

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

MEMORANDUM

By Dale S. Thompson

Date April 16, 1974

FILE: Governor's Justice Commission

On April 16, 1974, ROBERT R. SAYLOR, 40 Delmont Avenue, Harrisburg, was interviewed at the staff offices. His home telephone number is 564-2114, and his office number is 787-7663. He is presently Executive Director for Administrative Services, Bureau of Correction, Department of Justice, with offices at the headquarters building outside the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill. He has a bachelor's degree in psychiatry from Penn State, a master's degree in sociology from Penn State, and a master's degree in social work from the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Saylor had been employed as Assistant Director, Bureau of Children's Institutions, Department of Public Welfare, prior to the formation of the Pennsylvania Crime Commission. He contacted J. SHANE CREAMER, then Attorney General, and was detailed on loan to the Crime Commission for a number of months in connection with the new LEAA program. This was in late 1969 or early 1970. He continued on this program until he left the Governor's Justice Commission in February 1972.

During the times he was involved in this program, he served in various roles. He was first responsible for the supervision of the regional office directors and the management of subgrants. In regard to his regional office supervision, he was responsible for the coordination with the Regional Planning Council and directed the regional office directors who, in turn, were responsible for their staff direction. In regard to subgrants, he received them and initially reviewed them for program, budget, fiscal and other aspects. As the program grew, certain parts of the review of the grants were transferred to other organizations within the Commission. Such special units pertain to fiscal, program, legal, etc. He continued in his role as coordinator of the grants.

Subsequently, KARL BOYES was brought in to the central office (he had been in charge of the ~~north~~<sup>WEST</sup> regional office) and was given responsibility for supervision of the regional directors. Subgrant management coordination was put under TOM BERARD. BETTY PROCIK took over the grants coordination under Berard, as well as the fiscal review. Boyes also became responsible for reviewing grants as to program content.

Governor's Justice Commission - 2  
April 16, 1974

Thus, over a period of years, Mr. Saylor's responsibility was decreased. Some of this was naturally because of the increase in the work load; however, as a result of a reorganization, he became no longer involved in his prior activities. He was made a Special Assistant to Mr. GODFREY. Prior to becoming this Special Assistant, he had always reported to the Executive Director.

No one ever explained to Mr. Saylor just why this responsibility was being taken from him. Boyes and Berard came out of the reorganization in good shape. A "directorship" was given to each of them in their new responsibilities. Saylor described this experience as very demoralizing. He lost his professional spirit and couldn't get going again.

As a Special Assistant, he was responsible for preparing a report that would go beyond raw statistics in assessing the crime problem in Pennsylvania. It would also determine the validity of the crime causation theories as applied to Pennsylvania. He decided this was not the type of work he wanted to do so he sought other employment. He ended up with five job opportunities and took the one at the Bureau of Correction.

He described Boyes as bright, well respected, egotistical in a subtle way, could be ruthless, capable, and the type who wins Lions Club awards. He described Boyes as a better than average regional director based upon his supervision of Boyes. He does not know the quality of Boyes central office work. Some negative comments have been received by Saylor concerning Boyes in that he was less than considerate in dealing with personnel. Negative comments related to his personality also.

Mr. Saylor described Berard as severely neurotic, paranoid personality who believes all people are against him. Berard is extremely insecure and he compensates for this by being overbearing and "coming on hard." Berard picks on the little guy who won't counterattack. He is a driver of himself and others. Generally, he is a good administrator, but very poor in human relations. He's very ambitious and he would run over his mother to get ahead. Betty Procik left because she could not stand him and because of the pressures of her job. Berard was erratic and discourteous. Reportedly, he took credit for Procik's accomplishments and he was jealous of the respect she had among staff members. She was very well respected by all members of the staff and outsiders.

Boyes, Godfrey, Rinkovich, and many others all had problems with Berard. FAY BARSHINGER was subjected to Berard's insults for years. She was his

Governor's Justice Commission - 3  
April 16, 1974

Administrative Assistant and is now his Administrative Officer. She knows Berard very well. DEAN MANTIS, a fiscal aide to Berard, also has problems, as does WOODY RICE with Berard.

