

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

2017

Court of Common Pleas
of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania

Revised April 23, 2018

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

President Judge: Honorable Richard E. McCormick, Jr.
Associate Judges: 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 Scott O. Mears, Jr.
Honorable Harry F. Smail, Jr.
Honorable Timothy A. Krieger

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 Chris Scherer

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	2015	2016	2017
New Civil Cases Docketed	1727	1627	1803
Arbitration Awards	63	89	89
Beginning Year Balance of Civil Cases	1871	2289	2239
Civil Cases Disposed	1568	1622	2339
Total Civil Pending at End of Year	2030	2294	1703

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 and that the pending civil caseload is consistently less than the required 25%.

ESTATE AND GUARDIANSHIP STATISTICS

ORPHANS' COURT ESTATES	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	110	103	117	110	103
New cases	244	243	219	195	188
Cases Disposed	251	229	226	202	192
End of Year Balance of Cases	103	117	110	103	99

ORPHANS' COURT GUARDIAN	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	85	57	48	47	54
New cases	88	69	73	85	80
Cases Disposed	116	78	74	78	83
End of Year Balance of Cases	57	48	47	54	51

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

CRIMINAL COURT:

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. In 2017, the criminal court continued its scheduling with an individual trial calendar. All cases assigned geographically to a judge will be handled by that judge from receipt at Common Pleas level through trial.

CRIMINAL COURT STATISTICS

CRIMINAL FILINGS	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
New cases bound over to C.P.	5219	5815	5893	6334	5719
Fast Track Pleas and ARDs Disposed	3372	3966	3914	4775	4292
Fast Track DUIs Scheduled	569	643	790	800	625

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Jury Trial	20	22	31	21	33
Non-Jury Trial	19	32	28	28	22
Guilty Plea	3585	4177	3923	4046	4400
Dismissal Rule 586	63	60	56	53	60
Dismissed	128	118	120	115	135
Dismissed Speedy Trial	1	2	0	0	1
Nolle Pros	169	176	154	202	246
ARD	975	1239	867	927	868
Drug Court				64	38
Declared Inactive	444	603	671	668	897
Other/Uncategorized Dispositions ¹	63	35	160	299	277
Summary Appeals Disposed	590	495	511	784	696
Total Cases Disposed	5467	5866	5420	5761	6059
End of Year Cases Pending	2505	2439	2899	3130	2807

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.

In the face of a minimal increase in filings, the number of cases pending at the end of the year increased minimally over the 4 year period between 2013 and 2017. The number of jury trials has increased in 2017. This may be the result of a change to an individual calendar system for the judges, which was theorized would produce greater efficiency in disposing of cases. The number of guilty pleas shows a general trend of a greater number of guilty pleas over the past four years. The number of total cases disposed has grown consistently over the past three year period.

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 2016 and 2017.

CLERK OF COURTS' COLLECTIONS

	2016	2017
Restitution	1,140,477	1,311,036
Fines	463,418	448,340
Electronic Monitoring Fees	530,824	517,890
Supervision Fees (State)	638,186	557,504
Supervision Fees (County)	556,424	556,987
ARD Fees	183,158	172,417
Drug Education Fee	112,766	110,305
Sheriff Costs	31,487	32,897
MDJ Costs	71,493	70,526
Constable Costs	3,168	4,691
Appeals	22,256	20,774
Local Computer Surcharge Fee	13,853	13,733
Judgment Filing Fee	34,819	40,565
Expungements	17,412	17,182
Licenses	6,147	4,200
Pre-Trial Services Fees	15,901	12,147
Judgment Satisfactions	7,116	7,919
Extradition Fees	1,688	2,167
Juvenile EM Fees	3,755	5,166
District Attorney Costs	1,331	1,179
Witness Fees	1,466	1,428
Miscellaneous Revenues	2,023	3,333
Interest	0	0
Record Checks	580	565
Domestic Violence Fee	200	210
TOTAL COLLECTIONS	3,859,947	3,913,263

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 2017. 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 Scott O. Mears, Jr.
Judge Harry F. Smail, Jr.
Judge Timothy A. Krieger

2016 Family Court Assignments included the following: Judges Bononi and Mears heard delinquency cases; Judges Smail and Krieger heard dependency, termination of parental rights, and adoptions; Judges Mears, Smail, and Krieger heard Protection from Abuse matters; and all Family Assignment Judges 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 Mears
Fb - K	Judge Bononi
L - Ri	Judge Smail
Rj - Z	Judge Krieger

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	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	127	148	159	140	245
New cases	502	499	462	524	687
Cases Disposed	481	488	481	419	615
End of Year Balance of Cases	148	159	140	245	317

The above figures show that the numbers of new and disposed delinquency cases have grown significantly in 2017. 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)	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	213	204	176	213	217
New cases	125	102	118	99	139
Cases Disposed	143	126	86	95	111
End of Year Balance (cases)	204	176	213	217	245

FAMILY COURT – DEPENDENCY (STATUS OFFENSES²)	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	26	30	33	41	39
New cases	51	41	34	31	25
Cases Disposed	47	39	26	33	24
End of Year Balance of Cases	30	33	41	39	40

FAMILY COURT – DIVORCE	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	2700	2770	2766	2845	2914
New cases	970	906	1013	995	888
Cases Disposed	900	910	934	926	781
End of Year Balance of Cases	2770	2766	2845	2914	3021

FAMILY COURT – CUSTODY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	767	847	367	347	452
New cases	1383	1161	957	911	890
Cases Disposed	1303	1641	977	806	927
End of Year Balance of Cases	847	367	347	452	415

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 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	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	5	41	133	100	116
New cases	928	832	810	804	752
Cases Disposed	892	740	843	788	743
End of Year Balance of Cases	41	133	100	116	125

² Status offenses include truancy and incorrigibility.

