A Report of the Thirty-Seventh Statewide Investigating Grand Jury

I only called him "Father"

Statement of a victim of child sexual abuse
From an exhibit of the Grand Jury

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

The following report is based upon information which has been developed by the Office of Attorney General (OAG) under Grand Jury Notice of Submission 31 in conjunction with the efforts of the 37th Statewide Investigating Grand Jury and its inherent powers. In issuing this report the Grand Jury reviewed over 200 Grand Jury exhibits, took witness testimony and generated thousands of pages of Grand Jury testimony transcripts.

The investigation was initiated following a referral by the District Attorney of Cambria County, Kelly Callihan, to the OAG. Callihan had spoken about the related "Baker investigation" involving Bishop McCort Catholic High School on various occasions throughout 2013; the matter was referred in total to the OAG in early 2014. The initial concerns regarded a failure to report child abuse or related issues within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown, the Johnstown Police Department, and the Bishop McCort Catholic High School. In April 2014 this matter was accepted by the 37th Statewide Investigating Grand Jury for investigation.

This report contains the findings of the Grand Jury as they relate to the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. These findings are both staggering and sobering. Over many years hundreds of children have fallen victim to child predators wrapped in the authority and integrity of an honorable faith. As wolves disguised as the shepherds themselves – these men stole the innocence of children by sexually preying upon the most innocent and vulnerable members of our society and of the Catholic faith.

If these discoveries were not dreadful enough, this Grand Jury further found that the actions of Bishops James Hogan and Joseph Adamec failed to protect children entrusted to their care and guidance. Worse yet, these men took actions that further endangered children as they placed their desire to avoid public scandal over the wellbeing of innocent children. Priests were returned to ministry with full knowledge they were child predators.

This is not an indictment of the Catholic religion or the Catholic Church. Many who testified and spoke out regarding the horror of this abominable malfeasance are devout Catholics; as are members of this Grand Jury and OAG investigative personnel.

This is a finding of fact and an effort at transparency – not to slander a religion but to expose the truth about the men who hijacked it for their own grotesque desires.

A. An Overview of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown

As of July 31, 2015, the public website of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown stated the following information as it pertains to the history of that institution:

"The Diocese of Altoona was established in 1901, with the Most Reverend Eugene A. Garvey as the first Bishop. It was renamed the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown in 1957. Eight counties comprise the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown -- Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Centre, Clinton, Fulton, Huntingdon and Somerset. The Diocese is divided into eight Deaneries, or geographic administrative units. As of 2010, the total Catholic population of the eight-county area was 94,284.

The Church of Altoona-Johnstown is home to 89 parishes, 74 active Diocesan priests and 36 permanent deacons. Two men are enrolled in seminaries in preparation for Ordination to the Diocesan Priesthood. The Diocese is further served by priests from various Religious orders, including the Third Order Regular Franciscans, the Conventual Franciscans, and the Order of Saint Benedict.

Communities of nuns and sisters have served locally since 1848, and today engage in a variety of ministries including Catholic education, healthcare, social services and contemplative lives of prayer.

There are two Cathedrals in the Diocese -- the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament in Altoona and Saint John Gualbert Cathedral in Johnstown -- as well as the Basilica of Saint Michael the Archangel in Loretto, which Pope John Paul II named a Minor Basilica in 1996. Additionally, the Diocese has three shrines -- the Prince Gallitzin Chapel House/Our Lady of the Alleghenies Shrine in Loretto, Saint Joseph Mission Church at Hart's Sleeping Place in Carrolltown, and Immaculate Conception Shrine in Bitumen.

Since its establishment in 1901, eight Bishops have led the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. The current Bishop, the Most Reverend Mark L. Bartchak, was ordained a Bishop on April 19, 2011, at the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament in Altoona, and installed as the eighth Bishop of the Diocese on that day.

The Diocesan Administration Center, located in Hollidaysburg, serves as the administrative offices to the Bishop and the majority of his staff. The Diocese also has a Vocations Office at the Prince Gallitzin Chapel House in Loretto; Catholic Charities offices in Altoona, Johnstown and Bellefonte; and a Family Life office in Lilly.

The Church of Altoona-Johnstown boasts a proud education tradition with 20 Catholic elementary schools and three independent Catholic high schools. A fourth high school is scheduled to open in State College in Fall 2011. Enrollment in the elementary schools for the 2010-2011 academic year is 2,978. There are 963 students enrolled in the three high schools this year. Religious Education programs at each parish serve approximately 9,800 students not enrolled in Catholic schools. There are two Catholic colleges/universities located in the Diocese and Diocesan-sponsored Catholic Campus Ministry at all colleges/universities in the Diocese."

B. The Luddy Scandal

Public scrutiny has fallen upon the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown before. The Diocese found itself at the center of a child abuse scandal in the 1990's involving Diocesan Priest Francis Luddy. The press coverage of litigation surrounding allegations that Father Francis Luddy had molested children within the Diocese was relatively thorough. This coverage lasted past the trial and continued to appear in local papers into the 2000's. While there are many examples of press coverage of this very public ordeal, the following example by Susan Evans of the Tribune-Democrat, February 24, 2003, is representative of the type of investigative journalism that uncovered many alarming details buried within the Luddy litigation. Evans wrote in part:

"A conspiracy of silence has deep roots in the Altoona-Johnstown Roman Catholic Diocese, and in church law itself, where "secret archives" are used to hide scandalous information, such as sex abuse by priests. And until recently, the conspiracy of silence often was aided and abetted by police and judges, who wanted the diocese to handle its problems internally. Locally, a mid-1990s lawsuit against the diocese and since-defrocked Francis Luddy, accused of sexually abusing young boys, saw the first cracks in the church's wall of silence. Nationally, the sex scandal that started in Boston and spread from coast to coast, has torn down that wall of silence. Now, everyone's talking, either in court or in the court of public opinion.

But in the eight-county Altoona-Johnstown diocese, during the past several decades, errant priests were kept secret from their parishioners, often with police and even a few judges helping out. Records gathered for the Luddy trial in 1994, and only being made public in light of the national scandal, along with publicity about church Roman canon law, tell the story. Documents have been withheld because they are believed to be protected under centuries-old religious doctrine, said the attorney who sued the diocese in the Luddy case. Priests accused of sexual misconduct have been counseled to "lay low" and have been tipped off to police surveillance, court records show. And in at least one case, a priest wasn't sent for psychiatric treatment because diocese officials feared it would be an admission of guilt, court records say."

In that February 24, 2003, article Evans interviewed Richard Serbin, Esq. Serbin, an Altoona attorney, has made a career of litigation allegations of child abuse within the Catholic Church. Serbin's website is entitled "www.childsexabuseattorney.com" and details his litigation in that area. In the aforementioned interview with Tribune-Democrat, Serbin discussed the "secret archives" of the Diocese which became central to the Luddy Litigation stating:

Canon law mandates "a secret archive" in each diocese, Serbin wrote. "Each year documents of criminal cases concerning moral matters are to be destroyed whenever the guilty parties have died, or 10 years have elapsed since a condemnatory sentence concluded the affair," Canon law says. Only the bishop is to have the key to the secret archive, says Canon 490. Serbin said documents also are often written in a sort of secret code. For example, the words 'sodomized, sexually molested and pedophilia' will not appear. Instead, you will probably see 'certain indiscretions, familiarities, complaints, etc.," [Serbin} wrote."

While press accounts covered portions of the history of sexual child abuse, the Grand Jury was able to obtain a larger and clearer understanding of both the unpursued criminal activity and cover-up by members of the Diocese.

C. Uncovering the Documents

In the Catholic Church, Canon law is the system of laws and legal principles made and enforced by the Church's hierarchical authorities to regulate its external organization and government and to order and direct the activities of Catholics toward the mission of the Church. The Grand Jury had a reasonable basis to believe that information relevant to this investigation would be maintained due to provisions of Canon Law which direct the maintenance of sensitive records as follows, in part:

"Can. 486 §1. All documents which regard the diocese or parishes must be protected with the greatest care.

Can. 486 §2. In every curia there is to be erected in a safe place a diocesan archive, or record storage area, in which instruments and written documents which pertain to the spiritual and temporal affairs of the diocese are to be safeguarded after being properly filled and diligently secured.

Can. 486 §3. An inventory, or catalog, of the documents which are contained in the archive is to be kept with a brief synopsis of each written document.

Can. 487 §1. The archive must be locked and only the bishop and chancellor are to have its key. No one is permitted to enter except with the permission either of the bishop or of

both the moderator of the curia and the chancellor.

Can. 489 §1. In the diocesan curia there is also to be a secret archive, or at least in the common archive there is to be a safe or cabinet, completely closed and locked, which cannot be removed; in it documents to be kept secret are to be protected most securely.

Can. 489 §2. Each year documents of criminal cases in matters of morals, in which the accused parties have died or ten years have elapsed from the condemnatory sentence, are to be destroyed. A brief summary of what occurred along with the text of the definitive sentence is to be retained.

Can. 490 §1. Only the bishop is to have the key to the secret archive.

490 §3. Documents are not to be removed from the secret archive or safe."

Because of The Code of Canon Law and information obtained through Grand Jury testimony, investigators believed the Roman Catholic Diocese of Altoona–Johnstown, located at 927 S Logan Blvd., Altoona, PA contained the diocesan archive and the secret archive. A search warrant was executed by the Office of Attorney General on August 7, 2015.

