals arise from a detention hearing. In that event, the clients are transported home from detention and placed on electronic monitoring until further hearing. Referrals can also be made between the adjudication and dispositional hearings. In those cases, the clients are placed on electronic monitoring pending final disposition. In these pre-dispositional cases, the case is usually shared between the CBMR and referring officers.

Clients who are ordered to complete CBMR as a condition of probation are all transferred to the CBMR caseload. They are all placed on electronic monitoring, and unless otherwise ordered by the Court, will remain on monitoring for a minimum of 60 days. CBMR officers make regular contacts to make sure the juveniles are being compliant with monitoring, and all other conditions of their court order. Drug testing is conducted frequently, and clients must pass drug screens to have the electronic monitor removed.

Goals and objectives of the program include: providing an alternative for disposition other than placement, reductions of clients in detention, cost reduction, improved academic performance, and an increase in employment.

COMMUNITY-BASED PROBATION

A community-based officer is stationed at our satellite office in New Kensington, PA. This officer develops effective working relationships with community leaders, law enforcement, victim services, businesses, community agencies, churches and schools. In addition, intake interviews are also conducted at this location. The sub office is used by several probation officers on a regular basis.

The basis of the work for this position follows the JCJC Standard for Community Liaison Model. As such, this officer chairs the Community Involvement Workgroup. This workgroup is assisting the department to grow in a more community centered approach to probation work, and is enhancing our Service Matrix with local community resources including agencies and community groups, that families can access when probation services are ended. In addition to community services for specific issues like housing, workforce development, clothing and food, the Juvenile Probation Department is also developing a compendium of natural community supports for families and individuals such as recreational groups, churches and civic organizations. This enhances not only work with individuals living at home, but strengthens the network available to those youth who are reintegrating into the community from placement.

Additionally, this group is deeply involved in the work with Bridges out of Poverty, and the Circles® Initiative operated by Westmoreland Community Action. The department has been instrumental in not only the startup site in Jeannette, but also in the development of two of three additional sites in the New Kensington and Latrobe areas.

Further, this officer promotes restorative practices by conducting peace circles and wisdom circles by invitation and by request around the county. The most notable group has been a peace circle conducted at the JAYS afterschool program in Jeannette for the past 9 years.

Recognizing the impact of behavioral health of clients (sometimes including victims, families, and juveniles) within the juvenile justice system, we have worked with the Criminal Justice Advisory Board (CJAB) since 2006 to bring Crisis Intervention Training to law enforcement here in the county. This training was conducted in 2013 and was successful. It included several law enforcement agencies.

Goals for the upcoming year are:

- Continue to develop the Service Matrix
- Develop partnerships with more institutions of higher education and help probationers obtain training in areas where jobs are available
- Develop partnerships with employers who are willing to apprentice or sponsor probationers
- With CJAB expand training for CIT (this also applies to the PTSD position)

Further, in keeping with the current research in juvenile justice, the School Based Officers have been designated as Community Based Officers/Community Supervision Model and they will continue to service victims, juveniles, and families in the community.

COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK

One Juvenile Probation Officer coordinates this program and provides juvenile offenders the opportunity to perform meaningful community service work for the benefit of their community, to hold the child accountable for their actions, and to increase competency development skills. The program provides needed services to 100 non-profit organizations and local governmental agencies where the juvenile lives and commits the offense. It furnishes a tangible consequence to probation, and a possible alternative to restitution and fines. Juveniles are ordered into this program.

Community Service Work Data					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Male Youth Assigned Community Service Work	161	174	191	204	208
Female Youth Assigned Community Service Work	52	47	58	60	75
Total Assigned	213	221	249	264	283

Total Hours Worked in Communities		
Total Hours Worked in Communities	Year	Hours
	2011	7,474
	2012	6,983
	2013	8,823
	2014	7,457
	2015	6,760
Total		37,497

VICTIM SERVICES

In May of 2012, the Juvenile Office enhanced its services by adding a Juvenile Court Victim Advocate to its staff component. This position serves to orient the victim to the work and objectives of the juvenile justice system. The advocate encourages the victim's input and concerns as their case is addressed by the juvenile court master and moves through the system.