Mr. Saylor said that he has a liking for Berard. The two of them worked day and night and carried the Commission on their shoulders for many years. Berard has been good for the work of the Commission, however, he is responsible for terrible morale there. No one is near to Berard in matching him on this quality. Berard is very knowledgeable and gets things done. Saylor has no evidence that Berard was ever in violation of the law or regulations. Recently Berard froze a bank account of ALTERNATIVES, INC. of Harrisburg. Apparently there were irregularities in connection with finances which were determined as a result of the audit of the books.

Saylor said that the Commission staff thought Godfrey was a nice guy, but not a cracker-jack administrator. He was bright, friendly, very conscientious, but just not designed for this particular job. It is Saylor's information, based on staff rumor, that there was a strong conflict between Boyes, Berard and Godfrey and that Godfrey said he would get out if Boyes stayed. Reportedly Boyes was moved out, probably at the Governor's instigation. He thinks Godfrey's recent departure may have also been a part of the Governor's decision, but that the two of them were not told to leave at the same time. Saylor likened the Governor's decision to his decision to dismiss Creamer and Urella sometime prior thereto.

Mr. Saylor said that he had supervised SNAVELY as a regional director. He described the new Executive Director as very bright, very opinionated, very knowledgeable, highly politically ambitious, but could not give him an "A" for his personality. He is a type who comes on strong and will try to do a good job. This will result in conflicts between people with whom he works. Saylor likes Snavely very much.

In Mr. Saylor's opinion, everyone at the Commission did a reasonably good job. There was no great political heat from legislators, the Attorney General, or the Governor to his knowledge. Most grant awards were made on the basis of staff consensus and a very professional job was done. He is still in touch with members of the Commission staff and there is still a morale problem there as there has been for a number of years.

Governor's Justice Commission - 4  
April 16, 1974

Mr. Saylor said that he was at the Commission when the grant was made to the Bureau of Correction, but that he had no substantial part in it and has not been involved since he has been at the Bureau of Correction.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

MEMORANDUM

By Dale S. Thompson

Date April 16, 1974

FILE: Governor's Justice Commission

Department of Justice  
Bureau of Corrections  
Audit of LEAA Subgrant DA-104-71

On April 15, Mr. HARRY YAVERBAUM, Audit Specialist, Bureau of Audits, Auditor General's Office, Room 319, Finance Building, telephone No. 787-2150, made available copies of five pages of the audit report which are attached.

He advised that JOHN CURLEY of that office had conducted the audit, mostly by himself. He did not know why both the State and LEAA issued audit reports on this subgrant. He telephonically contacted Mr. Curley, who was out of the city, and obtained explanations in regard to certain audit items. He stated that Mr. Curley had not interviewed any of the State in-kind employees nor did he interview the two architects, THOMAS FORD and BRUCE MILLARD. Mr. Curley would not offer an opinion as to whether he thought the two contracts were legitimate or why four of the checks were redeposited.

Attachments

MATCHING FUNDS by STAFF FUNCTION

100 Account - Salary, Personal Services

2601 Security Element

2602 Maintenance of Health Element

1	Correction Officer III		9,057
2	Correction Officers II	@ 8,304	16,608
12	Correction Officers I	@ 7,532	90,384
3	Stewards I	@ 7,532	<u>22,596</u>
			138,645
	Employe Benefits 13%		<u>18,024</u>
			\$156,669

Part 2

Part 3

73,146  
9,887

14,899  
2,429

Name

- C. W. Markle - 31-B from 35-B Correctional Officer III OK
- C. Meyer, Jr. - 31-B - 32-B Correctional Officer II OK
- J. H. Wilson - 33-A, 32-A Correctional Officer II OK
- C. B. Lynch, Jr. - 31-B, 30-B Correctional Officer I OK
- G. L. Ash - 31-A change 21's from 30A "cor off I
- D. J. Finnelli, Jr. - 31-B "OK
- P. Calandrella - 31-B "OK
- G. Colaianni - 31-B "OK
- D. N. Ferrari - 31-B "OK
- R. D. Brinker - 31-B "OK
- R. C. Henry - 31-C "OK
- D. Duke - 31-C "OK
- R. A. Golkosky - 31-A "OK
- W. J. Holt - 31-C "OK
- P. J. Calandrella - 31-A, 30-A "Labor foreman
- C. F. Mayger - 33-A Steward II
- J. J. Timko - 31-B Steward I OK
- R. Solomon - 31-C Steward I OK

