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42. Diocese of Springfield Review Board - PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSING ALLEGATIONS
July 25, 2019

Dear Judge Velis:

I write to follow-up from our meeting earlier today with Bishop Mitchell T. Rozanski. Per our discussion, the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield (Diocese) agrees:

1. The charge for your independent and outside investigation exploring the allegations made by [redacted] concerning the late Bishop Christopher J. Weldon shall be:

   **Charge 1:** To assess the credibility of [redacted] allegation concerning the late Bishop Christopher J. Weldon for the purpose of determining whether (a) the allegations are credible, (b) the allegations are not credible, or (c) you are not able to determine if the allegations are credible.

   **Charge 2:** To (a) review how this situation has been handled by the diocese and (b) help identify opportunities for improvement in how the diocese handles these matters.

2. To pay Sgt. Dennis M. O'Connor (Ret.) as an investigator who shall work under your direction and supervision.

   **Rate of pay:** The Diocese agrees to compensate Mr. O'Connor at his usual and customary rate. The Diocese kindly asks that Mr. O'Connor complete and submit to my attention an IRS Form W-9 prior to the submission of any invoice for services rendered.

   **Indemnification:** The Diocese will provide Mr. O'Connor with an indemnification and hold him harmless from legal expenses, claims, settlements or judgements that he incurs as a result of this task.

   **Terms:** Mr. O'Connor will work under your direction as an investigator for the independent and outside investigation you are completing for the Diocese with respect to the aforementioned charge(s). Mr. O'Connor shall assist with investigatory tasks related...
to this matter under your direction. Further, with respect to charge 1, the assessment of credibility shall be determined by and the sole responsibility of Judge Peter A. Velis.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeffrey J. Trant

Enclosure
Dear Judge Velis,

I write on behalf of my client the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield (Diocese). The Diocese would like to engage your services to conduct an investigation and a general review of our existing procedures with regard to its handling of complaints involving claims of sexual abuse by clergy, employees, and/or volunteers.

The first part of your investigation would concern an allegation of sexual misconduct by the late Bishop Christopher J. Weldon, deceased. The engagement would be to ascertain, if possible, whether this allegation of criminal misconduct with a minor is capable of being established as credible on the basis of the complaint, investigation or any other records of the Diocese, including but not limited to Review Board records. Any employee, volunteer, clergy member, or consultant associated with the Diocese will be made available for interviews by you should you request. Full cooperation with your investigation will be rendered by the Diocese.

In addition to the review of this specific charge, the Diocese requests that you provide any suggestions you choose to improve and reform its present handling of complaints of this nature involving clergy, employees and/or volunteers of the Diocese.

As compensation the Diocese would pay your present hourly rate for such services plus all expenses, clerical and/or investigative expenses you incur in this matter.

The Diocese also will provide you with an indemnification and hold you harmless from any legal expenses, claims, settlements or judgments that you incur as a result of this task.
You have disclosed your present schedule is heavy and you anticipate a thorough and rigorous review cannot be accomplished within any specific timeline. The Diocese understands that you will make your best efforts for a timely completion of your task but that is highly contingent upon factors beyond your control.

Finally, the Diocese requests that when your work is completed it be summarized in a written report and delivered to Jeffrey Trant its Victim Assistant Coordinator. Mr. Trant will be your contact at the Diocese and provide you with anything you require from the Diocese to assist and complete your work.

If you are in agreement with the above terms, please advise.

Jack Egan
Jeffrey J. Trant, MSW, LCSW, CPRP
Director, Safe Environment & Victim Assistance
Diocese of Springfield, Massachusetts
65 Elliot Street | P.O. Box 1730
Springfield, MA 01102-1730
Direct: 413-452-0624
Mobile: 413-272-8840
Fax: 413-452-0678
Email: j.trant@diospringfield.org
diospringfield.org

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information, including patient information protected by federal and state privacy laws. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution, or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited and may result in legal action against you. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.
September 18, 2018

Dear Mr. [redacted]:

On behalf of the Diocesan Review Board, I want to thank you for sharing the details of your abuse as detailed in narrative relating to Bishop Christopher Weldon, Rev. Edward Authier, and Rev. Clarence Forand. After reviewing the investigative report presented to the Board by Kevin Murphy, listening to a narrative briefing by Dr. Patricia Martin, and hearing your compelling testimony on June 13, 2018, we want to express our sincere sorrow for the pain and suffering you have endured.

This letter, along with a copy of your requests for the support you would like to receive from the Diocese, will be forwarded to Bishop Rozanski advising him that the Diocesan Review Board finds your testimony compelling and credible. As we explained to you, the Board has no other authority except to notify the Bishop that we find your allegations credible.

Again, this Board expresses its sincere sorrow for the pain and suffering caused by this abuse.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
John Hale
Chair

cc: Most Rev. Mitchell T. Rozanski
Members Present: Theresa Finnegan, John Hale, Tom Lachiusa, Diana Lewis, Bonnie Moriarty and Marianne Triggs Smith. Also in attendance: Kevin Murphy (Investigator) and Mary Ashe (Secretary).

The meeting began with a prayer.

New Board Chair

Theresa Finnegan resigned her position as Chair of the Board, and upon motion duly made and seconded, John Hale was elected to serve as the new Chair.

_Bishop Christopher Weldon, Fr. Edward Authier, Fr. Charence Forand_

accompanied group, Brian, Rocky, and Dr. Patricia Martin entered the meeting. immediately requested that Kevin Murphy leave the meeting which Kevin did.

Theresa began by apologizing for the mix up at the May Board meeting.

was very emotional and nervous as he recounted his abuse. He said memories come back in patches which he found to be not only confusing but also painful.

Five years ago he was watching television and saw a program on the Vatican and immediately felt uncomfortable. Two days later he saw a program on the Sistine Chapel narrated by a Cardinal whose words were similar to words spoken to him by Fr. Clarence Forand. It was then that he realized he had been abused.

claimed he was nine years old and an altar boy when Fr. Forand began to abuse him. He described what he remembers as “grooming” including oral sex. He said he was scared and afraid to tell his family. Father also told him not to cry. He went on to describe subsequent abuse by Fr. Edward Authier as well as Bishop Christopher Weldon. A copy of Kevin’s Case Summary is attached to these minutes.

would like more time with the Review Board, possibly in September, and will submit a list of his requests as well as a list of his recommendations. He believes not to hear an apology since 2014, when he first met with Patti McManamy, is “not right.”
The Board will next meet on July 11, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Ashe, Secretary
To: Memorandum to the File

From: Jeffrey J. Trant
Director, Safe Environment and Victim Assistance
Diocese of Springfield, Massachusetts

Date: 06.21.2019

Re: Complainant

1. On Thursday, June 20, 2019 Bishop Mitchell T. Rozanski met with Complainant to hear (Complainant’s) story and allegations of clergy sexual abuse when he was a child. The meeting was scheduled at Complainant’s request and was held at the Our Lady of the Elms College, Berchmans Hall 1st floor conference room, located at 291 Springfield Street, Chicopee, Massachusetts.

2. Present for the meeting was Complainant, Dr. Patricia Martin, Witness 1, Witness 2 and Witness 3. For the diocese, Bishop Rozanski and Jeffrey Trant were present.

3. Bishop Rozanski and Mr. Trant arrived at the Berchmans Hall conference room at approximately 12:50 p.m. Complainant, Dr. Martin, Mr. Witness 1, and Witness 2 were already in the room. Before 1:00 p.m. Complainant contacted Mr. Witness 3 by telephone to inquire about his whereabouts. From Complainant’s conversation, it appeared that Witness 3 was lost. Complainant started to provide directions to the college. Dr. Martin intervened, asked for the telephone, and told Mr. Witness 3 that (Complainant) needs to prepare for his meeting, and (Witness 3) should use his GPS or go to a gas station and ask for directions to Elms College.

4. Shortly after 1:00 p.m. the meeting started. Dr. Martin stated they would like to audio record the meeting so that (Complainant) does not have to go through what has already happened with different accounts of what was stated. Bishop Rozanski and Mr. Trant both explicitly stated that they don’t consent to being audio recorded. Dr. Martin responded that it is (Complainant’s) right to have his statement recorded and they will only record when (Complainant) speaks. Bishop Rozanski agreed. Witness 2 stated he will be the person recording on his smartphone; that he will place the phone on the conference table; and that whenever (Bishop Rozanski) is going to talk (all parties) can watch him pause the recording. Witness 2 placed his smart phone on the table to audio record.

Witness 3 arrived at approximately 1:40 p.m.
5. Complainant began his statement by making prefatory remarks before he told his story. Complainant stated that he triggers himself when he tells his story and the signs are dry mouth and he speaks in a higher pitch voice. He asked to please not be interrupted when he tells his story and that he may need a moment. He then stated that this is what he told the (Review) Board at the time (June 2018 Review Board meeting). Complainant further stated that when you listen to my story it is that of a 9-year-old scared boy. He also stated that what he has learned is how to deal with emotional memories; that trauma gets stuck in the body and “shredded like confetti,” which is why “it comes out in bits and pieces.”

6. Complainant provided the following statement about his story:

   a. It all started with a tour of the Sistine Chapel during the Pope’s (Francis) election. (Complainant) hadn’t been involved with the church, except for midnight mass, for decades. He started thinking of a nightmare dream (he) had on repeat as a kid about monsters. While watching an interview by Matt Laeuer and a Cardinal (of a tour of the Sistine Chapel) he recalls the Cardinal state, “this is where we are and where we went in.” Complainant stated that everything the cardinal said was what (Rev. Clarence) Forand used to say to him in the rectory. He stated this was when the “bomb went off.” Complainant stated that he said to himself, “my god, I’ve been abused.”

   b. Complainant then stated that the next thing he remembers is Forand outside of the sacristy door saying, “So, want to go in there?” Complainant then stated that “he grabbed me by the left shoulder and dragged me into the room.” He then described Forand’s room as having a bed with kelly green sheets with the whitest bedspread he has ever seen. Complainant stated that Forand told him that “this is where you put your clothes.” He then stated that memory flash forwards to him screaming at me saying, “you have to fix your belt.” Complainant stated that as we were leaving the bedroom he (Forand) said that is my secret staircase for altar boys to come and go. Complainant stated that he was determined to go and tell his father, who was a policeman in Chicopee, but he was afraid.

   c. Complainant then stated that one of his opening lines to the (Review) Board was “I was raped.” He then stated that I originally described it as Forand pecking at me from behind like a bird beak. Complainant then stated that it was new to him to say that word, and “for me saying it up front got it out of the way. He then stated it (rape) wasn’t a onetime deal.

   d. Complainant stated that he would leave and go to an area afterwards and hide behind a tree. He stated that one time his butt was itchy. He remembers sticking his hands down his underpants and, when he pulled his hand out, there was blood. Complainant then stated that he thought he’d get in serious trouble and that he
didn’t know what to do. He stated that he still didn’t tell his parents. He would throw his underwear away because he didn’t want to get in trouble.

e. Complainant stated this is another sign for when I’m triggered. He described picking at his fingers like he is saying the rosary and trying to make himself invisible. Next, he stated that he was stuck. It was the 50’s. He had a very pious father and they were proud (Complainant) was an altar boy. Complainant stated that he was stuck and that he had to go to morning masses because he either get in trouble of with Forand. He then stated that he hated going to mass.

f. Complainant stated that inside the church was comical. He stated you had Authier as the pastor and Forand. There were two confessionals. The line would be out the door for Forand and no one for Authier. Complainant stated that one time he saw Authier pull someone out of the confessional and tell them to get out of here. Next, he stated that in the confessional Forand was a pervert. Complainant stated that Forand would ask if I touched myself down there and asked if I ever told told anyone? He then stated it was always the same, ten Hail Mary’s and ten Our Father’s.

g. Complainant stated that onetime while he was in the church someone grabbed him in the groin from behind and asked, “did I like that?” He then stated that the first time he saw Forand was at St. Anne’s behind the altar in a little room. (Forand) came into the room with a candle stick holder and (Forand) “peed” (urinated) into it. He also stated one time Forand opened his cassock and told me to hide inside.

h. Complainant stated that Forand stopped him from leaving the sacristy, pulled his pants down and put his head down there. Complainant stated that he remembers staring at one piece of blue stained glass.

i. Complainant stated that always in the rectory with Father Authier; he then stated that he had to go and sit on his lap every time. He then described Authier as a “drooler” who drooled all over you and also drooled on the altar. Complainant stated that Authier would drool all over him in the rectory.

j. Complainant stated that one time in the bedroom it was Forand and Authier. One of them grabbed (Complainant) by the head, shoved his face down and said, “No crying.” Complainant said onetime he asked, “What are you doing? Why me?” They responded by stating, “You’re not supposed to cry.” Complainant then clarified and stated “It was Forand and Authier.” Forand with the bird beak and Authier without the bird beak, but it hurt. Complainant then stated that the feeling of rape was follow. When it happens you can’t feel your body; you’re hollow.
Complainant then stated that when Weldon walked into the room it was like the parting of the Red Sea. Whoever was there, adults, would just get out of the way. Complainant stated Weldon was the boss. He had seen Weldon before as an altar boy and he was a nice guy it seemed. Complainant stated that (Weldon) would pat us on the head and make us kiss his ring, a lot.

Complainant stated that he saw Weldon in the rectory. He then stated that he remembers Authier upstairs with Forand and Weldon. Everyone got out of the way. Forand turned me over and said, “it’s okay.” Forand and (Complainant) were in the bed naked, feeling me all over front and back saying “it’s okay.”

Complainant stated that he often refer to him as “the cuddler.” Dr. Martin interjected and asked Complainant who he is referring to. Complainant responded, “Weldon.” He then stated that saying Weldon has a hollowness and, “I called him the cuddler.” Next, Complainant stated one time we were in bed. Bishop Rozanski interjected and asked Complainant who he is speaking of now? Complainant replied, “Weldon.”

Complainant stated at the rectory at St. Anne’s he was forced and told to stand and watch. Complainant stated he had me watch. There were two other altar boys. My goal was to be invisible. Complainant then stated after he was done, he was happy Weldon. Complainant then stated that Weldon said to him, “See over there? That is my secret staircase for altar boys to come and go.”

Complainant stated the names Forand, Authier, and Weldon. We went for rides. Complainant stated that he remembers Forand driving more than the others. He stated he doesn’t remember Weldon driving but he remembers him in the car. He reported sometime it was just (Complainant) and sometimes there were other kids. One time we went somewhere far and another time not so far. He described one of the locations as being near the water. Complainant stated there was a tent set up and altar boys were naked. Complainant stated that he remembers that Weldon was there and that (Weldon) walked him behind the tent to a dark building in the woods. Complainant stated that he thinks they went up the steps. He also stated that there were other house with one room. Complainant the described another place with a room that had a good, an oriental rug, and pews. He stated that every once in a while an adult (further described as a priest) would come in. Sometimes they would chat a lot with an altar boy and leave. Complainant stated that he remembers sitting in the corner trying to make himself invisible.

Complainant stated the names Forand, Authier and Weldon. He said there was a place that wasn’t too far from St. Anne’s and that he knows they went down a hill. We went there a few times. Complainant stated there was the #52 and 56 on the
door. He stated that he remembers the numbers because they were shiny on dark doors. Complainant stated that Weldon was there and he walked him up to #52. Complainant stated that he doesn’t remember that inside much. He remembers Weldon walking him out to #56. Next, Complainant stated that when they got to #56 there were green tomatoes. He stated that he thinks he remembers that because he had never seen green tomatoes before.

q. Complainant stated 52 had this huge book on a table by itself. As an adult, (Complainant) thinks it was a pedestal. Complainant then stated that there was this other place Weldon brought him that had a high table with a book. He described the location as having a staircase, but it wasn’t spiral and it went from wall-to-wall. He then stated it was a brick building. Next, Complainant stated that is all he remembers about that place. He then stated that as an adult he’s thinking it was a bible.

r. Complainant stated that at 56 Weldon brought him in there. He stated it was dark, there were a lot of rooms, and multiple floors. Complainant stated that he didn’t want to go down the hall and that he thinks he was there before. He described the floors as being uneven, that he would grab onto every door jam, and that Weldon grabbed onto (Complainant). Complainant then stated that he told the (Review) Board that if the building is still standing then my fingerprints are still on it. He then stated “I did not want to go in that room.” He remembers a bed, light, and dresser with a mirror.

s. Complainant stated “You’re not supposed to cry.” You beat that into a 9 year old, and then you rape them, and you learn how to cry without making a sound. Complainant stated Weldon pulled him into that room this one time, and not that it was one time. Complainant stated they wanted me on that bed and I didn’t want to go. Weldon told an altar boy to get me on the bed. I didn’t want to go but, “You’re not supposed to cry.” He then stated that a priest with a bowling ball head said, “I’ll take care of it.” Complainant stated Id did not want to get on that bed. He then stated a guy with a rectangular head with glasses – the kind that look like they didn’t have frames – called over an altar boy or a young priest who pinned (Complainant) down, flipped him over, and (Complainant) fought the entire time. He then stated, “It hurt like royal fucking hell” and they wouldn’t stop and it hurt like royal fucking hell.

t. Complainant stated that he told the (Review) Board I didn’t want to talk about this guy. “I called him the monster.” This guy was at 56 and he was huge. Complainant described the person as having jet black hair all over his body. He then described him as crazy. Complainant stated that he came up and knocked (Complainant) upside the back of his head, he was slippery all over,
(Complainant) fought like hell, and “I failed.” Complainant stated that next thing he can remember he was standing in the corner saying “I want my mommy.” He then stated that he couldn’t move his arms. He also stated they were yelling at George, whoever that fuck that was. Complainant then stated that he doesn’t know what happened.

u. Complainant stated years later, many years later, as an adult he went down to Florida with a woman he was living with to see his mother. He then talked about being 9-10. He stated they talked about how there was a horse/pony that children would ride in the neighborhood, but he never did. Complainant stated that every time his parents would try would try to take his shirt off he would cry.
Complainant stated that he was taken to the doctor and they said it must be because his collar bone is broken.

v. Complainant stated he was still an altar boy and he didn’t go to mass. He stated that they started using schedules. Everyone Forand would say mass he would skip and go to the store on the corner. Complainant stated that whenever Forand would fill in at mass it would be mass, rectory, woods.

w. Complainant stated that he doesn’t remember seeing Weldon that last time after 56. He then stated that he would only him at confirmation. Complainant stated they lined up by height. That during confirmation he remembers going up before him and kneeling. Complainant stated that he could see the look of death in his eyes. Complainant stated that his mother could see the imprint of his hand from all the way in the back of the church. Dr. Martin interjected and asked Complainant, what happened and what do you mean? Complainant stated that his mother could see the imprint of his hand and you could see that imprint on his face all the way from the back of the church.

x. Complainant stated that he has a memory that he’s not really sure of. He stated that he shares this because at some level he hopes it’s true. Complainant stated that he was at home crying and his father came into the room and asked “What are you crying for?” Complainant responded “I don’t know.” Complainant stated he father said, “God damn it, why are you crying?” Complainant responded “Fr. Forand.” His father asked, “What about Fr. Forand?” Complainant stated “I told him he touched me down there and it hurt.” His father hit him and stated, “God damn it priests don’t do that.”

y. Complainant stated there is this other memory and he likes to think it’s true. Complainant stated that his father didn’t go to mass at St. Anne’s because he went to St. Patrick’s. One time we went to mass at St. Anne’s and it just (Complainant) and his father. He got up and told me to stay here. After a while he came back and
said let’s go. There was not a word on the way home and (Complainant) was scared. He then stated that it’s nice to think that he went and kicked ass, but he doesn’t know. Complainant stated that he likes to think (his father) stopped it.

z. Complainant stated that if you have any records on that he would certainly like to know. At approximately 2:10 p.m. Complainant stated that he is talked out. He then stated that’s what he told the (Review) Board. Complainant then stated that John Hale coming with that statement was crushing. He stated that at the (Review Board meeting) no one asked questions. He stated Hale got up and said “I was in Vietnam and you had it worse than I did.” Complainant stated that Hale said Authier, Forand, Weldon they’re all credible. He then stated you don’t know how good that felt. Hale then stated they’re all credible and we’re going to put that in a letter.

