

PENNSYLVANIA COMMISSION ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY
CONSTABLES' EDUCATION AND TRAINING BOARD

Minutes of the August 9, 2012 Meeting

Members Present

Judge Richard Opiela, Allegheny Co, MDJ, Chairman
Fred Contino, Constable, Delaware County
A.R. DeFilippi, Court Administrator, Beaver County
Julie Sokoloff, Constable, Montgomery County
Harry Walsh, Constable, Allegheny County
Captain Adam Kisthardt, PA State Police

Members Absent

Teresa O'Neal, Juniata County Commissioner

Commission Staff Present

Donald Numer, Acting Manager, Bureau of Training Services
Donald Horst, Bureau of Training Services
Sherry Leffler, Bureau of Training Services
Kathy Clarke, Bureau of Training Services
Bob Merwine, Director, Office of Criminal Justice System Improvements (OCJSI)

Visitors

Mike Marcantino, Indiana University
Anthony Luongo, Temple University
Barry Betz, Constable, Lehigh County
Emil Minnar, PA State Constables Association (PSCA)
Tom Impink, Constable, Berks County, PSCA
R.F. Duncan, Constable, Lancaster County
Michael Connor, Constable, Delaware County

I. Call to Order

The Constables' Education and Training Board (Board)(CETB) meeting was held at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, August 9, 2012, at the Holiday Inn Morgantown in Morgantown, Pennsylvania.

The Honorable Richard Opiela, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and asked all to join him in the Pledge of Allegiance. Board and staff introductions were made to the audience members. Chairman Opiela noted that Commissioner O'Neal was not in attendance at the meeting.

II. Action Items

Chairman Opiela moved to the first action item on the agenda, Minutes of the May 10, 2012, Meeting, pages 1-16 of the board packet. Chairman Opiela asked if there were any questions or corrections concerning the minutes. There were no questions or concerns. Chairman Opiela asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Constable Harry Walsh motioned to approve the minutes. Constable Julie Sokoloff seconded the motion.

VOTING AYE: Opiela, DeFilippi, Contino, Sokoloff, and Walsh

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Opiela moved to the next action item of the agenda, **Financial Report for August 9, 2012, Meeting**, pages 17-20 of the Board packet. Mr. Donald Horst, PCCD, said the beginning balance from the previous year was \$6,513,974.24. The fee collections from 7/1/11 - 6/30/12 were \$1,929,080.94. As of 6/30/12, the total funds available were \$8,443,055.18. The total expenditures and commitments, looking to the end of the existing contracts (end of 2012), is \$6,956,619.41. That would leave a balance of 1,496,435.77, as of June 30, 2012. An important footnote is that the actual carry forward balance on July 1, 2012, for the FY 2012-2013 is \$6,411,197.56.

Chairman Opiela noted that on page 17, a substantial change is the commitment for 7/1/12 through 6/30/15 for Penn State University in the amount of \$726,991.94.

Mr. Horst said page 18 shows the Constable Fee Collections. He said the fee collections are down. The collections for State Fiscal Year 2011-12 are down about \$187,000 compared with State Fiscal Year 2008-2009.

Mr. Horst said page 19 shows the Administrative Costs. The column for Commitment Detail shows a total of \$62,258.23. The column for Expenditure Detail shows a total of \$600,924.35. The purchase order statuses on page 20 shows the new PSU Fayette Curriculum Development Purchase Order.

Mr. A.R. DeFilippi commented that, budgetarily, it looks as if we on target with the purchase orders. And it looks as if we will have a positive available balance at the end of contract terms. Chairman Opiela asked if bills have been submitted in a timely fashion, because there previously was an issue with bills not being submitted on time. Mr. Horst replied that the backlog has been cleared up. The oldest, outstanding invoices are for February 2012.

Mr. DeFilippi asked why we get so much money back at the end of purchase orders. Mr. Horst said contractors budget for the maximum amount, knowing that they would be covered if, for instance, legislation passed that would increase the number of training hours. There would be enough funds in the contracts without coming back to PCCD to re-negotiate their entire contracts.

Ms. Sherry Leffler, PCCD, said another example of this would be with the continuing education classes. Contractors currently budget for 40 hours, when classes have been running only 20 hours. Mr. Donald Numer, PCCD, stated it also could be because attendance wasn't as high in some classes, so the contractor would not be charging as much as if the classes were full.