In the past, victims did not appear at the juvenile's Detention Hearing; now they are invited to attend. In regard to Pre-Adjudication Conferences, it is helpful for the Juvenile Court Victim Advocate to speak with the victims prior to the Conference to obtain input from the victim in regards to: community service work, restitution, and having contact in the future. Victims are often asked whether they would object to having the charges reduced to a lesser offense and if they are not in agreement, this must be taken into consideration at the time of the hearing. With the victim's consent, the juvenile is often given the opportunity to be placed on a Consent Decree.

When the cases are scheduled before the court master, the Juvenile Court Victim Advocate escorts the victims to the Victim Waiting Room where they can discuss the case, their role in the hearing, and clarify uncertainties. In the court room, the Advocate accompanies the victim for support during the proceeding.

If a juvenile is placed outside of the home in a juvenile facility, the victim is empowered by having the option to receive regular notification of the juvenile's progress, when releases are being considered for a home pass, and when the juvenile is discharged from custody.

For the past few years there has been much discussion about creating or initiating a Restitution Program. This would be especially helpful for youth who have no monetary resources to restore the victim their losses. This continues to be a goal we wish to achieve.

With the addition of the Juvenile Court Victim Advocate in court master hearings, the victims will have a better understanding of their role in the process and an ongoing opportunity for input.

YOUTH COMMISSIONS

Mission - Our mission is to connect youth and family to community.

Vision – We envision a community where all children and youth have good mentors at every stage of development.

In the 1960s, the first Youth Commission was established in Pennsylvania by the Westmoreland County Juvenile Court. Its original purpose was to allow first time youthful offenders the opportunity to avoid a juvenile court record and encourage community involvement. Based upon the long term success of these efforts, and our commitment to restorative practices, we have expanded the program to include a reintegration component in which the community is instrumental in aiding a youth's successful transition from placement to home, or giving that extra support to a probationer who needs it. We recognize the importance of assisting victims, individuals, and families within their own communities as when the system is gone; community is still present to provide support and direction.

The Youth Commission is comprised of dedicated community volunteers who provide new and better opportunities for youth to learn, readjust, and conform to the laws of our society. It also is charged with helping the youth take responsibility for his/her actions and repair the harm caused to the victims and/or community.

DIVERSION CASES

Youth Commission Volunteers comprise a local diversionary program that is able to closely supervise a first time offender and allow him or her to repair the harms to a victim and community locally while also providing youth the opportunity to avoid fines and a permanent court record.

Crime creates social and spiritual separation from the community. For youth who have created harm in the community, mentoring helps them repair the harm and gain or regain a sense of self-worth and acceptance that allows them to be fully reintegrated into the community.

REINTEGRATION CASES

Youth Commission volunteers will assist the youth in pursuing employments, recreation, and other positive community based activities.

Crime creates social and spiritual separation from the community. For youth who have created harm in the community, mentoring helps them repair the harm and gain or regain a sense of self-worth and acceptance that allows them to be fully reintegrated into the community. This applies to both first time offenders and repeat offenders. In most instances youth remain in the community; however, in a small percentage of cases, it is necessary to place youth outside of the home. Placement creates physical separation of youth from her or his family, school, and community. For youth returning from placement meaningful connections to unpaid community members provides a critical link that allows youth the opportunity to gain trust, understanding, and redemption. The Commission is also positioned to assist families dealing with the struggles associated with a youth's return home. The ultimate goal is to provide the youth and their families a level of service, care, compassion and connection to the community that is conducive to success. This dramatically decreases the opportunities for re-arrest.

Referral Source: Juvenile Court ONLY

- ❖ The Juvenile Court Judge may refer a youth at any time.
- ❖ A Probation Officer may refer a youth at any time after disposition of the case following approval by a Probation Supervisor.

PENNSYLVANIA'S POSTTRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER (PTSD) PROJECT

Westmoreland County has been the demonstration site, and is now the permanent home to Pennsylvania's PTSD Project. This project began as an initiative to bring much needed female centered services to youth being served in the juvenile justice system. The program has since expanded from specialized Residential Treatment Curriculum (RTC) training and providing specialized care within placement agencies, to include PTSD Aftercare services, both provided in partnership with Adelphoi Village. Although the curriculum started out as gender-specific programming for girls, it has been found to be an effective treatment for boys as well. The RTC is currently being updated to include the newest research in the field of trauma, and the new version will be unveiled in the spring of 2016.