7. At approximately 2:15 p.m. Bishop Rozanski thanked Complainant for sharing this difficult story and also thanked his supporters. Next, Bishop Rozanski stated that this is a direct question and asked Complainant are you saying that Bishop Christopher Weldon sexually abused you? Complainant responded “Yes.” Complainant then stated just like I said to Murphy, Patti and Connolly back in 2014. Complainant then stated “Did he sexually abuse me? Yes, multiple times, multiple locations.” Complainant stated that no one asked me that direct question at the (Review) Board.

8. Complainant stated that (during his interaction with diocesan investigator Kevin) Murphy (Mr. Murphy) spent an hour and a half talking about himself. Complainant further stated that Mr. Murphy told him they could meet in his car for the interview in a parking lot, and (Mr. Murphy) would buy him dinner afterwards. Complainant stated that he felt very uncomfortable with this, and they met for the interview at the home of a friend.

9. Complainant stated that in 2014 he went to report to (Monsignor Christopher) Connelly and Patti (Macmany), and every interaction with the church has been abusive. It was reported that his happened again in (2018) at the (Review) Board when Complainant and his support network arrived at (the Pastoral Center). They had spoken with Patti by phone 20 minutes earlier and, when they arrived, were (1) not invited into the building, (2) told they weren’t on the agenda and there wasn’t time, and (3) they observed board members leave the meeting shortly after 7:00 p.m. When the (Review) Boards members left, they didn’t acknowledge Complainant who was still outside the Pastoral Center.

10. Bishop Rozanski stated that he will speak with the Congregation of Bishops about reporting this allegation against Bishop Weldon. Dr. Martin asked how Complainant will know the outcome. It was agreed that Mr. Trant will contact Complainant with updates on next steps.
11. Bishop Rozanski was asked if the diocese has received any other allegations against Bishop Weldon. Bishop Rozanski stated the diocese has received two (2) other allegations that were determined to not be credible. Dr. Martin stated that she would like to request that the diocese go back and review those allegations against Bishop Weldon that were found to be not credible.

12. Witness 3 asked if the Diocese already has a statement prepared to release about the meeting. Bishop Rozanski responded no.

13. Mr. Trant asked Complainant if no one at the Review Board meetings directly/explicitly asked if (1) Forand, (2) Authier, and (3) Weldon (i.e. parsed allegations and confirmed). Complainant responded no. Dr. Martin then stated that you had to practically “peel her off the floor,” referring to Theresa Finnegan.

14. Witness 1 asked Bishop Rozanski if he believes (Complainant’s) and he is credible. Bishop Rozanski stated that it is not his role to determine credibility, and that is the role of the (Review Board) and advise him on. Bishop Rozanski stated that Complainant’s story is very compelling.

At approximately 2:50 p.m. the meeting concluded. Complainant provided Mr. Trant with his contact information (Tel. XXX-XXX-XXXX; e-mail: XXXXXXXXXXX). Mr. Trant provided Complainant, Dr. Martin, Witness 3, Witness 2 and Witness 1 with his business card. Bishop Rozanski and Mr. Trant left the room and Complainant, Dr. Martin, Witness 1, Witness 2 and Witness 3 remained.
On 3-24-18 Patti McManamy contacted me regarding a new case that was being reported to her office. _______ called to report that he was molested and sexually abused by a number of different priests and on a few occasions Bishop Weldon tried to molest him.

On 4-04-18 I began my investigation and spoke to _______ to set up our initial interview. Mr. _______ has been in counseling for some time and Patti McManamy has arranged for the diocese to assist with the expense.

On 4-10-18 I met with _______ at the home of a friend. Mr. _______ stated that he lived in Chicopee, MA with his parents and three brothers. He went to St. Anne's church and was an altar server. It was there that he was first molested by Fr. Joseph Forand. Some of the incidents took place at the church and later at the rectory. Mr. _______ was 9 years old when the incidents happened. Mr. _______ further stated that Fr. Edward Authier also molested him at the rectory and other places. Mr. _______ further stated that he was brought to other locations by Fr. Forand and molested by three other unknown priests and Bishop Christopher Weldon. Mr. _______ stated that Bishop Weldon never molested him but tried to hug him and pull him within reach. On several occasions he would back up and the Bishop turned his attention to another youth who was in the room. Mr. _______ has a lot of difficulty discussing the types of sexual abuse each priest did to him and years of counseling were needed just for him to come forward now. The abuse took place over a period of two years and Mr. _______ cannot remember how many times each priest abused him. He remembers telling his father, _______ about the abuse and was slapped across the face and told priests "don't do that".

Mr. _______ put the incidents out of his mind and continued his education. He later worked for _______ at the _______ and the _______. It was during a counseling session in 2013 that Mr. _______ was flooded with the memories of his abuse.
CONCLUSION:

Mr. [redacted] has a lot of difficulty talking about the specific acts that were done to him by various priests. He clearly stated that Bishop Weldon didn't physically molest him. He witnesses another youth being molested by the Bishop.

Fr. Forand is deceased but has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. The previous complaint was found to be credible.

Fr. Authier is deceased and also has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. This complaint was found to be credible.

Bishop Weldon is deceased and has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. The victim is a prisoner in Texas serving time for homicide. The complaint was not found credible.

Mr. [redacted] tells a compelling story of constant sexual abuse by two priests in his home parish. There are three other priests that he is not able to identify by name. His description is too generic to aid in their identification. Years of therapy have settled his mind and he has two male friends who help him. I find his disclosure to be very credible and we should afford him any assistance he needs.

Respectfully

Kevin M. Murphy
On 3-24-18 Patti McManamy contacted me regarding a new case that was being reported to her office. The person called to report that he was molested and sexually abused by a number of different priests and on a few occasions Bishop Weldon tried to molest him.

On 4-04-18 I began my investigation and spoke to Mr. [redacted] to set up our initial interview. Mr. [redacted] has been in counseling for some time and Patti McManamy has arranged for the diocese to assist with the expense.

On 4-10-18 I met with Mr. [redacted] at the home of a friend. Mr. [redacted] stated that he lived in Chicopee, MA with his parents and three brothers. He went to St. Anne's church and was an altar server. It was there that he was first molested by Fr. Joseph Forand. Some of the incidents took place at the church and later at the rectory. Mr. [redacted] was 9 years old when the incidents happened. Mr. [redacted] further stated that Fr. Edward Authier also molested him at the rectory and other places. Mr. [redacted] further stated that he was brought to other locations by Fr. Forand and molested by three other unknown priests and Bishop Christopher Weldon. Mr. [redacted] stated that Bishop Weldon never molested him but tried to hug him and pull him within reach. On several occasions he would back up and the Bishop turned his attention to another youth who was in the room. Mr. [redacted] has a lot of difficulty discussing the types of sexual abuse each priest did to him and years of counseling were needed just for him to come forward now. The abuse took place over a period of two years and Mr. [redacted] cannot remember how many times each priest abused him. He remembers telling his father, a [redacted], about the abuse and was slapped across the face and told priests "don't do that".

Mr. [redacted] put the incidents out of his mind and continued his education. He later worked for [redacted] at the [redacted] and the [redacted]. It was during a counseling session in 2013 that Mr. [redacted] was flooded with the memories of his abuse.
CONCLUSION:

Mr. [REDACTED] has a lot of difficulty talking about the specific acts that were done to him by various priests. He clearly stated that Bishop Weldon didn’t physically molest him. He witnesses another youth being molested by the Bishop.

Fr. Forand is deceased but has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. The previous complaint was found to be credible.

Fr. Authier is deceased and also has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. This complaint was found to be credible.

Bishop Weldon is deceased and has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. The victim is a prisoner in Texas serving time for homicide. The complaint was not found credible.

Mr. [REDACTED] tells a compelling story of constant sexual abuse by two priests in his home parish. There are three other priests that he is not able to identify by name. His description is too generic to aide in their identification. Years of therapy have settled his mind and he has two male friends who help him. I find his disclosure to be very credible and we should afford him any assistance he needs.

Respectfully

[Signature]

Kevin M. Murphy
On 3-24-18 Patti McManan reported that she had been molested and sexually abused by a number of different priests and on a few occasions Bishop Weldon tried to molest him.

On 4-04-18 I began my investigation and spoke to Mr. to set up our initial interview. Mr. has been in counseling for some time and Patti McManan has arranged for the diocese to assist with the expense.

On 4-10-18 I met with at the home of a friend of his. Mr. stated that he had lived in Chicopee, MA, with his parents and three brothers. He went to St. Anne’s church and was an altar server. It was there that he was first molested by Fr. Joseph Forand. Some of the incidents took place at the church and later at the rectory. Mr. was 9 years old when the incidents happened.

Mr. further stated that Fr. Edward Authier also molested him at the rectory and other locations. Mr. further stated that he was brought to other locations by Fr. Forand and molested by three other unknown priests. Sometimes other boys were there as well and were also abused. Mr. stated that Bishop Weldon was often present and never molested him, but tried to hug him and pull him within reach. On several occasions Mr. would back up and the Bishop would then turn his attention to another youth who was in the room.

Mr. has a lot of difficulty discussing the types of sexual abuse each priest did to him and years of counseling were needed just for him to come forward now. He described severe anal penetration among other acts. The abuse took place over a period of two years and Mr. cannot remember how many times each priest abused him. He remembers telling his father, about the abuse and was slapped across the face and told “priests don’t do that.”
Mr. [redacted] put the incidents out of his mind and continued his education. He later worked for [redacted] at the [redacted] and the [redacted]. It was during a counseling session in 2013 that Mr. [redacted] was flooded with the memories of his abuse.

CONCLUSION:

Mr. [redacted] has a lot of difficulty talking about the specific acts that were done to him by various priests. He clearly stated that Bishop Weldon didn't physically molest him. He witnessed another youth being molested by the Bishop.

Fr. Forand is deceased but has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from two unrelated victims. The previous complaints were found to be credible.

Fr. Authier is deceased and also has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. This complaint was found to be credible.

Bishop Weldon is deceased and has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. The victim is a prisoner in Texas serving time for homicide. The complaint was not found credible.

Mr. [redacted] tells a compelling story of constant sexual abuse by two priests in his home parish. There are three other priests that he is not able to identify by name. His description is too generic to aide in their identification. Years of therapy have settled his mind and he has two male friends who help him. I find his disclosure to be very credible and we should afford him any assistance he needs.

Respectfully,

Kevin M. Murphy
On 3-24-18 Patti McManamy contacted me regarding a case that was newly reported to her office. Mr. [redacted] reported that he had been molested and sexually abused by a number of different priests and on a few occasions Bishop Weldon tried to molest him.

On 4-04-18 I began my investigation and spoke to Mr. [redacted] to set up our initial interview. Mr. [redacted] has been in counseling for some time and Patti McManamy has arranged for the diocese to assist with the expense.

On 4-10-18 I met with Mr. [redacted] at the home of a friend of his. Mr. [redacted] stated that he had lived in Chicopee, MA, with his parents and three brothers. He went to St. Anne’s church and was an altar server. It was there that he was first molested by Fr. Joseph Forand. Some of the incidents took place at the church and later at the rectory. Mr. [redacted] was 9 years old when the incidents happened.

Mr. [redacted] further stated that Fr. Edward Authier also molested him at the rectory and other locations. Mr. [redacted] further stated that he was brought to other locations by Fr. Forand and molested by three other unknown priests. Sometimes other boys were there as well and were also abused. Mr. [redacted] stated that Bishop Weldon was often present and never molested him, but tried to hug him and pull him within reach. On several occasions Mr. [redacted] would back up and the Bishop would then turn his attention to another youth who was in the room.

Mr. [redacted] has a lot of difficulty discussing the types of sexual abuse each priest did to him and years of counseling were needed just for him to come forward now. He described severe anal penetration among other acts. The abuse took place over a period of two years and Mr. [redacted] cannot remember how many times each priest abused him. He remembers telling his father, a [redacted], about the abuse and was slapped across the face and told “priests don’t do that.”

Mr. [redacted] put the incidents out of his mind and continued his education. He later worked for [redacted] at the [redacted] and the [redacted]...
It was during a counseling session in 2013 that Mr. was flooded with the memories of his abuse.

CONCLUSION:

Mr. has a lot of difficulty talking about the specific acts that were done to him by various priests. He clearly stated that Bishop Weldon didn’t physically molest him. He witnessed another youth being molested by the Bishop.

Fr. Forand is deceased but has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from two unrelated victims. The previous complaints were found to be credible.

Fr. Authier is deceased and also has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. This complaint was found to be credible.

Bishop Weldon is deceased and has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. The victim is a prisoner in Texas serving time for homicide. The complaint was not found credible.

Mr. tells a compelling story of constant sexual abuse by two priests in his home parish. There are three other priests that he is not able to identify by name. His description is too generic to aide in their identification. Years of therapy have settled his mind and he has two male friends who help him. I find his disclosure to be very credible and we should afford him any assistance he needs.

Respectfully,

Kevin M. Murphy
Hi

That was quite a meeting. OMG!!! I'm enclosing a draft, make any changes you'd like.

Will this be the only letter being sent? or will a separate letter be going to Bishop? Also, an fyi, Msgr. Connelly receives a copy of letters like this.

Let me know.

Mary
I forgot to attach the letter. Sorry.

[19K]

draft.docx

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=591f688e4b&view=pt&...
Dear Mr. ■

On behalf of the Diocesan Review Board, I want to thank you for sharing the details of your abuse as detailed in narrative relating to BCW, Fr. EA, and Fr. CF. After reviewing the investigative report presented to the Board by Kevin Murphy, listening to a narrative briefing by Patricia Martin, and hearing your compelling testimony on June 13, 2018, we want to express our sincere sorrow for the pain and suffering you have endured.

This letter, along with a copy of your requests, will be forwarded to Bishop Rozanski advising him that the Diocesan Review Board finds your testimony compelling and credible.

Again, this Board expresses its sincere sorrow for the pain and suffering caused by this abuse.

Sincerely,

John Hale, Chair
REVIEW BOARD

Agenda

June 12, 2019

1. Prayer

2. Minutes

3. Opening Remarks

4. Old Business - Kevin
   OUTSIDE THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

5. New Business
   - HIV POS
   - Fr. John
   - Diocesan E-mail Addresses
   - Bylaws - Send Jeffrey Suggestions

Systematic data collection in addition to investigation and report
REVIEW BOARD

Agenda

April 11, 2018

1. Prayer

2. Minutes – January 10, 2018, Meeting

3. Old Business

4. Paul Ashton, Clergy Monitor

5. New Business

6. Fr. Dan Foley – Memorial Contribution
Hi Theresa

Kevin Murphy will be in town for the meeting and is coming a day early to follow up with some cases.

Potential topics for the meeting:

Old:
Schools dept. issue/Sue C and Marianne letter

Ongoing:
- Report from Kevin
- Canon lawyer representative for Sue C?
- Memorial contribution for Fr. Foley
- Letter to Fr. Lawlor
- Letter from Bishop re Clergy monitor position
- Still in issues - letter from Bishop?

New:
- Report from me and Kevin
- New Marian report referred by Bishop
- Possible Kevin follow-up
- Unusual allegation from former nun
- Approval for assistance

Patti

---

Patricia Finn McManamy, LICSW
Director
Office of Child and Youth Protection

Diocese of Springfield
65 Elliot St., PO Box 1730
Springfield, MA 01102
(413) 452-0624
REVIEW BOARD

Agenda
August 8, 2018

1. Prayer

2. Minutes – June 13, 2018

3. John Hale

4. Old Business
   Safe Environment Training
   Deacon Bill Brawner

5. New Business
Review Board meeting August 8, 2018
Patti McManamy, OCYP

New Business

1. Recent report by
   a. Intake, personal statement, therapist letter
   b. Kevin’s report
   c. Follow-up letters to bishop/victim

2. Information
   a. Intake
   b. DA’s office follow-up

Old business

1. Next steps
   a. Sept 12 meeting agenda
   b. Visit to St. Anne Rectory and church

2. Clergy Monitor follow-up
   a. Letter regarding Paul Ashton?
   b. Letter regarding Canon Attorney position?
   c. Response re Kevin Murphy’s lack of interest in “Clergy Monitor” position?

3. New Superintendent of Schools Dr. Daniel Baillargeon
   a. Would anyone like to join me to meet with him regarding our ongoing schools issues?
   b. Should we invite him to a RB meeting?

4. Bishop’s response to Theresa’s letter regarding Chairperson change
   a. (Was Bishop informed of Elaine and Irene’s departures?)
REVIEW BOARD

Agenda

September 12, 2018

1. Prayer

2. Minutes – August 8, 2018

3. Old Business

4. New Business

5. [Redacted]
Members Present: John Hale, Tom Lachiusa, Bonnie Moriarty, Jim Ross, and Jim Stankiewicz. Also in attendance: Patti McManamy (Victim Advocate) and Mary Ashe (Secretary).

The meeting began with a prayer.

The minutes of the June 13, 2018, meeting were reviewed and approved.

John Hale

John reviewed last month's meeting with [redacted], who alleged sexual abuse by Fr. Clarence Forand and Fr. Edward Authier. It is expected he will attend a future meeting, probably in September, after he advises the Board what he anticipates and or expects from the Diocese. Patti also mentioned Mr. [redacted] would like to visit and tour St. Anne's rectory where the abuse took place.

John said would like to speed up the meetings and asked that the minutes and other paperwork be mailed out prior to a meeting.