Constable Fred Contino had a question about the administrative costs on page 19. He asked what the Expenditure Detail column included. Chairman Opiela said it was PCCD and the Board expenses for a year, \$600,924.35. Constable Contino said we bring in around \$2.1 million a year in CETA fees, but we are spending slightly more than in one year. Chairman Opiela said that is why our surpluses have fallen. Constable Contino said that contractor costs for a year are about \$1.5 million and administrative costs are around \$600,000, so because we are spending more than what we are bringing in in a year, the fund may be in deficit by 2017 or 2018.

Chairman Opiela asked about the \$205,659.81 for the contracted EDP Services. Ms. Leffler said this was, in part, because we have a second consultant helping with the re-design of the computer system. This person is part-time now, but it is anticipated that the individual will be full-time sometime in September. Chairman Opiela asked if this is a fee the Board should expect to see annually. Chairman Opiela said this is a new line item that the Board has seen over the past two and one half years. Mr. Horst said there will still be a charge for computer program maintenance, but it will be a lot less than the charges for re-designing the entire system. Ms. Leffler said after the new computer system is up and running, we will only have one contracted person for the maintenance of the computer program, so the amount will go down considerably. Chairman Opiela said that Board should not expect the amount of \$205,000 per year after the new computer system is in place.

Constable Walsh asked if the IT positions were put out for bid. Mr. Merwine said that IT consultants are brought in through a "Staff Augmentation" contract. The Commonwealth puts this contract out for competitive bid. It has pre-negotiated rates for various skilled positions. Job postings are made through the contract. Candidates for the positions are then interviewed, and selections are made.

Chairman Opiela asked for a motion to accept the financial report. A.R. DeFilippi motioned to accept the financial report. Captain Adam Kisthardt seconded the motion.

VOTING AYE: Kisthardt, Walsh, DeFilippi, Opiela, Sokoloff

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAINING: None

The motion carried.

Chairman Opiela noted that there were no instructor certifications for this Board meeting.

III. Discussion Items

Chairman Opiela said there were not any listed discussion items, but added Travel Related Expenses as a discussion item. He asked if we were closer to setting up regional video meetings. Mr. Numer said that after the last meeting, he went back and talked to PCCD's IT staff. It is possible to do this; however, the glitch is that when he approached them about the idea, the Commonwealth was getting ready to promote and stage an entire new phone system. PCCD is still having issues with the phone system. Mr. Numer said he would like to say, by the next board meeting, we will be ready and able to do it, but he does not have the assurance from IT staff that we will be ready.

Chairman Opiela asked if we would be able to use the Polycom systems. Mr. Numer said he did not have the answer to that, but there was about an 80% chance that there would not be any issues or problems. He said IT staff will have to check compatibility with the other systems. Chairman Opiela

said that, per PCCD's solicitor, it is legally permissible to conduct board meetings this way. Judge Opiela asked if the board needs to have a resolution that it is an adopted or accepted policy before we go forward with this. Mr. Numer said the Deputy Sheriff's Education and Training Board has people participate in board meetings this way and they do not have a board resolution or policy to do so.

Constable Contino asked what kind of time frame the board was looking at for this. The reason for his question was because of the Management Directive from the Governor's Office regarding the travel policies. It is cost prohibitive for him to travel to meetings. The directive that came out in June 2012 stated that it applied to all departments, boards, councils, etc., under the Governor's jurisdiction, that have not been exempted by the Executive Board. He wanted to know who sits on the Executive Board and how the CETB would go about getting an exemption. He said that taxpayers do not pay anything regarding the CETA. The mileage, etc., comes from constables' work. It is not taxpayer money.

Mr. Numer said he is not sure who sits on the Executive Board, but he has the same situation with the board for the Deputy Sheriff's Program. PCCD has gone to the State Travel Audit Section to ask for a blanket exemption for travel for CETB members, but they will not give one. It is a case by case basis for travel for every board member every time the member travels. It has to be requested for each board member for every board meeting. Our agency has done everything it can about the policy. Mr. Numer suggested board members call the Governor's Office to help their individual situations. Mr. Merwine said he would find out the membership of the Executive Board; staff would let board members know.

