

**HOUSE CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMMITTEE HEARING  
DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION  
June 10, 2010**

**INTRODUCTION**

Good morning members of the House Children and Youth Committee. I am George Mosee, Deputy District Attorney in charge of the Juvenile Division of the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office where Seth Williams is District Attorney. Thank you for asking me to be here today to discuss delinquency prevention and alternatives to detention.

The traditional role of the District Attorney is to prosecute a crime after it occurs. That is not going to address the source of the problem. District Attorney Seth Williams has recognized the societal benefits of being proactive not only reactive, preventative not only punitive.

There are many factors that lead to juvenile crime and violence – it is fueled by poverty, drug-dealing, broken families, and a popular culture that glamorizes narcotics and gunplay. We must, therefore, effectively and efficiently use our limited resources to continue successful initiatives, and develop new programs, to reverse this trend. Cities as a whole should be deeply invested in this problem, not only law enforcement and the courts, but community organizations, faith-based groups, health care providers, everyone with an interest in keeping our children and our streets safe.

The Philadelphia District Attorney's Office has invested much effort into collaborations with other agencies and the community. As a result, there has been a pronounced decrease in the number of court cases involving juveniles. In 2003, there were 10,000 delinquency petitions filed. In 2009 that number was down to 7,061. An

additional 691 cases were adopted by the Youth Aid Panels and 378 were adjusted at the Youth Study Center.

The District Attorney's Office has numerous innovative programs and initiatives that address the sources of crime, and intervene when a juvenile first encounters the justice system. We believe this is the best way to prevent delinquency and reduce the need for detention and placement.

#### **I. SCHOOL BASED INITIATIVES:**

##### **School Curriculum**

Developed during the drafting of the *Blueprint for a Safer Philadelphia*, the District Attorney's Office joined with the School District to create a Juvenile and Criminal Justice curriculum for all middle schools students.

It was born out of experiences presenting juvenile/criminal justice information to students in the Re-entry Transition Initiative Welcome Return Assessment Program (RETI-WRAP) designed to inform them, among other things, of the ramifications of continued delinquent/criminal conduct. It is meant to better apprise these students of what their exposure is under recidivism statutes, firearms mandatory minimums, certification and direct file criteria, etc. so that they will pause before engaging in further delinquent/criminal conduct.

It is rare that a juvenile in Philadelphia will be placed before acquiring an extensive or, at least, serious record. Even these "experienced" juveniles lacked information about the consequences of future adjudications or convictions.

In 2004, an innovative curriculum was implemented to teach students about delinquent/criminal conduct consequences. It is comprehensive enough to also cover

victim awareness issues including the impact of gun violence, the fiscal impact of crimes such as auto theft on society, the impact of drug and alcohol use along with the consequences for selling drugs. Sixth, seventh and eighth graders are given an opportunity to explore the relevance of the subject matter to their own lives, consider ways to avoid involvement and offer anti-crime strategies for general application. By fleshing out the issues at this early age we can insure that these young people have the information relevant to making decisions in their own lives about delinquent/criminal conduct.

The curriculum includes the presentation of subject matter through traditional lectures, case studies, scenarios, guest speakers, videos and panel discussions combining law enforcement with students. Research papers and testing are employed to gauge the student's understanding, but also to help us learn from them. Please see the attached curriculum. (*Appendix A*)

The District Attorney's Office, U.S. Attorney's Office, Pennsylvania Attorney General's Office, Police Department, Mayor's Office of Community Service and others interface with the schools through various programs. Previously, these efforts were not, however, coordinated in a way that all of Philadelphia's public schools had access to the law enforcement presentations or that the same information was presented. The new institutionalized curriculum creates a schedule for law enforcement and clarity regarding the subject matter presented. Teachers have to convey the bulk of the material because law enforcement cannot be relied upon to teach the curriculum. However, the aforementioned agencies provide the necessary support.

## **Re-Entry Transition Initiative Welcome Return Assessment Process Program**

Act 88 of 2002 requires that every person of school age who is released from a correctional institution or a residential delinquency program, or who is placed on probation in Philadelphia must: 1) be assigned to a transitional center, and 2) have a transition plan addressing the needs of the student and setting terms and conditions that must be met prior to a return to a regular school classroom, and 3) when adjudicated delinquent for certain offenses enumerated in the act, be placed in an alternative school, in a private alternative education institution, or in a general education program operating after the traditional school day.