He would also like to have a meeting with Bishop Rozanski in September to discuss the Clergy Monitor position, malpractice coverage for the Board, a job description for Board members, safety procedures in parishes and in Catholic schools, as well as recruiting new Board members. Jim Ross volunteered to join John, and Mary Ashe will contact the Bishop's office to set up an appointment.

OLD BUSINESS

Patti reviewed the status of William Brawner who is no longer a Deacon due to inappropriate behavior complaints. He had asked to be “retired,” however he subsequently was removed without faculties.

NEW BUSINESS

[redacted]/Richard Lavigne

Patti has been meeting with Mr. [redacted] who is alleging abuse by Richard Lavigne. Mr. [redacted] has been seeing a therapist, [redacted], for the past twenty years and is
suffering with emotional stress. Fr. Bill Lutney, who has been providing spiritual
direction to Mr. __, had reported the abuse to Patti. Mr. __ is interested in meeting
with Bishop and is in mediated settlement discussions with diocesan attorneys. Kevin
Murphy has also met with Mr. __, and Patti will ask him to submit a written report to
the Bishop as well as to the Board.

reported inappropriate behavior involving her great-
grandson, __, age __, who is living with her. Mrs. __ had welcomed and
encouraged __ in a mentoring role with __ believing it would be beneficial to
the boy. She subsequently noticed that __ was becoming over-involved in
life creating boundary violations. Neither Mrs. __ nor __ reported any
sexual abuse.

has had past issues with boundary violations and is at St. Luke’s for
assessment specific to the Code of Conduct. He has, however, refused some of the
testing.

The Board will next meet on September 12, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Ashe, Secretary
Office of Child and Youth Protection
Diocese of Springfield
Sexual Abuse Victim Intake Sheet

1. Name: [redacted]
2. DOB: [redacted]
3. Telephone number(s): 
4. Address: 
5. Email 
6. Adult or minor at time of reporting? adult
7. Date of Report _
8. Who made report? [redacted]
9. Name(s) of accused: Clarence Forand; Bishop Weldon; Edward Authier
10. Accused Type: Diocesan Priest; Bishop of Springfield; Order priest
11. Does the allegation involve an international cleric? no
12. Status of accused at time of report: CF deceased; CW; EA
13. Date status became effective: CF 2004; BW
14. Where did the abuse occur? 
15. When did the abuse occur? 1960-1962
16. Description of abuse: sexual molestation on many occasions by several priests who “shared” him and other youths
17. Have you/has victim reported this conduct to anyone else? Parent, as a child; Therapists: Monsignor Yargeau in 2014; Monsignor Connelly, VAC, Vatican in 2014 Anyone in authority? DA’s Office
18. Have you sought any medical, counseling or other assistance? Therapy, group therapy
19. What led to coming forward about abuse at this time? Continuing to process effects of abuse in therapy
20. What are you expecting from your contact with the Diocese? Support, therapy reimbursement; visit to the rectory and church to aid in his healing; Pope to visit his father’s grave; assistance with therapeutic retreat costs; time at Review Board meeting to tell his story;
21. If victim currently under age 18, was caller informed of requirement to report to Child Protective Services? NA
22. Was caller informed of victim’s right to report to criminal/civil authorities? Yes
23. Was caller informed of time frame to make a prompt response and next steps in process? Yes

Further action:
Met with VAC, met with Investigator, came to RB meeting; wants to visit St Anne OPArish, meet with Bishop, attend conference in Sweden, have Pope visit father’s grave; have Frouand’s body moved from elite part of cemetery, have 2 friends and one advocate attend all meetings her chosen.
Intake worker's name: Patricia McManamy LICSW
Date of intake:

**Documentation for Charter Audit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date first contact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date abuse reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to Bishop and Monsignor:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to Review Board chair:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to Diocesan Attorney:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to District Attorney:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date case was heard before RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was case found credible?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was accused contacted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim informed of previous allegations/Review Board process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date outreach/services offered:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Is the victim alive or deceased?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Has the victim identified him/herself or remains anonymous (unwilling or refuses to provide their name)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Is the victim pursuing the matter or reporting only?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Is the victim cooperating, or not giving details?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Is this part of a civil action (e.g., class action complaint involving multiple victims, bankruptcy filing, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Has the diocese initiated an investigation? If not, please explain why.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) If the allegation involved a religious order, identify the order.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) If the allegation was not reported to the review board, explain why.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) If listed as an “Other Diocese,” name the diocese/eparchy involved, and describe the circumstances under which it came forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Has the matter been referred to another diocese/eparchy? Is so, name the diocese/eparchy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) If unsubstantiated or unable to be proven, describe what steps were taken to restore the cleric's good name. If none, explain circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each victim labeled a MINOR (under the age of 18) above, identify below:

| (l) the age of the minor at the time of reporting |   |
| (m) the gender of the minor |   |
| (n) the age when the alleged abuse began/t ook place |   |
| (o) where the abuse occurred |   |
| (p) the relationship between the victim and offender |   |
| (q) the diocese/eparchy where the abuse took place |   |
| (r) which entity the abuse was reported to (civil/law enforcement) |   |
| (s) brief description of allegation |   |
On 3-24-18 Patti McManamy contacted me regarding a case that was newly reported to her office. He reported that he had been molested and sexually abused by a number of different priests and on a few occasions Bishop Weldon tried to molest him.

On 4-04-18 I began my investigation and spoke to to set up our initial interview. has been in counseling for some time and Patti McManamy has arranged for the diocese to assist with the expense.

On 4-10-18 I met with at the home of a friend of his. stated that he had lived in Chicopee, MA, with his parents and three brothers. He went to St. Anne’s church and was an altar server. It was there that he was first molested by Fr. Joseph Forand. Some of the incidents took place at the church and later at the rectory was 9 years old when the incidents happened.

Further stated that Fr. Edward Authier also molested him at the rectory and other locations. further stated that he was brought to other locations by Fr. Forand and molested by three other unknown priests. Sometimes other boys were there as well and were also abused. stated that Bishop Weldon was often present and never molested him, but tried to hug him and pull him within reach. On several occasions would back up and the Bishop would then turn his attention to another youth who was in the room.

has a lot of difficulty discussing the types of sexual abuse each priest did to him and years of counseling were needed just for him to come forward now. He described severe anal penetration among other acts. The abuse took place over a period of two years and cannot remember how many times each priest abused him. He remembers telling his father, about the abuse and was slapped across the face and told “priests don’t do that.”
put the incidents out of his mind and continued his education. He later worked for at the. It was during a counseling session in 2013 that was flooded with the memories of his abuse.

CONCLUSION:

has a lot of difficulty talking about the specific acts that were done to him by various priests. He clearly stated that Bishop Weldon didn’t physically molest him. He witnessed another youth being molested by the Bishop.

Fr. Forand is deceased but has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from two unrelated victims. The previous complaints were found to be credible.

Fr. Authier is deceased and also has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. This complaint was found to be credible.

Bishop Weldon is deceased and has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. The victim is a prisoner in Texas serving time for homicide. The complaint was not found credible.

tells a compelling story of constant sexual abuse by two priests in his home parish. There are three other priests that he is not able to identify by name. His description is too generic to aide in their identification. Years of therapy have settled his mind and he has two male friends who help him. I find his disclosure to be very credible and we should afford him any assistance he needs.

Respectfully,

Kevin M. Murphy
1. A decision statement, in writing, signed by the Bishop that the Review Board and Diocese Abuse Investigator concluded that all [Redacted]'s allegations are "Credible."

2. All abusers of [Redacted] are listed in the aforementioned decision letter including Forand, Authier, Weldon, "George" and "unnamed others."

3. [Redacted] wants an apology from the Pope. Either in writing with demonstrable assurances that it's actually from the Pope or the Diocese arranges a meeting with the Pope and pays for [Redacted]'s travel to Rome. This could also be made available to any diocesan survivor of clergy abuse who would request such an apology.

4. Reimbursement of copays and deductibles and all costs of therapy or therapy related costs going forward at any time. Including workshops and travel accommodations necessary to attend workshops for victims of clergy abuse.

5. List of altar boys that served during [Redacted]'s tenure as an altar boy. Connelly said "sure, we have them; I'll give you everyone except who has an ongoing complaint against the church."

6. The review board/and diocese personnel will contact former abuse victims who have come to the Board to determine if they are open to talking with [Redacted] as I try to uncover the names of my other sexual abusers.

7. Help in uncovering the diocese addresses with the numbers [Redacted] remembers of "52 and 56." (ie, rectory,
retreat center, retirement home etc). Also addresses of other known areas where abuse occurred with other victims between 1959-1963 in Springfield/Worcester diocese.

8. Copies of all Diocese records that include [redacted]’s name, his family members’ names or any reference to himself or family members.

9. Unrestricted and private access to churches, church property and rectories for purposes of “closure” for as many times and as long as needed.

10. Pictures of Forand. Ronnie Yargeau (former head altar boy and retired priest from Greenfield) said Forand visited his family home often. Ronnie should have pictures of Forand.

11. An investigation of Monsignor Ronald Yargeau relating to abuse and/or awareness of or participation in the abuse of altar boys, or cover up, at or in connection to St. Anne’s Church, Chicopee, during his time there.

12. Pictures of all priests, regardless of title, who were active or retired in the Worcester/Springfield diocese during the 1950’s and 1960’s.

13. Any monuments or photos of Forand, Authier and Weldon on display should be removed. Remove the name Weldon from Mercy Hospital Rehab.

14. Where is Authier buried?

15. [redacted]’s reasonable expectation is he will receive a copy of the written report that Kevin Murphy said he submitted to the Bishop and Review Board regarding his claims against the priests of the Springfield Diocese and his decision that all [redacted]’ abuses were “credible.” Kevin Murphy on several occasions stated all claims were credible for each person named and unnamed. [redacted] would like a copy of the report.
for his own piece of mind regarding accuracy in reporting.

16. List of names of all priests that Weldon supervised—living and/or now dead.

17. The Springfield Diocese will take the initiative to stand with victims and independently proclaim the elimination of any statute of limitations for legal complaints against a sexual abuser; also there will be no time limits on victims coming forward to the Diocese.

18. Background and CORI checks done every 5 years on all priests and associated church workers who come in contact with minors. And each time reassigned.

19. Photos of all priest abusers in the diocese to be put on the bishopaccountability.org website.

20. “If you see it stop it” – included in mandated Reporter responsibility. If you hear it, you report it. And if not reported, also charged with complicity in abuse.

21. In “Save the children” rules, Children should not be allowed in rectories at all. Do not allow that it is okay to meet in the kitchen area. Abuse occurs everywhere.

22. All workers in the Diocese should be trained in sensitivity toward victims; avoiding shaming behavior. Experiences beginning in 2014 have frequently not been respectful and not trauma informed in their responses. The cycle of abuse needs to stop. Minimally promises made should be followed through on and kept. No interviews should take place in a “parked car” or anywhere that the victim is not comfortable. No victim should be shunned away or ignored by anyone with a relation to the church.

23. Annual training of all diocesan personnel in their mandated reporter responsibilities.

24. The Diocese to take the initiative to ask all Bishops in the
US be mandated to sign a statement of Zero Tolerance going forward, like a petition to the Pope, as an act of contrition to all victims of sexual abuse. “Zero Tolerance” should also be part of annual mandated reporter training for all priests at every level and all personnel who work or perform a service to the church.
No matter how old the person is, you should act as if you are talking to a nine year old.

I have to try my best. I trigger for abuse.

Mom went off

Behind the tree - intro

Other places I was

Gut and heart

Blood, sweat and tears

Ronnie: report of amended - Author & Ferran & Waldron

Confessions, drowzer

Confessing out the door

You didn't tell?

Head in the face

Heard all over the Church

Good boy

Dec. 2014

George

You didn't tell?

You didn't tell?

Hollow feeling you have when you get raped. Terrible feeling

Hit for crying

Cry with relating to sound

Such a sound

It was in a room

I want my mommy

He's a boy

Bend broken collar bones

Some terrible thing happened in this room

Get raped. Terrible feeling

A man got in and they

Saw another man

This is the story

I said don't do this

I was so scared

Worse than I could imagine

Needed to get away
### Complainant and the Diocese of Springfield Timeline

Prepared July 23, 2019 by Jeffrey Trant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Contact between Complainant and Monsignor Ronald Yargeau (date not known to this writer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Meeting between Complainant, Monsignor Christopher Connelly and Patricia Finn McManamy (65 Elliot Street, Springfield, MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2014</td>
<td>Letter from Patricia Finn McManamy to Complainant acknowledging their meeting with Monsignor Christopher Connelly the week before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 2015</td>
<td>Letter from Monsignor Christopher Connelly to Complainant stating he received his 06/06/2015 letter on 06/19/2015, and asked (Complainant) to please call him so they can discuss this matter further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 2015</td>
<td>Letter from Patricia Finn McManamy to Complainant responding to (Complainant’s) report of abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24, 2018</td>
<td>Patricia Finn McManamy contacted Kevin Murphy (Review Board Investigator) regarding a new case, Complainant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 2018</td>
<td>Kevin Murphy interviewed Complainant at the home of a friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 14, 2018</td>
<td>Letter from Patricia Finn McManamy to Hampden District Attorney Anthony Gulluni reporting a man with the initials X.X (DOB XX/XX/XXX) reported sexual abuse by Fr. Clarence Forand and Fr. Edward Authier and 3 other unnamed priests around 1960-1962 when XX. Was 9 to 11 years old. It was also reported that (XX) stated Bishop Christopher Weldon was present during some of these acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 2018</td>
<td>Review Board meeting. Members present: Theresa Finnegan, Susan Cary, John Hale, Tom Lachiusa, Irene Rodriguez Martin, Bonnie Moriarty, Marianne Triggs Smith, James Stankiewicz. Staff Present: Patricia Finn McManamy, Kevin Murphy, and Mary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ashe. Minutes indicate Complainant asked to attend this meeting along with two friends as support; that he requested to speak for "a couple hours," and that Board said no "a shorter amount of time would be allotted." Complainant was accompanied by two friends and "a therapist also in his support, Dr. Patricia Martin."

June 13, 2018

Review Board meeting. Members present: Theresa Finnegan, John Hale, Tom Lachiusa, Diana Lewis, Bonnie Moriarty and Marianne Triggs Smith. Staff in attendance: Kevin Murphy and Mary Ashe. Complainant was accompanied to the meeting by Witness 1, Witness 2, and Dr. Patricia Martin. Complainant requested that Kevin Murphy leave the meeting, which Kevin did. Meeting minutes state, "Complainant claimed he was nine years old as an altar boy when Fr. Forand began to abuse him," and "He went on to describe subsequent abuse by Fr. Edward Authier as well as Bishop Christopher Weldon."

August 8, 2018

Review Board meeting. Members present: John Hale, Tom Lachiusa, Bonnie Moriarty, Jim Ross and James Stankiewicz. Staff in attendance: Patricia Finn McManamy and Mary Ashe. Minutes state "John (Hale, Chair) reviewed last month’s meeting with Complainant, who alleged sexual abuse by Fr. Clarence Forand and Fr. Edward Authier."

September 12, 2018

Review Board meeting. Members present: John Hale, Tom Lachiusa, Diana Lewis, Bonnie Moriarty, Jim Ross, Marianne Triggs Smith, Jim Stankiewicz and Fr. Bob White. Staff in attendance: Kevin Murphy and Mary Ashe. Minutes indicate Complainant attended the meeting and was accompanied by Dr. Patricia Martin and Witness 2. Kevin Murphy left the meeting when Complainant, Dr. Martin and Witness 2 entered. Minutes state, "Complainant was again very emotional and nervous as he talked about his abuse." Complainant brought a list of actions he is asking for from the diocese, and the list was reviewed and discussed.

September 2018

Patricia Finn McManamy accompanied Complainant to Saint Anne’s Parish Rectory in Chicopee, MA. Date not known to this writer and if any other persons were present for this visit.

Regional listening/dialogue session hosted by Bishop Rozanski addressing the sex abuse crisis in the Catholic Church at St. Mary’s Parish in Westfield. Complainant spoke at the session. People in attendance at the session reported that Complainant shared his story of clergy sexual abuse that evening.

Cathi Farr, Director of Human Resources for the Diocese of Springfield (and acting director of the Office of Safe Environment and Victim Assistance from January 2019 to June 2019) had a telephone conversation (memorialized in a memorandum to the file) regarding Complainant.

Mark Dupont spoke with Tom LaChiusa by phone regarding his recollection of the June 2018 Review Board meeting and Complainant.

Jeffrey Trant spoke with Kevin Murphy by phone regarding his recollection of the June 2018 Review Board meeting and Complainant.

Mark Dupont and Jeffrey Trant spoke with Fr. White by phone regarding his recollection of the June 2018 Review Board meeting and Complainant.

Mark Dupont and Jeffrey Trant spoke with Theresa Finnegan by phone at approximately 9:30 a.m. regarding her recollection of the June 2018 Review Board meeting and Complainant.

Mark Dupont and Jeffrey Trant spoke with Marianne Triggs Smith by phone at approximately 10:30 a.m. regarding her recollection of the June 2018 Review Board meeting and Complainant.

Mark Dupont and Jeffrey Trant spoke with Bonnie Moriarty by phone at approximately 10:40 a.m. regarding his recollection of the June 2018 Review Board meeting and Complainant.

Review Board meeting. Member present: John Hale, Tom LaChiusa, Ann Mislak, Marianne Triggs Smith, James Stankiewicz
and Fr. Bob White. Staff in attendance: Fr. John Lessard-Thibodeau, Kevin Murphy, Jeffrey Trant and Mary Ashe. Minutes indicate the recent newspaper articles regarding Bishop Weldon were discussed. "There is definitely confusion surround this allegation. Tom Lachiusa took notes when Complainant spoke at the Board meeting during which he said the Bishop was a 'cuddler' but did never mentioned [sic] 'touching.'"

June 20, 2019
Meeting between Bishop Rozanski and Jeffrey Trant from the diocese and Complainant, Dr. Patricia Martin, Witness 1, Witness 2, and Witness 3. At Complainant's request, Witness 2 audio recorded Complainant when he was speaking on his smart phone. At the meeting Complainant directly states that the late Bishop Christopher J. Weldon sexually abused him when he was a minor child. Bishop Rozanski stated to Complainant he will contact the Congregation of Bishop's regarding reporting the allegation against Bishop Weldon.

June 20, 2019
Diocese reported direct allegation of sexual abuse against Bishop Christopher Weldon by Complainant to District Attorney Anthony Gulluni (via facsimile and certified mail).

June 21, 2019
Diocese sent amended report correcting the names of Authier and Forand to District Attorney Anthony Gulluni (via facsimile and certified mail).