Chairman Opiela said another item he wanted to discuss concerned the April 2, 2012, memo from Mark Rothermel he had distributed to other members. It concerned constable payments and CETA fees. The letter was in response to Judge Opiela's own letter to AOPC, dated March 23, 2012. He said Allegheny County was redoing their constable handbook. Part of his letter related to how the Magisterial District Judge system viewed different fields of the constable payment sheet. The CETA fee was also covered in the letter. At the last board meeting, he said that sending a letter to Mark Rothermel and Zygmunt Pines was discussed, in order to keep them updated on the status of the CETA fee dilemma.

Mr. Numer said, in the second page of the letter from Mr. Rothermel, a possible solution could be the place at which AOPC displays the fee in their computer program. Mr. Numer said Mr. Horst had drafted a letter to Mr. Rothermel, which expressed the CETB's concern regarding the CETA fee and its impact on collections. It is looking to APOC for help in addressing the issue and finding out where they are in reference to what was stated in Mr. Rothermel's letter. Mr. Horst's letter will be sent to everyone who was copied on Chairman Opiela's letter. Then, if there is no resolution, the letter can be sent to others.

Constable Contino said he spoke with Mr. Rothermel in reference to the CETA fee in civil cases. In looking at the letter that Chairman Opiela provided to the Board, Mr. Rothermel stated "The MDJS procedural help desk is aware that the amount is based on the number of defendants served by a constable for a docketed civil case. The Constable Fee Bill is not clear regarding if this applies to each service for a given defendant per case." Constable Contino continued that the bill states the surcharge is "\$5 per named defendant in each civil case in which a constable or deputy constable performs a service."

Constable Contino said he spoke with Mr. Rothermel and AOPC produced a new screen showing where the constable fees can be added into the system. AOPC sent out a Laser fax to explain it and PCCD staff put the information in a training bulletin. Mr. Rothermel told him the fee can be put in for every service rendered in Civil cases; in Delaware County, for every service performed. Every time a warrant gets re-issued, everyone gets new costs except the constable \$5 CETA fee. Mr. Rothermel read the law to Constable Contino and Constable Contino asked him to explain the civil part to him. He said, "for every service rendered." The computer will not allow this, so AOPC added a second screen to add the fee. In Delaware County, the deputy court administrator did not interpret it the way he did.

AOPC's legal department said they are not allowed to interpret the laws, so they could not send out another Laser fax, in layman's terms, saying, "For every service a constable does, this must be followed." The Court Administrator in Delaware County finally agreed with Constable Contino's view that the CETA fee should be assessed per named defendant in civil and landlord/tenant cases every time a constable performs a service. In traffic and non-traffic cases, the CETA should be addressed as a one-time fee only.

Chairman Opiela described the various services in a landlord/tenant case. He said the first service a constable might perform is posting the case. The question is, "Should they get a \$5 CETA fee?" For the same case, an order of possession may be issued. Then, this order of possession may be served. Ms. Taylor, PCCD's legal counsel, previously gave an opinion that, in the second service, the fee could not be assessed again. This decision was based on the way the law was written and on AOPC's interpretation. The third service on this particular case could be the eviction. The question is why couldn't the \$5 charge be assessed on all three of these services. Ms. Taylor gave an opinion that she agreed with AOPC's interpretation.

AOPC's legal department underlined the following from Ms. Taylor's letter on October 24th: \$5 per docket number in each Criminal case and \$5 per named defendant in each Civil case in which a constable or deputy constable performs a service. He argued the point by saying that every time the judge gives him a piece of paper, he has to sign an affidavit of service. If it was the same service, he would not be filling out an affidavit for each one. AOPC will not put it in writing that we are or are not entitled to the fee. The screen is there to collect the fee. If it wasn't allowed, he did not think the computer system would allow it. AOPC has not reversed its position, but it made a screen to do it. If one county is doing it and collecting, why don't we inform the court administrators about collecting the fee more than one time? Mr. Rothermel's one letter contradicts what the law states when he says, "per case, not per service."

Constable Sokoloff said, since the computer system has the capability of entering the \$5 fee several times and, if the District Magistrate ordered his or her staff to input it like that, it could be done. Six months ago, it could not be done, but now it can be done. Constable Sokoloff said it sounds like we have to educate the district courts on this.