The School District of Philadelphia assigns students to the Re-Entry Transition Initiative Welcome Return Assessment Process Program (RETI-WRAP) which is located in William Penn High School. The RETI-WRAP Program provides comprehensive support to adjudicated youth that are returning from court-ordered placements.

The goal of the RETI-WRAP is to assist students in making informed decisions regarding educational options, to develop a viable academic plan and to facilitate their admission into an educational program. To meet this goal, the staff works with students to review their academic, behavioral and social patterns, procures and helps them understand their transcripts, and address important life skills that can make the return to public school a more positive experience. The information sessions include presentations from the Health Department, District Attorney's Office and Defender Association.

Students have an opportunity to achieve a successful educational career as a result of the support they receive at RETI-WRAP. Probation officers, psychologists, job developers and social workers help develop a comprehensive network of support for

these transitional students. Since the enactment of Act 88, over 2500 students have been assigned to the RETI-WRAP Program. After students meet the goals of their transition plan they are returned directly to appropriate school settings.

Court records reveal that approximately 1,200 adjudicated delinquent youth below the age of 21 are discharged from court placements annually and most return to the School District to complete their education. While some of the students are close to completion of credit requirements for graduation, many have very few credits, as low as 2 credits, at the age of 17. Many of these youths want to do a turn around and move toward positive activities/productive life styles. RETI-WRAP provides the supports that these youth need as they transition back into the District.

In RETI-WRAP we try to expose the students to various educational options. Our goal is to return these students back to a school environment so that they will graduate and become productive citizen in our society.

### **Reintegration Initiative**

In February 2005, the Probation Department and the Department of Human Services (DHS) launched an ambitious initiative to significantly enhance the support and supervision a delinquent youth receives when returning to the community from placement. There is multi-agency involvement including: the courts, juvenile probation, DHS, the School District, the Office of Behavioral Health and Workforce Development. It is essential to link all these agencies to provide wrap-around services to youth re-entering the community.

This program complements RETI-WRAP, but the focus on reintegration begins when the youth is placed in a juvenile facility, and it is meant to acclimate the youth to re-entry into the community, not just the school system.

Throughout placement there is an emphasis on family involvement and support. Importantly, there is linkage with and among all systems involved in supporting the family's welfare, including the School District, the Office of Behavioral Health and Workforce Development, and a mechanism for tapping additional resources from various agencies when a youth is in risk of failure.

Probation-led integration teams recommend reintegration plans for each juvenile returning from placement, classifying the youth as Standard or Intensive. The Court has final authority over all decisions related to the plan. There is now greater interaction and communication about the plan for each juvenile. Juveniles reintegrating into the community from youth facilities will receive additional supports, during placement and in conjunction with their probation services. Some of these supports include: life skills training, aggression replacement training, functional family therapy, academic support, community service, and workforce training and referrals.

## **II. EARLY INTERVENTION**

### **Early Case Review, Consent Decrees and Admissions**

Cases listed for a pretrial conference are reviewed by a senior prosecutor to determine the propriety of a non-trial disposition. Of the 3937 cases listed for a pretrial conference in 2009, 790 reporting consent decrees were offered of which 619 were accepted. 1447 negotiated admissions were offered, of which 472 were accepted. Ongoing oversight of the cases by the unit chief, assistant chief and senior prosecutor

resulted in an additional 471 consent decrees for a total of 1090 cases being resolved by consent decree in 2009. There were an additional 2039 admissions for a total of 2511 cases being resolved by admission in 2009. Seth Williams has made the certainty rather than the severity of punishment the priority for this office. Our approach to prosecuting juveniles reflects that philosophy.

### **Youth aid panels**

The Youth Aid Panel (YAP) is a juvenile diversion program that provides a community-based alternative to prosecution for some first-time juvenile offenders of non-violent crimes. The offender is given the option of appearing before a panel of community volunteers rather than entering the juvenile court system. A juvenile who completes the contractual obligations imposed by the YAP will avoid the stigma and possible adverse effects of a criminal record. YAP is based on a balanced approach to restorative justice, a justice philosophy that attempts to balance the needs of the offender, the victim and the community. This diversion program makes the juvenile accountable and makes him understand the seriousness of his actions and the effect that the crime has on himself, his family and his community.