D. The Files of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown

In the administrative office of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown, across from the Bishop's Office was an unmarked door containing multiple filing cabinets and boxes. This unmarked door was between the large reverent portraits of Bishop James Hogan and Bishop Joseph Adamec. Some of the filing cabinets were marked "Priests Personal", "Deceased Clergy", "Priests who left the Clergy" and "Confidential Litigation Files". Some of the boxes were marked "Luddy Litigation" and "To Be Opened Only by the Bishop or Secretary of Temporalities".

Inside the filing cabinet marked "Confidential Litigation Files", Special Agents found files for Priests who were accused of sexual misconduct. The filing cabinet held four drawers, all four drawers had files. The "Secret Archive" was a safe contained in a cabinet in the Bishop's Office. This safe was under lock in which only the Bishop had the key. This safe contained one file pertaining to a Franciscan Friar, Brother Stephen Baker.

Another room contained a filing cabinet marked "Confidential Litigation Files". This filing cabinet was also four drawers and contained files labeled by the victim's

names. As Special Agents of the Office of Attorney General stood inside an organization devoted to the tenets of scripture and morality, they found themselves surrounded with evidence of an institutional crisis of child sexual abuse. Agents did not find a couple files in a drawer which alleged child molestation, but rather boxes and filing cabinets filled with the details of children being sexually violated by the institution's own members.

Numerous boxes of documents and items were removed from the administrative offices (Buildings A, B &C) of the Diocese. This includes two 4-drawer filing cabinets marked "Confidential Litigation Files". Approximately 115,042 documents were removed from the Diocese. This total does not include the electronic data seized pursuant to the warrants.

Within these documents were the hand written memoranda of Bishop James Hogan; letters and documents of Bishop Joseph Adamec; numerous sexual abuse victim statements; letters from sexual abuse victims; correspondence with offending priests and internal correspondence.

The Grand Jury notes that this physical material is almost entirely related to the individuals named in this report. The Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown was in possession of a massive amount of data detailing a dark and disturbing history. That history of child sexual abuse and the attempt to conceal that abuse from the public is detailed in this report.

SECTION II

EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE OF CHILDREN BY DIOCESAN PRIESTS

The Grand Jury was able to document child sexual abuse by at least 50 different priests or religious leaders within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. The evidence also demonstrated that hundreds of children have been victimized by religious leaders operating within the Diocese; and that the mere presence of these child predators endangered thousands of children by exposure to potential sexual abuse. Predator after predator came before the Grand Jury. Each indicated that it was the first time any law enforcement official had questioned them.

The nature of this child sexual abuse took on many forms. Children reported having their genitals fondled; being forced to participate in, watch, or permit masturbation; being forced to perform or receive oral sex on and/or from priests, and being anally raped. In addition to this vile criminal behavior, the Grand Jury saw evidence of both alcohol and pornography being provided to children by Catholic priests.

Bishops James Hogan and Joseph Adamec could have reported these matters to the police. Those same Bishops could have removed these child molesting priests from any and all ministry. Hogan and Adamec could have encouraged the fellow priests of these child molesters to report what they saw or heard of this sexual behavior involving children. The Bishops did nothing of the sort. Instead Bishop James Hogan and Bishop Joseph Adamec chose to shield the institution and themselves from "scandal". Because of their choices and failed leadership hundreds of children suffered.

The Grand Jury has learned that euphemisms like "sick leave" and "nervous exhaustion" were code for moving offending priests to another location while possible attention to a recent claim of child molestation "cooled off". Diocese approved treatment centers like Saint Luke's Institute in Maryland or Saint John Vianney Center in Downingtown, Pennsylvania were used to provide cover for the Bishops as they left child predators in ministry. Reliant entirely on the cooperation and self-reporting of the sexual offender, these "treatment" facilities would often note that they had not diagnosed the offender as a "pedophile". But when dealing with the safety of children, this language matters. The accused priest had not been *cleared* of being a child predator. A simplistic

diagnosis had been offered that insufficient evidence existed to say that the accused was a sex offender; which was based almost entirely upon the self-reporting of the accused. Hiding behind that tissue thin layer of justification, the Bishops returned these monsters to ministry.

Testimony before the Grand Jury has identified the following priests as individuals who are alleged to have engaged in sexually abusive acts with children:

NAME:	Msgr. Francis Ackerson
DATE OF BIRTH:	December 17, 1918
DATE OF DEATH:	August 11, 2002
ORDINATION:	May 25, 1946

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1946-09/1949	St. Patrick's Church, Newry, PA
09/1949-06/1961	St. John's and St. Mary's Church, Cresson, PA
06/1961-07/1970	Holy Trinity Church, Huntingdon, PA
07/1970-11/1972	Society for the Propagation of Faith, Chapel House, Loretto, PA
11/1972-01/1980	Immaculate Conception, Johnstown, PA
01/1980-09/1983	Most Holy Trinity, Huntingdon, PA
09/1983-10/1986	St. Joseph's Church, Williamsburg, PA
07/1994 - Unknown	Senior Priest status
1996 - Unknown	St. Michael's Church, Loretto, PA

Monsignor Francis Ackerson is alleged to have victimized a 15-year-old boy between 1955 and 1956. Ackerson engaged in oral and anal sex with the child at the St. Mary's Orphanage Building in Cresson, Pennsylvania. At that time, Ackerson was a parish priest at St. John's and St. Mary's Church, in Cresson, Pennsylvania.

The victim recalled an occasion where Monsignor Ackerson came into his room and got into the victim's bed claiming he had given his own bed to a weary traveler. Once in bed with the boy, Ackerson began to play with the child's penis. Ackerson then took the child's hand and forced him to touch Ackerson's penis. Monsignor Ackerson then performed oral sex on the 15-year-old boy.

The child refused to continue to have contact with Ackerson, but under pressure from his parents and Ackerson, he returned to the orphanage where Ackerson was to help teach him a trade. The boy locked his door which agitated Ackerson who entered the room anyway. Ackerson molested the child again and attempted to anally rape the boy until the boy threated to call the orphanage housekeeper.

Struggling with the events and whether he should pursue a desire to become a monk the child reported these events to another priest, Father Jerome Pacello. Pacello told the boy "pray and go be a good monk, and not think of it again." Deeply conflicted, the victim was extremely upset and reported the incident to his parents who reported Ackerson's actions to Bishop Richard Guilfoyle. Guilfoyle was the Bishop of the

Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown from 1936 to 1957. The parents indicated they never received a response from Bishop Guilfoyle.

The life of this young victim was thrown into turmoil because of the actions of Francis Ackerson. He struggled to maintain relationships, had great difficulty trusting people, and contemplated suicide. Meanwhile, Ackerson continued in ministry as a priest in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown for decades.

NAME:	Fr. David Arsenault
DATE OF BIRTH:	March 31, 1945
STATUS:	Pastor, Most Holy Trinity Church
ORDINATION:	May 23, 1981

ASSIGNMENTS:

1981-1984	St. Joseph's Church, Renovo, PA
1984-1994	Most Holy Trinity Church, Huntingdon, PA
1994-1996	Penn State Catholic Community
1996-2000	Holy Cross Church (Spangler) and St. Jude Church (Bakerton)
2000-2005	unknown assignment
2005-present	Most Holy Trinity Church, Huntingdon, PA

Father David Arsenault was a priest at St. Joseph's Church in Renovo, Pennsylvania. Arsenault became interested in the athletic program of a local high school. Arsenault became the team chaplain, attended all the games, and "hung-out" with the boys in the boys' locker room. At the urging of his parents who believed that a priest would be a good influence, a 17-year-old boy began spending time with Arsenault. Arsenault insisted on counseling twice a week at the church rectory.

Counseling sessions would start with "wrestling" which turned into massages. Arsenault placed his hands on the boy's legs and thighs. On at least one occasion Arsenault attempted to grab the boy's penis. The boy learned to dissuade the priest by holding his legs together closely.

Shortly after turning 18 the victim went on a trip to Washington D.C. with Arsenault. The victim awoke after falling asleep to find Arsenault grinding his penis into the victim and kissing him. The victim forced him out of the room but remained awake all night in case Arsenault returned.

On the ride back from Washington D.C. the victim asked Father Arsenault why he did it. Arsenault told the victim he was gay and that 80% of Catholic priests are gay. The victim attempted to go on with life, twice attempting suicide. When questioned by Diocesan officials in 2005 Arsenault admitted he had engaged in "horseplay" with the boy. Father David Arsenault remains in ministry to this day.

On January 12, 2015, Father Arsenault invoked his rights against self-incrimination when asked how long he had been a priest in the Diocese.

NAME:	Fr. Joseph Bender
DATE OF BIRTH:	December 29, 1929
DATE OF DEATH:	August 7, 2000
ORDINATION:	May 25, 1957

ASSIGNMENTS:

05/1957-04/1958	St. Joseph's Church, Revono, PA
04/1958-06/1958	St. Columba's Church, Johnstown, PA
06/1958-08/1962	Cathedral of Blessed Sacrament, Altoona, PA
08/1962-11/1962	St. Andrew's Church, Johnstown, PA
11/1962-11/1968	St. Joseph's Church, Revono, PA
11/1968-06/1992	Immaculate Conception, Dudley, PA
06/1992	Retired "health difficulties" and "physical problems"

The Grand Jury has concluded that Father Joseph Bender was a serial child predator actively offending on children throughout the majority of his ministry within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. Bender paid particularly close attention to a group of boys he favored. Other children referred to these boys as "Benderites". The age range of Bender's victims spanned from 8 to 13 years of age.