Chairman Opiela said that Ms. Taylor supported AOPC's initial interpretation and he wondered what the Board's interpretation might be now. He said the language in civil CETA fee collections is different from criminal CETA fee collections. There is a lot of confusion with people getting the language between civil and criminal cases mixed up. Chairman Opiela said it is pretty clear that AOPC is deferring this issue to the legislature. It is an example of where the language is not completely clear in the legislation.

Constable Contino said AOPC has allowed a screen to be made to allow the fee to be collected. Chairman Opiela said the screen is still the same, only they changed the field where staff puts in the number of times to assess the fee. It is now an open-ended field in their system. MDJ staff can put the number of times to assess the fee in the field. Chairman Opiela said his staff is putting the fee in one time because they are following what AOPC has told them about the fee.

Chairman Opiela said he still feels a cordial letter should be sent, one that goes beyond AOPC. It should also go to the executive branch and to the legislature. That way, the Board is at least raising the issue so that more people know about it.

Constable Contino said we should educate deputy court administrators throughout the Commonwealth and start to collect the \$5 CETA fee for every service performed. The training fund's revenue would probably increase by about a third.

Mr. Numer said he didn't know what the solution is, but he suspects that if something is sent out to court administrators, the first thing they will do is contact AOPC and ask if they should do it.

Chairman Opiela said the legislature drafted the language and they will not change it unless they are put on notice about the problem. It should be pointed out to the legislature that it wouldn't cost taxpayers any money if it is properly administered. Chairman Opiela said the letter should indicate what everyone has done so far and should not be accusatory in any manner. It should identify the problem and the issues. Let it for them to decide. Constable Contino pointed out that some of the legislators and constables who helped draft the initial legislation are still around, so someone could ask them about their intent in regard to the language. He said he thought it would take a long time to get an answer about this through legislation.

Mr. Numer said that, based on Chairman Opiela's desire that the letter go beyond AOPC, they could figure out who it might be advantageous to send it to and try to get it to all the right people. Chairman Opiela said he feels like the Board has an obligation to raise the issue to the legislature. He does not have a problem with letting AOPC know of the intent to expand the letter beyond them.

IV. Informational Items

The first information item on the agenda was the **2013 Curriculum Overview-PSU-Fayette**. This item will be tabled, because Mr. Mellors from Penn State could not be at the meeting.

Constable Contino brought up the new landlord/tenant law which will be going into effect in the beginning of September. The law talks about the eviction process and defines it. It is a four-page law about which constables will have to be made aware. Chairman Opiela said we should put the new information on the website. Ms. Leffler said Penn State has been notified to include the new information in the 2013 curriculum and staff will also send a training bulletin to constables and deputy constables with the new information.

The next item on the agenda was **Status of Certifications Issued**. Mr. Horst said that as of July 13, 2012, there were 1,368 constables and deputy constables currently listed as active and certified. Of these, 1,057 were also certified to carry a firearm in the performance of their constable duties. Since

the inception of the Constables' Training Program in 1996, there have been a total of 3,854 individuals who successfully completed basic training or the waiver examination and were certified by the Board.

Chairman Opiela said he would like to see an update of how many constables and deputy constables (of the 77% of constables and deputy constables who are carrying firearms) waived out of participating in Defensive Tactics continuing education training. In the past, there was a vast difference between the number who were certified for firearms and those who participated in Defensive Tactics. Ms. Leffler said that staff would get those numbers for the Board.

The next informational item on the agenda was the **Constables' Information System Redesign Update**. Ms. Leffler reported that on July 10, 2012, she attended the PA Prothonotaries' and Clerks of Courts' Association conference and provided a demonstration on the county access part of the system to input information regarding constables in their counties. There was an overwhelming positive response from attendees regarding the proposed new system.

Ms. Leffler advised that PCCD sent out surveys to 66 Clerks of Courts/Prothonotaries' Offices in April and has received 58 of the surveys back so far. From those surveys, a possible 164 new computer systems users from county offices have been identified. Of the eight surveys we have not received back, Ms. Leffler said she has been in contact with them and they are anticipating becoming users of the new system as well. IT consultants have developed prototypes of the computer screens to show their offices. They are now working on the "guts" behind those screens: functions, connecting database tables, transferring information, etc. They are transmitting data back and forth on about four different screens now and are progressing forward at a steady pace. Staff has identified a lot of conversion issues regarding transferring information from the old system into the new system, cleaning up of the old system, and working on code tables. Meetings are held about every other week. A design document is in place from which staff is working. Ms. Leffler will continue to update the Board of the progress of the new system. Hopefully, by next late summer or fall, we will have the new system in place.