June 21, 2019
Bishop Rozanski sent a letter to the Papal Nuncio to the United States, Christopher Pierre, informing him of Complainant's allegation of sexual abuse by Bishop Christopher Weldon.

June 21, 2019
Mark Dupont and Jeffrey Trant spoke by telephone. Mr. Dupont stated that Bishop Rozanski spoke with the Archdiocese of Boston today; that general counsel at the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) was consulted on Bishop Rozanski's request for guidance on how to file a report against a deceased bishop in light of the new bishop accountability measures voted on by USCCB in June. Mr. Dupont further stated that Bishop was advised the new measured don't address deceased bishops.

June 25, 2019
Jeffrey Trant received a voicemail message from Witness regarding the EthicPoint investigation (EthicPoint is the third
party company who will be receiving reports/allegations against bishops in the United States once the system is established).

June 25, 2019
E-mail from Witness to Jeffrey Trant, Cathi Farr, Bishop Rozanski’s Office, Vivian Soper (Archdiocese of Boston), Rev. Robert Kickham (Archdiocese of Boston), and Complainant regarding Ethicspoint,

June 25, 2019
Call from Jeffrey Trant to Complainant at 4:22 p.m. No answer. Jeffrey left a voicemail message requesting a return call.

June 28, 2019
Jeffrey Trant received a voicemail message from Complainant returning his call from earlier in the week. Please call back.

July 1, 2019
Call from Jeffrey Trant to Complainant at 2:12 p.m. No answer. Jeffrey left a voicemail message requesting a return call.

July 2, 2019
Jeffrey Trant received a voicemail message from Complainant returning his call from earlier in the week. Please call back.

July 3, 2019
Telephone call between Complainant and Jeffrey Trant (9:58 a.m. to 10:12 a.m.) During the call, Jeffrey stated that Bishop Rozanski has followed up with the metropolitan regarding reporting in accordance with the new bishop accountability measures. Jeffrey states that the diocese does not have specific details to report to him today, but the diocese will communicate in writing re. next steps.

July 7, 2019
E-mail from Jeffrey Trant to Patricia Finn McManamy at 10:56 a.m. enclosing a letter asking (Ms. Finn McManamy) (1) if notes were maintained from Ms. Finn McManamy and Monsignor Connelly’s meeting with (Complainant) from December 2014, (2) whether (Ms. Finn McManamy) has notes from the parish rectory visit in fall 2018, and (3) if there are any of notes concerning (Complainant) during (Ms. Finn McManamy’s) work with (Complainant) from 2014 to 2019 that are not in the record.

July 12, 2019
E-mail from Witness at 6:33 a.m. to Jeffrey Trant, Complainant, Vivian Soper, Rev. Robert Kickham and Bishop Rozanski’s office. Message states “Complainant’s questions to how, who and whom will be in contact has not been answered.”
E-mail from Witness at 12:19 p.m. to Jeffrey Trant regarding Ethicspoint and exploring if that is an option.

E-mail from Witness at 7:12 a.m. forwarding his e-mail to Jeffrey Trant (07/12/2019 at 12:19 p.m.) to Mark Dupont, Jeffrey Trant and Bishop Rozanski’s office.

E-mail from Witness at 3:38 p.m. to Jeffrey Trant, Vivian Soper, Complainant, Rev. Robert Kickham, Bishop Rozanski’s office regarding Ethicspoint and 3rd party reporting.

Call from Jeffrey Trant to Complainant at 4:10 p.m. No answer. Jeffrey left a voicemail message requesting a return call.

E-mail from Witness at 6:37 p.m. to Complainant, Jeffrey Trant, Vivian Soper, Rev. Robert Kickham, Mark Dupont, Terrance Donilon (Archdiocese of Boston) and Paul Ciamitiro (unknown party) stating that the Bishop of Springfield is not great.

Call from Jeffrey Trant to Complainant at 5:17 p.m. No answer. Jeffrey left a voicemail message requesting a return call.

Return call from Complainant to Jeffrey Trant at 5:35 p.m. Jeffrey reports to Complainant since the June 20th meeting with Bishop Rozanski, (1) diocese reported the direct allegation against Bishop Weldon to District Attorney Gulluni’s Office, (2) Bishop contacted the Metropolitan and Apostolic Nuncio regarding the allegation and inquired how to report allegations against deceased bishops; he was told the new reporting system does not apply to deceased bishops and that the (Diocese of Springfield) policies shall be used, (3) because there is disagreement between the review board and (Complainant) on the nature of the allegations and the findings of the board, Bishop Rozanski is not able to make a decision at this time. Further, Jeffrey stated that Bishop Rozanski has decided to name retired Superior Court Judge Peter Velis as an independent and outside investigator.

Letter from Bishop Rozanski to Complainant (dated 07/19/2019) sent via certified U.S. post (tracking # 91 7199 9991 7039 5357 7659).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 20, 2019</td>
<td>Letter from Bishop Rozanski to Complainant e-mailed by Jeffrey Trant to Complainant at 5:17 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 2019</td>
<td>E-mail from Jeffrey Trant to Complainant at 12:16 p.m. asking if he considers any of the documents/materials shared with the church/Diocese of Springfield as confidential and which he does not want Judge Velis to see as part of his independent and outside investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23, 2019</td>
<td>E-mail from Complainant to Jeffrey Trant at 12:35 p.m. stating that he considers all documents/materials confidential at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 12

needed support from the Diocese of Springfield 9-12-18

1. A decision statement, in writing, signed by the Bishop that the Review Board and Diocese Abuse Investigator concluded that all [redacted] allegations are “Credible.”

2. All abusers of [redacted] are listed in the aforementioned decision letter including Forand, Authier, Weldon, “George” and “unnamed others.”

3. [redacted] wants an apology from the Pope. Either in writing with demonstrable assurances that it’s actually from the Pope or the Diocese arranges a meeting with the Pope and pays for [redacted]’s travel to Rome. This could also be made available to any diocesan survivor of clergy abuse who would request such an apology.

4. Reimbursement of copays and deductibles and all costs of therapy or therapy related costs going forward at any time. Including workshops and travel accommodations necessary to attend workshops for victims of clergy abuse.

5. List of altar boys that served during [redacted]’s tenure as an altar boy. Connelly said “sure, we have them; I’ll give you everyone except who has an ongoing complaint against the church.”

6. The review board and diocese personnel will contact former abuse victims who have come to the Board to determine if they are open to talking with [redacted] as I try to uncover the names of my other sexual abusers.

7. Help in uncovering the diocese addresses with the numbers [redacted] remembers of “52 and 56.” (ie, rectory,
retreat center, retirement home etc). Also addresses of other known areas where abuse occurred with other victims between 1959-1963 in Springfield/Worcester diocese.

8. Copies of all Diocese records that include [redacted]'s name, his family members’ names or any reference to himself or family members.

9. Unrestricted and private access to churches, church property and rectories for purposes of “closure” for as many times and as long as needed.

10. Pictures of Forand. Ronnie Yargeau (former head altar boy and retired priest from Greenfield) said Forand visited his family home often. Ronnie should have pictures of Forand.

11. An investigation of Monsignor Ronald Yargeau relating to abuse and/or awareness of or participation in the abuse of altar boys, or cover up, at or in connection to St. Anne’s Church, Chicopee, during his time there.

12. Pictures of all priests, regardless of title, who were active or retired in the Worcester/Springfield diocese during the 1950’s and 1960’s.

13. Any monuments or photos of Forand, Authier and Weldon on display should be removed. Remove the name Weldon from Mercy Hospital Rehab.

14. Where is Authier buried?

15. [redacted]'s reasonable expectation is he will receive a copy of the written report that Kevin Murphy said he submitted to the Bishop and Review Board regarding his claims against the priests of the Springfield Diocese and his decision that all [redacted]' abuses were “credible.” Kevin Murphy on several occasions stated all claims were credible for each person named and unnamed. [redacted] would like a copy of the report
for his own piece of mind regarding accuracy in reporting.

16. List of names of all priests that Weldon supervised — living and/or now dead.

17. The Springfield Diocese will take the initiative to stand with victims and independently proclaim the elimination of any statute of limitations for legal complaints against a sexual abuser; also there will be no time limits on victims coming forward to the Diocese.

18. Background and CORI checks done every 5 years on all priests and associated church workers who come in contact with minors. And each time reassigned.

19. Photos of all priest abusers in the diocese to be put on the bishopaccountability.org website.

20. “If you see it stop it” — included in mandated Reporter responsibility. If you hear it, you report it. And if not reported, also charged with complicity in abuse.

21. In “Save the children” rules, Children should not be allowed in rectories at all. Do not allow that it is okay to meet in the kitchen area. Abuse occurs everywhere.

22. All workers in the Diocese should be trained in sensitivity toward victims; avoiding shaming behavior. Experiences beginning in 2014 have frequently not been respectful and not trauma informed in their responses. The cycle of abuse needs to stop. Minimally promises made should be followed through on and kept. No interviews should take place in a “parked car” or anywhere that the victim is not comfortable. No victim should be shunned away or ignored by anyone with a relation to the church.

23. Annual training of all diocesan personnel in their mandated reporter responsibilities.

24. The Diocese to take the initiative to ask all Bishops in the
US be mandated to sign a statement of Zero Tolerance going forward, like a petition to the Pope, as an act of contrition to all victims of sexual abuse. “Zero Tolerance” should also be part of annual mandated reporter training for all priests at every level and all personnel who work or perform a service to the church.
Office of Child and Youth Protection
Diocese of Springfield
Sexual Abuse Victim Intake Sheet

1. Name: [Redacted]
2. DOB: 
3. Telephone number(s): 
4. Address: 
5. Email: 
6. Adult or minor at time of reporting? Adult: 
7. Date of Report: 
8. Date(s) Abuse occurred: 
9. Who made report? 
10. Name(s) of accused: Clarence Forand, Bishop Weldon
11. Accused Type: Diocesan Priest
12. Does the allegation involve an international cleric? No
13. Status of accused at time of report: deceased
14. Date status became effective: CP 2004: BW 
15. Where did the abuse occur? 
16. When did the abuse occur? 
17. Description of abuse: 
18. Have you/has victim reported this conduct to anyone else? Anyone in authority? DA
Office requirement: 
19. Have you sought any medical, counseling or other assistance? Therapy, group therapy
20. What led to coming forward about abuse at this time? 
21. What are you expecting from your contact with the Diocese? 
22. If victim currently under age 18, was caller informed of requirement to report to
Child Protective Services? NA
23. Was caller informed of victim's right to report to criminal/civil authorities? Yes
24. Was caller informed of time frame to make a prompt response and next steps in
process? Yes

Further action:
Met with VAC, met with Investigator, came to meeting; wants to visit St Anne
OPArish, meet with Bishop, attend conference in Swed, have Pope visit father's grave;
have Forand's body moved from elite part of cemetary, have 2 friends and one advocate
attend all meetings her chosesd

Intake worker's name: Patricia McManamy LICSW
Date of intake: 

2018 Intake / Office of Child and Youth Protection: page 1
### Documentation for Charter Audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date first contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date abuse reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to Bishop and Monsignor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to Review Board chair:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to Diocesan Attorney:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to District Attorney:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date case was heard before RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was case found credible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was accused contacted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim informed of previous allegations/Review Board process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date outreach/ services offered:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Is the victim alive or deceased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Has the victim identified him/herself or remains anonymous (unwilling or refuses to provide their name)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Is the victim pursuing the matter or reporting only?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Is the victim cooperating, or not giving details?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Is this part of a civil action (e.g., class action complaint involving multiple victims, bankruptcy filing, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Has the diocese initiated an investigation? If not, please explain why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) If the allegation involved a religious order, identify the order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) If the allegation was not reported to the review board, explain why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) If listed as an &quot;Other Diocese,&quot; name the diocese/eparchy involved, and describe the circumstances under which it came forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Has the matter been referred to another diocese/eparchy? Is so, name the diocese/eparchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) If unsubstantiated or unable to be proven, describe what steps were taken to restore the cleric's good name. If none, explain circumstances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For each victim labeled a MINOR (under the age of 18)** above, identify below:

| (l) the age of the minor at the time of reporting        |  
| (m) the gender of the minor                             |  
| (n) the age when the alleged abuse began/took place     |  
| (o) where the abuse occurred                            |  
| (p) the relationship between the victim and offender    |  
| (q) the diocese/eparchy where the abuse took place      |  
| (r) which entity the abuse was reported to (civil/law enforcement) |  
| (s) brief description of allegation                      |  

2018 Intake / Office of Child and Youth Protection   page 2
Office of Child and Youth Protection
Diocese of Springfield
Sexual Abuse Victim Intake Sheet

1. Name: [Redacted]
2. DOB: [Redacted]
3. Telephone number(s): [Redacted]
4. Address: [Redacted]
5. Email
6. Adult or minor at time of reporting? adult
7. Date of Report: Initial report Dec 2014 did not include abuse report; 2018 April-July gradually identified three+ clergy and abuse
8. Who made report? [Redacted]
9. Name(s) of accused: Clarence Forand; Bishop Christopher Weldon; Edward Authier
10. Accused Type: Diocesan Priest; Bishop of Springfield; Order priest
11. Does the allegation involve an international cleric? no
12. Status of accused at time of report: CF deceased; CW deceased; EA deceased
13. Date status became effective: CF 2004; BW
14. Where did the abuse occur? St. Anne sacristy and rectory, other locations
15. When did the abuse occur? 1960-1962
16. Description of abuse: sexual molestation and rape on many occasions by several priests who “shared” him and other youths with other clergy
17. Has VAC or victim reported this conduct to anyone else? Parent, at around age 12; Therapists: Monsignor Yargeau, a fellow former altar server, in 2014; Monsignor Chris Connelly, VAC, in 2014; Vatican 2015
18. Anyone in authority? VAC reported to DA’s Office
19. Have you sought any medical, counseling or other assistance? Therapy, group therapy
20. What led to coming forward about abuse at this time? Continuing to process effects of abuse in therapy
21. What are you expecting from your contact with the Diocese? Support, therapy reimbursement; visit to the rectory and church to aid in his healing; Pope to visit his father’s grave; assistance with therapeutic retreat costs; time at Review Board meeting to tell his story; additional requests.
22. If victim currently under age 18, was caller informed of requirement to report to Child Protective Services? NA
23. Was caller informed of victim’s right to report to criminal/civil authorities? Yes
24. Was caller informed of time frame to make a prompt response and next steps in process? Yes

Further action:
- met with VAC, met with Investigator, came to RB meeting July; wants to visit St Anne Parish sacristy and rectory living quarters; meet with Bishop, attend conference in Sweden, have Pope visit father’s grave; have Forand’s remains moved from current cemetery, have 2 friends
and one advocate attend all meetings with Diocese that occur;

**Intake worker's name:** Patricia McManamy LICSW  
**Date of intake:**
## Documentation for Charter Audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date first contact</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date abuse reported</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to Bishop and Monsignor:</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to Review Board chair:</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to Diocesan Attorney:</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake sent to District Attorney:</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date case was heard before RB</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was case found credible?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was accused contacted?</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim informed of previous allegations/Review Board process?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date outreach/ services offered:</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Is the victim alive or deceased?</td>
<td>alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Has the victim identified him/herself or remains anonymous (unwilling or refuses to provide their name)?</td>
<td>identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Is the victim pursuing the matter or reporting only?</td>
<td>2014—reporting only; 2018 pursuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Is the victim cooperating, or not giving details?</td>
<td>2018 details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Is this part of a civil action (e.g., class action complaint involving multiple victims, bankruptcy filing, etc.)?</td>
<td>Not at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Has the diocese initiated an investigation? If not, please explain why.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) If the allegation involved a religious order, identify the order.</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) If the allegation was not reported to the review board, explain why.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) If listed as an “Other Diocese,” name the diocese/eparchy involved, and describe the circumstances under which it came forward.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Has the matter been referred to another diocese/eparchy? Is so, name the diocese/eparchy.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) If unsubstantiated or unable to be proven, describe what steps were taken to restore the cleric’s good name. If none, explain circumstances.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For each victim labeled a MINOR (under the age of 18) above, identify below:</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) the age of the minor at the time of reporting</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) the gender of the minor</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) the age when the alleged abuse began/took place</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) where the abuse occurred</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p) the relationship between the victim and offender</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q) the diocese/eparchy where the abuse took place</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r) which entity the abuse was reported to (civil/law enforcement)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s) brief description of allegation</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Contact Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forand, Authier,</td>
<td>Phone, cell, email, in person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Welden)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YES**
KEVIN MURPHY <KMurphy1602@msn.com>

To: ""<>

Fri, Sep 13, 2019 at 12:05 PM

It's attached
Hi Patti  Here are my outstanding hours.... Has       finished or is he coming back next month?
Thanks  Kevin

2 attachments

- open hrs billed.docx
  14K
- [redacted].docx
  18K
On 3-24-18 Patti McManamy contacted me regarding a case that was newly reported to her office. [Redacted] reported that he had been molested and sexually abused by a number of different priests and on a few occasions Bishop Weldon tried to molest him.

On 4-04-18 I began my investigation and spoke to Mr. [Redacted] to set up our initial interview. Mr. [Redacted] has been in counseling for some time and Patti McManamy has arranged for the diocese to assist with the expense.

On 4-10-18 I met with [Redacted] at the home of a friend of his. Mr. [Redacted] stated that he had lived in Chicopee, MA, with his parents and three brothers. He went to St. Anne's church and was an altar server. It was there that he was first molested by Fr. Joseph Forand. Some of the incidents took place at the church and later at the rectory. Mr. [Redacted] was 9 years old when the incidents happened.

Mr. [Redacted] further stated that Fr. Edward Authier also molested him at the rectory and other locations. Mr. [Redacted] further stated that he was brought to other locations by Fr. Forand and molested by three other unknown priests. Sometimes other boys were there as well and were also abused. Mr. [Redacted] stated that Bishop Weldon was often present and never molested him, but tried to hug him and pull him within reach. On several occasions Mr. [Redacted] would back up and the Bishop would then turn his attention to another youth who was in the room.

Mr. [Redacted] has a lot of difficulty discussing the types of sexual abuse each priest did to him and years of counseling were needed just for him to come forward now. He described severe anal penetration among other acts. The abuse took place over a period of two years and Mr. [Redacted] cannot remember how many times each priest abused him. He remembers telling his father, a [Redacted], about the abuse and was slapped across the face and told "priests don't do that."
Mr. put the incidents out of his mind and continued his education. He later worked for at the and the . It was during a counseling session in 2013 that Mr. was flooded with the memories of his abuse.

CONCLUSION:

Mr. has a lot of difficulty talking about the specific acts that were done to him by various priests. He clearly stated that Bishop Weldon didn’t physically molest him. He witnessed another youth being molested by the Bishop.

Fr. Forand is deceased but has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from two unrelated victims. The previous complaints were found to be credible.