Many of Bender's victims report being encouraged by their parents to spend time with Bender in the hopes that they would choose the vocation of priest. Other parents took pride in the fact that a priest was taking an interest in the wellbeing of their child. To the children themselves, the adoration of the priest by their parents as well as the priest's divine authority left the children with the impression that the actions of the priest were inherently good and well-meaning.

Bender would take the boys on trips to include a cabin in Renovo, Pennsylvania. Bender was also active in camp activities through the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament in Altoona, Pennsylvania. The boys were sexually abused almost constantly at any location at which Bender could have access to a child. One victim reported being kissed on the lips at the Cathedral and touched. Another victim reported that Bender ejaculated on the child after fondling the child's genitals and anus. Yet another victim reported being molested while in bed on a trip with Bender. Victims often reported Bender making their bodies have contact with his erect penis.

Bender would lash out in anger when the children rebuffed his advances. In a particular incident Bender grabbed a boy by the neck and asked "don't you love me anymore" when the child insisted on wearing underwear to bed. Bender took issue with the insistence on dignity as he directed the boys to sleep without underwear when they were on trips with him. Bender would also kiss the boys and chastise them if they did not give him a "proper" kiss. A proper kiss was on the lips according to Father Bender.

The victims all describe similar difficulties after the abuse: struggles to maintain their faith; drifting away from the church; inability to trust authorities; the challenge after being Bender's victim wasn't to attempt to live well, but to simply attempt to live. One victim, now over 50-years-old, stated that his life "became a living hell."

Father Joseph Bender was accused by an anonymous letter in 1991 for sex offenses against a child in the 1970's. The letter was addressed to Bishop Joseph Adamec. The letter stated in part:

"All of us were altar boys, and spent a considerable amount of time at Father Bender's cottage located in Cypher, PA. We also went on vacations to the west coast for a month every summer, in which I attended two. I was his favorite young boy in our group. While on weekend visits, Father Bender would treat me as a lover. He would seduce me with various forms of hugging and kissing, with sexual overtones. Being a small child I was helpless to resist this man. As night time came, he would take me to his bedroom and egage in numerous forms of sexual acts. These pedophilic acts included fondling, fore-play, masturbation, and oral sex. He would continue with the sexual encounter until he reached an orgasm. Immediately following the sexual act, he would speak of guilt and admission of what he had done was wrong, and that I would never tell anyone, especially my parents. He is a very calculative and manipulative man with young boys. Because I respected his position, and feared the consequences of disobeying him, I would remain silent. I would estimate that I was abused approximately one hundred times."

The letter went on to note that it was being written upon the realization that Bender was continuing to have contact with young boys. The writer requested that Adamec stop Bender from hurting anymore children and noted his own struggle with his deep emotional scars. Adamec permitted Bender to resign his ministerial duties in 1992. The public reason that was given was ongoing health issues or physical problems. However Adamec had kept notes from Bender's October 1991 evaluation which showed the threat

level of sensitivity. This occurred from 1967-1968 while at a parish in Renovo, Pa. "I regretted it, however there was that very strong attraction." Essentially, the first lad involved was a 12-year-old boy dating back to 1967-1968. It is related that manual sexual activities of a manipulatory nature was the only type of activity involved in that first relationship.

Father Bender then assumed his position as a Pastor at Immaculate Conception Catholic Church, Dudley, Pa. At that parish, two additional male minors became involved. The patient had also come to fully realize his sexual orientation. With this awareness he found an adult intimate male friend who resided at a considerable distance away from the parish. Father Bender now realizes in retrospect that these sexual encounters are somewhat of an evolutionary process of his sexuality and identity

For approximately the past 10 years, there has been no involvement of any type regarding sexuality as Father Bender conveyed he has been impotent. As perhaps a note of irony, he became impotent during the adult homosexual encounter. He commented. "for at least 10 years I've tried to keep at arms length from any boys so I wouldn't be accused of anything. I realize how guilty I felt and know how they must have felt." He continued, "At times, I considered killing myself."

...Father Bender did demonstrate, what I feel is, a genuine remorse regarding this entire situation, with the total of three minors involved."

Father Bender had been in active ministry continually for 35 years, yet Bishop Joseph Adamec never contacted the police upon learning of the allegations or Bender's damning admission to sexually abusing children. The Grand Jury finds that there were more than "a total of three minors" who were sexually abused by Father Bender. That error appears to be just one of the many made in Bender's so-called "evaluation" or so our collective common sense leads us to believe. An inconvenient common sense Bishop Adamec conveniently ignored. Father Joseph Bender died retired but still a priest in 2000. His victims attempt to live on.

NAME: Fr. Peter Bodenschatz
DATE OF BIRTH: July 9, 1905
DATE OF DEATH: June 10, 1961
ORDINATION: June 10, 1933

ASSIGNMENTS: No documented record

"Don't cry. That's ok. What a sweet child you are." Father Peter Bodenschatz uttered those words to a crying 8th grader as he unzipped the boy's pants and fondled his penis. This child, an altar boy, had stayed after school one day a week to help count the children's Sunday school offertory collection. Throughout this and many other incidents of sexual child abuse, Bodenschatz exposed his penis and brutalized the fragile psyche of a little boy.

The victim reported the incident to Bishop Joseph Adamec in 2002. He explained the acts occurred when Bodenschatz was associated with St. Mary's Church in Nanty-Glo, Pennsylvania and within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. In his letter to Adamec the victim spoke of the fear of reporting based upon a belief that no one would believe a beloved priest would do such a thing to a child.

Though the sexual abuse occurred in 1940, the victim wrote with passion calling Bodenschatz an "evil man" and said:

"We in the Catholic Church are suffering dearly today for the mistakes of secrecy and errors in judgement that were made in the past to protect men who were not worthy of the priesthood."

The writer sought no relief or compensation in his letter to Bishop Adamec. He merely sought to inform the Bishop of his experience that "at least" one sexually predatory priest had been abusing the children of the Diocese. That letter was filed amongst the other numerous child predators once or currently in the Diocese under - Bodenschatz, Rev. Peter.

NAME:	Fr. Charles Bodziak
DATE OF BIRTH:	September 22, 1941
STATUS:	Pastor, St. Michael's Church
ORDINATION:	May 20, 1967

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1967-05/1969	St. Mary's Church, Nanty Glo, PA
05/1969-06/1971	St. Joseph's Church, Renovo, PA
06/1971-05/1973	St. Agnes Church, Lock Haven, PA
05/1973-06/1974	St. Leo's Church, Altoona, PA
05/1979- Unknown	St. Leo's Church, Altoona, PA
06/1995- Unknown	Christ the King and St. Stanislaus Kostka, Barnesboro, PA
06/1998- Unknown	Sacred Heart Church and St. John the Baptist, Central City
07/2001- Unknown	St. Agnes Church, Cassandra, PA and St. Bartholomew Church, Wilmore, PA
07/2010-present	St. Michael's Church, St. Michael, PA

In 2003, a victim reported that Father Charles Bodziak repeatedly engaged in sexual intercourse with her while she was a 16-year-old girl in foster care. The victim alleged that in 1971 while Bodziak was a parish priest in Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, he would pick her up in his car and take her to local places where teenagers "made out". She was removed from foster care and blamed for having a "love affair" with a priest.

NAME:	Fr. John Boyle
DATE OF BIRTH:	June 11, 1924
DATE OF DEATH:	December 14, 2011
ORDINATION:	May 26, 1956

ASSIGNMENTS:

05/1956-06/1958	Cathedral of Blessed Sacrament, Altoona, PA
06/1958-11/1962	St. Patrick's Church, Johnstown, PA Part time instructor at Johnstown High School
11/1962-06/1964	Immaculate Conception, Lock Haven, PA
06/1964-08/1964	Most Holy Trinity, Huntingdon, PA
08/1964-06/1965	St. Mark's Church, Altoona, PA
06/1965-01/1966	St. Joseph's Church, Portage, PA
01/1966-01/1969	Most Precious Blood, Emeigh, PA and Holy Incarnation, Marsteller, PA
*01/1969-11/1970	"Sick Leave"
11/1970-06/1971	St. Catherine's Church, Mt. Union, PA
06/1971-10/1971	St. Edward's Church, Barnesboro, PA
10/1971-10/1972	Corpus Christi, Dunlo, PA
10/1972-06/1995	St. Agnes Church, Beaverdale, PA
*02/03/1995 – 02/17/1995	Evaluation at treatment facility
06/95	"Retired"

On October 1, 1954, the Rev. Francis J. Sexton, Vice-Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Boston, wrote Bishop Richard T. Guilfoyle of the Diocese of Altoona the following:

"I am happy to enclose the letter of his Excellency, Archbishop Cushing, excardinating from the Archdiocese of Boston John J. Boyle. I shall be most grateful if Your Excellency will send to me the formal letter incardinating Mr. Boyle into the Diocese of Altoona. I pray that Mr. Boyle will give many years of fruitful service to the Diocese of Altoona."