Chairman Opiela has heard that counties are happy that PCCD is designing a new computer system. He said that, while there will be one person in each county having input rights to the system, he had a request for review ability for county controllers' offices. Ms. Leffler said staff had talked about the county controllers' offices having access to the system.

Constable Contino asked if constables would have access to other constables' information in order to contact them. He said he often can't get a hold of a constable in another area. Ms. Leffler said the information is confidential and PCCD does not give out the information. Constable Contino wondered if there could be an opt-in to allow a work address or phone number information to be shared with other constables. Ms. Leffler said she would have to look into that. Right now, the design allows county staff access to all of the constables within their county. Constable Contino said that constables should be allowed to view other constables' information. He asked if a county could look at constables' information from another county. Ms. Leffler said counties will be able to view constable information from another county. Maybe view-only access could be allowed for other counties.

Chairman Opiela asked if something could be put on the PCCD website which would allow a constable to authorize the release of his or her personal information to any other county or constable.

He said it would have to be up to each constable to sign-off on whether he or she would allow this. Ms. Leffler said she would check into his request.

The next informational item of the agenda is the **Request-For-Proposals Update**. Mr. Numer said the Requests-For-Proposals went out for the delivery of training in the Western, Central, and Eastern Training Regions. The technical review committee completed their scoring, the Bureau of Small Business Opportunities (BSBO) returned their scores, and cost proposals were opened. Recommendations for the Western and Eastern Training Regions have been made. This information cannot be released, because it has to be approved by PCCD's Executive Director. In the Central Training Region, the decision was made to go back to the vendors to offer them the opportunity to do a "Best and Final Offers" for costs and BSBO. Chairman Opiela said the Board would be looking forward to more substantive information at the November Board meeting.

The next informational item on the agenda is the **Board Regulation Update**. Mr. Horst said that on August 3, 2012, the final regulation was delivered to the Office of General Counsel and the Governor's Policy and Budget Offices. They each have 30 days for comment and approval. At that point, it will go back to the House and Senate committees and the Independent Regulatory Review Commission. After 30 days, it will go to the Office of Attorney General's for another 30 days. After their approval, the Office of General Counsel will send it to the Legislative Reference Bureau for publication.

Constable Sokoloff asked what regulation Mr. Horst was talking about. Ms. Leffler said it is the regulation that the Board has adopted at previous Board meetings.

Constable Sokoloff asked when the RFP for curriculum development starts. Mr. Horst said the new contract for curriculum development started July 1, 2012. The new contracts for training delivery will start January 1, 2013.

Chairman Opiela asked if we were still on the timeframe for the CIS Re-Design. Ms. Leffler said, "Yes." Another IT Consultant will be coming on full-time to work on the system sometime in September.

V. Public Voice

Chairman Opiela announced the Board would take public comments and questions.

Tom Impink, Constable, Berks County, president of the PSCA, asked the Board if the training providers are subject to audits. He feels the training classes are top heavy with instructors. Mr. Horst said there are periodic audits. There are prescribed instructor student ratios for training classes.

Constable Impink said that the income to the CETB will be shrinking even more if some legislation passes. The legislation is House Bill 1803, which includes the decriminalization of parking tickets in the Commonwealth of PA. It moved through the House and stopped in the Senate. It was sent back to appropriations for a second look. If the Board loses \$5 per service for warrants, in Berks County alone, there were 27,000 parking warrants issued. Take \$5 off of the 80% the end of getting served. This money would be lost for training. The City of Reading is just one of 53 3rd class cities that the Board would lose CETA fees if this bill passes. It would be a devastating loss for PCCD and constables. The City of Reading claims they can collect \$400,000 with a civil collection agency

through a parking authority versus the \$963,000 they collected the year before. At the same time, look at the losses to the CETA fund.

Constable Impink said that on the training side, the Board is responsible to make sure that training is done properly. He wondered what kind of training constables are receiving on the fee bill.