Additionally, the PTSD Project provides monthly training opportunities at the Juvenile Service Center in Greensburg, and it also provides on-site training for many placement agencies, juvenile detention centers, other probation offices, schools, and Children and Youth agencies. The PTSD Project offers a variety of one day trainings that address PTSD, mental health issues, stress management for youth, and stress management for professionals. All of our trainings have been updated to include the most current research, as well as to reflect all of the changes from the DSM V. Members of the PTSD Project are also significantly involved in the Southwest

Regional CIT team, which is a group that provides 40 hour training in crisis intervention and mental health issues for local police officers, probation and parole officers, security personnel, and corrections officers. The coordinator of the project, Gary Lewis, also provides a weekly PTSD treatment group at a local group home for girls, and he serves as a board member on the Ray of Hope, which is a task force that works to prevent suicides in Westmoreland County. Gary has been a guest lecturer on numerous occasions at local universities, and he presented the PTSD Signs and Symptoms Training at the 2015 National Symposium for Juvenile Services.

Future goals for the Pennsylvania PTSD Project include:

- Making a new PTSD Training Video
- Complete the newest version of the RTC
- Launch a website that will be home to a distance learning program where people can participate in our trainings online
- Provide a new Booster Training to train RTC therapists on the new version of the curriculum
- Continue to provide regular trainings for professionals and paraprofessionals that serve youth in any capacity
- Continue outreach to community groups and organizations
- Utilize trauma informed care to enhance the services that the juvenile probation department provides to the community
- Initiate research to study the outcomes of the RTC and PTSD Aftercare

REINTEGRATION PROBATION

One of the most critical moments for juveniles placed in residential facilities occurs once they return from placement and attempt to reintegrate into their homes and communities. Often, juveniles who benefit from a controlled, structured environment have difficulties applying their newly acquired skills to real-life situations. Reintegration Probation provides a period of supervision and service delivery to assist youth during this transitional period with the goal of preventing and reducing recidivism. Additionally, youth who have been found delinquent and feel ostracized from the community and have a poor support system may also reduce their risk of recidivism with the structure and assistance of Reintegration Probation.

In addition to monitoring the progress of Court ordered conditions the Reintegration Officers should determine targeted support systems for the juvenile for example; family members, peers, schools, employees or other community members. Reintegration Officers should facilitate interaction and involvement between juveniles and the community. Reintegration Officers should continually identify and develop community resources that assist in the enhancement of the juvenile's strengths. The intent of Reintegration Probation is to offer a higher level of supervision in order to decrease the likelihood of recidivism.

2015 HIGHLIGHTS

A Message from the Director:

The Juvenile Probation Department of Westmoreland County has the unique and critical responsibility of shaping young lives as well as addressing and serving the needs of victims and communities.

This community report gives us an opportunity to share the exciting and innovative work that has been accomplished by our group of dedicated probation officers and support staff in the last year.

This year was a significant year as we continued to move toward utilizing evidence based practices in order to enhance our Westmoreland County Juvenile Justice System.

Through legislation, the purpose clause of Pennsylvania's Juvenile Act now contains language that requires employing evidence-based practices with fidelity at every stage of the Juvenile Justice Process. Evidence-based practice simply means "applying what we know in terms of research to what we do in our work with youth, their families, and the communities in which we live." As a result, we will focus our efforts and begin to collect and analyze the data necessary to measure the results of these efforts; and, with this knowledge, we will strive to continuously improve the quality of our decisions, services and programs. This use of research and our outcomes will allow our juvenile justice system to achieve and confirm the effectiveness of our Balanced and Restorative Justice Mission

Prior to this, Act 33 of 1995 amended the purpose clause of Pennsylvania's Juvenile Act to establish balanced and restorative justice as the philosophical and theoretical framework for the juvenile justice system. The statute clearly defined three goals for our system: 1) The protection of the community; 2) The imposition of accountability for offenses committed and 3) the development of competencies to enable children to become responsible and productive members of the community.

In order to enhance and support these efforts, we are emphasizing the use of research-based evidence to guide our development of policy and practice in all aspects of Balanced and Restorative Justice and the application of evidence-based research to protect the community from further harm by reducing rearrests and recidivism rates for youth involved in the juvenile justice system through the process of behavioral change.

- ❖ In order to fulfill our mission "*to provide supervision and rehabilitation to youth and families while providing Community Protection, Victim Restoration and Youth Redemption*" our department continues to implement programs and protocols that move us in that direction.
- ❖ Family Involvement - We have continued to work toward engaging families whose children are involved in juvenile court in a much more meaningful way. We created a

Family Satisfaction Survey and encourage families to complete it at the time of Case Closing. The results of that survey have been positive. When children are involved in our system, involving families in the development of a case plan are crucial to a successful outcome.