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 2016 by Judges Mears, Smail, and Krieger. 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	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	55	48	59	99	56
New cases	212	171	166	173	214
Cases Disposed	219	160	126	216	160
End of Year Balance of Cases	48	59	99	56	110

OPHANS' COURT – ADOPTIONS	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Beginning Year Balance of Cases	15	10	9	11	16
New cases	144	99	109	113	123
Cases Disposed	149	100	107	108	124
End of Year Balance of Cases	10	9	11	16	15

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.

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
EXPENSES	5,683,624	5,765,638.63	5,714,669.86	5,827,584.98	5,995,704.55
REVENUES	1,083,432	1,109,816.73	1,161,006.60	858,570.68*	918,786.23*
NET COST	4,600,192	4,655,821.90	4,553,662.26	4,969,014.30	5,076,918.32

*Since 2016, the Court Administrator's Grant from the state has been reduced by 31% which adversely affected the revenue. Prior to 2016, the grant was \$750,000. In 2016 and 2017, \$507,034 was received.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE ADVISORY BOARD

Chaired by Judge Anthony G. Marsili in 2017, 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.

VETERANS DIVERSIONARY PROGRAM

In 2012, Westmoreland County developed a Veterans Diversionary Program. This program is available to qualifying Veterans who have served and who have certain summary or misdemeanor charges pending against them. Those with pending felony charges, DUI charges, charges of sexual crimes involving a minor child, and first-class misdemeanors other than retail theft are excluded from the program. In 2017, the program was expanded to allow those charged with terroristic threats to participate in the program, provided a weapon was not used in the commission of the crime. Veterans agree to participate in the program and are screened by a Veterans Justice Outreach Coordinator. Participants who qualify obtain consent of the District Attorney and agree to undergo treatment through the Veterans' Administration. Upon successful completion of the program, charges are dismissed. The goal of Veterans Court is to provide incentives to obtain the treatment helpful for rehabilitation, and thereby reduce recidivism.

WESTMORELAND COUNTY
ADULT PROBATION AND PAROLE DEPARTMENT
2017 ANNUAL REPORT

President Judge:	Honorable Richard E. McCormick, Jr.
Administrative Judge:	Honorable Meagan Bilik-DeFazio
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 2017, the Westmoreland County Adult Probation/Parole Office consisted of eighty four (84) full-time employees. More specifically, in addition to the Chief and Deputy Chief, there were nine (9) Supervisors, one (1) Office Supervisor, one (1) Fiscal Assistant, twenty eight (28) Probation Officer IIs, twenty four (24) Probation Officer Is, twelve (12) Probation Officer Aides, five (5) Legal Secretaries and two (2) Department Clerks. As of December 31, 2017, the total number of offenders under the supervision of the Westmoreland County Adult Probation/Parole Office was 7,789. Of that total, 5,454 were male and 2,335 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.
- 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 (closed on September 1, 2017)
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 information regarding the circumstances of the offense, victim/restitution information, the defendant's prior criminal history and sentencing guideline ranges. The Court can also request additional information including the following: the defendant's family and marital history; education and employment information; drug and alcohol history; emotional and physical health status, and; financial information. Eighty (80) presentence investigations were ordered by the Court in 2017.

The sentencing judge is required to consider the sentencing guidelines in determining the appropriate sentence for offenders convicted of felonies and misdemeanors. During 2017, four thousand six hundred twenty eight (4,628) 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

2017 STATISTICS

TYPES OF CASELOADS	NUMBER OF OFFENDERS
ARD	1,064
General Field – North Region	630
General Field – South Region	678
General Field – East Region	766
General Field – West Region	650
General Field – Central Region	572
Sex Offenders	124
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENDERS	4,484

As of December 31, 2017, there were 881 offenders in Bench Warrant status.

2017 OFFENDER REPORTING

Report Place	In Person	By Mail	Pretrial	Drug Court	TOTAL
Main Office	10,788	10,594	916	2,846	25,144
DRC (Greensburg) until closure on 09-01-17	7,133	0	0	0	7,133
New Ken. Sub-Office	3,566	0	153	392	4,111
Monessen Sub-Office	2,340	0	79	401	2,820
TOTALS	23,827	10,594	1,148	3,639	39,208

2017 EXPUNGEMENTS

ARD	423
PWV	106
TOTAL	529

2017 EARLY RELEASES

ARD	194
PWV	8
IP	40
TOTAL	242

2017 DRUG TESTING

Location	Drug Tests Conducted
DRC (until the closure on 9-1-17) and RIP/ATS	8,107
Field	1,505
Greensburg (Main Office)	4,250
Monessen Sub-Office	1,217
New Kensington Sub-Office	1,057
Westmoreland County Prison	47
Pretrial	1,809
TOTAL	17,992

Adult Probation also conducted 526 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	2016	2017
Adult Probation Office	195	180	220
County Prison	91	108	92
Field	0	0	2
New Kensington Sub-office	42	34	8
Monessen Sub-office	10	0	10
DRC	0	0	0
Total	338	322	332

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, 2017 was 2,094.

2017 TRANSFER CASES

New Cases Transferred to County of Residence	524
New Cases Transferred to State of Residence	20

2017 CO-OP CASES

Requests Received to Supervise Cases from Other Counties	390
--	-----

COUNTIES MAKING THE MOST REQUESTS:

Allegheny	139
Indiana	33
Fayette	30
Washington	29
Armstrong	27

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 2017, the equipment used to monitor those offenders was leased through BI, Incorporated.