With that letter the ministry of Father John Boyle began in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Between 1958 and 1960, Father John Boyle engaged in sexual child abuse of a 10 or 11-year-old boy. Boyle engaged in fondling the boy's genitals, masturbation, and oral intercourse with the child. The matter was not reported to the Diocese until 1992.

In 1969, Boyle was accused of sexually abusing another child, a 12-year-old boy. The nature and location of the crime are not recorded in diocesan records. The matter was reported to the Diocese and the Pennsylvania State Police by the boy's "irate" father.

was reported to the Diocese and the Pennsylvania State Police by the boy's "irate" father. In January 1969, Diocesan leadership noted the events which were occurring in handwritten memos found in the archives of the Diocese by Office of Attorney General investigators in 2015. The notes remark that while the victim's father was a "hill-billy", Boyle was "ill" and that the "boy's story is believed by all." Hogan notes indicate that it was believed there was "sufficient" evidence for charges. Bishop James Hogan further noted that he intended to point out to Father Boyle (coded as "Fr. B" in Diocesan records) that he "could move."

On February 25, 1970, a vague letter was dispatched to Father Boyle by Bishop James Hogan. That letter explains, in part, why charges were never filed:

"Mr. Bionaz, who remembers you well and fondly, points out that police superiors cannot be expected to regard the case with all the sensitive delicacy exercised by their Catholic investigating subordinates. Nor can he permit the issue to die with a vague promise of "we'll look into it and take care of it". Too many cases return to haunt them. The D.A. is disposed to do this: To withhold the filing of formal charges as well as a pressing for extradition. This, however, provided that I guarantee two things. First, that you not re-enter the area and that no parochial assignment be given to you until professionally recommended. Secondly, that you immediately place yourself in the care of a competent psychiatrist or hospital for the examination and treatment deemed to be indicated. You will appreciate that I had little room here for options. Mr. Bionaz, accordingly, was so assured."

Before concluding the letter, Bishop James Hogan notes "Your priestly life and effectiveness is my sole concern-as it is yours." Bishop James Hogan placed Father John Boyle on "sick leave" by his agreement and returned Boyle to ministry at St. Catherine's Church in Mount Union, Pennsylvania less than a year later.

In 1971, Father John Boyle groped the genitals of a 15-year-old boy in the basement of St. Edward's Church in Barnesboro, Pennsylvania on numerous occasions. Boyle also kissed the boy and performed oral sex on him. The boy was confused. He could taste the alcohol on Father Boyle's mouth. He concluded that what was happening to him must be what the Church called the "mystery of the Church and Priesthood."

Between 1973 and 1975 Father Boyle rendered another child unconscious by plying him with alcohol. After the child was unconscious, Boyle anally raped him. Boyle repeatedly raped the boy numerous times in the rectory of St. Agnes Church in Beaverdale, Pennsylvania between the boy's 14th and 16th birthdays.

In 1982 Father Boyle met a troubled 16-year-old boy and offered him a job at St. Agnes Church. One day Boyle took the boy to buy new clothes and asked him to come to the rectory to model them. The boy modeled the clothes for Boyle who gave the boy alcohol. The boy spent the night at Boyle's request. While the boy was asleep Boyle came into his room and began to molest his genitals. Then Boyle forced the boy to perform oral sex. The sexual abuse continued for approximately one year and evolved to include anal intercourse. During that time the boy recalled being given lavish gifts to include a 1981 Toyota Celica GT. Boyle played the Alabama song "When we make love" on trips with the boy and told him "this is our song." As a man over 40, the victim looked back on the boy that went to Father John Boyle for help and concluded his situation only got worse because of Father Boyle.

Joseph Adamec, the Bishop of the Diocese in 1992, finally acted on the 1992 complaint as well as additional complaints by sending Boyle to "treatment" in 1995. Boyle was permitted to retire in 1995. Father John Boyle died a Roman Catholic priest in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown.

NAME:	Fr. James Bunn
DATE OF BIRTH:	September 30, 1938
STATUS:	Retired
ORDINATION:	May 23, 1964

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1964-06/1965	St. Andrew's Church, Johnstown, PA
06/1965-06/1967	Sacred Heart Church, Altoona, PA
06/1967-05/1976	Asst. Principal Bishop McCort High School St. Clement Church, Johnstown
12/1977-07/1978	Acting Principal Bishop McCort High School
07/1978-08/1984	Principal Bishop McCort High School
08/1984-06/1995	Saints Philip & James Church, Meyersdale, PA
*03/1988	Psychiatric evaluation
06/1990-04/1992	Seven Dolors Church, Clearville, PA
06/1995-05/2002	Saint Joan of Arc and St. Thomas Aquinas, Ashville, PA
*1997	Guest House treatment facility
05/15/2002	Retired

Father James Bunn engaged in sexual intercourse with a child on multiple occasions during a six month to one year period between the child's 10th and 13th birthdays. Bunn befriended the child's family as their Parish Priest at St. Andrew's Church in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. Bunn would return to visit the victim's family after his transfer to Sacred Heart in Altoona, Pennsylvania. The family remarked that Bunn was "always in the company of a different boy."

Bunn's victim was sodomized on numerous occasions when Bunn would stay with the victim's family and often while consuming alcohol. The entire family deeply trusted their priest, James Bunn. The stress of Bunn's victimization of their family was crushing. The victim's father found himself dealing with intense feelings of anger and violence. The victim's mother was treated with medication. The victim himself began to struggle with his faith and abandoned hopes of being a priest.

The victim's parents addressed the violation of the child with Bishop James Hogan in March 1982. The family did not seek any kind of compensation for what had occurred, only to speak to the Bishop of their pain and ask that Bunn not be permitted to have contact with children. The victim wrote the Bishop on January 23, 1982. The victim explained in detail that Father Bunn showed him how to give a "blow job" and explained his first sexual encounter was with Father Bunn. The victim stated "He's a

very sick man and needs professional help. I feel very sorry for him. I just can't imagine taking a kid in grade school to bed with me especially knowing the permanent damage that is being done." Bishop James Hogan gave the family and the victim assurances that he would take care of the matter.

The family again approached the Bishop in 1984 with concerns noting that Bunn had been made Principal of Bishop McCort Catholic High School. The family brought a family friend with them to their meeting, Cambria County Judge Caram Abood. The family hoped that the Bishop could be persuaded to keep his promise and remove Bunn from ministry. The family complained that Bunn and Father Martin McCamley had continued to correspond with their son suggesting he should enter the priesthood because he was of the same sexual "orientation" as Bunn and McCamley. Bishop James Hogan removed Bunn as principal of McCort and assigned Father Bunn to continue in ministry as a parish priest at Saints Philip & James Church in Meyersdale, Pennsylvania.

The family sought action from Bishop Joseph Adamec shortly after he became Bishop of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. The Grand Jury has substantiated much of this evidence through the Diocese's own documents. One such document contained the notes of Bishop Joseph Adamec. Bishop Adamec met with Bunn on Friday, February 26, 1988 following the family's latest complaint to Adamec. Adamec recorded the following:

"I explained to him (Bunn) my receiving the file after our meeting at the Residence and the additional information that it contained. When asked why he did not share it with me on the 7th of January but actually stated that he had no involvement with any minors, he stated that it was his impression that Bishop Hogan considered the case closed and, so, he did not think it necessary to mention. He again denied the allegations and somewhat blamed the mother on being possessive and not wanting to share friends, implying that she somehow was getting back at him. He also said that the son, (REDACTED), was somewhat effeminate and could easily misunderstand certain actions. Likewise, he denied the comment to (REDACTED) that it was alright to enter the seminary and study to be a priest since his orientation was not different from his (Bunn). Father Bunn stated more than once that he (Bunn) has no problem of the nature we were discussing. When I kept asking him for answers and clarifications, Father Bunn asked if the matter involving the

allegations is still being pressed for action. I answered that it was. At that, his whole attitude changed, and he became silent. After my observing to him that very fact and asking why it apparently made a difference in his attitude, he answered by admitting that there was one incident at the (REDACTED) house when he stayed overnight with him in his bed. He attributed it to drinking and said that neither of them knew what was going on. I said that it would appear that (REDACTED) did since it continues to haunt him and he remembers it to this day. When asked if he has a drinking problem, he answered "no" but stated that he has a drink everyday, before and after the evening meal. Since he obviously was not willing to share the truth with me unless I pulled it out of him, I stated that it was difficult at this point to believe anything that he said. Father Bunn insisted that there were no incidents of involvement since in the past "20" years and that he does not have this kind of a problem."

Bunn was sent for an evaluation which did not clear Bunn for pedophilic tendencies but rather concluded Bunn, based upon his self-report, did not demonstrate such interests. Adamec returned James Bunn to further ministry within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown as a parish priest for over a decade until requiring him to seek additional treatment. The Grand Jury concludes this was yet more of the same. A priest had been identified as an admitted child predator, yet the Diocese simply shuffled the priest to another location with access to the children of the faithful and the public.