- ❖ We continued to use a Risk-Needs Assessment Instrument for all youth who enter the Westmoreland County's Juvenile Justice System. It is designed to assist our officers in making structured and consistent decisions. The results are used to develop a more comprehensive case plan for juveniles that focus on reducing identified risk factors and emphasizing youth's strengths. Research shows that youth whose services are matched with the correct interventions based on their needs assessment will have better outcomes and the recidivism rate of that youth will decrease.
- ❖ Our sub-office in New Kensington, PA continues in full operation. Intake interviews for families in that part of the county are regularly conducted at that office. This provides a convenience to families and communities in the northern part of the county who as a result do not need to travel to the county seat in Greensburg to meet with a probation officer.
- ❖ Bridges out of Poverty continues to be a major initiative and our staff works diligently in Westmoreland County communities to ensure its success. Our commitment to this is strong and staff is continuously encouraged to participate and enhance its mission which has forced us to try and understand poverty and how we can better connect with people in poverty.
- ❖ Our Community Involvement Workgroup continues to seek ways to partner and expand the concepts and principles of a Balanced & Restorative Justice System in communities and develop strategies that will increase positive outcomes for all those involved. They are continually exploring avenues in which our department may reach people in communities in positive ways.
- ❖ We developed a protocol and an educational component to assist others in understanding the ramifications of Sexting/Technology and Sexual Violence. We are conducting a Sexting Class for youth involved in the juvenile justice system and who appear before the Magisterial District Court. Our goal is to share this with parents and community members as an awareness and preventative method as well.
- ❖ Motivational Interviewing - Our staff has completed its second year of Motivational Interviewing. Motivational Interviewing is a communication skill that helps probation officers resolve their client's ambivalence to change. It also changes and strengthens their relationship with their probationers to one of a guide and helper. There are six Motivational Interviewing Coaches within the department. The Coaches are expected to work with our probation officers, review their conversations with their clients and provide positive and negative feedback to our officers.

- ❖ Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) Project - We continue to offer a variety of trainings in this area for law-enforcement, probation officers, mental health workers, school teachers and administrators, juvenile detention and shelter personnel, children & youth caseworkers, private providers and others across the state of Pennsylvania. We continue to promote the importance of recognizing signs and symptoms of PTSD and the need to address trauma in youth.
- ❖ Juvenile Court Week - We began our Juvenile Court Week celebration at the Westmoreland County Courthouse by providing the public with information on various resources and services available to them in their communities. The County Commissioners presented a Proclamation to the Honorable Michele Bononi, Juvenile Court Administrative Judge, to kick off the week. In addition, the Commissioners also presented a Proclamation to Otis DiCerbo, a volunteer and the Chair of our Norwin Youth Commission. Otis was honored and presented the 2015 Meritorious Service Award by the Juvenile Court Judges Commission at a state conference in Harrisburg. There were over 800 in attendance at the conference.

In addition we held a very successful Family Fun Night for the general public at Twin Lakes Park. Many provider agencies attended and provided important information regarding available services within their communities. There were many gift baskets and other donated items raffled to the several hundred who attended. Food and beverages were provided to all.

- ❖ Youth Commissions and Reintegration - We worked diligently to expand our Youth Commission Program during the year. We introduced a new concept of our volunteers working with youth as mentors in the community and not just as a diversion from the system. Our commissions were assigned youth throughout the year and it was a positive experience. Many youth lack community support from their parents, families, neighbors, etc. The goal is to establish an on-going relationship between a youth and a commission member even after the case is closed in Juvenile Court.
- ❖ We had a very productive year moving forward in our Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy. Through continued training, our probation officers are mastering skills in evidence based practices. We will continue to work toward achieving PA's Juvenile Justice Goals: the protection of the community, the imposition of accountability for offenses committed, and the development of competencies to enable children to become responsible and productive members of the community.