2017 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.	687
Number of Offenders who were Ineligible for IP	39
Average Length of Stay on Electronic Monitoring (Days)	94
Number of IP Cases Transferred to Other Counties for Supervision	96
Number of Offenders who Successfully Completed Electronic Monitoring	611
Number of Offenders who were Unsuccessfully Discharged from Electronic Monitoring	50
Total Jail Days Saved	56,398
Electronic Monitoring Fees Collected	\$536,030

IP PROGRAM TRENDS

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Pending	140	148	183	234	202
Average Length of Stay (Days)	144	141	107	172	94
Number of Offenders Placed on Electronic Monitoring	643	656	637	624	687
Average Number of Offenders on EHM	394	328	285	238	243

2017 OVERALL STATISTICS

3,756 new offenders and 4,703 new cases were added to Adult Probation's system during the 2017 calendar year. During that same time period, 3,909 offenders were released from supervision.

2017	NEW	NEW	Program of these new cases.						RELEASED
	OFFENDERS	CASES	ARD	INC	PAR	PRO	PWV	IP	OFFENDERS
JAN	318	395	91	36	49	153	20	46	365
FEB	258	326	83	27	41	135	17	23	302
MAR	418	510	110	31	60	232	32	45	420
APR	311	398	82	18	43	185	27	43	354
MAY	325	404	78	36	50	168	30	42	345
JUN	302	381	92	28	42	159	22	38	280
JUL	261	335	62	21	52	154	16	30	308
AUG	313	407	93	28	41	187	21	37	347
SEP	307	376	75	30	51	145	25	50	311
OCT	314	369	78	20	51	151	25	44	375
NOV	326	417	87	21	73	166	36	34	284
DEC	303	385	90	24	56	151	18	46	218
TOTALS:	3756	4703	1021	320	609	1986	289	478	3909

VIOLATIONS FILED IN 2017

ARD Violations Filed	596
Probation, Parole and Intermediate Punishment Violations Filed	4,520
TOTAL	5,116

OFFENDER REFERRALS FOR TREATMENT

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

Referral Type	Number of Referrals in 2017
Drug and Alcohol	4,054
Alcohol Highway Safety School	2,770
Mental Health	667
Community Service	56

PRETRIAL SERVICES AND INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE PROGRAM

Pretrial cases involve offenders released on bail. Those cases are supervised by one Probation Officer II. There are times, however, when some of the pretrial electronic monitoring cases are supervised by Intermediate Punishment Officers.

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	2016	2017
Average Monthly Caseload – Non Electronic Monitoring	145	168	166	180	156
Average Monthly Caseload – Electronic Monitoring	24	27	35	27	25
New Pretrial Cases Received – Electronic Monitoring and Non Electronic Monitoring	253	258	293	223	209
Pretrial Electronic Monitoring Fees Collected	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$6,965	\$15,901	\$12,146

INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE OFFICER STATISTICS

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Parole Applications Processed and Release Plans Verified	266	258	201	246	253
Re-Parole Investigations/ Special Investigations	90	148	33	64	78
Inpatient Drug and Alcohol Evaluations and Treatment Coordination	198	91	254	221	351
Nominal Bond Investigations	44	63	62	48	86

DRIVING UNDER SUSPENSION – 1543(b)

DRIVING UNDER SUSPENSION (DUS) STATISTICS

	2015	2016	2017
Number of Offenders Sentenced to IP for DUS	104	137	168
Number of Offenders Placed on Electronic Monitoring for DUS	74	84	98
Number of Offenders found Ineligible	8	23	32
Number of Offenders on the Pending List as of the last day of the year	22	30	38

DAY REPORTING CENTER

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

In 2017 (until the closure of the DRC on September 1, 2017), 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 and several therapists. A K-9 officer from the Westmoreland County Sheriff's Office conducted 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 were provided such as life skills, nutrition, yoga and Certified Recovery Specialist groups.

DRC STATISTICS

	2015	2016	2017
Number of Individuals Admitted into the Program	205	130	81
Number of Successful Completions	47	34	9
Number of Unsuccessful Completions	147	100	61

MEGAN'S LAW REGISTRATION

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

MEGAN'S LAW REGISTRATION STATISTICS

	2015	2016	2017
New Registrations	26	30	46
In person appearances to update information	107	159	148
In person appearances to verify information	199	160	207

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.

2017 DRUG TREATMENT COURT STATISTICS

Number of Referrals	65
Total Number of Individuals Admitted to Drug Court	23
Number Admitted – Diversion	8
Number Admitted – Intermediate Punishment Sentence	12
Number Admitted - Re-Entry	3
Number of Participants as of December 31, 2017 (This number includes individuals who were admitted to Drug Court in 2016.)	47 29 Male 18 Females

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	2016	2017
Number of AHSS Class Cycles	43	40	47	47
Number of Offenders who Completed Classes	958	970	1,042	1,066
Total AHSS Fees Collected (this Includes Individuals who Paid in Advance and have yet to Enroll/Complete Classes)	\$291,905.40	\$293,628.45	\$294,509.90	\$300,059.04
Total Rescheduling Fees Collected (\$30.00 per rescheduled class) This fee started in 2017.	—	—	—	\$7,345.00
Instructor Wages Paid	\$39,167.04	\$35,641.00	\$45,040.00	\$46,060.00
Net Revenue	\$240,478.71	\$249,675.46	\$233,452.20	\$250,777.18

BUDGET EXPENSES AND REVENUES

EXPENSES

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Personnel, Fringes	\$5,379,411.84	\$5,430,574.95	\$5,396,371.97	\$5,660,648.30	\$5,764,129.74
Operating Expenses	\$1,186,434.27	\$1,444,499.58	\$999,246.71	\$784,623.56	\$921,425.78
Capital	\$26,188.37	\$23,118.26	\$1,609.00	0	\$19,830.50
TOTAL	\$6,592,034.48	\$6,898,192.79	\$6,397,227.68	\$6,445,271.76	\$6,705,386.02

REVENUES

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Grant-In-Aid	\$522,363	\$512,603	\$520,000	\$512,604	\$515,000
Supervision Fees	\$991,161	\$1,072,855	\$1,245,729	\$1,141,589	\$1,114,492
Electronic Monitoring Fees	\$622,660	\$642,762	\$634,424	\$586,359	\$548,176
Grant (IP and RIP/ATS)	\$207,864	\$200,726	\$208,912	\$184,181	\$220,776
ARD Administrative Fees	\$50,911	\$58,705	\$54,216	\$51,341	\$51,131
AHSS	\$51,797	\$240,478	\$249,675	\$294,510	\$300,059
Miscellaneous	\$291	\$1,330	\$496	0	\$1,000
TOTALS	\$2,447,047	\$2,729,459	\$2,393,972	\$2,770,584	\$2,750,634

ELECTRONIC MONITORING FEES

During the past 5 years, Adult Probation has collected and turned over to the county \$3,034,381 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.

