

PP

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

*Jlm*

MEMORANDUM

---

By Dale S. Thompson

Date June 12, 1974

FILE: Governor's Justice Commission

On June 11, Dr. E DREXEL GODFREY was interviewed at his home, Mountain View Boulevard, Dauphin, Pennsylvania, telephone No. 921-8324, and furnished the following information.

He reported that a great amount of dollars was immediately available to combat local crime conditions immediately after the LEA Act was passed. There was a great effort to get this money out. Consequently, there was not adequate time for planning and the setting of priorities at either a state or local level. What really needed to be done was to assemble good data, analyze it, and determine what the needs were and set priorities prior to the awarding of dollars. Because the problem had not been identified, adequate plans could not be made. This is still a deficiency within the State of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania could get additional LEAA funds for this purpose; however, a state needs to guarantee five years of continuous matching funds. This agreement must be signed by the Governor and there must be a commitment of state agencies to participate in certain program areas of the total effort. It was never possible to get this kind of commitment within the State of Pennsylvania and, as a result, adequate plans and priorities have never been established. Somewhere, the State Legislature should push to get this accomplished.

In regard to the RIZZO-SHAPP controversy mentioned in the Pinskey memo, it was Rizzo's position that he should be in a position to name the members of the Philadelphia Regional Council of the Governor's Justice Commission. The LEAA joined Rizzo in this position and froze some of the funds to the State. This was when the Administration was "courting" Mr. Rizzo. Subsequently, Rizzo was dropped by the feds and the issue disappeared.

A similar problem developed in Allegheny County where there is a strong political fight between the Democrats there. Mr. LEONARD STAISEY, Chairman of the County Commissioners, and EUGENE COONS, Sheriff and Democratic Chairman, oppose each other in regard to LEAA programs. These two issues are evidences of political infighting within the State which handles the overall justice program.

Governor's Justice Commission - 2  
June 12, 1974

In connection with the planning process, it is Dr. Godfrey's opinion that local planning is poor. It takes about one year from the time plans are developed until funds are available. Consequently, there are changes in the purposes for which local officials want to spend the money. He believes that intermediate size cities should be given planning funds in order that they can hire a permanent planner. This theory is 100% opposed by the Regional Councils who want to keep their power in regard to planning.

The appointment of Regional Council members was nonpolitical at first; however, as vacancies occurred and replacements were suggested, it was hard to get these appointments made by the Governor. While Dr. Godfrey does not believe this was a political issue, it was just that the Governor did not give it a high priority. Dr. Godfrey became personally exasperated after he had talked to the Attorney General and to the Governor. He believes it was Norvel Reece who told him that these appointments had to go through the "Thieman shop." The Governor did appoint some Republicans and some Democrats, so it Godfrey's opinion that the Governor wanted to appoint good people who would not be subject to adverse publicity after appointment.

Another problem at the Governor's Justice Commission is the membership of the Commission. The Act specifies some individuals who will be on the Commission. As an example: Mrs. Helene Wohlgemuth, Secretary of Public Welfare; and Colonel James D. Barger, Commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police. They have extremely important and full time jobs which have higher priorities than the Governor's Justice Commission. As a result, they are not in a position to devote adequate time to the problems of the Justice Commission. They are able to pass on awards, but not much to the work. BILL NAGLE is the best man on the Commission for the job as he is an extraordinarily able individual and thoroughly courageous in his decisions. He has been trying to push the board into really establishing policy meetings, however, he has been disappointed in connection with this.

Dr. Godfrey feels that the evaluation program at the Justice Commission is adequate. He says that the Pennsylvania evaluation efforts were in the beginning stages prior to the Monagan Committee hearings (this is doubtful). He does not believe in self-evaluation.

---

Governor's Justice Commission - 3  
June 12, 1974

In regard to the initial selection of Washington Justice Associates to do the evaluation work, it is Dr. Godfrey's recollection that J. SHANE CREAMER indicated that WJA had been contracted with by the Bureau of Correction to do a particular study. The work had been completed; however, the contract called for WJA to perform more time and it was arranged that they would do some work on the evaluation process at the Governor's Justice Commission without specific cost to the Commission. Dr. Godfrey believes that this contract was funded either by General Funds available to the Department of Justice or to the Bureau of Correction.