REVENUES AND EXPENSES

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
EXPENSES	\$10,345,543.00	\$8,186,558.44	\$7,810,489.68	\$7,444,557.00	\$7,158,496.00
REVENUES	\$4,679,130.70	\$4,355,472.05	\$3,987,085.39	\$3,355,218.27	\$3,205,612.00

WESTMORELAND COUNTY DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION 2015 ANNUAL REPORT

President Judge: **Honorable Richard E. McCormick**
Administrative Judge: **Honorable Scott O. Mears**
Department Head: **Terence O'Halloran, Esquire**

2015 PERFORMANCE

INCENTIVE MEASURES:

For the eighth consecutive year, Pennsylvania again met the minimum 80% complete requirements for all 6 of the categories monitored in FFY 2015. In fact, Pennsylvania again led the nation in its overall performance in 2015. And moreover, once again this year, Westmoreland County exceeded Pennsylvania's performance level.

The following charts reflect the comparative results for Westmoreland County for the last two fiscal years. (Note: The red numbers are the Incentive categories that are considered for federal reimbursement purposes.) As you can see, there is no significant statistical difference over the years. Westmoreland County continues to maintain its strong position in the establishment, collection and enforcement of child support and medical support.

What has changed, however, is the improvement other states and territories have made in their own performance levels. The effects Westmoreland County and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania feel is in the form of less money being distributed, since the federal "pot" doesn't expand when more states get bigger portions, states like Pennsylvania receive less as a result of simple mathematics.

While Westmoreland County and Pennsylvania remain in the position of reaping the maximum amount possible from federal incentives as a result of our performance matrices, we anticipate receiving less in the future as more states improve their performances.

CRS Incentive Measure

[Westmoreland] [Time (By Federal Fiscal Year)] MEASURES

MEASURES as values		FFY 2014	FFY 2015
Westmoreland	Line 01 - Count of Open IV-D Cases	8,964	8,808
	Line 02 - Count of IV-D Cases with Support Order Established	8,852	8,417
	Support Ratio (Line 2 / Line 1)	95.74%	95.59%
	Line 5 - Count of Children Born Out of Wedlock	5,264	5,397
	Line 6 - Count of Children with Paternity Established	5,767	5,889
	Paternity Ratio (Line 6 / Line 5)	109.56%	109.12%
	Line 24 - Amount of Current Support Owed	\$34,082,989	\$33,348,456
	Line 25 - Amount of Current Support Disbursed	\$28,885,446	\$28,504,774
	Current Support Ratio (Line 25 / Line 24)	84.75%	85.48%
	Line 28 - Count of Cases with Arrears Owed	7,625	7,456
	Line 29 - Count of Cases with Disbursements toward Arrears	6,475	6,319
	Arrears Ratio (Line 29 / Line 28)	84.92%	84.75%
	Line 2e - Count of Arrears-Only IV-D Cases with Orders Established	949	942
	Line 21 - Count of IV-D Cases with Medical Support Ordered	7,264	7,121
	Line 21a - Count of IV-D Cases with Medical Support Ordered and Provided	7,022	6,875
	Medical Support Establishment Ratio (Line 21 / (Line 02 - Line 2e))	95.17%	95.26%
Medical Support Enforcement Ratio (Line 21a / Line 21)	96.67%	96.55%	

CASELOAD

Again this year, the caseload slightly decreased in 2015, this time by 159 cases. The breakdown is as follows:

2012 – 2015 Caseload Comparisons								
Year	SSI	Federal Foster Care	General Assistance	Medical Only	Non-Federal Foster Care	Non-TANF	TANF	Total
2010	0	267	23	3	163	9225	691	10,372
2011	0	310	16	6	158	8932	684	10,106
2012	0	293	0	4	147	8788	636	9,868
2013	0	266	0	4	148	8696	536	9,650
2014	1	293	0	4	152	8345	567	9,362
2015	1	354	0	3	139	8153	553	9,203

2015 CASE PROCESSING ACTIVITY

Year	Paternity Estab.	Paternity Excluded	Complaints Processed	Modifications Processed	Conference Conducted	Record Hearings	Contempt Hearings
2010	479	55	2209	3647	5634	257	3727
2011	174	36	2136	3629	5521	234	3897
2012	128	24	2053	3368	4996	231	3782
2013	108	51	1990	3122	4673	273	3784
2014	112	40	1871	3213	4587	257	3793
2015	124	27	1854	3095	4504	216	3565

COLLECTIONS COMPARISONS

Although the collection per case increased slightly in 2015, Westmoreland continues to rank near the top among 1st through 3rd class counties in dollars collected per case. In addition to Total and Per Case collections, the other important performance factor is effective enforcement of established obligations.