On March 17, 2015, Father James Bunn testified before the Grand Jury. Bunn's attorney sought 5th amendment protections from the Supervising Judge of the Grand Jury. Resultantly, Father Bunn secured a right to not discuss any details of the allegations made against him. However, Father Bunn, now retired, explained how his time in active ministry came to a close following an additional complaint lodged against him in 2001:

> *Mr. Dye: And then there's this complaint in 2001 where you're sent for an evaluation again?*
> *Fr. Bunn: Yeah.*
> *Mr. Dye: And then at that time that's whenever you're removed from public ministry in 2002. And that was when you retired?*
> *Fr. Bunn: Yeah, that's when it came – see, I retired. The Bishop suggested – that's when I went – In those days we were sent -- the Diocese had a practice. I was sent out to the Mayo Clinic for a health examination and so on and so forth. And the way the Bishop stated then before I went out there, he said simply that then when I retired – when I*

came back, he said, that will be the end of it and so on, just retire and so forth. And there was no public announcement made of this until the following year.
Mr. Dye: And the public announcement, do you recall what was said?
Fr. Bunn: No. It was just an announcement in the paper --
Mr. Dye: Okay.
Fr. Bunn: -- in the Johnstown Tribune, that I had been rem- -- I had retired on that basis; but my retirement actually had taken place the year before.

NAME:	Monsignor Harold J. Burkhardt
DATE OF BIRTH:	March 3, 1922
DATE OF DEATH:	March 18, 2000
ORDINATION:	June 1, 1947

ASSIGNMENTS:

1947-08/1971	Pontifical College Josephinum, OH
09/1971-05/1973	Holy Name Church, Ebensburg, PA
05/1973-06/1988	St. Mary Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA
06/1988	Resigned due to poor health
04/1989	Retired

While pastoring at St. Mary Immaculate Conception Church in Altoona, Pennsylvania, Father Harold Burkhardt perpetrated sexual child abuse on a 9-year-old boy. As an adult, the victim recalled being fondled through his clothes and being forced to suck Burkhardt's penis. On subsequent occurrences Burkhardt would pull down the victim's pants and insert a finger into his anus. Burkhardt asked the child a question, "What do you think God would say?" The victim didn't respond. Burkhardt filled the silence stating "God approved."

In 2005 this individual came forward and reported his victimization to the Diocese. The victim reported struggling with his psychological effects of his victimization, and was concerned that people would think he was "gay" or know he was "abused." The victim stated he denied being an abuse victim for years and even struggled with thinking that Burkhardt stopped abusing him because he stopped liking him.

The Grand Jury notes the absurdity of the so-called investigation into this matter. Bishop Adamec, the Diocese, and the Allegation Review Board responded to this report by hiring private detectives to investigate the victim. They sought the victim's school records. They interviewed Father William Rosensteel to obtain an opinion about the victim and his family. Rosensteel noted that the family didn't attend church often and that he couldn't imagine Monsignor Harold Burkhardt doing "anything like the allegation." Finally, they looked at Burkhardt's personnel file to see if there was any indication which would "support the allegation."

Though Burkhardt was dead at the time of the report, his alleged actions were clearly criminal. Rather than expose the conduct and embolden the silent victims of

abuse the Diocese chose to remain silent itself. The Grand Jury found, as was the case in most sexual child abuse reports involving priests in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown, Diocese officials did not report the matter to the police. Instead, the church engaged in secrecy and an assessment of civil liability. The investigation of the victim and the reliance on the opinion of another priest, one who was a child predator himself, is galling and offensive to reason. However, from 1940 to 2011 such conduct on the part of Diocesan officials occurred regularly.

NAME:	Fr. Thomas Carroll
DATE OF BIRTH:	May 15, 1945
DATE OF DEATH:	October 1, 1988
ORDINATION:	May 15, 1971

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1971-10/1972	St. John Gualbert Church, Johnstown, PA
10/1972-12/1972	St. Joseph's Church, Revono, PA
01/1973-09/1973	St. Augustine Church, St. Augustine, PA
09/1973-09/1973	St. Boniface Church
12/1973-08/1974	St. Therese Church, Altoona, PA Altoona Hospital, Altoona, PA
08/1974-02/1975	Garvey Manor, Hollidaysburg, PA
02/1975-06/1975	Our Lady of Mercy Church, Johnstown; Mercy Memorial and Lee Hospitals, Johnstown
06/1975-08/1988	St. Barnabas Church, Johnstown, PA
08/1988	Medical Leave

In 1971, Father Thomas Carroll used alcohol to render a 12 to 13 year old boy compliant to his will. Carroll fondled the boy and anally raped him. The assault occurred after Carroll ingratiated himself to the family as a priest serving St. John Gaulbert Church in Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

The victim was a good Catholic boy who was known for doing well in school and loved to serve Mass. After the incident the victim broke down. He failed in school and began to drink. His life collapsed around him as Carroll continued to minister within the Diocese.

In 1988 Bishop Joseph Adamec became aware of rumors that Carroll, then pastor of St. Barnabas Parish in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, was an "active homosexual, associates with young males, and has been seen in places frequented by gays." Adamec met with Carroll on Thursday, January 7, 1988. Carroll admitted to having a "homosexual affair" with a 17-year-old boy. Carroll promised to be more "prudent." Adamec noted he felt Carroll had "homosexual orientation" and suggested out-patient counseling. Carroll died later that year.

By 2004 Carroll's first known victim had worked valiantly to recover from his alcohol addiction, and reported his sexual abuse in 1971 to the Diocese. His only request of the Diocese was counseling to aid him in his recovery from the damage Carroll had inflicted.

40 years later, one of Carroll's fellow priests testified before the Grand Jury that it was common knowledge that Carroll was molesting children. Father Dan O'Neil appeared before the Grand Jury in July 2015 and explained that Carroll was known at the time as a "bad dude" who had a sexual interest in a young boy who worked in Carroll's parish. O'Neil indicated that the "priest network", defined as gossiping priests, spoke of his proclivity for sex with minors. O'Neil said Carroll was known to always be in the company of young boys.

The 1971 victim noted that Carroll was extremely close to his younger brother as well, but no one ever reported the assault out of fear of embarrassment in the community. The Grand Jury found this to be a common occurrence in such situations, for many of the reasons discussed later in this report by experts from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

NAME:	Fr. Martin Cingle
DATE OF BIRTH:	January 14, 1947
STATUS:	Suspended
ORDINATION:	May 5, 1973

ASSIGNMENTS:

05/1973-05/1978	Our Mother of Sorrows, Johnstown, PA
05/1978-06/1981	Our Lady of Victory, State College, PA
06/1981-02/1986	Holy Name Church, Ebensburg, PA
02/1986-04/1987	St. Mary Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA
04/1987-08/1988	Most Holy Redeemer, Revloc, PA
08/1988-06/1992	Saints Cyril & Methodius, Windber, PA
06/1992-04/1993	St. John the Evangelist, Altoona, PA
04/1993-0619/95	St. Matthew Church, Tyrone, PA
06/1995-07/2000	Visitation of the Blessed Virgin, Johnstown, PA
*07/24/2002	Saint Luke's Institute
07/2000-10/2015	St. Francis of Assisi, Johnstown, PA
10/2015	Removed from active ministry due to OAG investigation

In 1979, Martin Cingle groped the genitals of a child while sleeping next to the child on a cot in his underwear. Cingle stopped fondling the boy's penis when the boy awoke and struck him. Father Cingle met his 15-year-old victim when the boy served as an altar boy at Our Lady of Victory in State College, Pennsylvania. This child had felt a very close relationship to Father Cingle and looked to him as an older brother and trusted friend. Father Cingle's actions were a profound violation of that trust.

Years later, and after undergoing counseling, the victim met with Bishop Joseph Adamec on June 24, 2002. The victim explained what occurred to Bishop Adamec who vowed to take action.

Records from the Diocese show that on July 2, 2002, Bishop Joseph Adamec met with Father Cingle. The notes indicate that Cingle stated he could not remember any action that would cause the allegation but did remember traveling with the child and the child striking him. The Bishop sent Cingle to treatment which concluded on August 3, 2002 that "there is no evidence of psychopathology in the psychological data" but noted "repression is not a viable explanation for Father not remembering." The report also noted that nothing in "Father's history" which would be consistent with "attempting to initiate sexual relations with a man." Following "treatment" Father Martin Cingle returned to fulltime ministry within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown.

Bishop Adamec requested that the victim provide a written account of what had occurred to him. The matter was closed on June 24, 2003 when the victim did not provide the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown with a written statement that he was molested as a child by Father Martin Cingle, a Roman Catholic Priest in the Diocese of Altoona Johnstown.

On September 15, 2015 Martin Cingle was called by the Grand Jury to account for his actions. Cingle stated he was currently pastoring at two parishes and teaching at three worship centers in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. Cingle initially indicated he could not recall what occurred with that child back in 1979. The following exchange occurred:

Mr. Dye: Were you involved—the young man you were with at the time, do you recall his name?

Fr. Cingle: Yes.

Mr. Dye: What was his name?

Fr. Cingle: (REDACTED)

Mr. Dye: (REDACTED) was the young man, and this was approximately 1980?

Fr. Cingle: Yes.

Mr. Dye: And why were you sleeping in the same room again? Where were you at?

Fr. Cingle: We were out on the porch, screened-in porch area.

Mr. Dye: Of?

Fr. Cingle: Of his – I believe his aunt's house.

Mr. Dye: Why were you staying there with him?

Fr. Cingle: We were – we only spent one night there. Well, we were on vaca – he went on --- I took him on vacation to his relatives', to his grandmother and her great grandmother is what it was, and then for Mass.

Mr. Dye: Okay. Is it your habit to take 16-year-old boys on trips?