Emil Minnar, PA State Constables Association (PSCA), said he is frustrated because the answers to the questions that been discussed and raised are not here. There is no coordination of information whatsoever. He said that Constable Impink and himself go to many legislative committee meetings on a voluntary basis and if they didn't go to the meetings, no one would know what is going on.

Mr. Minnar said they just put out a bulletin which includes House Bill 1803 and two other bills- one affecting constables at the polls and the other is SB 887 regarding landlord/tenant actions. SB 887 is an excellent bill. He said PCCD used to have a person assigned the responsibility to be a coordinator between the governor, AOPC, and a few other agencies. Mr. Numer said the position that Mr. Minnar is referring to was the Legislative Liaison which PCCD currently does not have. Mr. Minnar said there has to be some kind of information liaison.

Constable Contino said there is also the question that if the fee is raised, constables could out price themselves. He lost the contract he had for 16 years with Philadelphia because they are using certified mail for service. His courts' dockets for Civil cases have increased, but the constable services have stayed the same. When the Sheriff's Office raised the fees, people did not have the choice except to pay the fees, but it is a different scenario for civil cases that constables serve because collection agencies are using certified mail. Mr. Numer said that people who would normally not support the increase in fees for the Deputy Sheriffs' Program, supported it because some counties were not getting paid.

Mr. Minnar said there are a number of concerns surrounding Bill 1803. It will affect the CETA fee, Also, County Commissioners should be aware that there is \$18 per warrant that goes back to the county. This money will not go back to the county if the bill is passed. There is a lot of money involved and it has far reaching affects. On the day the Senate was making the final vote on the appropriations, Mr. Minnar and Constable Impink spent a lot of time with the Senators pointing out the problems that existed with this bill. The best thing they could do was put it on hold for re-consideration, which is the best thing that could have happened because there would be a major impact of this bill down the road.

Mr. Minnar suggested that there has to be some type of coordination of information at PCCD, so that PCCD knows who is working on what, what the progress is, how things get done, and who is doing them or should be doing them. As far as training, PCCD has a problem about the interpretation of fees because they have an obligation to teach fees.

Constable Contino asked who the legislative liaison was at PCCD? Mr. Merwine said it was Dennis Hoyle. The position at PCCD is in a reserved compliment status right now. Positions go into that status for a number of years before they disappear from the compliment altogether.

Mr. Numer said that John Pfau spends a lot of time researching on the legislative sites looking for anything that could be constable or deputy sheriff related. Constable Contino said that Mr. Pfau sees the bills on the websites, but does not hear about these bills prior to this.

Chairman Opiela said that he is not opposed to Bill 1803. He gave an example of a situation where there are 15 citations for one house. It could turn into fifteen warrants. These types of cases should be put into one criminal complaint within fifteen different counts. This would lower the constable fees from 15 warrants to one warrant. The reality is that in many situations this was completely out of control and if the constables association would agree to this, then it would be fair for the legislature to agree that if you go out the same defendant five different times for different services, you would collect five different CETA fees. This would make things more consistent. He also said that he thinks there are other ways to correct the problem rather than Bill 1803. Looking at the entire picture to what is reasonable and fair, it could work out that constables are fairly treated, the CETA fund is properly protected, and the CETB can properly train and educate constables.

Emil Minnar said that with any piece of legislation, it would seem proper to ask what the impact is of the legislation, who is it going to effect and what is the intent of the legislation. Particularly, with this bill, the appropriations how much is it going to cost the state. Then, what are the costs to the county as well.

Mr. Minnar said during last year alone, there were between \$13 and \$16 million in outstanding fines in the City of Philadelphia that were given to collections agencies of which almost none were collected. If there is no criminal hammer to make the individual pay the fine, he/she is not going to pay it. He/she receives it and throws it in a basket. Mr. Minnar said that Bill 1803 would cause that reaction as well.

Chairman Opiela commented that Mr. Minnar's analysis is not wrong. Constable Contino said if the parking enforcement goes to a collection agency, it is going to hurt everyone. Chairman Opiela agreed with the public comment regarding the need to have a legislative connect between their body and the legislature. He understands the frustrations and as a Board he feels like they are just circling the wagon. He wants to look at a reasonable goal and look forward towards it. He thinks that PCCD's Executive Director needs to understand the frustration of the CETB.