In connection with Dr. Godfrey's proposal in 1973 to the Attorney General, it was his desire to set aside people to perform much needed work. He said that when operations and policy and planning are combined, operations gets done first and planning and policy and research gets what is left. This has been a tremendous deficiency at the Governor's Justice Commission. Because of the lack of policy, planning, and research, the reorganization was to provide adequate staff through separation of responsibilities and some additional positions so that this important work could get done. This reorganization also provided that headquarters staff would have more time and authority to work specifically on applications from their origin to the time of award.

In regard to the fragmented criminal justice system in the State, Dr. Godfrey said there were too many police agencies in the State. The system can never provide good results this way. Many of the police departments are just too small and should be consolidated.

Another problem of fragmentation is that juvenile offenders are under the authority of both the Public Welfare Department and the judges who sentence them. The judges' authority does not penetrate into the Public Welfare Department and the judges there seldom see eye-to-eye on the problem. Another example is that juveniles are placed in adult county jails. This is both wrong in terms of juvenile detention and is against the law in the State; however, adequate funds had not been provided in some counties and there is nothing the counties can do about it. He also cited the outmoded bail bond system in the State. He described the large holding establishments for children throughout the State as being inadequate.

He was asked about the conflict of opinion on consolidation between the State Police and the Governor's Justice Commission. He said this had been a thorn in his side for three years. He did bring this to the Governor's attention a number of times. He was present when the Governor told Attorney General Packel and Commissioner Barger that the State Police should "cool" their

Governor's Justice Commission - 4  
June 12, 1974

position in this consolidation issue. He said the State Police did not have to go out and advocate consolidation, but they should not publicly oppose it. Nevertheless, attacks by the State Police still went on at the local level. Dr. Godfrey indicated this could have been a meeting with Attorney General Creamer and Commissioner Urella, but thinks it was with Packel and Barger.

He could not remember the issue about the Department of Transportation providing radios for cars in opposition what the Governor's Justice Commission wanted. He said that some small local police agencies had made application to the Governor's Justice Commission to buy some police cars. In an effort to advance consolidation, these requests were turned down by the Governor's Justice Commission. The applicants then went to the Department of Transportation where they got their cars.

There is some indication that when the LEA Act is renewed in 1976 that it may permit direct revenue sharing as contrasted to going through state agencies. If the state agency in Pennsylvania is thus eliminated, the State can "kiss goodbye" to any effort to establish standards and goals throughout the State and really do a good job of statewide planning. There is some indication this change may take place. However, if the Governor's Justice Commission was a legislated body with broad statewide planning and policy powers, then it would be most helpful.

The present standards and goals project really doesn't have much of a chance to succeed unless it is subsequently folded into the Governor's Justice Commission or some other permanent State body which can give it the muscle to receive adequate consideration. Even the Governor's Justice Commission will have a problem with establishing statewide standards and goals unless it is given more support by the Legislature and the Executive Branch.

✓ Dr. Godfrey is in favor of the bill introduced by the Committee regarding logger recorders.

4 Dr. Godfrey believes the Legislature should become more active in connection with criminal justice throughout the State. This is the only way adequate muscle can be obtained. The Governor's Justice Commission should become a permanent and strong body and the Legislature should permit and assist, through enabling legislation and cooperative agreement, the idea of consolidation.

The division responsibilities between the courts and the Welfare Department on juveniles needs remedial legislation or no progress can be made. This is a very serious and thorny problem which needs correction.

He also believes that the Governor's Justice Commission should be a legislated body which is under the aegis of constant review by the Legislature. More legislators should be on the Commission. This could be done through legislation. Also, the Governor's Justice Commission could serve in a staff role to a Legislature Committee involved with criminal justice matters.

He thinks that the amount of tax dollars appropriated in the State for the criminal justice system is thoroughly inadequate. He says that only 4/10 of 1% of the budget goes to criminal justice in the State. Pennsylvania pays \$9.00 vs \$1.00 from the Federal Government. The 4/10 of 1% is just not a high enough percentage to get the job done in the State.

In regard to the Easton project, Dr. Godfrey recognizes that he was one of the sole supporters at the administration level. He said he thought that the Regional Council had been a little capricious in turning down this project because there had never been a grant to Easton before. He also considered this grant as a beginning of cooperation and ultimately consolidation in that it provided for joint communications and training facilities. He does remember receiving the Boyes memo in opposition to the project; however, when that was received, he had already committed himself to the Mayor of Easton to approve the project. He does not believe he got any calls from the Attorney General, the Governor, or any of their staff pushing this project. He may have had some calls just asking where the project stood, but not specifically advocating it. He believes he did get a call from SENATOR REIBMAN in connection with the project.