CASELOAD/COLLECTION TREND

(We rank #4 out of 12 counties listed as 3rd class in dollars collected per case)

Westmoreland Collections per Case Trend			
Year Ending	Caseload	Collections	Per Case
12/31/2010	10,372	\$40,274,471.02	\$3,883.00
12/31/2011	10,106	\$40,029,045.74	\$3,960.92
12/31/2012	9,868	\$40,087,351.32	\$4,062.36
12/31/2013	9,650	\$39,681,987.15	\$4,112.12
12/31/2014	9,362	\$38,764,261.32	\$4,140.60
12/31/2015	9,203	\$38,451,526.16	\$4,178.15

DRS TITLE IV-D FUND BALANCES:

DRS maintain four (4) distinct fund sub-accounts within the IV-D Fund account:

Checking – all income and expense passes through this account.

Program income is deposited here. Transfers are made to and from the county, and in and out of the investment accounts. More money is kept in cash to help offset overall banking fees. Transfers out of the investment s are used to cover weekly expenditures.

PLGIT Trust – a short-term investment account which includes reimbursements for Title IV-D eligible expenditures and interest income on all accounts. In the past, Investments were used to increase cash balances through interest earnings; however, with interest rates so low, less money is in investments.

PA Treasurer’s Money Market – a short-term investment account which contains deposits similar to those in the PLGIT. This account is managed by the County Fiscal Department, making transfers in and out of the checking account, as necessary.

Invesco AIM – an investment account established for the sole purpose of separating Title IV-D earned incentive dollars. This was necessitated by the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA).

(The Title IV-D Account Statement for the year ended 12/31/15 is attached to the end of this report)

WHERE SUPPORT DOLLARS COME FROM?

Seventy seven percent of support dollars are collected through wage withholding. Cash and Checks, including contempt purge payments and relatively few payers with wage withholding waivers, make up another 14%. The balance consists of payments received from other states, Unemployment Compensation attachments, and federal tax offsets. 97% of payments to recipients are paperless. The two paperless options for support recipients are direct deposit into a checking or savings account or deposit into a stored value debit card with the acronym Eppi Card.

2015 Disbursement Types

Direct Deposit	55.13%	\$21,182,583.37
Eppi Card (stored value)	41.58%	\$15,975,202.79
Check	3.29%	\$ 1,263,224.65

COUNTY SHARE OF COSTS

Local government is responsible for providing the non-Federal share (approximately 34%) of the cost of DRS operations. 2011 represented the first year Westmoreland County had to pay that percentage as a result of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. The detailed explanation of the change was provided in prior year's Domestic Relations Report to the Court.

As a result of the 34 percent reimbursement requirement, the court's share of 2015 costs of this office's operations is as follows:

DRS total budgeted expenditures for 2015:	\$ 4,250,702
County Shared Calculation Includes:	
34% shared Direct Expenditures:	1,215,376
Plus Unallowable costs:	115,452
Plus 100% workers comp. Medical & Ind.	<u>47,000</u>
Total County Contributions:	\$ 1,377,828

These figures compare to a 2014 DRS budget of \$4,238,409 with the county budgeted to have paid \$1,414,365 towards that amount.

It should be noted here that the Federal Standard for Cost Effectiveness for DRS offices is \$5 collected per \$1 expended. Westmoreland County excelled with the county average Cost Effectiveness of \$10.34 for FFY 2015.

The DRS continues to use restricted Incentive dollars to fund capital improvements and training, completely releasing the County from those costs.

CURRENT DRS BUSINESS PLAN

There are no plans to change the operational framework of this office since it appears that we have established a good mix of establishing "right-sized" orders and early intervention with those people having trouble making payments for whatever reason. The numbers speak for themselves.

For the last five years or so there has been a small but steady decline of child support cases in the Domestic Relations Offices across the state, including Westmoreland County. While a steady emigration from Pennsylvania could be the cause of some of the decline, it is believed that Westmoreland's numbers result from the natural aging of the population beyond child-bearing years.

In any event, we will remain alert for opportunities as they arise to increase efficiency by combining duties and responsibilities within the office.

The largest variable facing this office is the technological changes proposed by BCSE in the coming years. For example, we are on the verge of implementing a state-wide imaging system which is the first step in the long journey of making Domestic Relations a paperless environment.