Fr. Authier is deceased and also has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. This complaint was found to be credible.

Bishop Weldon is deceased and has a prior complaint of sexual misconduct from an unrelated victim. The victim is a prisoner in Texas serving time for homicide. The complaint was not found credible.

Mr. tells a compelling story of constant sexual abuse by two priests in his home parish. There are three other priests that he is not able to identify by name. His description is too generic to aide in their identification. Years of therapy have settled his mind and he has two male friends who help him. I find his disclosure to be very credible and we should afford him any assistance he needs.

Respectfully,

Kevin M. Murphy
Reply from John Hale, Chair of Diocesan Review Board

On behalf of the Diocesan Review Board I wish to clarify an inaccurate characterization reported in an article which appeared May 29 on the Berkshire Eagle website.

Let me be clear, the Review Board has never found that the late Bishop Christopher Weldon, deceased since 1982, engaged in improper contact with anyone.

The complaint reported on in the Eagle article involved sexual misconduct involving two now deceased priests that dates back to the early 1960s with the individual recalling it within the last few years and bringing the complaint to the Review Board in 2018.

As a part of the complaint it was also alleged that Bishop Weldon had actual knowledge of the abuse or he should have known because he was present at a gathering where some abuse took place. However there was no finding against Bishop Weldon as the individual also indicated that the former Bishop never abused them.

However the actual abuse complaint made by this individual involving the misconduct of former priests Clarence Forand and Edward Authier was found credible and the individual was offered counseling services as is our normal practice.

In addition, at the request of this individual, they were provided an opportunity to visit the location where the abuse took place as part of an effort to deal with the trauma caused by the abuse.

John M. Hale
Chairperson, Diocesan Review Board
Questions from The Eagle RE the Hale statement

John Hale <jhaile7418@aol.com>
To: m.dupont@dio springsfield.org

Hi Mark,

Each review board meeting begins by board members reviewing intake and investigative reports concerning the complainant. The board will sit for thirty/fifty-five minutes and review reports generated by the victims advocate and reports from any investigators assigned by the diocese. At the June 13, 2018 (Theresa Finningan, Chair) and Sep 12, 2018 (John Hale, Chair) Review Board meeting, Mr. __________ arrived accompanied by his "support" group, ________ and Dr. Patricia Martin. The Review Board members had read ___________ statement to Mr. Kevin Murphy, Diocesan Investigator. The fourth paragraph of Detective Kevin Murphy's report stated, ___________ further stated that Fr. Edward Authier also molested him at the rectory location. ___________ further stated that he was brought to other locations by Fr. Forand and molested by three other unknown priests. Sometimes other boys were there as well and were also abused. ___________ stated that Bishop Weldon was often present and never molested him, but tried to hug him and pull him within reach. On several occasions ___________ would backup and the Bishop would turn his attention to another youth who was in the room. The Review Board uses the complainant's statement, intake information, investigative statements and personal testimony to determine veracity. Any complainant testimony that differs from the previously prepared statements is cause for questioning and further testimony.

On the other hand, Review Board minutes taken by Ms. Mary Ashe, an impartial observer, June 13, 2018, eighth paragraph states, "He ___________ went on to describe subsequent abuse by Fr. Edward Authier as well as Bishop Christopher Weldon." The minutes were approved by the Review Board, accepted by a second motion and voted as accurate by a majority (Yeses) of the members.

These abuses happened when ___________ was nine years old where he was an altar boy at St. Anne's Church. Fr. Joseph Forand, Fr. Edward Authier and Bishop Christopher Weldon are all deceased. ___________ testimony was very emotional. It was hard for him to recall the facts and the narratives that he spoke about were hard to listen to. Mr. ___________ was advised that the Review Board had no authority other than to make a decision as to whether or not the allegation is credible and to advise the Bishop of the finding. JMHale, Chair, 8/4/2019

[Redacted text hidden]
Re: Reply from John Hale, Chair of Diocesan Review Board
1 message

John Hale <jhale7416@aol.com>
To: m.dupont@diospringfield.org
Fri, May 31, 2019 at 8:18 PM

Mark, this is as accurate response. Thanks again. JMHale

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail
Get the new AOL app: mail.mobile.aol.com

On Friday, May 31, 2019, Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org> wrote:

On behalf of the Diocesan Review Board I wish to clarify an inaccurate characterization reported in an article which appeared May 29 on the Berkshire Eagle website.

Let me be clear, the Review Board has never found that the late Bishop Christopher Weldon, deceased since 1982, engaged in improper contact with anyone.

The complaint reported on in the Eagle article involved sexual misconduct involving two now deceased priests that dates back to the early 1960s with the individual recalling it within the last few years and bringing the complaint to the Review Board in 2018.

As a part of the complaint it was also alleged that Bishop Weldon had actual knowledge of the abuse or he should have known because he was present at a gathering where some abuse took place. However there was no finding against Bishop Weldon as the individual also indicated that the former Bishop never abused them.

However the actual abuse complaint made by this individual involving the misconduct of former priests Clarence Forand and Edward Authier was found credible and the individual was offered counseling services as is our normal practice.

In addition, at the request of this individual, they were provided an opportunity to visit the location where the abuse took place as part of an effort to deal with the trauma caused by the abuse.

John M. Hale
Chairperson, Diocesan Review Board
I will send prior to that a statement regarding the policy and procedure for listing names of credibly accused clergy.

question from The Eagle regarding Bishop Weldon

Lawrence Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com>  

Wed, May 29, 1:41 PM

to me

Mark,

It's come to my attention that the diocese is not listing, Christopher J. Weldon, the former bishop, as credibly accused, even though the Diocesan Review Board told a Chicopee man in a letter last September that it found his allegations against Weldon "compelling and credible."

The online list also does not name the Rev. Edward Authier, who the review board also named in its letter.

The Sept. 18, 2018, letter was copied to Bishop Rozanski.

Did the bishop not accept the review board's finding that allegations involving Weldon and Authier were credible?

Why are Weldon and Authier not listed as "credibly accused," eight months after the letter was sent?

Thanks,

Larry Parnass
Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>

Thu, May 30, 10:29 AM

to Most, Catherine, Jeffrey, Attorney

See below. This comes from a Review Board letter sent to a victim last year which has also been the source of recent communications from

The letter did not accurately correspond to the complaint investigated and heard by the review board. Although clearly stated Bishop Weldon did not sexually abuse him but rather was aware of this abuse, John Hale’s letter grouped Bishop Weldon’s name with the two priest/perpetrators which the board found to be credible. Based on this letter has clearly suggested Weldon abused. Finally both priests and Bishop Weldon were deceased when made his complaint, which means no names would have been added to our online listing.

I’d like to respond along the lines...

"The diocese investigates all complaints that come to our attention and would bring these allegations to the Review Board for a finding. If found to be credible the victim/survivor would be afforded resources from the diocese to assist in healing. If the accused clergy member is alive at the time an allegation is made, and that allegation is found to be credible then that clergy member is permanently removed from ministry and their name is added to the online listing of diocesan clergy with credible allegations of sexual abuse. If the accused clergy is deceased at the time an allegation is made, everything remains the same with the exception of listing the name. This is because that clergy member was not afforded the opportunity to defend themselves.

But so as to be clear there is no finding by the review board of a credible allegation of sexual abuse against Bishop Christopher Weldon."
Diocese of Springfield, MA

Diocesan Policy regarding online Clergy listing

Inbox

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>

Fri, May 31, 1:20 PM

to Larry, Kevin

"The diocese investigates all complaints that come to our attention and bring these allegations to the Review Board for a finding. If found to be credible the victim/survivor would be afforded resources from the diocese to assist in healing. If the accused clergy member is alive at the time an allegation is made, and that allegation is found to be credible then that clergy member is permanently removed from ministry and their name is added to the online listing of diocesan clergy with credible allegations of sexual abuse. If the accused clergy is deceased at the time an allegation is made, everything remains the same with the exception of listing the name. This is because that clergy member was not afforded the opportunity to defend themselves.

In this specific matter Clarence Forand's name does appear because although he is now deceased he was alive when an earlier credible allegation was made.

I would respectfully point out that while critics say this doesn't go far enough, in fact based on the criteria we use, it is well beyond the self reporting done by any other public or private institutions."

Lawrence Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com>

Fri, May 31, 1:53 PM

to me, Kevin
Received, Mark. Thanks. Should I also be expecting a statement from John Hale regarding the Sept. 2018 letter sent to [redacted]?

I've read the statement you provided about the listing process a few times.

A question about this: "If the accused clergy is deceased at the time an allegation is made, everything remains the same with the exception of listing the name. This is because that clergy member was not afforded the opportunity to defend themselves."

Is this offered as an explanation of why Bishop Weldon is not listed as credibly accused? I do not want to read anything into it that's not there.

Also, in your off-the-record note this morning, you wrote: "You should know that there is NO finding of sexual abuse of any person involving Bishop Weldon - NONE. And the letter you reference does not say otherwise. In fact even the unnamed victim acknowledged that Weldon did not abuse him in statements made to our investigator."

I have a copy of the review board letter sent to [redacted] It names the bishop as well as Authier and Forand and refers to [redacted] "pain and suffering" and "this abuse" and says the board found his testimony "compelling and credible."

Can you provide an on-the-record explanation as to why this letter was not a finding of abuse involving Bishop Weldon?

Thanks, Larry

Larry Parnass
INVESTIGATIONS EDITOR
o. 413-496-6214 · c. 413-588-8341
75 South Church Street
Pittsfield, MA 01201

The Berkshire Eagle
article

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  
May 30, 2019,  
7:43 PM

to Larry, Kevin

OFF THE RECORD:
I am surprised you didn’t indicate you were on deadline when you sent your request yesterday. I have been gathering the facts since I first received your email so as to provide a clear and accurate response. You should know that there is NO finding of sexual abuse of any person involving Bishop Weldon - NONE. And the letter you reference does not say otherwise. In fact even the unnamed victim acknowledged that Weldon did not abuse him in statements made to our investigator: [redacted] has misrepresented to you the Review Board letter and then without waiting for our reply you published his false narrative.

I take your request seriously and do my homework before rushing to reply. I would think you’d exercise the same due diligence.

If you are simply going to publish every allegation, regardless of merit, made by [redacted] and other critics of the Church why bother asking for our comments.

Mark Dupont  
Catholic Communications  
RC Diocese of Springfield, MA

(413) 452-0648 - work  
(413) 747-0273 - fax  
(413) 478-8516 - cell  
@DupontMark (twitter)

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  
May 31, 2019,  
9:31 AM

to Larry, Kevin

John Hale the chairperson of the Review Board will be providing a statement to you later today. I hope to have this to you before 5pm.

I will send prior to that a statement regarding the policy and procedure for listing names of credibly accused clergy.
Diocesan Policy regarding online Clergy listing

3 messages

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org> Fri, May 31, 2019 at 1:20 PM
To: Larry Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com>, Kevin Moran <KMoran@berkshireeagle.com>

"The diocese investigates all complaints that come to our attention and bring these allegations to the Review Board for a finding. If found to be credible the victim/survivor would be afforded resources from the diocese to assist in healing. If the accused clergy member is alive at the time an allegation is made, and that allegation is found to be credible then that clergy member is permanently removed from ministry and their name is added to the online listing of diocesan clergy with credible allegations of sexual abuse. If the accused clergy is deceased at the time an allegation is made, everything remains the same with the exception of listing the name. This is because that clergy member was not afforded the opportunity to defend themselves.

In this specific matter Clarence Forand's name does appear because although he is now deceased he was alive when an earlier credible allegation was made.

I would respectfully point out that while critics say this doesn't go far enough, in fact based on the criteria we use, it is well beyond the self reporting done by any other public or private institutions."

---

Mark Dupont
Catholic Communications
RC Diocese of Springfield, MA

(413) 452-0648 - work
(413) 747-0273 - fax
(413) 478-8516 - cell
@DupontMark (twitter)

Lawrence Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com> Fri, May 31, 2019 at 1:53 PM
To: Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>
Cc: Kevin Moran <KMoran@berkshireeagle.com>

Received, Mark. Thanks. Should I also be expecting a statement from John Hale regarding the Sept. 2018 letter sent to [redacted]? I've read the statement you provided about the listing process a few times.

A question about this: "If the accused clergy is deceased at the time an allegation is made, everything remains the same with the exception of listing the name. This is because that clergy member was not afforded the opportunity to defend themselves."

Is this offered as an explanation of why Bishop Weldon is not listed as credibly accused? I do not want to read anything into it that's not there.

Also, in your off-the-record note this morning, you wrote: "You should know that there is NO finding of sexual abuse of any person involving Bishop Weldon - NONE. And the letter you reference does not say otherwise. In fact even the unnamed victim acknowledged that Weldon did not abuse him in statements made to our investigator."

I have a copy of the review board letter sent to [redacted]. It names the bishop as well as Authier and Forand and refers to [redacted] "pain and suffering" and "this abuse" and says the board found his testimony "compelling and credible."

Can you provide an on-the-record explanation as to why this letter was not a finding of abuse involving Bishop Weldon?
John Egan <jje@efclaw.com>  

to me, Most, Catherine, Jeffrey  

I would lead with the Bishop Weldon issue, since that is what they care about anyway.  
I suggest:  

The Review Board has never found that Bishop Weldon engaged in improper contact with anyone. In the Complaint in question the allegation was that Bishop Weldon knew or should have known that other priests engaged in such conduct but that he failed to remove them from ministry. The Complaint was filed in 2018 and the alleged actions took place in 19--. Bishop Weldon died in 19--. The Complaint about the misconduct was found credible and the party was offered counseling services as is our normal practice. Improper conduct on the part of Bishop Weldon was never alleged rather a failure to discipline was, and no further investigation on that was possible since all parties were long deceased.  
Follow with your first paragraph  

Bishop Mitchell <mtrozan@diospringfield.org>  

to John, me, Catherine, Jeffrey  

Yes, thank you. This is a good response. Bp. Mitch  

Bishop Mitchell Rozanski  
Diocese of Springfield, MA  

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  

to John  

My only concern is we may be feeding him more information than we need to and inadvertently fueling this story.
I'm not certain □ gave □ permission to share his information.

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  Fri, May 31, 9:59 AM

to John, reviewboard, Most, Catherine, Jeffrey, John

It appears the Eagle went ahead on Wednesday night, without warning, and published an online article regarding Bishop Weldon - not sure if it also was in print.


John Hale will be providing me a statement later today setting the record straight. Jack I will provide him the draft you shared with me as a starting point.

Under separate cover I will send Eagle my explanation of who gets listed online.

* ReplyReply allForward
Response to Eagle article

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>
Fri, May 31, 2019 at 10:51 AM

Here is some language Jack Egan provided... I’ve attached the original letter and Kevin’s report. Jack the Weldon allegation is a bit more complicated, please read Kevin’s report. I’d like to get to Eagle by late afternoon. I will also share with Berkshire priests as a courtesy.

On behalf of the diocesan Review Board I wish to clarify an inaccurate and false characterization reported in an article which appeared on May 29 on the Berkshire Eagle website.

Let me be clear, the Review Board has never found that the late Bishop Christopher Weldon engaged in improper contact with anyone.

In the complaint in question the allegation was that Bishop Weldon may have been present and therefore knew or should have known that other priests engaged in such conduct but that he failed to remove them from ministry.

The complaint was filed in 2018 and the alleged actions took place in early 1960s. Bishop Weldon died in 1982.

The complaint about the misconduct involving former priests Clarence Forand and Edward Authier, both deceased, was found credible and the individual was offered counseling services as is our normal practice.

However there was no such finding against Bishop Weldon as even the individual admitted that Bishop Weldon did not sexually abuse them.

Mark Dupont
Catholic Communications
RC Diocese of Springfield, MA

(413) 452-0648 - work
(413)747-0273 - fax
(413) 478-8516 - cell
@DupontMark (twitter)

John Egan <jje@efclaw.com>
Fri, May 31, 2019 at 11:18 AM

Mark
I would take out the reference to Bishop Weldon being present.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=4223841739&view=p&search=all&permthid=thread-a%3A0i673254820%7Eiq%3A0%7Eid%3A8710566225...
It sounds like he was watching
At the end it should be that the individual said Bishop Weldon never abused him.
On the possibility of Bishop being present I would say the allegation was Bishop had actual knowledge of the abuse or he should have known because he was present at a gathering where some abuse took place.
Can we say it was a large gathering I can't tell.
Also I think we should lead with an allegation of abuse in the 1960s and the victim didn't recover his memories until around 2017 to 2018

Sent from my iPhone.
[Quoted text hidden]
<201905311407.pdf>

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>
To: John Hale <hale7416@aol.com>, reviewboard@diospringfield.org, "Attorney John J. Egan" <jje@efclaw.com>

Fri, May 31, 2019 at 12:00 PM

Sorry John but Jack offered some suggestions and I added the last part to show the extent we have gone to assist this victim.

On behalf of the diocesan Review Board I wish to clarify an inaccurate and false characterization reported in an article which appeared on May 29 on the Berkshire Eagle website.
Let me be clear, the Review Board has never found that the late Bishop Christopher Weldon engaged in improper contact with anyone.
The complaint in question dates back to the early 1960s with the individual recalling it within the last few years, bringing the complaint to the Review Board in 2018. Part of the complaint was that Bishop Weldon had actual knowledge of the abuse or he should have known because he was present at a gathering where some abuse took place. However there was no such finding against Bishop Weldon as the individual said Bishop never abused him.
The complaint about the misconduct involving former priests Clarence Forand and Edward Authier, both deceased, was found credible and the individual was offered counseling services as is our normal practice. In addition, at the request of this individual, he was provided an opportunity to visit the location where the abuse took place as part of effort to deal with the trauma caused by the abuse.

[Quoted text hidden]

John Hale <hale7416@aol.com>
To: m.dupont@diospringfield.org

Fri, May 31, 2019 at 2:56 PM

Hi Mark,
I agree with this statement and have no problem signing this response. Thank you for being on top of this. JMHale

[Quoted text hidden]

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>
To: John Hale <hale7416@aol.com>

Fri, May 31, 2019 at 5:15 PM

I just released with some minor tweaks... thanks

[Quoted text hidden]

John Egan <jje@efclaw.com>
To: Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>

Mon, Jun 3, 2019 at 9:25 AM

Mark did the eagle print this?

From: Mark Dupont [mailto:m.dupont@diospringfield.org]
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 12:00 PM
To: John Hale; reviewboard@diospringfield.org; John Egan
Subject: Re: Response to Eagle article

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=422384173f&view=pt&search=all&permhjid=thread-a%3Ar376254620071131468&aelmpl=msg-a%3Ae;6710582225... 2/3
Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield - Response to Eagle article

Sorry John but Jack offered some suggestions and I added the last part to show the extent we have gone to assist this victim.