To go before a YAP, the juvenile must first admit involvement in the crime. They then meet with a panel of volunteers from the community to again admit the activity, and give the panel a chance to ask questions about school and home life. The YAP then devises a contract for the child, typically requiring three things from the youth: some form of victim restitution, serious reflection on the crime, and community service. Each contract is tailored to the specific child. If the child does not live up to the obligations in the contract, they are diverted back to juvenile court.

The city's 31 YAPs hear close to 1,000 cases per year, thereby diverting approximately ten percent of the juvenile court's caseload. Nine out of ten juveniles live up to their contract requirements. Seventy-eight percent of those who complete the monitoring period remain arrest-free.

**Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Sub-Committee of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency**

Over the past six years a group of stakeholders from Philadelphia's juvenile justice system has been convening meetings and forums to thoroughly examine the relationships between young people and law enforcement. Working under the auspices of the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Sub-Committee of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, this group, known as the Philadelphia Working Group, includes representatives from the Police Department, Sheriff's Office, SEPTA Police Department, Philadelphia Housing Authority, Department of Human Services, School District, Religious Community, Institute for the Development of African American Youth (IDAAY), Defender Association and District Attorney's Office.

The DMC Subcommittee, chaired by Daniel Elby, was established in 1990 to assess and address the overrepresentation of minorities in Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system, especially secure juvenile facilities. Since its inception the subcommittee has consistently addressed issues related to the development and implementation of strategies to reduce the disproportionate confinement of minority youth. The current focus is on the relationship between police and minorities.

The Philadelphia Working Group has been conducting forums since 2003 to explore the nature of the relationships between youth and law enforcement. The first two forums afforded young people and law enforcement the opportunity to honestly explore

perceptions held by both sides in an effort to improve relations. The third forum afforded Philadelphia's most important policy makers the opportunity to examine the findings and to give feedback concerning the feasibility of recommendations that flowed from the first two forums. The attendees included **the School District CEO, DHS Commissioner, Recreation Commissioner, Chief Public Defender, Police Commissioner and District Attorney**. After the presentations the policy makers convened to discuss a plan of action to effectively address the needs of law enforcement and our young people. Our recommendations were fully embraced and a commitment was made by each representative to support the effort.

The recommendations included conducting forums in high schools and developing a curriculum for recruits at the Philadelphia Police Academy. To date, forums have been held at Bartram (2 occasions), Overbrook and South Philadelphia High (2 occasions). Moreover, on March 2<sup>nd</sup> 2009 we conducted the first Youth Law Enforcement training at the Philadelphia Police Academy using the curriculum developed by the Working Group. A second training was held at the Academy on June 25, 2009. Both trainings were extremely well received. Forums have also been held at St. Gabriel's Hall, the Philadelphia Youth Study Center and Congresso De Latinos.

A number of forums are planned for the future and we are committed to continuing the trainings at the Academy. We are convinced that these forums and trainings can be a first step toward actually improving the relationship between our young people and the police. Improved relations will result in less volatile interactions and better outcomes for law enforcement, young people and the community.

### **III. SPECIALTY COURTS**

#### **Juvenile Treatment Court**

The Philadelphia Treatment Court, the first in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, commenced operation in April 1997 under the leadership of the Honorable Louis J. Presenza. The primary drugs of choice are marijuana and crack-cocaine, however phencyclidine (PCP) and heroin usage has steadily increased in the 18-24 age group. As of January 2010, the Philadelphia Treatment Court has enrolled 3111 clients and has witnessed 1946 people successfully complete the program (413 are currently active), while 484 were unsuccessful and thereby terminated and sentenced. In addition to treatment, the Court provides clients with housing, vocational training, counseling, medical treatment and employment placement, along with other ancillary services.

The success of the adult Treatment Court led the city in September 2004 to create a Juvenile Treatment Court pilot program in West Philadelphia. There are approximately 200 youths participating in Juvenile Treatment Court, which affords nonviolent substance abusing juveniles quick access to treatment and the opportunity to avoid an adjudication of delinquency. Like the adult program, it includes a comprehensive screening procedure.

Eligibility for participation is determined through consideration of the juvenile's record, the facts of the offense, the need for restitution and/or need for victim notification, and any other relevant information. There is an automatic review of all felony drug cases in the West Philadelphia area, although all non-violent offenses are eligible for consideration.