Fr. Cingle: No.

Mr. Dye: Why did you take this individual boy on a trip?

Fr. Cingle: Well, he asked and his mother said it was okay.

Mr. Dye: Is it your habit to sleep with a 16-year-old boys in briefs and a t-shirt or sleep near a 16-year-old boy in briefs and a t-shirt?

Fr. Cingle: Well, I didn't have no – we weren't—we were staying over his grandmother's. That's where my clothes were.

Mr. Dye: Okay.

Fr. Cingle: My pajamas and things like that.

Mr. Dye: This individual, you obviously had a positive relationship with him to offer, you know---

Fr. Cingle: Well, yeah, we did, yeah, you could say.

Mr. Dye: What was the nature of this relationship that you would take him on a trip? I mean, obviously there's some closeness there.

Fr. Cingle: Oh, we used to go hunting together. Fishing.

Mr. Dye: Okay.

Fr. Cingle: And go over his house, you know, watch—

Mr. Dye: This is somebody that you spent time with then?

Fr. Cingle: Yeah, I spent some time with him and his mom.

Mr. Dye: What would you watch? I guess you would watch television, I assume?

Fr. Cingle: Well, yeah, with his mother. H—well, they had HBO and so I guess way back then in the---

Mr. Dye: And whenever you would--- let me ask you this. Again, this sounds very positive. It sounds like even now this was a very positive relationship and you think fondly of this person?

Fr. Cingle: I don't have nothing against him, no.

Mr. Dye: Why would this person lie?

Fr. Cingle: I—I can't answer that question.

Mr. Dye: Why would this person say that they were touched if they weren't touched?

Fr. Cingle: I can't answer that question. I don't know.

Mr. Dye: In terms of the relationship after the allegation was made, did you stay in contact with this individual?

Fr. Cingle: Not really, no.

Mr. Dye: Is it "no" or "not really"?

Fr. Cingle: Well, no. I would say no, because I don't think he wanted anything to do with me.

Mr. Dye: Okay.

Fr. Cingle: Of course, he did stop to talk to me in the sacristy sometimes after Mass and talk to me, but that was it. I never went back to the house.

Mr. Dye: I mean, it sounds to me like at least from a 16-year-old boy's perspective he felt he had a positive relationship – that he had built a meaningful relationship with you of some kind.

Fr. Cingle: Yeah.

Mr. Dye: And so it there --- follow me here. If you can't think of any reason he would lie, it's a positive relationship of which this child is getting much benefit, you're taking him places, you're doing things with him, you're spending time with him, it would seem to me that what he alleged happened did happen. Would you disagree with me?

Fr. Cingle: I cannot disagree with you.

Mr. Dye: You cannot disagree with me. Because it did happen, correct?

Fr. Cingle: I don't remember.

Mr. Dye: Sir---

Fr. Cingle: I'm sorry. I'm serious.

Mr. Dye: Okay, let me finish my question. You are under oath?

Fr. Cingle: Yes.

Mr. Dye: You have counsel. (Present in the Grand Jury Chambers)

Fr. Cingle: Right.

Mr. Dye: This is many, many years ago.

Fr. Cingle: Right.

Mr. Dye: Perjury today is not many, many years ago.

Fr. Cingle: I know. I understand.

Mr. Dye: Perjury today is very chargeable.

Fr Cingle: Right.

Mr. Dye: So I want to be absolutely clear on this. I'm going to ask you with a chance to correct any misstatements you may have made thus far, did you touch this 16-year-old's genitals?

Fr. Cingle: If I did this way (indicating), yes, I did.

Father Cingle attempted to clarify by gesturing with his arm straight up into the air then curving back down.

The Grand Jury was appalled to hear Father Cingle's attempt obfuscate by saying that he could have accidentally fondled the penis of a 16-year-old boy while he was sleeping. The Grand Jury took note that throughout his testimony Cingle made it very clear he was lying on a cot in his underwear and a t-shirt three inches away from a 16-year-old boy in his underwear and a t-shirt. Cingle went on to clarify that he had explained this version of events to Bishop Adamec as he had to the Grand Jury.

That same day, Deputy Attorney General Daniel J. Dye dispatched a letter to the current Bishop of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown stating "Bishop, you are certainly aware of the nature of our ongoing investigation. Please remove Father Martin Cingle from active ministry. Father Cingle should not be in contact with minors." Bishop Bartchak acted upon that letter and suspended Cingle from ministry pending an investigation.

Bishop Joseph Adamec was asked if Father Cingle ever explained his version of events to the Bishop. The Grand Jury notes that Adamec stated that Cingle had told him it was somehow an "accidental" fondling of a minor. Adamec made the exact same gesture to demonstrate for the agents as Cingle had made when testifying before the Grand Jury.

The Grand Jury concludes that Cingle's clearly incriminating statement to Adamec that he had accidentally fondled a partially undressed child, whom he was sleeping next to while partially undressed himself, warranted Cingle's removal at that time. The Grand Jury is left to wonder why the account that both Adamec and Cingle recalled does not appear in diocesan records. Moreover, why Cingle was left in ministry until the current Bishop responded to the Deputy Attorney General's request. We must conclude this is yet another example of the Bishop's reliance on self-reporting to treatment centers which render conclusions upon a paucity of evidence and a desire to

avoid scandalizing the Diocese on his watch. Bishop Joseph Adamec never reported Cingle's conduct or his admission to law enforcement.

NAME:	Fr. Dennis Coleman
DATE OF BIRTH:	April 17, 1944
DATE OF DEATH:	March 12, 2014
ORDINATION:	May 16, 1970

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1970-08/1972	St. Patrick's Church, Gallitzin, PA
08/1972-05/1975	St. Mark's Church, Altoona, PA
05/1975-08/1979	St. John's Church, Bellefonte, PA
08/1979-05/1982	Sacred Heart, Johnstown, PA
05/1982-01/1986	St. Benedict Church, Johnstown, PA
*01/1986	Saint Luke's Institute for evaluation
02/1986-08/1986	"Fr. Coleman suffering nervous problem"
09/1986-07/1987	Sisters of Sacred Heart, Cresson, PA
07/1987	Suspended

On August 23, 1979 the parents of a 10-year-old little boy met with Bishop James Hogan. The parents explained that they had noticed a change in their child over the past 6 to 8 months. His parents said he seemed tense and anxious. The parents recounted that their son had told a teacher at St. John's school that he "thought Father Coleman was gay." Coleman was a priest at St. John's Church in Bellefonte, Pennsylvania. Hogan noted in the "Secret Archives" of the Church that "The parents, on the other hand, were upset in going over (REDACTED) story. Distressed over emotional repercussions, involvement with others, possible scandal, Father's future. Persuaded of illness."

Bishop Hogan met with the 10-year-old himself. The boy recounted that Father Coleman practiced "hypnosis" and would invite little boys to spend the night at the rectory. Coleman would sneak into the room and sniff their feet. Hogan noted that Coleman would also rub his "membrum virile" on the boy's feet. The Grand Jury notes that Hogan's use of Latin did not change the fact that Coleman, a diocesan priest, was rubbing his penis on the feet of little boys. On other occasions Coleman asked to take pictures of the child in his underwear.

After initially wondering whether or not the victim was confused about the definition of the word "gay", Hogan concluded the victim was "quite normal, and likable – given to sports." Hogan records indicate that a discussion was had with the parents and their reference to it possibly being a "criminal offense" but that he felt the parents

recognized the "weak human element." Hogan's memo to the "Secret Archive" concludes:

I informed the parents I would immediately check the story for Fr's (Coleman) reaction. My own reaction will depend. If help is indicated, my job is to .... Assured that they did the right thing in coming, and that the matter will be dealt with appropriately. Mr. & Mrs. seemed much relieved – and said so. Expressed gratitude for my listening, assurances, etc. James J. Hogan, August 23, 1979

In a follow-up memo the next day, Hogan recounts an interview with Coleman where Hogan and Coleman question the mental competency of the victim. Wondering if it was a "dream" or a "bizarre imagination" the Bishop gave Father Coleman four steps to complete:

1. *Keep kids out of the rectory.*
2. *No more trifling with hypnotism.*
3. *Discuss with parents my intervention and his story. If not satisfactory, bring (victim) into discussion. Does boy need help?*
4. *Get back to me re result of discussion. Fr. C (Coleman) is aware of fact that if things go badly a transfer may be necessary.*

Coleman returned to ministry at St. John's much to the horror of the victims' parents. In the face of outcry and risking "scandal" Hogan transferred Father Coleman to Sacred Heart in Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

Within a year of being reassigned to Sacred Heart Father Dennis Coleman invited a 12 to 13-year-old student of the Sacred Heart School into the rectory to "hypnotize" him. Coleman took the boys feet and used them to rub his exposed genitals. Coleman continued to meet with the boy 2 to 3 times a month for these sessions for a period of two years until the child finished the 8th grade.

In 1982 Coleman was moved to St. Benedict Church in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. While there Coleman molested at least three 13-year-old boys. Father Coleman would take boys camping and attempt to "hypnotize" them. Coleman would enter the boys' room at night and take the boys' feet and rub them on his exposed genitals. At least one of the children became extremely distraught during an assault and demanded to return home. Coleman kept the boy for hours until finally relenting and taking the boy home at 4:00 A.M. The child immediately disclosed the abuse to his parents. That child suffered

extreme emotional distress and spent many years suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

In 1986 Bishop Hogan was forced to face the reality that he could no longer hide Coleman's conduct. Coleman was unresponsive to Hogan's usual attempts to keep things quiet and avoid "scandal." Coleman began to resist additional transfers and objected to "treatment." Hogan found himself faced with a rare challenge, a priest that wouldn't help him keep his terrible secret.