[Quoted text hidden]

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>
To: John Egan <jja@eflaw.com>

Mon, Jun 3, 2019 at 8:49 AM

Not that I can find, but [redacted] tried to drag 22News into making the same false report but thankfully they called me yesterday afternoon and I was able to set the record straight.

[Quoted text hidden]
Reply from John Hale, Chair of Diocesan Review Board

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  
Fri, May 31, 5:11 PM

to Larry, Kevin, bcc: Jeffrey, bcc: Most, bcc: Attorney, bcc: Catherine, bcc: Mary, bcc: reviewboard, bcc: John, bcc: Christopher, bcc: Christopher, bcc: Bishop, bcc: Michael

On behalf of the Diocesan Review Board I wish to clarify an inaccurate characterization reported in an article which appeared May 29 on the Berkshire Eagle website.
Let me be clear, the Review Board has never found that the late Bishop Christopher Weldon, deceased since 1982, engaged in improper contact with anyone.
The complaint reported on in the Eagle article involved sexual misconduct involving two now deceased priests that dates back to the early 1960s with the individual recalling it within the last few years and bringing the complaint to the Review Board in 2018. As a part of the complaint it was also alleged that Bishop Weldon had actual knowledge of the abuse or he should have known because he was present at a gathering where some abuse took place. However there was no finding against Bishop Weldon as the individual also indicated that the former Bishop never abused them. However the actual abuse complaint made by this individual involving the misconduct of former priests Clarence Forand and Edward Authier was found credible and the individual was offered counseling services as is our normal practice. In addition, at the request of this individual, they were provided an opportunity to visit the location where the abuse took place as part of an effort to deal with the trauma caused by the abuse.

John M. Hale  
Chairperson, Diocesan Review Board

Bishop Mitchell <mtrozan@diospringfield.org>  
Fri, May 31, 7:26 PM

to me

Thanks, Mark, this is very good and clear. Bp. Mitch

Bishop Mitchell Rozanski
Reply from John Hale, Chair of Diocesan Review Board

2 messages

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  
Fri, May 31, 2019 at 5:11 PM

To: Larry Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com>, Kevin Moran <KMoran@berkshireeagle.com>
Bcc: Jeffrey Trant <j.trant@diospringfield.org>, "Most Rev. Mitchell T. Rozanski" <mtrozan@diospringfield.org>, "Attorney John J. Egan" <jje@efclaw.com>, Catherine Farr <c.farr@diospringfield.org>, Mary Ashe <m.ashe@diospringfield.org>, reviewboard@diospringfield.org, John Hale <jahle7416@aol.com>, "Msgr. Christopher D. Connelly" <c.connelly@diospringfield.org>, "Rev. Christopher Malatesta" <c.malatesta@diospringfield.org>, Bishop Timothy McDonnell <tamod@diospringfield.org>, "Msgr. Michael Shershanovich" <msgrmike@berkshire.rr.com>

On behalf of the Diocesan Review Board I wish to clarify an inaccurate characterization reported in an article which appeared May 29 on the Berkshire Eagle website.

Let me be clear, the Review Board has never found that the late Bishop Christopher Weldon, deceased since 1982, engaged in improper contact with anyone.

The complaint reported on in the Eagle article involved sexual misconduct involving two now deceased priests that dates back to the early 1960s with the individual recalling it within the last few years and bringing the complaint to the Review Board in 2018.

As a part of the complaint it was also alleged that Bishop Weldon had actual knowledge of the abuse or he should have known because he was present at a gathering where some abuse took place. However there was no finding against Bishop Weldon as the individual also indicated that the former Bishop never abused them.

However the actual abuse complaint made by this individual involving the misconduct of former priests Clarence Forand and Edward Authier was found credible and the individual was offered counseling services as is our normal practice.

In addition, at the request of this individual, they were provided an opportunity to visit the location where the abuse took place as part of an effort to deal with the trauma caused by the abuse.

John M. Hale
Chairperson, Diocesan Review Board

Bishop Mitchell <mtrozan@diospringfield.org>  
Fri, May 31, 2019 at 7:26 PM

Thanks, Mark, this is very good and clear. Bp. Mitch

Bishop Mitchell Rozanski  
Diocese of Springfield, MA

Exhibit 30
Thanks, just so I am clear the focus of this story hasn't changed these folks et al still claim we should list Bishop's name based on abuse to this victim in question? And they claim he alleged sexual abuse by the bishop at the June 2018 meeting? That's the nuts and bolts of their complaint.

Lawrence Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com>  
Jun 4, 2019, 2:01 PM

to me

The focus, in addition to reporting on the Hale statement, is their claim that the statement is untrue in that the victim did expressly mention abuse by Weldon, both at the review board hearing and in his interview with Murphy.

John Hale <jhale7416@aol.com>  
Jun 4, 2019, 2:04 PM

to me

Hi Mark,

Each review board meeting begins by board members reviewing intake and investigative reports concerning the complainant. The board will sit for thirty/fifty-five minutes and review reports generated by the victim advocate and reports from any investigators assigned by the diocese. At the June 13, 2018 (Theresa Flinnigan, Chair) and Sep 12, 2018 (John Hale, Chair) Review Board meeting arrived accompanied by his "support" group, a fellow named and Dr. Patricia Martin. The Review Board members had read statement to Mr. Kevin Murphy, Diocesan Investigator. The fourth paragraph of Detective Kevin Murphy’s report stated, further stated
that Fr. Edward Authier also molested him at the rectory location. Further stated that he was brought to other locations by Fr. Forand and molested by three other unknown priests. Sometimes other boys were there as well and were also abused. Stated that Bishop Weldon was often present and never molested him, but tried to hug him and pull him within reach. On several occasions would backup and the Bishop would turn his attention to another youth who was in the room. The Review Board uses the complainant's statement, intake information, investigative statements and personal testimony to determine veracity. Any complainant testimony that differs from the previously prepared statements is cause for questioning and further testimony.

On the other hand, Review Board minutes taken by Ms. Mary Ashe, an impartial observer, June 13, 2018, eighth paragraph states, "He went on to describe subsequent abuse by Fr. Edward Authier as well as Bishop Christopher Weldon." The minutes were approved by the Review Board, accepted by a second motion and voted as accurate by a majority (Yeahs) of the members.

These abuses happened when was nine years old where he was an alter boy at St. Anne's Church. Fr. Joseph Forand, Fr. Edward Authier and Bishop Christopher Weldon are all deceased. Mr. testimony was very emotional. It was hard for him to recall the facts and the narratives that he spoke about were hard to listen to. was advised that the Review Board had no authority other than to make a decision as to whether or not the allegation is credible and to advise the Bishop of the finding. JMHale, Chair/64/2019

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  
Jun 4, 2019, 2:54 PM

to Lawrence

Sorry but I just want to be clear- abuse involving that victim or abuse by the former bishop of other persons which this victim claimed to have knowledge on? It matters...
Lawrence Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com>  
Jun 4, 2019, 3:44 PM

to me

This victim's claims of abuse he experienced from and by Weldon. The Hale statement said he made no such claim.

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  
Jun 4, 2019, 3:51 PM

to Lawrence

Thanks, statement to follow but off the record for now that is not reflected in either what he told our investigator and the recollection of Mr Hale regarding the June 2018 meeting.

Lawrence Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com>  
Jun 4, 2019, 4:02 PM

to me

Your latest note prompts this question: are the review board hearings taped? Does someone keep notes? That would be meaningful.
I think it’s important to go back to the initial allegation as reported May 29 in a Berkshire Eagle article- that the diocese has failed to include former Bishop Weldon on our listing of clergy credibly accused of sexual abuse. For that to be true the individual in this matter would have had to claimed they were sexually abused by the former bishop and that claim would have had to been found to be credible by our Review Board. As John Hale, board chair has responded that wasn’t the case. So yes we stand by Mr. Hale’s May 31 response. Twice in former State Trooper Kevin Murphy’s report it was stated that the victim directly stated they had not been sexually abused by the former bishop. So, absent that, it’s difficult to understand under what circumstance we could have listed the former bishop’s name - something that should have been readily obvious to any former board member. Again the important fact here is that this victim did not assert in his statement to our investigator that Bishop Weldon abused them. They did assert what both our investigator and the board found credible, which was this victim’s allegations against two deceased priests. This was the basis for the board’s action last year.

Neither Mr. Hale nor the diocese disputes that this victim, who it is important to note was 9 years old when this occurred in the early 1960’s, did mention the former bishop’s presence and improper behavior involving some unknown other person. And that was in fact part of this victim’s statement to our investigator and presented at the June 2018 meeting, but the Review Board is charged with responding to firsthand complaints of sexual abuse not second hand observations. Beyond that while our investigator found this victim’s allegations against the two deceased priests as compelling, he didn’t share that same confidence in circumstances involving the former bishop.

If however this individual is now changing what they told Kevin Murphy, then they or Dr. Martin should reach-out to the diocese to pursue this matter further. The US Bishops are scheduled to discuss a procedure for handling complaints against bishops at their spring meetings next week.

We do have a responsibility to balance the legitimate needs of those who bring forth allegations with a process that is also fair to the clergy accused, especially when that clergy member is deceased and cannot defend themselves. Though rare, false or inaccurate allegations are not totally uncommon.
Whenever we are alerted to any abuse allegation, regardless of the clergy member involved, we fully act on that complaint.

We strongly disagree with both Patricia Martin and assertions. If the diocese was interested in covering up these terrible actions, we'd do like all other public and private institutions, we simply wouldn't publish names on our website nor utilize an independent review board comprised of mandated reporters. In fact we are doing our best to address the victims of this terrible abuse in a fashion that is fair and just. We don't claim the process to be perfect and have receive both criticism and gratitude from victims. We do however understand that we can never satisfy all, but are committed to doing our best.

Lawrence Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com>  

Jun 4, 2019, 4:59 PM

to Kevin, me

Got it. Thanks Mark.

On your first statement, wouldn't allegations against Weldon after 1982 fall under the church policy of not listing clergy who died before claims arose? Given that, I'm unclear on your point there.

Did you review written or recorded notes of the June session with?

This is an important question that I hope you will address. Is it standard practice to at least keep a written record of allegations in a review board session?
As a side note, neither nor any one of the others I have interviewed feels they are changing the story about Weldon. They are firm in recalling that he was specifically named as an abuser to Murphy and the entire board.

Larry

Mark D <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  
Jun 4, 2019, 5:27 PM

to Lawrence

Headed home will respond within the hour.

Mark Dupont <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  
Jun 4, 2019, 6:34 PM

to Lawrence

My point is that even before you get to the discussion of listing names we need a credible finding based on an allegation.

Even if the accused clergy is deceased it wouldn't stop the review board from following up on an allegation.

Remember, the Review Board is designed to be impartial and independent from the diocese. They neither represent the interest of the diocese, the accused or the complainant. They are individuals, who are mandated reporters and are not employed by the diocese. Their sole duty is to try to establish whether a complaint, many times decades old, is credible. They base their findings on the initial intake form and investigator’s report- and when a victim comes to the review board - that testimony. They provide an honorable service and are not "liars", Dr. Martin’s unfortunate characterization.
Again the major consideration here was Kevin Murphy's report based on his conversation with this individual and again the victim twice said they were not molested. Those are factual statements.

Again as we have demonstrated we are interested in providing this independent forum so as to provide victims a process towards healing. This victim is free to reach out if they now want to make new allegations.

Lawrence Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com>  

Jun 4, 2019, 7:16 PM  

to me

Mark,

OK, have that.

I will have to say, I guess, that you did not respond to my question about whether the hearing was recorded or otherwise memorialized through note-taking.

Larry
Mark D <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  

Jun 4, 2019,  
7:46 PM

to Lawrence

It's not recorded. Notes are taken.

Lawrence Parnass <lparnass@berkshireeagle.com>  

Jun 4, 2019,  
7:51 PM

to me

OK. You didn't say whether the notes confirm Hale's belief that the victim did not name Weldon.

Do the notes record, or not record, that allegation against Weldon? That is the question most people will have.

Mark D <m.dupont@diospringfield.org>  

Jun 4, 2019,  
7:58 PM

to Lawrence

The notes are limited but don't indicate the victim contradicting his previous statement to our investigator that they had not been molested by the former bishop.
On behalf of the Diocesan Review Board I wish to clarify an inaccurate characterization reported in an article which appeared May 29 on the Berkshire Eagle website.

Let me be clear, the Review Board has never found that the late Bishop Christopher Weldon, deceased since 1982, engaged in improper contact with anyone.

The complaint reported on in the Eagle article involved sexual misconduct involving two now deceased priests that dates back to the early 1960s with the individual recalling it within the last few years and bringing the complaint to the Review Board in 2018.

As a part of the complaint it was also alleged that Bishop Weldon had actual knowledge of the abuse or he should have known because he was present at a gathering where some abuse took place. However there was no finding against Bishop Weldon as the individual also indicated that the former Bishop never abused them.

However the actual abuse complaint made by this individual involving the misconduct of former priests Clarence Forand and Edward Authier was found credible and the individual was offered counseling services as is our normal practice.

In addition, at the request of this individual, they were provided an opportunity to visit the location where the abuse took place as part of an effort to deal with the trauma caused by the abuse.

John M. Hale
Chairperson, Diocesan Review Board

Bishop Mitchell Rozanski
Diocese of Springfield, MA
[THE FOLLOWING IS NOT A PART OF THE DEED, AND IS NOT TO BE RECORDED.]

GENERAL LAWS, (Ter. Ed.) Chapter 183, Section 10.

A deed in substance following the form entitled "Warranty Deed" shall, when duly executed, have the force and effect of a deed in fee simple to the grantee, his heirs and assigns, to his and their own use, with covenants on the part of the grantor, for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators and successors, with the grantee, his heirs, successors and assigns, that, at the time of the delivery of such deed (1) he was lawfully seized in fee simple of the granted premises, (2) that the granted premises were free from all encumbrances, (3) that he had good right to sell and convey the same to the grantee and his heirs and assigns, and (4) that he will, and his heirs, executors and administrators shall, warrant and defend the same to the grantee and his heirs and assigns against the lawful claims and demands of all persons.

[Handwritten notes and signatures]
A deed in substance following the form entitled "Quitclaim Deed" shall when duly executed have the force and effect of a deed in fee simple to the grantee, his heirs and assigns, to his and their own use, with covenants on the part of the grantor, for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators and successors, with the grantee, his heirs, successors and assigns, that at the time of the delivery of such deed the premises were free from all encumbrances made by him, and that he will, and his heirs, executors and administrators shall, warrant and defend the same to the grantee and his heirs and assigns forever against the lawful claims and demands of all persons claiming by, through or under the grantor, but against none other.
KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that I, LAWRENCE E. PRUNIER

of Fairview, Hampden County, Massachusetts,

in consideration of Seven Thousand Five Hundred and no/100 ($7,500.00) Dollars

grant to THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD, a corporation sole under Chapter 368 of the Acts of 1898 of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, of Elliot Street, Springfield, Mass.

the land together with the buildings thereon in the City of Chicopee, County of Hampden, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and being more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point at the southerly side of Britton Street, fifty-two (52) feet easterly from the northeasterly corner of the French Church lot, this point being the northeasterly corner of land conveyed by Jeremie Senecal to Frank Decele, et ux., by deed dated July 7, 1923, and recorded in Hampden County Registry of Deeds, Book 1184, Page 527; thence running

SOUTHERLY along said last named land, two hundred five (205) feet more or less to land of one Tarte, now or formerly; thence running

EASTERLY along last named land, eighty-nine (89) feet, more or less, to the southwest corner of land conveyed by said Jeremie Senecal to one Ellen Boucher, by deed dated April 2, 1921, and recorded in said Registry, Book 1108, Page 55; thence running

NORTHERLY along last named land, one hundred seventy-six (176) feet more or less to said Britton Street; thence running

WESTERLY along said Britton Street, ninety-five and one-half (95½) feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

This deed creates no new boundaries.

Executed as a sealed instrument this fourteenth day of May 1971.

[Signature]

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Hampden, ss. May 14, 1971

Then personally appeared the above named Lawrence E. Prunier and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be his free act and deed.

[Signature]

RECEIVED
MAY 14, 1971
AT 4:45P.M.
AND
B E F O R E THE ORIGINAL

Before me,

[Signature]

We, Charles R. Tracy and Florence M. Tracy, husband and wife, both of Chicopee, Hampden County, Massachusetts, being married, for consideration paid, grant to The Roman Catholic Bishop of Springfield, of Springfield, Massachusetts, with quitclaim covenants

the land in Chicopee, Hampden County, Massachusetts, bounded and described as follows:

[Description and encumbrances, if any]

Beginning at the northwest corner of the Royal Street Property of the grantors, thence S 43° 16' 27" E along land of the grantors, and shown as the westerly boundary of premises of grantors in Land Court Case No. 34130, 152.36 feet to land now or formerly of Henry H. Morgan; thence S 68° 28' 57" W along land of said Morgan 7.11 feet more or less; thence northwesterly to the point of beginning; meaning and intending to convey land continuously and notoriously possessed and occupied by grantors for a period in excess of twenty years. See Land Court Case No. 34130, Registry District of Hampden County, Massachusetts, date of registration, September 30, 1968.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

ss.

Then personally appeared the above named

Florence M. Tracy and Charles R. Tracy

and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be their free act and deed, before me

Robert W. Ritchie

Notary Public — Justice of the Peace

My commission expires June 18, 1976

(*Individual — Joint Tenants — Tenants in Common — Tenants by the Entirety.)
April 2, 1971

Reverend William F. Breen, Pastor
Saint Ann’s Church
53 College Street
Chicopee, Massachusetts

Dear Father Breen:

His Excellency, Bishop Weldon, has considered the proposal of your Parish Council and you to agree to the price of $7,500.00 for the purchase of property adjacent to your present Church property. He concurs with the Diocesan Real Estate Advisor, Mr. James Brody of 31 Elm Street, Springfield that $5,000.00 should be the top price to pay for this lot and grants permission for this price only to be paid. If you wish to talk to Mr. Brody and explain things to him personally in the feeling that you can convince him the price of $7,500.00 is equitable you may call him at 785-5339.

With very best regards, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD

(Rev. Msgr.) Robert E. Foudy
Chancellor

REF/mad
February 27, 1971
Dear Msgr. Foudy:

Our newly elected parish council had its first meeting on February 24, 1971. One matter that had prime consideration was the possible purchase of the Prunier land adjacent to the Britton St. side of St. Anne's property.

The council discussed all angles of the question thoroughly. Taking into consideration our acute parking problem - on street parking is now prohibited - even though purchase of the Prunier land would not entirely solve our problem, it would alleviate it to such an extent that the council unanimously recommended meeting the $7,500.00 tentative price mentioned by the Dolan & Grady Realtors in their letter of December 7, 1970. The council felt that the parish as a whole was agreeable. I was requested to relay this information to the attention of the Most Reverend Bishop.