There are other projects in various stages of roll out that have met with varying degrees of success around the state so far. Technology will continue to evolve but, as with all progress, it will be at varying rates. Combining the domestic relations data base with the Commonwealth's enterprise system is a difficult task and everyone involved is committed to not interfering with our successful business model as enhancements to the system become available.

**WESTMORELAND COUNTY LAW LIBRARY
2015 ANNUAL REPORT**

President Judge: **Honorable Richard E. McCormick, Jr.**
Law Librarian: **Elizabeth Ward, MLS**

ORGANIZATION

Betty Ward; Law Librarian, Master of Library Science, Univ. of Pittsburgh
Cindy Woods; Library Assistant, Assoc. of Applied Science, Legal Assisting, WCCC

SERVICES

The Law Library provides:

- An up-to-date collection of approximately 25,000 law books and 450 CD's, with a strong emphasis on Pennsylvania practice materials. Attorneys and courthouse personnel may borrow materials for a 1 week period; the public must use materials on-site.
- Four public access computers used to search online legal information, such as, Westlaw, Shepard's, Lexis, Smart Litigator, etc. Information can be printed or E-mailed. The computers are also used to access the internet, court and county information, records, forms, and the library's CD-Rom collection. The public and attorneys sometimes use the computers to type and prepare legal documents.
- Trained library staff to maintain the library and assist users in locating information and materials appropriate to their needs.
- A quiet, comfortable setting for people to study and conduct their research.
- A small meeting room for attorneys, clients and courthouse personnel to discuss legal matters in a private setting.
- Equipment including: copier, fax machine, and printer available to library users for a nominal fee.
- Wireless Internet Access (Wi-Fi) available for those with wireless capable laptop computers or devices.
- Interlibrary loan and document delivery services to provide materials not available at our library.
- Customized "in-house" databases and guides created to make our various collections more accessible and user friendly. Available for: local municipal ordinances, PBI collection, Pathfinder series (research guides), and local court opinions.
- Convenient hours for the public - the Law Library is open during regular courthouse hours with extended hours, until 7:30 PM, on Wednesday evenings.
- Extended hours available for Westmoreland Bar Association members.

2015 EVENTS

- Referrals of Pro Se litigants from Family Court, the Prothonotary's Office, and the Pro Bono Office, increased throughout the year. 1,218 individuals printed custody and divorce forms with others visiting to research the law or receive instruction on using computers to access Family Court forms and information.
- New features were added to LexisAdvance to make it more user-friendly. 1,884 searches were run using Lexis to access Pa. content and Shepard's Citations.
- The Law Library's Computers were used to conduct 12,807 Westlaw transactions. They were also used for thousands of other searches using Smart Litigator, the internet, and our other licensed legal databases.
- Through our associate membership to the Jenkins Law Library in Philadelphia, our Law Library can offer access to over 20 licensed online products, including: National Consumer Law Center, HeinOnline, LoisLaw Treatise Library, ProQuest Congressional, NewsBank, etc.
- The Law Library hosted 8 Legal Research classes from WCCC and some additional school and mock trial team visits.
- Research assistance and materials were provided to Senior Judges.
- The Law Librarian participated in 2 "Bridge the Gap" seminars for the Westmoreland Bar Association.
- The Law Librarian attended the Pa. Library Association's annual conference in State College, and several regional meetings.
- In March, the Librarian attended a WBA, Inn of Court meeting, to present information about our Law Library's services and collection.
- Library staff participated in training and online courses offered by the Western Pa. Law Library Association, Westlaw, Lexis, and the American Association of Law Libraries.
- An inventory of all books and CD's was completed
- 42 customized "Pathfinder" research guides (on frequently requested topics) were updated to assist our users in locating information available in our own library.
- The "in-house" directories and databases of local municipal ordinances and local court opinions were updated.