There are no set time periods for participation. Performance, compliance and sobriety will determine how long a juvenile remains in the program. Urine testing is administered throughout.

Although relapse may prolong a participant's stay in the program, only chronic use or a combination of infractions will result in termination from the program. The Juvenile Treatment Court program responds to negative behavior with escalating sanctions such as writing an essay, appearing at 1801 Vine to observe Treatment Court proceedings, community service, electronic monitoring, respites and detention. Conversely, positive behavior is recognized through decreased supervision, in court commendations, tangible rewards and ultimate graduation.

#### **Crossover Court**

Crossover Court is a centralized Family Court program in Philadelphia County which addresses both the delinquent and dependent issues of juveniles. The Administrative Judge for Family Court designates the judge who presides over Crossover Court.

In Philadelphia County, Family Court is divided into two branches: Delinquent Court and Dependent Court. Historically, the Delinquent and Dependent Courts co-existed with very little interaction. This was a problem inasmuch as many juveniles in the Philadelphia Family Court system presented with both delinquent and dependant issues, and had open petitions in both Delinquent and Dependent Court. With the Delinquent and Dependent Courts operating autonomously, scarce resources were wasted. Different Judges working to address the needs of the same child sometimes replicated services or worse yet, worked at cross-purposes. After recognizing the need to

address these cases in a special way, the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office, the Philadelphia Defender Association, and the Honorable Judge Dougherty, Administrative Judge of Philadelphia County's Family Court, met and fashioned a solution. From these meetings, "Crossover Court" was created.

Crossover Court was created to effectively and efficiently address the special needs of certain juveniles who have both delinquent and dependent issues.

Dependent children are those children who present to Family Court with neglect, abuse, truancy, housing and/or mental health issues. Common dependency issues include: children who are chronically truant; children who have been abused or whose caregivers (for whatever reason) are unable to or refuse to provide adequate care for the child; children who have no caregivers; children suffering from unaddressed medical issues; and, children suffering from mental illness and/or behavioral problems to the extent that they are unable to properly socialize in the home, school or community. Dependency issues, while potentially detrimental to the health, safety and socialization of the child, do not rise to the level of delinquency because the child's conduct is not criminal.

When addressing dependency issues, the Court's duty is to ensure that the child is safe and his/her needs are being met. The Court is legally obligated, whenever possible, to provide for the safety and needs of a dependent child within the confines of the existing family structure. This is done by providing school, family and/or individual support services to the child and his family in the home. Such services include Wrap-Around and TSS services in the classroom, mobile family and individual therapy in the home, and mentoring programs. In such cases, custody remains with the parent,

supervised under the watchful eye of The Court and the Department of Human Services (DHS).

However, where it is not possible to ensure the safety of the child within the confines of the home, the Court will remove the child from the home and award custody of the child to DHS. DHS is then entrusted with ensuring the safety of the child. Even when this most drastic step is taken, the goal (at least initially) is usually re-unification of the family once the Court determines that the parent(s) are able to adequately provide for the child's needs.

Delinquent children are those children who: 1) engage in conduct, which if committed by an adult would be criminal; and, 2) are in need of "treatment, rehabilitation and/or supervision" (hereinafter, "TRS"). This second requirement is important because some children engage in criminal conduct but are not in need of TRS. Unless and until a Judge determines that a child is in need of TRS, the child is not adjudicated delinquent and no juvenile justice consequences arise.

Each case is reviewed by the Commonwealth to insure that dependency consideration is appropriate in the face of a pending delinquency allegation. Violent felonies and cases involving handguns are not appropriate for crossover consideration. Felony sex offenses are also inappropriate. Moreover, no case can receive crossover treatment without the agreement of the Commonwealth. The Juvenile Act requires the Court to determine whether the juvenile is in need of treatment, supervision or rehabilitation no later than 60 days after a finding that the juvenile committed the acts charged. This 60 day limit "may only be extended pursuant to the agreement of the child **and the attorney for the Commonwealth.**" 42 Pa.C.S. § 6341 (b) (emphasis added). If

the case is deemed to be appropriate by the Commonwealth, the prosecution agrees to defer the issue of delinquency while the dependency issues are addressed. The juvenile agrees that by entering the Crossover Court he or she will not be allowed to withdraw his/her admission.