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				
2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
\$991,161.59	\$1,072,855.68	\$1,245,729.10	\$1,141,589.13	\$1,114,492.00

County Portion of Supervision Fees Transferred to County General Fund				
\$497,636.71	\$536,172.26	\$625,012.62	\$570,449.51	\$556,987.00

State Portion of Supervision Fees Returned to County General Fund				
\$493,524.88	\$536,683.42	\$620,716.48	\$571,139.62	\$557,505.00

In summary, during the past 5 years, \$5,565,827.50 in supervision fees was collected. During the same time period, the President Judge released \$2,786,258.10 to the county general fund and the state returned \$2,779,569.40 to the county general fund for a total of \$5,565,827.50 released to the general fund.

NOTE: According to Warden John Walton, in 2017, Westmoreland County earned \$2,340.00 in revenue by renting out space to other facilities at a per diem rate of \$78.00. 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
Juvenile Hearing Officer: John Casario, Esq.
Juvenile Hearing Officer: 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.

2017 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.

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Total Referrals	687	686	645	610	687
Delinquency Placements	61	65	108	86	97
Total Placements	61	65	108	86	97
Total Dispositions	2186	2167	2131	2071	2129

COURT ACTIVITY

A Juvenile Court Hearing Officer or Judge hears juvenile charges. The court adjudicates delinquency and orders the disposition. Court hearings are held each week either by a Hearing Officer 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

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Total No. of Hearings before Judges	684	708	600	627	835
Total No. of Hearings before Masters	949	938	983	1036	947
TOTAL	1633	1746	1583	1663	1782

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. 173 children were detained in the Juvenile Detention Center in 2017. The average length of stay was 15.3 days. The following is a breakdown by race, age and gender and a 10 year comparison of juveniles detained each year.

DETAINED IN 2017 BY RACE (173)													
WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		BIRACIAL		OTHER		NATIVE AMERICAN		ASIAN	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
74	26	39	9	0	0	21	4	0	0	0	0	0	0

DETAINED IN 2017 BY AGE (173)										
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	OTHER	
0	1	1	14	18	25	30	44	22	18	

10 YEAR COMPARISON									
2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
317	266	239	214	208	196	202	152	116	173

The average length of stay was 15.3 days.

EMERGENCY SHELTER

The Emergency Shelter is used as a least restrictive alternative to juvenile detention. The following is statistical information for 2017:

DETAINED IN 2017 BY RACE (119)													
WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		BIRACIAL		OTHER		NATIVE AMERICAN		ASIAN	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
49	23	11	7	0	1	10	4	6	8	0	0	0	0

DETAINED IN 2017 BY AGE (119)									
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	OTHER
1	0	7	8	7	18	25	23	22	8

10 YEAR COMPARISON									
2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
-	-	-	78	115	109	90	111	114	119

The average length of stay was 19.39 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 2017:

- 83% of Juvenile Offenders Successfully Completed Supervision
- 73% 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 2017:

- 90 % of juveniles completed assigned community service obligations
- 5,965 hours of community service were completed
- \$46,168 of restitution was paid to victims
- 84% 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 2017:

- 89% of juveniles were employed or in an educational or vocational activity
- 96% 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, 951 referrals have been made to the CBMR Program including 53 in 2017. 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.

In 2016, juvenile probation entered into a separate contract with BI Incorporated. Prior to this year, all equipment was handled under an agreement with adult probation. This eases inventory issues and also has provided more equipment availability. At this time, juvenile probation is able to choose between 3 different home electronic monitoring systems. This allows equipment to be used that best meets the needs of the client.

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

Community-based probation services are intended to enhance the ability of the juvenile justice system to achieve its mission by establishing and maintaining effective working relationships with community members, agencies and social institutions.

The Juvenile Court Judges Commission describes two models of community-based probation services; community supervision and community liaison.

In the community supervision model, the juvenile probation officer supervises a caseload of juveniles while developing effective working relationships in the community that provide natural support, training and mentoring opportunities for juveniles under supervision. Presently, there are six probation officers working in this capacity. Four of these officers work within public schools and two are roaming officers meeting the fluctuating needs of the department. An example of the work is that they act as department liaisons for the youth commissions. The community-based officers participate in youth commission proceedings and trainings, and actively work to recruit new members. There are countless other ways that these probation officers serve the community; they offer educational instruction to youth in the classroom on a variety of topics, including responsibility in social media, drug and alcohol prevention, and the law, to name a few. They serve as members of the Student Assistance Program. They help youth to repair the harm that they have caused to the victim(s) and the community by working toward meaningful community service, training in victim awareness to promote an appropriate apology and by seeking community resources individualized to benefit the youth and family. They often can be found completing community service work with youth and attending community driven events such as Build a Better Block in New Kensington, and participating in National Night Out, a crime prevention program, in a number of communities. These probation officers continually work to develop relationships with community leaders, law enforcement, victim services, businesses, community agencies, churches and schools. They network with employers, educators and others who can provide youth with job skills and employment opportunities.