Dr. Godfrey said, as it turned out, he was not particularly proud of the decision he made, particularly because the project turned out to be too grandiose and required too many dollars. He said that after the first amount was approved, the Mayor of Easton came back and said that additional dollars would be required and so the Commission provided additional monies. This particular additional funding item has never been brought to the attention of the staff before.

Dr. Godfrey reported that he had asked KARL BOYES to leave the employ of the Commission because Boyes was not doing an effective job. He felt Boyes had lost interest and steam. He did offer to let Boyes look around and see what he could find. Boyes kept delaying leaving. During that time he drew up a bill of particulars against BERARD and Godfrey and went to the Governor which developed a "ding dong" situation. This precipitated a number of meetings,

Governor's Justice Commission - 6  
June 12, 1974

including one with the Governor. Godfrey was required to answer a lot of accusations. The upshot was that Godfrey, in effect, was supported and Boyes was asked to leave.

He described the Boyes-Berard conflict as a clash of personalities. He said Berard was strong in his field, while Boyes had charm but no substance. As an example: Berard would work like a dog to correct some audit problem or deficiency; Boyes' attack to the problem would be to start making a number of calls to see how the problem could be fixed. Boyes' staff lost respect for him. Godfrey said he personally appointed Boyes. He apparently was taken in by the latter's charm. He said that the Boyes-Berard episode drained his interest in the work of the Commission and he indicated he wanted to leave. Both the Attorney General and the Governor asked him to stay on, but he felt the GJC needed a new head. He wanted to go back to teaching. It is not true that he first learned of his resignation when the Governor made a public announcement of it. He had told the Governor that he wanted to leave and was going to publicly announce his resignation at the end of the particular conference where the Governor spoke. However, the Governor beat him to the gun on the announcement and gave him warm praise.

Dr. Godfrey said that while working with the CIA, he had been responsible for preparing daily briefings for the White House. He said he did this under three different Presidents. Members of his staff were also responsible for working in the situation room at the White House. Dr. Godfrey went to the GJC in September 1971 until the last of January 1974.

He said that since his leaving the Commission, he had not received any money from Washington Justice Associates. He indicated, jokingly, that such money would have been welcome during some of the lean months he had, however, it would be improper. He has made a number of lectures in various schools throughout the country, particularly pertaining to law enforcement.

He said that the Yoke Crest-Alternatives situation really developed immediately after he left the Commission. He knows nothing about the freezing of funds or audit results. He does remember that he and the attorney for the Commission met with Mrs. Kunkel of Yoke Crest concerning some legal arrangements which had been proposed. He does not remember the details, however, he does remember they were not favorably disposed to the proposition. Mrs. Kunkel was very concerned about this proposal.

Governor's Justice Commission - 7  
June 12, 1974

He described Tom Berard as rough and rugged, but also has a strong streak of compassion in him. He is honest and knowledgeable, and has saved hundreds of thousands of dollars for the program through reduction in grants which were too grandiose. As an example of what Berard would do, he said some people would look at a set of books and financial transactions and describe them as lousy and put the grantee out of business - Berard's attitude, which was fostered by Godfrey, would be to get the books in shape so that business could be continued for the benefit of all concerned.

Dr. Godfrey said he would be glad to testify before the Committee in regard to the foregoing or other matters.

Addendum: Refer to Page 5 of this memorandum

With reference to the Easton grant, Mr. John Snavely, Executive Director, Governor's Justice Commission, telephonically advised that there was not a subsequent grant in the Easton case. He explained by stating that the original request for the grant was slightly in excess of \$1/2 million in 1972. At the time the request was made, the Justice Commission had only \$300,000 available in Sennett Resolution funds. The Justice Commission, therefore, limited the amount of the award to \$300,000.

When the City of Easton learned of this action, they immediately appealed the matter and stated that the City of Easton could not raise additional funds and would be unable to go ahead with the project at that time. Consequently, the matter was reopened for further hearings. At a second meeting of the Commission in 1973, discretionary funds were used in making the award for the full amount that had been originally requested.