2015 STATISTICS

Total Visits/Contacts by those using the Law Library: 10,013

Attorneys	5,231
Court and County	1,570
Public	3,212

Reference/Research Assistance Provided: 10,820
(Includes phone and Email inquiries)

Materials Circulated (Books, CD's, Document Delivery): 5,854

Online Research Transactions - Licensed Products:

Westlaw	-	12,807
Shepard's	-	1,884
Smart Litigator and other licensed databases	-	842

**Plus thousands of additional internet searches

Local Ordinances Filed: 122 (proposed, enacted & revised codes)

Photocopier: 14,186 copies (public, courthouse attorneys and library staff)

Printer: 22,203 pages (public, courthouse attorneys and library staff)

**WESTMORELAND COUNTY MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT COURTS
2015 ANNUAL REPORT**

President Judge:	Honorable Richard E. McCormick
Magisterial District Judges:	James Albert
	Mark Bilik
	Jason Buczak
	Charles M. Christner
	Charles Conway, Esq.
	Joseph Dalfonso
	Joseph DeMarchis
	Roger Eckels
	Helen M. Kistler, Esq.
	Michael R Mahady
	Mark Mansour, Esq.
	Charles Moore
	Frank Pallone, Esq.
	Cheryl Peck Yakopec, Esq.
	Denise Snyder Thiel, Esq.
	Douglas R. Weimer, Jr
	James Falcon, Esq., Sr. MDJ
	J. Bruce King, Sr. MDJ
	Bernice McCutcheon, Sr. MDJ
	Robert Scott, Sr. MDJ
District Court Administrator:	Amy DeMatt, Esq.
Deputy Court Administrator:	Donald L. Heagy, Jr., MSOL

The magisterial district courts are the initial level court of Pennsylvania’s Unified Judicial System. There are 17 magisterial district courts in Westmoreland County. Magisterial District Courts’ jurisdiction includes: summary offenses; ordinance cases; landlord tenant actions; civil claims, except those involving title to real property or a claim against a Commonwealth party, of \$12,000.00 and under, issuing arrest, bench, and search warrants; setting bail; conducting arraignments; and presiding over preliminary hearings. Magisterial district judges also administer oaths and affirmations, take acknowledgments, solemnize marriages, and preside over emergency protection from abuse matters.

Magisterial district judges are assisted in their responsibilities by “magisterial district judge secretaries.” The tenth judicial district employs 70 magisterial district judge secretaries. In 2015, L. Anthony Bompiani, Esq. was elected to serve as Magisterial District Judge in District 10-2-01 beginning 2016.

In 2015 there were 72,398 cases filed in the magisterial district courts of Westmoreland County. The following chart shows case filings for 2015 and grand totals for the last three years.

	TRAFFIC	SUMMARY	CRIMINAL	CIVIL	TOTALS		
	<u>2015</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
10-1-01 DeMarchis	4311	336	630	355	3273	5400	5632
10-1-03 Dalfonso	1483	416	602	184	2462	2616	2685
10-1-04 Yakopec	3032	741	652	434	4721	4103	4859
10-1-05 Pallone	1032	814	1385	540	3309	3360	3771
10-2-01 Sr. MDJ	3734	329	419	265	6527	6053	4747
10-2-03 Kistler	2189	242	407	185	2797	3267	3023
10-2-06 Christner	3106	392	518	192	4257	4271	4208
10-2-08 Mahady	2510	272	608	337	3410	3408	3727
10-2-09 Weimer	1973	212	558	315	4572	3474	3058
10-2-10 Albert	3914	540	628	453	7538	5751	5535
10-3-01 Mansour	5617	167	566	271	8714	6778	6621
10-3-02 Conway	3326	171	357	275	4160	3659	4129
10-3-05 Buczak	3647	238	340	240	4428	4541	4465
10-3-08 Bilik	3468	577	342	203	5049	4985	4590
10-3-09 Thiel	3730	261	210	133	3705	4929	4334
10-3-10 Moore	3077	321	500	310	3183	4826	4208
10-3-11 Eckels	2234	155	216	201	2872	2974	2806
TOTAL	52383	6184	8938	4893	74977	74395	72398

After Hours Coverage

The Tenth Judicial District uses web-based video conferencing to conduct preliminary arraignments, handle emergency protection from abuse petitions and orders, and issue arrest and search warrants. Web-based video conferencing equipment is located in each of the 17 magisterial district courts, 30 police departments including 2 state police barracks, and the Westmoreland County District Attorney’s office. The Westmoreland County Prison also has a video conferencing unit for preliminary arraignments held every morning resulting from arrests made after night court closes and as needed on weekends and holidays. Through state court funding, all magisterial district courts are equipped with new Polycom HDX4000 video conferencing units.

Magisterial District Court Expenses & Revenues (2011 – 2015)

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Revenue	1,443,932	2,061,534	1,303,137	1,170,338	1,213,926
Expense	5,201,862	5,027,804	4,469,814	4,453,052	4,447,563