The second model of community-based probation is the community liaison model. The officer in this model is dedicated to developing and maintaining effective working relationships with community leaders, law enforcement, victim services, businesses, and community agencies. There is one officer assigned to this position. The community liaison operates from a bigger picture perspective, and encourages and supports the community in delinquency prevention activities, and is dedicated to educating the public about the Juvenile Justice System. Traditionally the person occupying this position sits on a number of Boards and committees, from local communities, countywide, and state. Following are some highlights of those in which the greatest responsibility is held.

The community liaison is responsible for the department's sexting education program. This program receives referrals from District Judges and law enforcement for youth who have been charged with offenses under this statute. Referrals are also received from parents and other probation officers. Participants' parents are also provided with valuable tools to help them to talk to their children about the dangers of sexting. Further, the community liaison has conducted sexting education programming to local youth in school and community settings.

The community liaison is the chair-person for the Westmoreland County Child Death Review Team. This team meets regularly to review every Westmoreland County childhood (to the age of 21 years) death and to promote childhood death prevention efforts.

The community liaison is active on the Council of Substance Abuse and Youth, a coalition of the Westmoreland Drug and Alcohol Commission, conducts Circles (a group process that fosters listening and communication skills), attends CASSP meetings and conducts educational programming in local school districts and universities.

Each of these efforts, and every new endeavor, is conducted with the goal of reducing and repairing the harm in our communities, restoring youth and families, and reducing recidivism.

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					
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Male Youth Assigned Community Service Work	191	204	208	227	190
Female Youth Assigned Community Service Work	58	60	75	75	67

Total Assigned	249	264	283	302	257
Total Hours Worked in Communities					
Total Hours Worked in Communities	Year			Hours	
	2013			8,823	
	2014			7,457	
	2015			6,760	
	2016			7,226	
	2017			6,836	
Total				37,102	

VICTIM SERVICES

The Westmoreland County Juvenile Department has had a dedicated Juvenile Victim Advocate since May of 2012. The wellbeing of the victims that we serve is of the utmost importance in the department. Research shows that victims feel the most comfortable when they have a person who is not working with the offender in their case. The Victim Advocate takes very specific actions to see that victims are properly notified of, accompanied to, and heard in court proceedings. The system is often confusing and the Victim Advocate is there to alleviate that confusion. Victim input is encouraged and any concerns they have can be addressed immediately by the Advocate.

The other Juvenile Probation Officers rely on the Advocate to understand victims' concerns and desires prior to the adjudication hearing, including requests for restitution, special conditions, such as no contact, and possibly a requested site for the youth to complete community service. The Probation Officer can then reinforce these wishes in court. Victims have the right to make an impact statement in court, and the Advocate helps each victim do so if they wish. Safety and empowerment are often compromised when a person is victimized and actions such as these can be an important part of the healing process for them. The Advocate is available to the victim for the duration of the case and beyond to answer questions and provide support.

Currently, the Advocate is working on projects that may enable greater opportunities for victims, communities, and offenders to heal from harms caused. One program that has been implemented in our department to enable these opportunities is our Victim Awareness Program. Our main goal with this restorative program is for the juvenile to become cognizant of their actions that have affected the victim, their families, friends and the entire community as a whole. This recognition for what the offender has caused the victim can only come from assuming full responsibility and acknowledgment. Subsequently, in cooperation with the offender, the program facilitators will meet with the offender and devise a plan to complete an apology letter to the victim. This apology letter is a vital part of this program as it sets the structure for what the offender has done and how they are going to mend the harm and distress they have caused to the victim. Statistical data compiled in 2017 showed that a total of 76 juveniles had successfully completed the Victim Awareness Program. Collectively, our department is confident that this program and its restorative practices have greatly improved the behavior and future decisions of the juvenile making them a productive member of the community.

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.

There are currently 17 Youth Commissions in Westmoreland County with 89 members. Those Youth Commissions are Burrell, Derry, Franklin, Greensburg, Hempfield, Jeannette, Latrobe, Ligonier, Monessen, Mt. Pleasant, New Kensington/Arnold, Norwin, Penn, Rostraver, Scottdale, Trafford, and Yough. In the calendar year 2017 a total of 65 cases were diverted by the Youth Commissions.

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.

Referral Source: Juvenile Court ONLY

- ❖ Juvenile Probation Office.
- ❖ MDJ
- ❖ School Resource Officers

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. In the calendar year of 2017 there were 6 Reintegration cases.

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 continues to be the permanent home to Pennsylvania's PTSD Project. The program includes training therapists statewide on the Residential Treatment Curriculum (RTC), specialized PTSD Aftercare services, and a variety of one day trainings for professionals that work with youth in any manner. The RTC, which is a twelve session treatment curriculum to help youth that have been traumatized, was updated in 2016 to include the most current research in the field of trauma treatment. The PA PTSD Project, in conjunction with Adelphoi Village, provided the 40 hour training to certify therapists in the RTC on two occasions in 2017 and certified 19 staff members from various facilities around the state. In addition, 15 people that were previously certified in the RTC participated in a booster training to get certified in the updated curriculum. Perhaps the biggest accomplishment for the PTSD Project in 2017 was completion of the new training video, which was produced in February of 2017. The video is used in the RTC, as well as in various one-day trauma trainings that are conducted by the PTSD Project. The video stars a young lady from Adelphoi Village that has completed the RTC and is doing very well overall since completing the curriculum. The video has gotten great reviews from the audiences that have viewed it during trainings this year, and it will help the PTSD Project train staff members all over the state for years to come.

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. In 2017, the PTSD Project provided 33 trainings and trained 589 participants in a variety of training opportunities that address PTSD, mental health issues, stress management for youth, and stress management for staff. Like the RTC, all of our one-day trainings have been updated to reflect the most current research in the field of trauma. The PTSD Project added three new one day training opportunities in 2017, as Developmental Trauma Disorder, PTSD in Special Populations, and Urban Violence Traumatic Stress Response Syndrome. The new trainings were very well received throughout the year, as they were done at various facilities all over our state.