By identifying those juveniles who present with both dependent and delinquent Issues, and then moving these cases into Crossover Court, the Philadelphia Family Court has made it possible for a single judge to handle all of a child's Family Court issues rather than inefficiently using two judges to address the same child's needs.

### **Graduated Sanctions Court**

Most youth on probation are supervised by the judge who entered the initial disposition or by a master. Philadelphia has five active trial courtrooms in which judges hear probation review cases and one courtroom in which a master hears probation reviews. In order to ensure consistent application of the graduated sanctions model, youth who have alleged violations of probation and are otherwise eligible for graduated sanctions as an alternative to placement have their cases diverted to a special Graduated Sanctions Court (Sanctions Court). The court operates one day a week and is presided over by a juvenile court master who hears all Sanctions Court cases.

### **Eligibility**

The target population for Sanctions Court is young people on juvenile probation (supervised by geographic probation) who are at risk of being placed in a residential program as a result of technical violations of probation. Technical violations of probation include testing positive for drugs or alcohol, school failure issues, failure to report to juvenile probation as required and failure to complete court ordered conditions such as

community service or restitution. Technical violations result in placement for a significant number of youth in Philadelphia. Conversely, in Graduated Sanctions Court, the infraction results in the imposition of a sanction commensurate with the violation and the track record of the juvenile.

#### **IV. VIOLENCE REDUCTION**

##### **Youth Violence Reduction Partnership**

A very successful program in Philadelphia is the Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP). The District Attorney's Office joined with Juvenile Court, Adult Court, the Philadelphia Police Department, Public/Private Ventures, Department of Human Services, the Philadelphia Anti-drug Anti-violence Network, School District and District Attorney's Offices to create YVRP in 1998. It identifies persons under the age of twenty-four who are high-risk to kill or be killed. It provides services such as job training and placement, recreational activities, and drug/alcohol screening and treatment. There is also intensive surveillance by police and probation officers, which results in swift intervention if a participant does not take advantage of the services provided.

##### **Don't Fall Down In The 'Hood**

A program in our Juvenile Court is a model for firearm violence prevention initiatives, addressing the specific offense of carrying a firearm. In 1999, Don't Fall Down in the 'Hood was developed by our office, along with the Philadelphia DHS, the Juvenile Court system, and the Youth Homicide Review Team. The program is administered by the Institute for Development of African-American Youth in and funded by DHS.

Don't Fall Down in the 'Hood is a three-month program specifically designed for those juveniles who are adjudicated delinquent for the offense of carrying a gun, not using

one. It targets gun-carrying behavior of the offender while addressing issues of community protection, defendant accountability and competency development.

Approximately 80 to 100 youths, ages fourteen to eighteen, spend three or four months in the program. For the first two months of Don't Fall Down in the Hood, the offender must attend classes four days a week from 3:30 to 7:30 P.M. and all day Saturday. They receive academic support for their school studies, as well as instruction in entrepreneurial skills. This keeps them off the streets during the prime hours that juveniles are likely to get in trouble, and it teaches them essential tools to become a productive member of the community. They are also taken on weekly trips to places such as the Medical Examiner's office, Magee Rehabilitative Center, hospital trauma centers, funeral homes, and the prisons. This is an effort to show the offender, up front and personal, the consequences of gun crime. During the last month of the program the offender is required to perform sixty hours of community service.

Most participants of Don't Fall Down in the 'Hood have successfully completed the program. If we can put our efforts into programs like this one, that target those who carry a gun but have not yet used it to commit a violent crime, we will be able to reduce the amount of gun offenses in our city even further.

## **CONCLUSION**

For me, one of the most disturbing aspects of what transpired in Luzerne County was the complete dearth of prevention and diversionary programs. Cases that resulted in detention and placement in Luzerne would have never seen the inside of a courtroom in Philadelphia much less detention. As a prosecutor I'm going to ask for detention when it is required to protect the person or property of others or of the juvenile,

or because the juvenile may abscond or be removed from the jurisdiction of the court, or because he has no parent, guardian, or custodian or other person able to provide supervision and care and return the juvenile to court when required. In the former, in home detention and electronic monitoring may satisfy my primary concerns about absconding. In the latter non-secure detention can be used. The bottom line is that detention is a last resort only used when necessary.