DIDN'T WORK ON  
THIS PROJECT  
THESE PEOPLE ARE  
NOT PART OF THIS  
PROGRAM

copy

Supervisor

Supervisor

"

FINDING

copy

DATE OF INVOICE	PAYEE	Amount
11-9-71	Thomas Ford	175.00
12-15-71	Thomas Ford	900.00
1-3-72	Thomas Ford	900.00
11-5-71	Bruce Millard	175.00
12-15-71	Bruce Millard	900.00
1-3-72	Bruce Millard	900.00

Each one of the amounts listed above can be traced to a warrant number and therefore payment. On 5-24-71 both Mr. Millard + Mr. Ford presented a two week <sup>architectural</sup> study of the existing structure of 1503-1505 N. 15th St. Phila, Pa. for a community treatment center. Work drawings were completed 7/30/71 and were presented to the Bureau of Correction. On 11/1/71, Thomas Ford requested payment of \$175 for his services here and on 11/5/71 Bruce Millard did likewise. Each invoice consists of a plain typewriter paper with no letterhead. Each was signed by the individual. Note the format of the letters - similar. On 12/15/71 the same people submitted two separate invoices of \$900 each for the same services. But notice the handwriting as compared to the signatures of the two previous letters - drastically different. Two more checks were issued. And finally on 1-3-72 two more invoices are shown each indicating \$900 is due them for the services they rendered on the same bldg. Notice the format of the invoices. Two more checks were issued to these people - each \$900. "

Could not locate in 71-72 revenue transmittals any refunds for such monies.

see p 5-40 + 5-41  
for copy of checks.

## Contracted Services

The following comments and analysis is a result of a study of certain service purchase contracts between the auditee and a Mr Thomas Ford and a Mrs Bruce Millard. A total of four different contracts were made for "consulting architectural services for renovation of a building located at 1503-1503 North 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Philadelphia, Pa, to be used as a community treatment center."

Pages 5-5 and 5-9 contain the first <sup>submitted</sup> invoices for payment by Mr Ford + Mr Millard. These invoices relate to Contract # 152407 and # 152406 respectively.

Note (1) format of the letters are similar (2) no letterheads were used (3) each was signed by the individual. State checks # 31-448444 + # 31-448441 are payments for said submitted invoices. Each check consisted of \$175<sup>00</sup> However, the checks were

not paid to the individuals listed but were redeposited  
state (see p 5-20 + 5-21)

to the Treasury. The Comptroller's Report # 27 reflected such  
"payments" but did not show the redeposit. A search  
was conducted through the Comptroller's revenue transmittals  
which reveals that ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> deposits were being ~~on~~ were misclassified.

A similar situation arises for service purchase  
contracts # 152419 and # 152724 (see p 5-26 + 5-27)

for similar services to the same people but for  
\$900.00 each. A review of expenditures <sup>(p. 35)</sup> reveals that

Mr Ford and Mr Millard were paid twice. However,  
an examination of the cancelled checks p. 5-40 + p. 5-41

reveals that one check was expensed and one

check was redeposited into the state Treasury.

Duplicate payment was not made. However,

comptroller records do not reflect such redeposit.

No control found. S/B a contract liquidator. See page

OVER

Made an attempt to locate a debit memorandum from Treasury showing that these monies were redeposited into revenue code 181118 - DA-104-71. Traced through the 1972-1973 debit memorandums and could not locate the redeposit. Report #57 does not reflect such deposits. Went to the rodent infested storage area (see finding), could not locate the 1971-72 debit memorandums. They were supposed to be located at the "Chicken coop".