Constable Contino said he is afraid that the PCCD will lose the constable program. He said that Mr. Pfau takes the Board recommendations to PCCD's Commission. He wondered if Board members should go and stand behind John to show support when he takes recommendations to PCCD's Commission. He said the CETB is the one that is on the verge of going bankrupt, within 10 years or so. Constable Contino said the May CETB minutes said the Board is going to do a Video Conference Call at the next meeting in November. Mr. Numer said that we are working towards it, but it is not a guarantee. It would be one site (Pittsburgh) for the first time to test it.

Constable Michael Connor, Delaware County, said he sat through many training classes during the 14 years he has been a constable where the trainers that had little to offer. He didn't care for the Cultural Diversity training class, but the instructors did a great job. He said that earlier in the meeting was the first time he has heard about the new landlord/tenant act which will be going in affect soon. It is too late to get into the training this year. We would have to discuss it with the curriculum developer to get it in the curriculum for 2013. It is critical information that is needed because many constables have had to go to court over things that they are interpreting to be the law. Loss of revenue, insurance issues. If there is a major part of constables' work that is going on with how they do landlord/tenant civil paperwork, it is dangerous they need to know about it. People lives are at stake.

Chairman Opiela said he anticipates the new landlord/tenant law will be included in the legal updates part of Continuing Education for 2013. It will not be a separate section of the training.

Constable Contino said that PCCD will also be able to put the new information regarding the law in a training bulletin like they have done in the past. The bill is scheduled to pass at the end of the month. Chairman Opiela said PCCD will discuss with Penn State to have the information included in the 2013 curriculum.

Mr. Minnar proposed that the Laser fax system that the District Courts have is a great tool. Constables receive information after the fact, which is too late. Constables are prone to a lawsuit, so they need to be notified in a reasonable amount of time when a change goes in effect. As an association, they have a concern about these issues. Chairman Opiela said PCCD and the Board have directed Penn State and Mr. Mellors to put curriculum on-line and is accessible at any point to constables/deputy constables. PCCD still has the ability to do training bulletins as well.

Constable Contino asked that when a new bill comes out that affects constables/deputy constables, we should fax the information to district courts' offices. Mr. Numer said there are a couple of issues here. PCCD is not on any type of distribution list that receives information if it related to constables. There is no guarantee that PCCD will even receive the new information in a timely manner. Chairman Opiela said AOPC does not notify District Courts for every change that may affect them.

Ms. Leffler said that in the new Constable Information System, there will be a field that includes constables' email address and staff will be able to do group emails to constables and deputy constables.

Constable Walsh asked who approves the curriculum for constable training? Chairman Opiela said the Board approves it. Constable Walsh expressed his displeasure of the four hour Cultural Diversity course.

Chairman Opiela said he disagreed and said these issues seem like there are common sense, but it is needed. Approaches may need changed to different. It is important to have these types of courses. Constable Sokoloff said it all comes down to how the information is taught to constable. Constable Contino said constables need to take their own personalities out of it and look at the broad picture.

Constable Connor was displeased that Penn State did not show up to give the Board the Curriculum Overview. Chairman Opiela said that Penn State has done an enormous amount of work for the Board. Mr. Numer said that we will work with the contractor to get the new information into the curriculum. Constable Contino said that having training in one central location would be beneficial, so that the same instructors teach the information to all of the constables throughout the state.

Chairman Opiela said it is important to continue surveys and questionnaires at the end of class as well as staff monitoring of training classes. Constable Contino said that unless 75% of the class gives a poor evaluation of the class, the Board will not see the results. He advised that constables should write the Board a letter.

Ms Leffler advised that in response to concerns from the Public Voice previous Board meetings, PCCD received approval from the PA Emergency Health Services Council to provide their contact information as a resource available to constables and deputy constables who are involved in

shootings or other critical incidents. The Pennsylvania Emergency Health Services Council has Critical Incident Stress Management (CISM) Teams available at the county level to assist with these incidents. The link to the Pennsylvania Emergency Health Services Council is <http://www.pehsc.org/> and is listed on PCCD's website.

VI. Adjournment

Chairman Opiela adjourned the meeting at 11:55 p.m. and advised the next Board meeting will be held November 15, 2012, (*correct meeting date November 16, 2012*) at 10 a.m. in Harrisburg.