Moreover, there is a continuum of preventative efforts in Philadelphia's Juvenile Justice System. On one end we have programs such as those related to Disproportionate Minority Contacts and our school curriculum and on the other end we have initiatives developed to facilitate the reintegration of institutionalized juveniles into community life. Some of the programs seek to prevent crime by addressing the root causes, others address preventing the escalation of conduct and others seek to prevent recidivism. Together, they amount to a monumental effort to make Philadelphia safer.

It may sound like I'm stating the obvious, but in order to prevent delinquency Juvenile Justice has to be a priority for all stakeholders, including prosecutors. The Pennsylvania District Attorney's Association recently adopted **Standards for Pennsylvania Prosecutors in Juvenile Court**. The standards unequivocally state that Juvenile Court must be a top priority for prosecutors:

"Contrary to anyone's misperception of juvenile court as just "kiddy court," a careful examination of delinquency cases shows that juveniles commit the same gamut of offenses perpetrated by adult offenders, and more. Certainly, from the perspective of a victim, it matters not that the thief, robber or rapist was underage. On the other hand, many juvenile offenders are amenable to rehabilitation and can be steered clear of future misconduct when held accountable and effectively supervised, sometimes without an adjudication of delinquency. Considering the seriousness of some offenses perpetrated by Pennsylvanians under the age of 18, along with the fact that many juvenile cases present a high potential for the rehabilitation of the offender and the prevention of future

offenses, District Attorneys throughout the Commonwealth must be committed to making juvenile justice a priority. The adoption of these Standards reflects that commitment.

Finally, prevention can't happen unless all stakeholders work together to achieve it. What we have witnessed in Philadelphia over the last few years is an incredible collaboration of representatives from the courts, schools, Department of Human Services, local law enforcement officials, community organizations, defenders and prosecutors. Working together we have enhanced the efficient functioning of Philadelphia's juvenile justice system and its continuum of prevention.

## ***APPENDIX A*** ***School Curriculum***

### **Introduction to American Jurisprudence**

- Comparison to other systems of justice (innocent until proven guilty verses guilty until proven innocent).
- Fourth (search and seizure) and Fifth Amendment (self incrimination) rights

### **Definitions of Criminal Acts**

- Murder and other crimes of violence
- Property crimes
- Quality of Life Crimes
- Drug offenses (sale and use)
- Offenses committed in school (zero tolerance)

### **Impact of Crime**

- Victimization (presentations from victims groups, information on injuries both physical and emotional).
- Economic (insurance costs, property value depreciation, cost of emergency room visits and hospitalizations, juvenile placement/prison costs, police overtime).
- Quality of Life (graffiti, crack houses, open air drug sales).
- Drug addiction (pharmacological information, recovery dilemma, presentations by recovering addicts).
- Police/Youth relations (speakers, forum)

### **Juvenile Justice System compared to Criminal Justice System**

- Age
- Delinquent Act/Crime
- Adjudication/Conviction
- Disposition/Sentencing (scenarios, mandatory sentences, U.S. Attorney's Operation Safe Neighborhoods video).
- Placement/Incarceration
- Direct File Juvenile cases
- Act 88

### **Coping Skills/Avoiding Negative Influences**

- engage in pro-social activities,
- choose peers wisely/avoid joining a gang
- refrain from using alcohol or drugs
- refrain from selling drugs, gambling, riding in stolen cars, etc.
- seek positive role models, activities and situations

### **Understanding Crime**

Why Do People Commit Crime? Do rap music, video games, movies, etc. influence criminal conduct? Are economic conditions the main factor? (essays, panel discussions) How can we reduce crime? (essays, panel discussions)

**APPENDIX B**  
**Project GO Budget**

**PERSONNEL**

<b>Position</b>	<b>Computation</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Supervisor ADA	\$80,000 x 1	\$ 80,000
Line ADA	\$60,000 x 2	120,000
Paralegal Assistant	\$35,000 x 1	<u>35,000</u>
		\$235,000

**FRINGE**

<b>Benefit</b>	<b>Computation</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Supervisor ADA	\$85,000 x 30% x 2	\$24,000
Line ADA	\$60,000 x 30% x 2	36,000
Paralegal Assistant	\$35,000 x 30% x 1	<u>10,500</u>
		\$70,500

\$305,500