Members of the PTSD Project are significantly involved in the Southwest Regional Crisis Intervention (CIT) Team, which is a group that provides 40 hours of 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 PTSD Project serves as a board member on the Ray of Hope, which is a task force that works to prevent suicides in Westmoreland County and has also earned Certification in Traumatic Stress Studies from the Trauma Center at the Justice Resource Institute in June of 2017.

Future Goals for the Pennsylvania PTSD Project include:

- Launch a website that will be home to a distance learning program where people can participate in all of our trainings online
- Continue to certify therapists statewide in the RTC
- Continue to provide Booster Trainings on the updated version of the RTC
- Continue to provide regular trainings for professionals and paraprofessionals that serve youth in any capacity
- Continue outreach to community groups and organizations
- Research the outcomes of the RTC and PTSD Aftercare
- Utilize trauma informed care to enhance the services that are available to the youth of Westmoreland County

REINTEGRATION PROBATION

One of the most critical moments for juveniles placed in residential treatment 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 determines targeted support systems for the juvenile, for example; family members, peers, schools employees or other community members. Reintegration Officers facilitate interaction and involvement between juveniles and the community. Reintegration Officers

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.

Another responsibility of the Reintegration Officer is to educate their peers about community resources. This is achieved by offering Resource Days. Resource Day is when organizations from different communities come to the Probation Office to inform Probation Officers about the services they offer. The Resource Officer's job is to keep up-to-date on the different and new services being offered.

DANGERS OF SEXTING DIVERSION PROGRAM

The Westmoreland County Juvenile Probation Office has been diligent in creating a program specifically designed to address the issue of Sexting. The Dangers of Sexting Diversion Program works with juveniles to assist them in realizing the serious and complex consequences that can stem from these acts. Transferring sexually explicit images of a minor through the use of a cell phone is considered the distribution of child pornography which is felonious conduct. There are many adolescents that are naïve to this subject of Sexting and do not realize the ramifications that may follow their behavior. Most of the courts within our state of Pennsylvania have come to the affirmation that the majority of adolescents who engage in Sexting behavior may not require such a harsh punishment.

In 2017, The Dangers of Sexting Diversion Program serviced and facilitated 35 juveniles, ranging in ages from 14 through 18. In a more in-depth approach statistical data compiled in 2017 also showed:

- ✓ 20 Males
- ✓ 15 Females
- ✓ 2 Referrals came from The Westmoreland County Youth Commission
- ✓ 5 Referrals came from the Probation Officers
- ✓ 24 Referrals came from the Magisterial District Judges
- ✓ 2 Referrals came from the District Attorney's Office
- ✓ 5 Juveniles were unsuccessful in completing the program and referred back to the Magisterial District Justices Office

At the conclusion of the program, a post-test is distributed among the juveniles for their input and to collect the information that they have learned. One of the most important questions asked on the post-test reads "If they thought anything was private", 100% of the juvenile's responded "No". The last question on the post-test asks "If you would do anything differently", the responses received were regrettable responses.

The Magisterial District Judges, local law enforcement officials, educators, and parents are all able to make referrals to this program. The Dangers of Sexting Diversion Program strives to see that the juvenile's involvement in this curriculum is successful. Moreover, it is vital that we raise awareness regarding this subject and increase education in our youth and the community as a whole.

2017 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. Our goal is to reduce the youth's risk to reoffend as well as change long term behavior. Westmoreland County Juvenile Probation is committed to using evidence based practices and the principles of Balanced and Restorative Justice with fidelity at every level of our system.

This 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 very busy year for the department. We continue to strive toward implementing and utilizing evidence-based practices to enhance Westmoreland County's Juvenile Justice System.

Through legislation, the purpose clause of Pennsylvania's Juvenile Act 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 focus our efforts and collect and analyze data necessary to measure the results of these efforts; and, with this knowledge, we 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 case closing. This can be done on line or via hard copy. The results of that survey have been positive. When children are involved in our system, involving families in case planning and goal setting and in all phases of the juvenile system are critical to a successful outcome for that child. We have made a commitment to continue our pledge and partner with communities to improve prevention and diversion services.
- ❖ We continue to use a Risk-Needs Assessment Instrument for all youth who enter 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 no longer 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 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. This workgroup is in the process of creating a Newsletter of the department’s accomplishments and juvenile justice issues which will be distributed in hard copy and electronically to youth, families, victims and the community.
- ❖ Our staff continues to conduct youth groups as an educational component to assist in their understanding as well as the consequences of Sexting/Technology and Sexual Violence. These youth consist of those involved in the juvenile justice system or who appear before the

Magisterial District Court on a sexting summary offense. Our goal is to share this with parents and community members as an awareness and preventative method as well.

- ❖ Motivational Interviewing - Motivational Interviewing is a communication skill that helps probation officers resolve their client's ambivalence to change. It also strengthens their relationship with probationers to one of a guide and helper. Currently there are six Motivational Interviewing Coaches within the department. The Coaches are expected to observe probation officer's meetings with clients, review a recording of a probation officer's conversation with a client and provide immediate positive and/or 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. A Proclamation was presented by the County Commissioners to the Honorable Michele Bononi, Juvenile Court Administrative Judge, to kick off the week. In addition we held a very successful Family Fun Night for the general public at Twin Lakes Park. Many provider agencies attended and distributed 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. In the last few years, volunteers have worked with youth as mentors in the community and not just to divert youth 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, connect the youth to his/her community and give him/her the skills to become a responsible, law abiding citizen after the case is closed in Juvenile Court.
- ❖ Pennsylvania Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (PaDRAI) - In January of this year we began using this valid instrument to assist probation officers in using objective criteria through this tool. It increases objectivity & consistency in the detention decision making process, to properly identify youth who pose the greatest risk for re-offending or failing to appear for court. It encourages the proper use of alternatives to detention. More importantly this instrument is intended to ensure Fundamental Fairness in the detention decision

making process. The underlying principles of the PaDRAI are Objectivity (to reduce the inherent biases), Uniformity (use the same rules for everyone), and Risk-based (use actuarial science to evaluate/measure only proven risk factors).