With the knowledge the council has of the situation, I concur with their decision. The next meeting of the council will be on Wednesday March 31, 1971.

Appreciating your assistance in obtaining the permission to go ahead with the purchase, I remain

Sincerely yours,

William F. Breen
Pastor
November 5, 1970

Mr. Paul J. Dorsey
Dolan Grady
33 School Street
Springfield, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Dorsey:

The matter of the purchase of property in Fairview by St. Anne's Church has been referred to the Pastor for his decision on the matter. Please contact him for any further discussion.

Sincerely yours,

DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD

(Rev. Msgr.) Robert E. Foudy
Chancellor

REF/maj
November 3, 1970

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert Foudy
Chancery Office
76 Elliot Street,
Springfield, Massachusetts

Dear Monsignor:

Seeing you on television last evening reminded me that Mr. Raymond O'Connell, the listing broker of the property in the rear of Saint Anne's Church, Fairview, called last night just before closing time to say he was going to New York for the week and inquired if I had heard from you regarding the status of the above property.

He asked if I'd contact you to inquire where we stand now, as the owner is continually calling him and he keeps putting him off. In all fairness, if the parish is interested, the owner is entitled to know of its intentions and if and when they could take title. Certainly you wouldn't want to tie up the property for some time thus preventing him from selling it, and possibly not acquire same.

I'd very much appreciate it, Monsignor, if you could give me some idea up to date of where your intentions now stand so I might convey this to Mr. O'Connell and the owner. Thank you very much.

With kindest personal regards, I remain

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul J. Corsey

PJD/bs
October 8, 1970

V. Rev. Msgr. Robert Foudy  
Chancery Office  
Diocese of Springfield  
76 Elliot Street,  
Springfield, Massachusetts.

Dear Monsignor Foudy:

First, may I thank you for your kindness in regard to the property in the rear of Saint Anne's Church in Fairview that both Mr. O'Connell in Holyoke and myself spoke with you about. Mr. O'Connell enlisted our aid, as he very sincerely believes that the Church needs and should have said property. And I thank you for hearing me out.

Per your instructions, I did visit with the new pastor, Father Breen, and we checked the property together and I acquainted him with the parcel and brought him up to date on past negotiations as best I knew them. He informed me that he would take it up with the parish council and advise you of their opinion, as you had instructed me to tell him.

In speaking with Father the other evening, he told me the council recommended acquiring the property. I understand they were almost unanimous. Since Mr. O'Connell is away for a week, I was wondering if perhaps you were trying to contact him? In his absence, if we can be of assistance, please advise me. As you know, should you acquire the property, you will buy it with the house on it and you will have to demolish it at your own expense.

Hoping this matter work out to your satisfaction, I remain

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Paul J. Dorsey

PJD/bs
July 3, 1970

Reverend Edward G. Authier, Pastor
Saint Ann's Church
52 College Street
Fairview, Massachusetts

Dear Father Authier:

I have discussed your desire to purchase a piece of property which abuts your present parish property with a real estate appraiser and with His Excellency, Bishop Weldon. They both feel that the cost of 18,757 square feet at $15,000.00 to be too high for the purposes to which you will put this land. In your letter you state that the house is in deplorable condition. It would have to be demolished at the expense of the church if you were to purchase it adding to the cost of the land.

If I may be of further assistance in this matter please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD

(Rev. Msgr.) Robert E. Foudy
Chancellor

REF/mad
June 23, 1970

Dear Mayor Tory,

There is a piece of property next to our 

...determined that it is for sale. This property is 975 square 

and consists of an old 2-family house. In 1975, there was 

...turbine, owned by Lawrence & O'Brien of相通.

The house is twenty years old and rundown. It seems, have 

...solved the house of health to its occupants and it is they are 

...bears that an advantage for children. This would and since 

...property exchange or purchase but does present any 

...construction of any kind. Mr. O'Brien, contacted $5000 add 

...will be to a maximum price, limited $3000 at 

...first. I am interested in a house for a family member who 

......presents an offer. Can we surrender some credit and get 

...loan for a house? Certainly, please in receipt. (w.r.)

Ed Cothee
Jim Brady offers says this price seems awfully high
St. Anne’s parking lot area on College Street, Chicopee, Massachusetts

In my opinion, based upon examination of the public records of the City of Chicopee and the Hampden Registry of Deeds, there was a residence or structure located between the St Anne’s Church rectory (#30 College St); in what is now a parking lot, and the residence known as #60 College Street.

1. The ‘Chicopee, Fairview, Willimansett City Directory of 1959’ lists:
   
   #52 - St Anne’s Rectory (which became #30 after changes to street numbering in 1994).
   #44 - Dorman, George T (would have been located in the present parking lot)
   #60 - Morgan, Henry H

2. The church purchased the parcel of land, that is now included in the parking lot, on July 6, 1959, as evidenced by Certificate of Title #9485 in the Land Court Records of the Hampden Deeds office. The Land Court Plan clearly shows a building located on this College Street parcel.

3. The Chicopee Assessor’s office contains a volume of the street maps by Sanborn Map Company first produced in 1926.

   The assessors would ‘paper over’ to make changes to this map for a period of time - and keep ‘correcting’, if you will, the property layouts. This was told to me by an employee of this office.

   That map was updated to show the property of St Anne’s Church that includes what is now the parking lot area and is marked “parking”. You can clearly see that a building and perhaps a shed have been papered over in the parking area. This is the structure I believe was referred to as #44 College Street as stated in #1 & #2 above.

4. An Atlas of Hampden County dated 1912 also shows a structure #44 next to St Anne’s Church property where the parking lot would now be, (prior to the church purchase of the parking lot area in 1959).
St. Anne's parking lot area on College Street, Chicopee, Massachusetts

In my opinion, based upon examination of the public records of the City of Chicopee and the Hampden Registry of Deeds, there was a residence or structure located between the St Anne's Church rectory (#30 College St); in what is now a parking lot, and the residence known as #60 College Street.

1. The 'Chicopee, Fairview, Willimansett City Directory of 1959' lists:

   #52 - St Anne's Rectory (which became #30 after changes to street numbering in 1994).
   #44 - Dorman, George T (would have been located in the present parking lot)
   #60 - Morgan, Henry H

2. The church purchased the parcel of land, that is now included in the parking lot, on July 6, 1959, as evidenced by Certificate of Title #9485 in the Land Court Records of the Hampden Deeds office. The Land Court Plan clearly shows a building located on this College Street parcel.

3. The Chicopee Assessor's office contains a volume of the street maps by Sanborn Map Company first produced in 1926.

   The assessors would 'paper over' to make changes to this map for a period of time - and keep 'correcting', if you will, the property layouts. This was told to me by an employee of this office.

   That map was updated to show the property of St Anne's Church that includes what is now the parking lot area and is marked "parking". You can clearly see that a building and perhaps a shed have been papered over in the parking area. This is the structure I believe was referred to as #44 College Street as stated in #1 & #2 above.

4. An Atlas of Hampden County dated 1912 also shows a structure #44 next to St Anne's Church property where the parking lot would now be, (prior to the church purchase of the parking lot area in 1959).
Transfer Certificate of Title.

BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD, a corporation, under Chapter 365 of the Acts of 1890 of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,

in Springfield, in the County of Hampden, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In the name of the said Bishop of Springfield, in the County of Hampden, and Commonwealth, bounded and described as follows:

Northeast by the southeasterly line of North Street, fifty-two (52) feet;
Northeast by land now or formerly of Lawrence H. Tracy and one hundred fifty-five and forty-four hundredths feet (155.44) feet;
Southwest by land now or formerly of Florence H. Tracy forty-eight (48) feet and;
Southwest by land now or formerly of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Springfield one hundred thirty and five-tenths (130.5) feet.

The land shown as lot 1 on the plan hereinafter mentioned, also another parcel of land situated in said Chicopee, bounded:
Northeast by the northwesterly line of College Street one hundred ninety-seven and 1/4 (197.25) feet;
Northeast by said Roman Catholic Bishop of Springfield land one hundred forty-five and 1/10 (145.09) feet;
Northeast by said Florence H. Tracy land one hundred fifty-two and 9/10 (152.9) feet and;
Northeast by land now or formerly of Harry H. Morgan at one hundred twenty-five and 1/10 (125.1) feet.

The lot is shown as lot 2 on said plan.

All of said boundaries are determined by the Court to be located on the true line and true distances shown on said plan, as recorded and approved by the Court, filed in the Land Registry-Worcester District, a copy of a portion of which is filed and recorded Certificate of Title No. 9318.
Greetings Dan,

I believe I can count on you to facilitate this communication for me.

It's just a little "thinking of you"

Greetings to Matthew — in that I heard good things of him from some of my former parishioners.

As you may know, I was pastor there (1988-2002). I thought he may need a lift!

Meanwhile, take care of yourself amidst current "goings on." A victim of Weldon's came to me in 2005 — reminiscing, though, to come forward. I know Patsy Martin; we have spoken.

The current person is not my 2005 person. I fear there is more to come. Focus on St. Patrick's people and your own health.

My regards to you as well as those from Joe Soannad.

Jim
Review Board.
May 9, 2018

MINUTES

Members Present: Theresa Flannagan, Sue Cary, John Haie, Tom Lachfuss, Irene Rodriguez Martin, Bonnie Moriaty, Marianne Trigges Smith, Jim Stankiewicz, and Fr. Bob White. Also in attendance: Pat McManamy (Victim Advocate), Kevin Murphy (Investigator), and Mary Ashe (Secretary).

Information related to other matters omitted.

had asked to attend tonight's meeting along with two friends as support. When he arrived, he said he wanted to speak for a couple of hours to the Board and was told no - a shorter amount of time would be allotted to him. He was not happy about that decision, and went out. Along with his two friends, he was also accompanied by a therapist also in his support, Dr. Patricia Martin.

has accused Bishop Christopher Weldon, Fr. Edward Authier, and Fr. Charette of abuse. Kevin has met with , and said he finds his allegations against the two priests credible but has questions about Bishop Weldon's involvement.

will be invited to the June meeting and allowed more time.

The Board will next meet on Wednesday, June 13, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Ashe, Secretary
TRAINING AND PREVENTION

Educating our youth

The diocese provides awareness training to youth attending Catholic schools or taking part in parish faith formation programs. These programs are designed for various age groups and have the common theme of educating young people on the signs of inappropriate behavior and how to report these dangers.

Training employees and volunteers

The diocese requires all clergy, religious, and lay employees, as well as all volunteers affiliated with any parish, school, ministry, service or department at the time of hire or start of volunteer work, to submit to a Massachusetts C.O.R.I. (Criminal Offender Record Information) background check; complete the online VIRTUS Safe Environments training; and to read and sign a Code of Conduct. These must be renewed every three years.

In addition, Catholic school teachers also must submit fingerprints, as required by Massachusetts law. These help identify persons with a criminal record which makes them unsuitable for work within the church. The training helps adults spot inappropriate behavior and teaches them how to respond to victims of abuse and how to immediately report any complaints they might receive or problematic behaviors they observe.

By directive of the Bishop of Springfield, all clergy, religious, lay employees and volunteers must consider themselves as “mandatory reporters” and follow reporting procedures.

What happens to clergy with credible allegations?

If any complaint involves current behavior, the accused clergy member is temporarily removed from active ministry. Should there be a determination that the allegation is credible and/or a criminal finding of guilt, the clergy member is permanently removed from all ministry and is directed not to present themselves as clergy. Public notification is given. If an accused diocesan clergy is alive when an allegation is received, and subsequently found to be credible, then that person’s name is placed on a diocesan list available online at http://diospringfield.org/credibly-accused-clergy/. This case is then forwarded to the Vatican for final determination of status of the clergy, either permanent removal from ministry under a life of prayer and penance or permanent removal from the clerical state – laicization.

Once laicized, the former cleric is no longer entitled to any financial assistance from the diocese. For those who are not laicized, but removed from public ministry, the diocese, under church law, is obliged to provide some minimal assistance.

What if the clergy member in question is deceased?

Any individual who has been or suspects they were abused, regardless of how long ago, is encouraged to file a complaint. Even if the clergy member is deceased, the complaint and review process is followed and that person is entitled to counseling/therapy services as well as a settlement.

Review board

Since 1994, the Diocese of Springfield has had an independent board, consisting of mostly lay members, to review complaints brought forward to the diocese. They can be contacted either by calling 413.452.0624 (or 1-800-842-9065) or emailing reportabuse@diospringfield.org.

Resources

- The Department of Social Services website contains a wealth of valuable information: http://www.mass.gov/dcf
- For all information regarding the church’s ongoing efforts: http://diospringfield.org/Ministries/child-youth-protection/
**DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD ABUSE REPORTS: 1986-2018**

When abuse occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When abuse was reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These charts show that the vast majority of abuse took place decades ago going back to the 1930s, but almost all were only reported since 1993.

**How to report abuse, past and present**

Department of children and families:
During business hours, call the appropriate office:
Springfield, 413.452.3200
Holyoke, 413.493.2600 (or 1.800.698.3935)
Northampton, 413.584.1698 (or 1.800.841.2692)
Greenfield, 413.775.5000 (or 1.800.842.5905)
Pittsfield, 413.236.1800 (or 1.800.292.5022)
After hours, call 1.800.792.5200 or contact local law enforcement.

Diocesan reporting venues:
1-800-842-9055 or reportabuse@diospringfield.org

**COST OF SETTLEMENTS**

Since 1992 the Diocese of Springfield has paid out 147 abuse claims totaling $14,948,001, $8,500,000 of which came from insurance carriers with the remainder coming from diocesan self-insurance reserves.

**How are individual settlement amounts determined?**

Not all persons filing a report of abuse seek any settlement or other assistance.
A significant number of victims participated in two group settlement procedures. In each, independent arbitrators, agreed to by the victims' attorneys, reviewed each claim and independently determined a settlement amount. Victims were allowed to meet with the arbitrators to share their story.

Now, with fewer claims, the diocese works individually with victims and their attorneys, using past settlements as a basis for resolving these more recent claims.

**What about therapy and counseling?**

In addition, victims of abuse have received $2,250,000 for therapy/counseling needs. This is an ongoing commitment made by the diocese to victims. In fiscal year 2018, therapy costs exceeded $150,000. In addition, on occasion, victims receive supplemental assistance from the diocese.
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**147**

**ABUSE CLAIMS PAID OUT SINCE 1992**

**$14,948,001**

**TOTAL COST OF CLAIMS**

**$8,500,000 Paid for by insurance carriers**

**$2,250,000**

**AMOUNT PAID FOR THERAPY/COUNSELING**

**$150,000**

**TOTAL THERAPY COSTS FOR 2018**

**Normal Procedure for Handling Abuse Report**

**Report of abuse received**

- Notice sent to relevant district attorney
- Notice sent to State Department of Children and Families if child at risk
- Accused temporarily suspended from ministry
- Follow-up with victim, and investigation by diocesan investigator (Investigation may be deferred at request of district attorney)
- Consideration by diocesan review board
- If found "credible"
  - Eligible for financial assistance with counseling
  - Eligible for possible damage claim settlement
- Possible investigation by district attorney's office
- Possible investigation by Department of Children and Families
- Report to diocesan bishop

*If person named in the complaint is in active ministry they are temporarily suspended pending outcome of the investigation.*

This memorandum of understanding between the Roman Catholic Bishop of Springfield, a Corporation Sole, (hereinafter the Diocese) and the offices of the District Attorneys of the Berkshire, Hampden, and Northwestern Districts sets out an agreement by the Diocese to report, to the appropriate authorities, as set out below, any report of sexual abuse or attempted sexual abuse of a vulnerable person and/or sexual misconduct involving a vulnerable person, of which it becomes aware during the term of this Agreement, by (i) any Roman Catholic priest or other clergy, of whatever order, including women religious, (ii) any official or employee of the Diocese, and/or its agents, including subcontractors of any kind, (iii) any person of legal age volunteering with or otherwise acting under the auspices of the Diocese or subject to the direction or control of the Diocese, or (iv) any other person of legal age employed by, volunteering with, or otherwise acting under the auspices of or subject to the direction and control of any other entity of the Roman Catholic Church within the geographic Diocese of Springfield, Massachusetts.

AGREEMENT

As used in this memorandum, the term “vulnerable person” means a person who is known or believed to be under the age of 18 (i.e. “a child”), or a person between the ages of 18 and 59, inclusive, who is a disabled person as that term is presently defined in Massachusetts General Laws chapter 19C, section 1 (i.e. “a disabled adult”), or a person who is 60 years of age or older (i.e. “an elderly person”). Vulnerable persons are persons who are sometimes referred to as “special victims” in the law enforcement community.

For the purposes of this memorandum, the “appropriate authorities” to whom reports will be sent means the District Attorney’s Office (“DAO”) for the area where the vulnerable person resided and where the reported conduct occurred as best those offices can be determined. The Diocese will send its notice to the DAOs by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, and the date on the receipt will constitute the starting date for the investigatory suspension by the Diocese as described below.

With respect to any such report of sexual abuse, attempted sexual abuse, and/or sexual misconduct involving a vulnerable person of which the Diocese becomes aware by any means, including but not limited to, complaint, report, statement, observation, or allegation, the Diocese agrees to provide forthwith to the appropriate authorities the following information:

1. The name(s), address(es) and other contact information of each victim, or potential victim;
2. The name(s), address(es) and other contact information of the person(s) who reported the sexual abuse, attempted sexual abuse, and/or sexual misconduct involving a vulnerable person;

3. The name(s), address(es) and other contact information of every witness known to the Diocese or its representative(s) pertaining to the complaint, report, statement, observation, or allegation of sexual abuse, attempted sexual abuse, and/or sexual misconduct involving a vulnerable person;

4. The date that the complaint, report, statement, observation, or allegation of sexual abuse, attempted sexual abuse, and/or sexual misconduct involving a vulnerable person was made to the Diocese or its representative(s), and the name and address of the person(s) who received the complaint, report, statement, observation, or allegation of sexual abuse, attempted sexual abuse, and/or sexual misconduct involving a vulnerable person on behalf of the Diocese;

5. The name and address of the attorney, if any, who represents or represented the victim in the victim’s dealings with the Diocese or its representative(s);

6. The name and address of the priest, other clergy, official, employee, or volunteer alleged to have committed the sexual abuse, attempted sexual abuse, and/or sexual misconduct involving a vulnerable person;

7. Any summary of the facts of the reported sexual abuse, attempted sexual abuse, and/or sexual misconduct involving a vulnerable person unless such summary or any other documents are protected as a result of the priest penitent and/or spiritual counseling privilege, the attorney client privilege, or information pertaining to psychological counseling;
   a. Any document which would otherwise be produced pursuant to this Agreement but which is not produced because the Diocese claims it is protected by one or more privileges shall be identified by the Diocese by providing its date, if any, the names of any known author(s), originator(s) and recipient(s), and stating the type of document [e.g. letter, email, memorandum, etc.] and the privilege(s) claimed by the Diocese.