The Grand Jury found that Hogan's 1979 memo from the "Secret Archive" was altered on May 1, 1986, by Bishop Hogan. Hogan added the following:

"In retrospect, though I accepted Fr.C's story and did actually transfer him to Sacred Heart Parish, Altoona on September 1, 1979, (incidentally, as correspondence indicates the social worker in Johnstown accepted Fr's story as well). No further adverse information to my knowledge while at Sacred Heart. Since Fr. C preferred Johnstown and a need arose, he was transferred to St. Benedict's, Johnstown on May 22, 1982. In retrospect (forgive lapse in L.I), I should have directed professional evaluation and treatment indicated back in 1979. Later developments, in my opinion, cast suspicion on Fr. C's 1979 story. But, at that time, he seemed truthful. Nor was there the current climate. The present furor was action upon immediately with removal and institutional direction. J.J. Hogan"

At the time of this addendum, Hogan was engaged in a successful attempt to broker an agreement with Altoona Police to defuse the potential scandal of Father Leonard Inman's (referenced as L.I.) sexual child abuse of children. The Grand Jury has no doubt that Hogan's return to the archive was a poor attempt at revisionist history in the midst of being faced with the possibility of another explosive exposure of a priest raping children in the most magnificent Cathedral of the Diocese, the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament in Altoona, Pennsylvania. If Hogan believed this footnote would permit posterity to judge him more gently, he erred.

As the reigns of authority were passed from Bishop Hogan to Bishop Joseph Adamec a new arrangement was hatched. Coleman had been sent to the Sisters of Sacred Heart convent in Cresson, Pennsylvania as Chaplain. His refusal to comply with "treatment", in the face of damning evidence against him, was causing fractures in the usual process of self-reporting "treatment" followed by a designation which would protect the institution from scandal and permit the priest to continue in ministry. Adamec

was struggling to deal with the possibility of Coleman's conduct being exposed or continuing. On July 30, 1987, Adamec wrote Coleman stating:

"While the Diocese is in the process of trying to deal with the situation outside of civil court, you have been observed to continue associating with young men both in private and in public. This makes it appear that I, as Bishop, am not concerning over the harm that you have caused or can continue to cause. It also appears that you are insensitive to the hurts which you inflict on others as a result of your own needs and inclinations."

Adamac concluded that letter by suspending Coleman. However, Adamec made an attempt to insert Coleman into the public sphere of employment with the aid of the Cambria County President Judge. Coleman was granted the opportunity to work at the Cambria County Courthouse. Coleman himself ruined the gift Adamec had secured for him by boasting of his newfound status and bringing attention to his assignment. Joseph Kiniry wrote the Bishop on September 29, 1987 and explained that the reactions were becoming so strong that "devout Catholics" were now objecting and that it would be "a disaster for the Church, for the clergy in general, and for the Catholic population of the Courthouse and for the Ebensburg area in particular." Kiniry summarized:

"Unfortunately, "the best of plans of mice and men, etc" – I am writing to inform you that following our conversation on Sunday evening about the possibility of a position for Father Coleman at the Cambria County Courthouse, and my relating your expression of gratitude to Judge Joseph O'Kicki for his assistance, the bottom fell out Monday."

By July 1988, Coleman's continued refusal to submit to treatment forced the Bishop's hand. Coleman, more by his own actions than the Bishop's intent, was finally suspended and never returned to ministry. Neither Hogan or Adamec ever reported Coleman's conduct to law enforcement. He died in 2014.

NAME:	Fr. James B. Coveney
DATE OF BIRTH:	January 18, 1937
STATUS:	unknown
ORDINATION:	May 23, 1964

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1964-06/1968	St. John Gualbert Church, Johnstown, PA
06/1968-06/1971	St. Benedict's Church, Geistown, PA
06/1971-08/1972	Saints Cyril & Methodius Church, Windber, PA
08/1972- Unknown	St. Patrick Church, Gallitzin, PA
10/1985-08/1988	St. Joseph's Church, Portage, PA
08/1988- Unknown	Holy Family Church, Culver, PA; Board of Directors for Bishop Carroll High School
07/2000- Unknown	St. Mark's Church, Altoona and Penn State Altoona Campus
07/2011	Senior Priest

In 1986, Father James B. Coveney fondled the genitals of a 10 year old boy while serving as a parish priest at St. Joseph's Church in Portage, Pennsylvania. The matter was reported to Bishop Joseph Adamec and the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown in 1996. The events of the Diocese's 1996 investigation of this molestation are disturbing.

The victim came forward to report the matter in early 1996. Bishop Adamec, Monsignor George Flinn, Reverend Thomas Acklin, and Reverend Alan Thomas met with Father James Coveney at St. John Gualbert's parish rectory on May 14, 1996 at 8:30 P.M. Coveney denied the allegation and haggled over details stating that the victim alleged he was abused between 1984 and 1986, but Coveney wasn't in Portage in 1984. In the course of this meeting Coveney stated it was like *déjà vu* since he had been accused of molesting numerous boys in 1988 and addressed the matter with Bishop Joseph Adamec. Adamec acknowledged that there had "indeed" been previous allegations.

Coveney insisted that those involved in the inquiry go back and look at the reports of his psychiatrist when he was sent to treatment in 1988. Coveney was shocked at Adamec's response that he "doesn't keep those records. There's a lot of stuff I don't keep." Conveney was stunned, he asked again if the records were in his personnel file. Adamec replied "I don't know. No. I don't keep a lot of stuff." Coveney asked the Bishop again how such records could not be maintained and asked if they were, Bishop

Adamec again responded that they were not in his file and that he doesn't keep "those things."

Coveney was becoming increasingly frustrated. He had been accused of molesting numerous boys in 1988. Coveney was sent to treatment by Adamec and believed that he had been cleared of pedophilia. However, Coveney was now being questioned about molesting a boy in 1986, and yet the Bishop Adamec was denying knowledge of the details of the previous allegations which he had been personally involved in. Moreover, Adamec was claiming no paperwork had been maintained.

Father Thomas Acklin was at the May 1996 meeting and was also aware of the 1988 allegations. Coveney asked him if he recalled discussing the matter with him at a Shoney's restaurant. Acklin indicated he did. However, in March 1996, Acklin was now claiming difficulty in remembering the "treatment" involved in the prior allegations of sexual child abuse.

The 1988 allegations were nearly identical to the allegation being brought forward in 1996. Coveney fondled the genitals of approximately five 7th grade boys. The boys described Coveney's contact with their genitals as being "pulled" or "grabbed". The Diocese located a child who stated it had never happened to him, but he had seen it happen to other boys. Coveney would keep them late at the rectory or offend on them while they served at parish functions. The Grand Jury found these reports to be credible and corroborative. Father James Coveney was molesting the children of St. Joseph's parish in Portage, Pennsylvania. However, Bishop Joseph Adamec never notified the police. The Grand Jury further notes that the allegation reported in 1996 is consistent with the allegations made in 1988.

Coveney was dispatched for "treatment" approved by the diocese which, as usual, was based upon self-reporting and limited information to render a conclusion that based upon the information provided by Coveney he could continue in ministry. This useless "treatment" protocol was accepted by Adamec and Coveney returned to ministry following yet another allegation of molesting children. As in 1988, no one called the police.

The Grand Jury does not find Adamec's statements that he does not keep records shocking. The Grand Jury found significantly less records from Adamec's time as

Bishop than during the time of Bishop Hogan. But by that time Adamec was aware of the potential to be held accountable for the Diocese's shell-game of moving predatory priests. Adamec simply chose to avoid a paper trail. In the case of Father James Coveney, even the accused predator found this disturbing. The Grand Jury, on that single point, agrees with Father Coveney.

NAME:	Fr. William Crouse
DATE OF BIRTH:	December 26, 1930
DATE OF DEATH:	July 11, 2009
ORDINATION:	March 14, 1959

ASSIGNMENTS:

1959-1964	Comboni College, Ethiopia
1964-1965	St. Joseph's Church, Georgia
1965-1968	Sacred Heart Seminary, Ohio
1968-1970	Verona Feathers, NJ
1970-1971	Military Fort, Gordan, GA
1971-1972	Long Bingh, Vietnam
1972-1975	Fort Meade, MD
1975-1977	Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico
1977-1979	St. Mary's Church, Altoona, PA
1979-1980	St. John Evangelist Church, Bellefonte, PA
1980-1987	Chaplain at SCI Rockview
1987-2002	St. Kateri Tekak., Penns Valley
*07/2002	Therapist Evaluation
10/2002	medical retirement

Father William Crouse sodomized a 14-year-old boy while serving at the Verona Feathers of Mount Claire, New Jersey. The victim reported Crouse's sexual abuse of him to Bishop Joseph Adamec in 2002. The victim explained that he recalled lying on his stomach in pain and crying begging William Crouse to stop raping him. He recalled other times where Crouse would take him fishing and give him alcohol until he would pass out. The victim would awake with severe pain in his "bowels" and find blood in his stool. The victim also spoke of an additional incident where Crouse and another priest identified as "Father Ben" gave the boy alcohol. He awoke to both priests molesting him. The victim reported that he had suffered years of drug and alcohol abuse trying to deal with his rape as a child. In one of three letters located by the Office of Attorney General in Diocesan files, the victim wrote Bishop Joseph Adamec on July 10, 2002 and stated that the effect of Crouse's assaults left him "a daily drunk hiding my shame and that destroyed what happiness I could have had."