2017 was productive as we moved even further into the Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy. Through on-going training, our probation officers are developing and mastering skills in evidence based practices. Through the Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy, we will achieve our Balanced & Restorative Justice Mission, Community Protection, Victim Restoration and Youth Redemption.

REVENUES AND EXPENSES

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
EXPENSES	\$7,810,489.68	\$7,444,557.00	\$7,158,496.00	\$7,228,268.03	\$7,394,467.00
REVENUES	\$3,987,085.39	\$3,355,218.27	\$3,205,612.00	\$4,266,509.62	\$3,259,463.00

WESTMORELAND COUNTY DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION
2017 ANNUAL REPORT

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

2017 PERFORMANCE

INCENTIVE MEASURES:

For the tenth consecutive year, Pennsylvania again met the minimum 80% complete requirements for all 6 of the categories monitored in FFY 2017. In fact, Pennsylvania again led the nation in its overall performance in 2017. And moreover, once again this year, Westmoreland County exceeded Pennsylvania's performance level.

In October, 2017, Westmoreland County Office of Domestic Relations underwent a one-week on-site audit from BCSE which resulted in a very rare "No Findings" Report indicating no discrepancies, irregularities or shortfalls were found in DRO operations for the years 2015-2016.

The following chart reflects the comparative results for Westmoreland County for 2017 fiscal year. There has been no significant statistical difference over the recent years so Westmoreland County continues to maintain its strong position in the establishment, collection and enforcement of child support and medical support.

But again like last year, other states continue to improve their statistical performance resulting in increased revenue sharing from the federal IV-D funds.

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 are seeing a decline in our incentive monies as we projected as a result of other states improving their performances.

MEASURES as values	Westmoreland	Pennsylvania
Line 01 - Count of Open IV-D Cases	8,458	370,004
Line 02 - Count of IV-D Cases with Support Order Established	8,156	335,378
Support Ratio (Line 2 / Line 1)	96.43%	90.64%
Line 5 - Count of Children Born Out of Wedlock	5,403	283,752
Line 6 - Count of Children with Paternity Established	5,943	307,094
Paternity Ratio (Line 6 / Line 5)	109.99%	108.23%
Line 24 - Amount of Current Support Owed	\$32,768,364	\$1,253,126,320
Line 25 - Amount of Current Support Disbursed	\$27,735,535	\$1,053,897,490
Current Support Ratio (Line 25 / Line 24)	84.64%	84.10%
Line 28 - Count of Cases with Arrears Owed	7,185	265,642
Line 29 - Count of Cases with Disbursements toward Arrears	6,036	223,557
Arrears Ratio (Line 29 / Line 28)	84.01%	84.16%
Line 2e - Count of Arrears-Only IV-D Cases with Orders Established	937	42,417
Line 21 - Count of IV-D Cases with Medical Support Ordered	6,930	272,888
Line 21a - Count of IV-D Cases with Medical Support Ordered and Provided	6,664	255,282
Medical Support Establishment Ratio (Line 21 / (Line 02 - Line 2e))	96.00%	93.15%
Medical Support Enforcement Ratio (Line 21a / Line 21)	96.16%	93.55%

CASELOAD

Again this year, the caseload slightly decreased in 2017, this time by 178 cases. The breakdown is as follows:

2013 - 2017 Caseload Comparisons								
Year	SSI	Federal Foster Care	General Assistance	Medical Only	Non-Federal Foster Care	Non-TANF	TANF	Total
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
2016	1	397	0	3	127	7990	534	9,052
2017	1	385	0	5	91	7889	503	8,874

2017 CASE PROCESSING ACTIVITY

Year	Paternity Estab.	Paternity Excluded	Complaints Processed	Modifications Processed	Conferences Conducted	Record Hearings	Contempt Hearings
2013	108	51	1990	3122	4673	273	3784
2014	112	40	1871	3213	4587	257	3793
2015	124	27	1854	3095	4504	216	3565
2016	102	21	1862	2972	4384	221	3646
2017	75	15	1728	2766	4079	211	3758

COLLECTIONS COMPARISONS

Although the collection per case decreased slightly in 2017, Westmoreland continues to perform well above the federal minimums. In addition to Total and Per Case collections, the other important performance factor is effective enforcement of established obligations.

CASELOAD/COLLECTION TREND

(We rank #5 out of 12 counties listed as 3rd class in dollars collected per case)

Westmoreland Collections per Case Trend			
Year Ending	Caseload	Collections	Per Case
12/31/2013	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
12/31/2016	9,052	\$38,508,572.14	\$4,254.15
12/31/2017	8,874	\$37,283,516.36	\$4,201.43

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 investments are used to cover weekly expenditures.

PLGIT Trust – a short-term investment account which includes interest income from the Invesco AIM account. 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 12/31/17 is attached to the end of this report)

WHERE SUPPORT DOLLARS COME FROM?

Seventy eight 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.

2017 Disbursement Types

Direct Deposit	55.96%	\$20,847,487.71
Eppi Card (stored value)	40.95%	\$15,253,731.64
Check	3.09%	\$ 1,152,011.04

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 2017 costs of this office’s operations is as follows:

DRS total budgeted expenditures for 2017:	\$ 4,286,526
County Shared Calculation Includes:	
34% shared Direct Expenditures:	1,236,055
Plus Unallowable costs:	122,877
Plus 100% workers comp. Medical & Ind.	<u>40,000</u>
Total County Contributions:	\$ 1,398,932

These figures compare to a 2016 DRS budget of \$4,525,342 with the county budgeted to have paid \$1,479,500 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 \$10.44 for FFY 2017.