8. All parties agree that the present intake form of the Diocese, attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit 1, complies with all the notice requirements outlined in paragraphs 1-7 above. The Diocese has also added to its intake form, Exhibit 1, a statement to be communicated to every caller that they can and should report their situation directly to law enforcement, and the Diocese will give them the contact number for their local District Attorney’s Office Sexual Abuse Unit if they wish. Each District Attorney shall supply the Diocese with the appropriate contact number and any changes. Further all parties agree the Diocese shall provide the agents of the District Attorneys voluntarily with any additional information it possesses reasonably requested by them to facilitate any further investigation, including at the request of a DAO the assignment cards for the
alleged or suspected perpetrator priests or clerics or similar assignment information for alleged or suspected perpetrators who are not clerics.

The intent of this memorandum is to provide at least for the reporting of conduct of the kind which would generate a mandatory report pursuant to M.G.L. c.119, §51A, c.19C, §10, or c.19A, §15 if those statutes had been in effect at the time of the conduct and would have applied in the circumstances. The parties recognize that the Diocese may not learn about such events until some appreciable time after they occur and at a time after an alleged or suspected perpetrator has died or when the perpetrator cannot be reliably identified or when the Diocese does not have all the information expected to be reported pursuant to this memorandum. It is the intent of the parties that in those circumstances the Diocese will report the information that it has available to the DAO for the area where the vulnerable person resided and where the reported conduct occurred as best those offices can be determined.

The Diocese confirms that it is aware of the reporting obligations under the statutes referred to above and has taken steps to educate its personnel about those requirements. In addition to its reporting pursuant to this memorandum, the Diocese will also comply with its reporting obligations under those statutes.

In cases where it appears that there may be potential prosecution, it has been the policy of the Diocese of Springfield to suspend its investigation of reported abuse for a period of time in order to avoid interference with investigation by the appropriate civil authorities. However, the obligations of the Diocese under the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People (revised January, 2018), promulgated by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and the Essential Norms for Diocesan Policies Dealing With Allegations of Sexual Abuse of Minors require the Diocese to investigate allegations of sexual abuse. As part of this Memorandum of Understanding, the Diocese agrees that it will suspend its investigation of such cases for up to 90 (ninety) days after the allegation is reported to the civil authorities, absent unusual circumstances and a written request by the civil authorities justifying a longer suspension. The DAOs agree that they will notify the Diocese before the end of the suspension period if there is no further need for the Diocese to continue the suspension of its investigation.

Finally, the Diocese agrees to continue its past practice of neither imposing nor seeking to impose on any victim of reported sexual abuse, attempted sexual abuse, and/or sexual misconduct any type of confidentiality agreement, to notify any such victim of the existence of this disclosure agreement, and to encourage victims of reported sexual abuse to report the abuse to the appropriate civil and law enforcement authorities.

For the purposes of giving notice or coordinating or following-up on the provision of information as set forth in this memorandum, the parties designate the following representatives as their respective contact person(s). The parties agree to notify each other in writing of any change in the designated contact person or said person’s contact information.
For the Diocese:

Jeffrey J. Trant, Director
Office of Safe Environment and Victim Assistance
Diocese of Springfield, Massachusetts
65 Elliott Street, P.O.Box 1730
Springfield, MA 01102-1730
TEL: (413) 452-0624
FAX: (413) 452-0678
j.trant@diospringfield.org

with a copy to

John J. Egan, Esq. and/or Kevin D. Withers, Esq.
Egan, Flanagan and Cohen, P.C.
67 Market Street, P.O.Box 9035
Springfield, MA 01102-9035
TEL: (413) 737-0260
FAX: (413) 737-0121
jje@efclaw.com, kdw@efclaw.com

For the Offices of the District Attorneys:

Anthony D. Gulluni, District Attorney
Hampden County District Attorney's Office
50 State Street
Springfield, MA 01102
TEL: (413) 747-1000
FAX: (413) 781-4745

Andrea Harrington, District Attorney
Berkshire County District Attorney's Office
7 North Street, P.O.Box 1969
Pittsfield, MA 01202
TEL: (413) 443-5951
FAX: (413) 499-6349

David E. Sullivan, District Attorney
Northwestern District Attorney's Office
One Gleason Plaza
Northampton, MA 01060
TEL: (413) 586-9225
FAX: (413) 584-3635
EFFECTIVE DATE AND DURATION OF THIS AGREEMENT

The provisions of this Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective between the Diocese and each DAO as of the date it has been signed by the Bishop of the Diocese and the particular District Attorney, and shall remain in full force and effect between the Diocese and each DAO until June 30, 2024 or until it is amended by agreement or rescinded by the withdrawal of a party. Any party may withdraw from this Agreement only by giving all other parties ninety (90) days of advance notice in writing. Any amendment of this Agreement shall be in writing and signed by the then current Bishop and the respective District Attorneys.

The Parties recognize that there are religious orders, institutes, communities and other organizations which are part of the universal Catholic Church that conduct operations within the geographic confines of the Diocese that are independent of the Diocese and not subject to its direction or control (the “independent organizations”). As provided above, if the Diocese receives from any source a report of sexual abuse or attempted sexual abuse of a vulnerable person and or sexual misconduct involving a vulnerable person by the agents, servants, employees, contractors or volunteers of an independent organization, the Diocese will notify the appropriate DAO of such report. In addition, the Diocese agrees to advise the independent organizations of the terms of this Agreement, to request that the independent organizations provide the Diocese with a copy of reports that they receive concerning the subject matter of this Agreement, to recommend and encourage the independent organizations to adopt and follow the procedures set forth herein with respect to such incidents and, to the extent possible, the Diocese will work to convene meetings or other contacts between the independent organizations and the DAOs to enter into separate agreements, or amendments of or addendums to this Agreement, for the purpose of developing uniform and standardized procedures for reporting and investigating such incidents that are reported to have occurred within the geographic confines of the Diocese of Springfield.

FOR THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD, A CORPORATION SOLE:

MITCHELL T. ROZANSKI, D.D.
Its Present Bishop

JOHN J. EGAN, ESQ.
Counsel for the Roman Catholic Bishop of Springfield,
a Corporation Sole
FOR THE OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR THE BERKSHIRE DISTRICT:

ANDREA HARRINGTON, ESQ.
District Attorney

4/23/2020
Date

FOR THE OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR THE HAMPDEN DISTRICT:

ANTHONY D. GULLINI, ESQ.
District Attorney

April 10, 2020
Date

FOR THE OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHWESTERN DISTRICT:

DAVID E. SULLIVAN, ESQ.
District Attorney

April 25, 2020
Date
BYLAWS
OF
THE DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD REVIEW BOARD

ARTICLE I

NAME AND OFFICE LOCATION

SECTION 1. NAME

THE DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD REVIEW BOARD

SECTION 2. PRINCIPAL OFFICE

THE PRINCIPAL OFFICE OF THE REVIEW BOARD SHALL BE AT THE PASTORAL CENTER OF THE DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD LOCATED AT 65 ELLIOT STREET, SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS.

ARTICLE II

PURPOSE

THE PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW BOARD WILL BE:

► TO ASSIST THE DIOCESAN BISHOP IN ASSESSING ALLEGATIONS AND FITNESS FOR MINISTRY OF CLERGY OR OTHER CHURCH PERSONNEL;
► TO REGULARLY REVIEW DIOCESAN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH SEXUAL ABUSE OF MINORS;
► TO OFFER ADVICE ON ALL ASPECTS OF THESE CASES, WHETHER RETROSPECTIVELY OR PROSPECTIVELY.

ADDITIONALLY, THE REVIEW BOARD WILL HEAR ALLEGATIONS INVOLVING SUBSTANCE ABUSE, EMOTIONAL DISORDERS, AND RELATED MATTERS OVER WHICH THE ORDINARY HAS SUPERVISION AND CONTROL AS AFFECTING PERSONNEL.

ARTICLE III

DUTIES OF THE REVIEW BOARD

THE DUTIES OF THE REVIEW BOARD ARE TO:

► REVIEW CASE MATERIALS AS PRESENTED BY THE VICTIM ADVOCATE AND/OR THE DIOCESAN INVESTIGATOR;
► PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE VICTIM TO PRESENT HIS/HER CASE IN PERSON;
► PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE ALLEGED OFFENDER TO PRESENT HIS/HER CASE;
► MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ORDINARY OR TO THE VICAR FOR CLERGY TOGETHER FOR APPROPRIATE ACTION INCLUDING, AS NECESSARY:
  • PREVENTIVE OR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS;
  • COUNSELING OR OTHER TREATMENT FOR PERSONNEL AND/OR VICTIMS;
  • ANY DISCIPLINARY OR OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION.
ARTICLE IV

POWERS OF REVIEW BOARD

The Review Board shall have the powers necessary to effect the foregoing purpose, including:

- Access to personnel files at appropriate times and places;
- Use of diocesan offices;
- The right to expend funds specifically made available to it by the ordinary but not otherwise.

These powers are all to be exercised in accord with the canon law of the church.

ARTICLE V

MEMBERS

The Review Board, established by the diocesan/eparchial bishop, will:

- Be composed of at least five persons of outstanding integrity and good judgment in full communion with the church;
- Have the majority of the members be lay persons who are not employed by the diocese/eparchy;
- Have at least one member be a priest who is an experienced and respected pastor of the diocese/eparchy in question;
- Have at least one member who has a particular expertise in the treatment of the sexual abuse of minors;
- Have a promoter of justice who will desirably participate in the meetings.

Members will be appointed for a term of five years, which can be renewed.

A member may be removed only by action of the ordinary after consulting with the other members of the Review Board.

A member may resign at any time by filing a written resignation with the ordinary who shall thereupon fill the vacancy.

ARTICLE VI

OFFICERS

SECTION I. OFFICERS

The officers of the Review Board shall be a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson.

A secretary to the Review Board will be appointed by the ordinary.
SECTION 2. ELECTION AND TERM OF OFFICERS

ALL OFFICERS SHALL BE ELECTED BY THE REVIEW BOARD FOR SUCH TERM AS THE REVIEW BOARD SHALL DETERMINE.

ARTICLE VII

DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SECTION 1. CHAIRPERSON

THE CHAIRPERSON SHALL:
- PRESIDE AT ALL MEETINGS;
- PREPARE AN AGENDA;
- MAINTAIN CONTACT WITH THE VICAR FOR CLERGY AND THE ORDINARY AS DIRECTION BY THE REVIEW BOARD;
- REPORT ALL REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AS REQUIRED BY THE FOREGOING PURPOSE.

SECTION 2. VICE-CHAIRPERSON

THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON SHALL PRESIDE IN THE ABSENCE OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND CARRY OUT ANY DUTIES ASSIGNED EITHER BY THE CHAIRPERSON OR BY THE REVIEW BOARD.

SECTION 3. SECRETARY

THE SECRETARY SHALL MAINTAIN ALL REVIEW BOARD RECORDS INCLUDING REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES AND SHALL MAINTAIN CONFIDENTIALITY THEREOF TO THE SAME EXTENT AS ALL OTHER MEMBERS.

ARTICLE VIII

MEETINGS

SECTION 1. PLACE

ALL MEETINGS OF THE REVIEW BOARD SHALL BE HELD AT THE PRINCIPAL OFFICE OF THE REVIEW BOARD OR AT SUCH OTHER PLACE AS THE REVIEW BOARD MAY DETERMINE.

SECTION 2. HOLDINGS OF MEETINGS

THE REVIEW BOARD SHALL HOLD SUCH MEETINGS AS IT DEEMS APPROPRIATE, GENERALLY AT THE CALL OF THE CHAIRPERSON, OR AT THE REQUEST OF ANY MEMBER, THE ORDINARY OR THE VICAR FOR CLERGY.
SECTION 3. NOTICE OF MEETINGS

THE DATE OF ANY SUBSEQUENT MEETING MAY BE SET BY THE REVIEW BOARD AT ANY DULY CONVENED MEETING. OTHERWISE, NOTICE SHALL BE GIVEN BY MAIL, TELEPHONE CONTACT, PERSONAL CONTACT BY ANY MEMBER, OR ANY OTHER REASONABLE METHOD, IN SUFFICIENT TIME TO INSURE ATTENDANCE AND, CIRCUMSTANCES PERMITTING, ONE WEEK IN ADVANCE.

SECTION 4. QUORUM

A QUORUM FOR ALL MEETINGS SHALL CONSIST OF A SIMPLE MAJORITY OF THE REVIEW BOARD.

ARTICLE IX

DURATION OF REVIEW BOARD

THE REVIEW BOARD SHALL REMAIN IN EXISTENCE SO LONG AS THE ORDINARY CONSIDERS IT NECESSARY FOR THE GOOD ORDER OF THE DIOCESE.

ARTICLE X

CONFIDENTIALITY

ALL MATTERS COMING BEFORE THE REVIEW BOARD AND ALL PROCEEDINGS OF THE REVIEW BOARD SHALL BE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCE BY THE MEMBERS, EXCEPT AS MAY BE REQUIRED BY LAW. THE REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS ARE TO REPORT ALL INSTANCES OF MISCONDUCT BY CLERGY OR CHURCH PERSONNEL WITH A MINOR TO THE APPROPRIATE CIVIL AUTHORITY.

ARTICLE XI

HOLD HARMLESS AND INDEMNIFICATION

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FACT THAT THE REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS ARE DONATING THEIR TIME, ENERGY AND SKILLS TO ASSIST THE PERSONNEL OF THE DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD, THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD, A CORPORATION SOLE, AGREES TO INDEMNIFY AND HOLD HARMLESS EACH AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE REVIEW BOARD AND ANY TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS ENGAGED BY THE REVIEW BOARD FROM ANY LAWSUIT, AWARD, CAUSE OF ACTION OR OTHER CLAIM PRESSED AGAINST ANY SUCH MEMBER OR ASSISTANT AS THE RESULT OF SERVICES PERFORMED HEREUNDER SO LONG AS THE ACTIONS COMPLAINED OF WERE TAKEN IN GOOD FAITH, AND FURTHER AGREES TO PROVIDE EACH SUCH MEMBER WITH LEGAL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE IN DEFENSE OF ANY SUCH CLAIM.
ARTICLE XII

AMENDMENT

WITH RESPECT TO ALL MATTERS SET FORTH HEREIN, EXCEPT AS TO NAME, PURPOSE AND NUMBER OF MEMBERS, THESE BYLAWS MAY BE AMENDED BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF THE REVIEW BOARD AT ANY REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING PROVIDED AT LEAST ONE WEEK'S NOTICE IS GIVEN IN WRITING OF THE SPECIFIC CHANGE PROPOSED.

THE ORDINARY RESERVES THE RIGHT TO CHANGE THE NAME, PURPOSE AND NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE REVIEW BOARD AND TO OTHERWISE DETERMINE ITS EXISTENCE.

ARTICLE XIII

ADOPTION


ARTICLE XIV

RULES OF PROCEDURE

IN ALL CASES NOT COVERED BY THESE BYLAWS, THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AS SET FORTH IN THE MOST RECENT EDITION OF ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER SHALL GOVERN.

ADOPTED

May 25, 2005

ENDORSED AND APPROVED

ORDINARY

BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD

A CORPORATION SOLE

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST

SECRETARY

VERIFIED

CHAIRPERSON

Revised March 2005
THE DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD REVIEW BOARD

PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSING ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL ABUSE AND MISCONDUCT BY CLERGY OR OTHER CHURCH PERSONNEL

The following procedure has been developed by the Diocese of Springfield Review Board to facilitate the assessment process of sexual abuse allegations made against clergy and/or other church personnel. The goal is to complete this process within fourteen (14) to thirty (30) days after the Victim Services Coordinator is contacted about a complaint of sexual abuse. The Diocesan Review Board is also responsible for hearing complaints involving other misconduct issues by Diocesan personnel.

I. The alleged victim contacts the Victim Services Coordinator by either calling the hotline number (1-800-842-9055) or calling the Coordinator directly (413-452-0624). The Coordinator meets with the alleged victim. If the alleged victim is 18 years of age or younger, the Victim Services Coordinator will immediately file a 51A with DSS and notify the Bishop.

II. The Victim Services Coordinator completes the Intake Form and sends it to the:
   - Bishop
   - Diocesan Attorney
   - District Attorney (only if the alleged victim was 18 years old or younger at the time of the alleged incident)
   - Review Board Chair

III. The alleged victim will be asked to submit a written statement detailing the abuse. If necessary, the Coordinator assists the alleged victim with writing the statement.

IV. The Victim Services Coordinator contacts the Review Board Chair requesting a meeting of the Board to present the allegations.

V. The Victim Services Coordinator presents the preliminary report to the Review Board. After reviewing the allegation, if it is determined that the allegation warrants further investigation, the Victim Services Coordinator contacts the Diocesan Investigator, and the Bishop is informed the investigation is going forward. The Bishop then informs the cleric that a claim has been made against him and that he
has the right to canonical counsel. Any other accused Diocesan employee will be notified of an allegation against him/her by the appropriate Diocesan office.

If it is determined the allegation is not in the purview of the Review Board, it will be forwarded to the appropriate Diocesan authority.

VI. The Diocesan Investigator contacts both the alleged victim and the alleged offender for an interview. The Investigator may also contact others to obtain further information.

VII. The Victim Services Coordinator and Investigator present their findings to the Review Board.

VIII. The alleged victim is offered the opportunity to attend a Review Board meeting to present his/her allegations. A supportive person may attend with the alleged victim; however, it may not be his/her attorney if that attorney is suing the Diocese on behalf of the alleged victim.

IX. The alleged offender is offered the opportunity to present his/her case to the Review Board prior to the Board making recommendations to the Bishop. The alleged offender has the right to bring a supportive person with him/her to the Review Board hearing. It should be noted that the alleged offender would not attend the same Review Board meeting as the alleged victim.

X. The Review Board will make written recommendations to the Bishop. The Victim Services Coordinator will receive a copy of these recommendations. A letter is also sent to the victim with the results of the hearing.

XI. At this point, the Bishop, after reviewing all materials and recommendations, issues a decree closing the preliminary investigation.

XII. The Bishop then informs the cleric and the Victim Services Coordinator of his decision. The Victim Services Coordinator informs the alleged victim and the Review Board of this decision. In cases of a Diocesan employee, the appropriate Diocesan staff will inform the employee of the Bishop's decision.
XIII. The Review Board recognizes that at times, it may be necessary to consider on a case-by-case basis the need to be flexible in the following of these procedures, and the Board reserves the right to do so after careful consideration of all factors involved.