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

The Office of Domestic Relations underwent an In-House Performance Review by the Westmoreland Court of Common Pleas which resulted in some minor administrative changes but since our performance level regarding the establishment of support orders and medical support, as well as enforcing those orders, there is no plan to drastically alter our business model on the county level. As has been the case for several years, there continues to be a gradual decline in the number of support cases overall, reflecting the aging of the commonwealth's population and this office has gradually diminished its staffing through attrition in response to that population change. By doing so, Westmoreland DRO has maintained its superlative cost effectiveness by collecting more than \$10 for every dollar spent on child support in this county.

WESTMORELAND COUNTY MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT COURTS
2017 ANNUAL REPORT

President Judge: Honorable Richard E. McCormick
Magisterial District Judges: 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.
Wayne Gongaware, Esq.
James Falcon, Esq., Sr. MDJ
James Albert, Sr. MDJ
Douglas R. Weimer, Jr. 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 2017, Magisterial District Judge Wayne Gongaware, Esq. was elected to a 6 year term to fill the vacancy in District Court 10-2-09 and Magisterial District Judge Chris Flanigan, Esq. was elected to a 6 year term to fill the vacancy in District Court 10-1-10. Magisterial District Judges James Falcon, James Albert and Douglas Weimer serve the District Courts in Senior Capacity.

In 2017 there were 71,907 cases filed in the magisterial district courts of Westmoreland County. The following chart shows case filings for 2017 and grand totals for the last three years.

	TRAFFIC	SUMMARY	CRIMINAL	CIVIL		TOTALS	
	<u>2017</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>
10-1-01							
DeMarchis	3811	765	386	532	5632	5749	5494
10-1-03							
Dalfonso	1435	389	475	248	2685	2675	2547
10-1-04							
Yakopec	2593	983	536	502	4859	4642	4614
10-1-05							
Pallone	660	1061	759	607	3771	3288	3087
10-2-01							
Bompiani	3591	324	363	425	4747	4561	4703
10-2-03							
Kistler	1440	274	296	257	3023	2097	2267
10-2-06							
Christner	3231	481	316	333	4208	4255	4361
10-2-08							
Mahady	1956	547	538	415	3727	3256	3456
10-2-09							
Gongaware	1798	339	492	514	3058	3133	3143
10-2-10 Sr.							
MDJ	4499	1060	743	393	5535	5826	6695
10-3-01							
Mansour	6569	299	448	298	6621	6161	7614
10-3-02							
Conway	3020	294	349	312	4129	4154	3975
10-3-05							
Buczak	4406	291	293	226	4465	4904	5216
10-3-08							
Bilik	2024	749	269	268	4590	4682	3310
10-3-09							
Thiel	4888	277	181	159	4334	4549	5505
10-3-10							
Moore	2231	467	379	379	4208	3365	3456
10-3-11							
Eckels	1681	273	260	250	2806	2338	2464
TOTAL	49833	8873	7083	6118	72398	69635	71907

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 Polycom HDX4000 video conferencing units.

Magisterial District Court Expenses & Revenues (2013 – 2017)

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Revenue	1,303,137	1,170,338	1,213,926	1,156,565	1,346,115
Expense	4,469,814	4,453,052	4,447,563	4,575,864	4,531,672

WESTMORELAND COUNTY LAW LIBRARY
2017 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
Pamela Snyder; 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 405 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.
- Five public access computers used to search licensed online legal information, such as, Westlaw, Shepard's, Lexis, HeinOnline, 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 collection. The public and attorneys often 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 and borrowing privileges available for Westmoreland Bar Association members. The Library's Collection includes over 2,000 Pa. Bar Institute CLE books.

2017 EVENTS

- The Pa. Lexis Advance plan was upgraded to include all Pa. specific Lexis/Nexis and American Lawyer Media titles, and a Document Links feature. The subscription also includes access to: Shepard's Citations, Pa. Law Encyclopedia, Dunlap Hanna Forms, Pa. Transaction Guide, and Remick's Pa. Orphan's Court Practice. Lexis was used for 2,436 searches.
- The Law Library's Computers were used to conduct 12,211 Westlaw transactions. They were also used for thousands of other searches using HeinOnline, court forms, the internet, and our other licensed legal databases. The computers are also used by attorneys and the public to type legal documents.
- The Public Access Computers section of the Law Library was reconfigured to add a 5th computer and to provide more privacy for those using the computers.
- Referrals of Pro Se litigants from Family Court, the Prothonotary's Office, and the Pro Bono Office, increased throughout the year. 1,453 individuals' printed custody and divorce forms, with others visiting to research the law or receive instruction on accessing Westmoreland Family Court and State Court forms and information.
- Through our associate county law library membership to the Jenkins Law Library in Philadelphia, our Law Library can offer access to over 22 licensed online databases and E-Book collections, including: U.S. Newspapers, Gale Legal Forms, National Consumer Law Center, HeinOnline, Fastcase Treatise Library, ProQuest Congressional, LegalTrac, Pa. Legislative Histories, etc.
- Our Law Library was selected as a beta-test location for library staff to access a digitized collection of Pa. Common Pleas opinions (under development). It is being developed by Jenkins Law Library, and shows great promise in accessing difficult to locate opinions.
- Each semester the Law Library hosted several legal research classes from the WCCC Paralegal Program
- 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 annual conference of the Pa. Library Assoc. and several regional meetings sponsored by PaLA and the Western Pa. Law Library Association.
- Library staff utilized online training and continuing Ed webinars 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, Pa Bar Institute publications, and local court opinions were updated.