Adamec interviewed Crouse on July 23, 2002. Crouse stated he had engaged in an "inappropriate relationship" with the boy which he said would be called "child molestation" today. Crouse admitted he had been "worried about this for a long time" but minimized the conduct in therapy stating that the victim approached him and that

Crouse simply gave in and allowed it to happen. Crouse's therapist informed the Bishop that Crouse was neither a "homosexual nor pedophile" and that he was "not a danger to anyone." Among Adamec's recommendations to Crouse was that he try to find the victim and "apologize" to him. Crouse was to let Adamec know if he was successful. Father William Crouse retired following his "treatment." Crouse died in 2009. There is no record Adamec reported this matter to authorities or attempted to identify the other priest involved in the alleged assault.

NAME:	Fr. Mario Fabbri
DATE OF BIRTH:	May 19, 1902
DATE OF DEATH:	Unknown
ORDINATION:	February 2, 1931

ASSIGNMENTS:

1931-1932	San Francisco, teacher
1932-1934	Seminary teacher, Richwood, CA
1934-1935	Teacher in Tampa, FL
1936-1948	Italy
1948-1953	St. John Gualbert, Johnstown, PA
1953-1955	Our Mother of Sorrows, Johnstown, PA
1955	Italy (Last Known Location)

In 1950 Father Mario Fabbri took a 9th grade boy to a bed in the rectory of St. John Gaulbert parish in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. Fabbri start to pet the boy and tell him he loved him. Fabbri then anally raped the boy. Fabbri ingratiated himself to the boy's well-respected family and lavished gifts on his victim to maintain contact with his victim. However, the victim began to suffer from the trauma of his assault. As his grades fell he became more distanced from his parents. Fabbri took advantage of the fractured bond and told his parents to allow him to spend more time with the boy. Fabbri obtained the parents' permission to take the boy on a trip to Canada. He raped the boy in New York, Quebec and Montreal.

In 1999 the victim, now in his 70's, contacted the Diocese. The victim stated he gave up his Catholic faith and that the assaults had a profound impact on his life. After years of therapy the victim wanted someone to know that he believed the Diocese knew at the time. Fabbri's sexual abuse of the boy continued until his transfer and the victim was concerned there were additional victims of Mario Fabbri. As Father Fabbri abused the victim he stated "you are not as cooperative as the others." Fabbri's last known location was somewhere in Italy. He is presumed dead.

NAME:	Fr. Elwood Figurelle
DATE OF BIRTH:	March 29, 1933
DATE OF DEATH:	July 16, 2008
ORDINATION:	May 18, 1963

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1963-11/1969	St. Mary Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA; Bishop Guilfoyle High School
11/1969-06/1971	St. Leo Church, Altoona, PA
06/1971-08/1973	St. Rose of Lima, Altoona, PA
08/1973-08/1974	St. Joseph's Church, Renovo, PA
08/1974-03/1979	St. Michael's Church, West Salisbury, PA
03/1979-06/1995	St. Mary Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA
06/1995-03/2003	St. Catherine Church, Mt. Union, PA
*04/2003	Saint Luke's Institute

Father Elwood Figurelle's potential for deviancy might have been noticed in 1973. While a parish priest at St. Rose of Lima in Altoona, Pennsylvania, Figurelle was arrested that year for indecent exposure. The Diocese transferred him to another parish after his arrest.

In 2003 Figurelle was the subject of a federal investigation and arrest for possession of child pornography. Federal Bureau of Investigation reports, designated FD-302's, were found inside Diocesan files by Office of Attorney General investigators. On March 20, 2003, Figurelle was interviewed by FBI agents at his parish. Figurelle admitted to being "fascinated with male genitalia" and admitted he had viewed materials depicting nude prepubescent boys on several hundred occasions. Father Figurelle claimed he didn't know that viewing the material was illegal, however he confessed to federal agents that he had purchased software to erase his computer memory out of a concern he was being tracked.

At 2:00 P.M. on March 20, 2003, Figurelle met with one of Bishop Joseph Adamec's closest advisors, Monsignor George Flinn. Figurelle confessed to Flinn that he had been downloading and making copies of child pornography. Monsignor Flinn's notes indicated that Figurelle's housekeeper and secretary were to "leave and keep quiet." Figurelle himself told Monsignor George Flinn that his 1979 matter had been taken care of at a "private" hearing at the Blair County Courthouse. He was promised there would

be "no record." There is no evidence that the Diocese turned any of this information over to the FBI in Flinn's notes.

After his conviction, Figuerelle served 15 months in federal prison for his crimes. Following his release he was placed on retired status. Monsignor Flinn was awarded the Prince Gallitzin Cross award in April 2003 for exemplifying in his discipleship the evangelizing characteristics of the Reverend Priest and Prince, Servant of God Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin. An award established by Bishop Joseph Adamec in 1990 and bestowed by the discretion of the Bishop. Flinn is now deceased.

NAME:	Fr. Joseph Gaborek
DATE OF BIRTH:	June 30, 1945
STATUS:	Dismissal from Priesthood
ORDINATION:	May 15, 1971

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1971-11/1972	St. Benedict's Church, Geistown, PA
11/1972-05/1973	Saints Peter & Paul Church, Philipsburg, PA
05/1973-05/1976	St. Joseph's Church, Portage, PA
1973-1974	Part time religious teacher Bishop Carroll High School
05/1976-05/1980	St. Agnes Church, Lock Haven, PA
05/1980-03/1981	St. John Cantius, Windber, PA
04/1981-08/1984	St. Michael's Church, West Salisbury, PA St. Mary's Church, Pocahontas, PA
*08/1984	Sabbatical at Orchard Lake School
08/1984-08/1987	St. Thomas More, Roaring Spring, PA
*08/1987	Saint Luke's Institute (Diocese knew of active warrant in Somerset County)
08/1988	Suspended from ministry
2004	Dismissed from Priesthood

Joseph Gaborek was a priest and child predator in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. During the summer of 1982 Gaborek recruited a 16-year-old boy to work at St. Michael's Church, West Salisbury and St. Mary's Church, Pocahontas, Pennsylvania. Father Gaborek invited the child to stay overnight at the rectory where he proceeded to sexually violate the boy. On other occasions Gaborek would take the boy into St. Mary's and molest the boy inside the parish itself.

During the final incident of abuse, Gaborek took a break during the extended and brutal assault; the boy ran from the rectory screaming for help and found it at a nearby home.

The Pennsylvania State Police were promptly involved. The state's criminal investigation of Gaborek was brought to the attention of Bishop Hogan almost immediately. Bishop James Hogan's brief notes in the "Secret Archives" tell a chilling tale of cover-up:

"On 2.VIII.84 Officer Markle (?) Stat. Pol. Somerset Investig. Div. called for an apt. to go over a complaint filed w. office by CASA re Fr. G"

Hogan went on to explain that the victim's grandmother was pushing the issue writing "it is the grandmother that is bitterly hostile and wants something done." Hogan notes that

Father Gaborek was seen in the Nanty-Glo and Twin Rocks area with youthful boys. However, Hogan closes the note optimistically recording that while the state police officer was non-Catholic he was "great." He had consulted with a Catholic lawyer and then with the permission of his superior gone to Hogan. Hogan records that there was no desire to "occasion publicity, etc." and that he gave his assurance he was moving Gaborek and sending him to an institution "e.g. Orchard Lake." The Bishop's August 6, 1984 letter to Gaborek again summarizes the agreement. Hogan told Gaborek he could take a brief "sabbatical."

Bishop James Hogan had worked a successful cover-up for Gaborek. But as cover-ups go, James Hogan was particularly proud of this one. Years later, even the 1987 clinical notes confirm the Bishop's interference with a police investigation. Those notes state that Gaborek "would have been prosecuted and convicted of [sexual contact with a 16 year old boy] except that the bishop intervened and he was sent to Michigan for treatment and then placed in another parish upon his return". Gaborek's "treatment" in 1987 was part of the standard self-reporting based "treatment" ritual the Diocese commonly engaged in - which would permit Hogan to return the priest to ministry in another parish, St. Thomas Moore in Roaring Spring, Pennsylvania.

Gaborek himself testified before the Grand Jury on February 10, 2015. Gaborek admitted to molesting the 16-year-old boy and stated *"[Bishop Hogan] said, Joe, he says, I made a deal with the authorities -- maybe I shouldn't say this about him -- he says, and I was moving you for them to, you know, get you off the burner."* Gaborek testified regarding Bishop Hogan's 1982 discovery of his crimes stating:

Mr. Dye: This was '82?
Mr. Gaborek: '82.
Mr. Dye: Okay. Now, we've seen a lot, a lot, a lot, a lot of Bishop Hogan's writings where he talks about your incident in 1982. So he was aware of that?
Mr. Gaborek: Yes.
Mr. Dye: In '82. How did he become aware of it?
Mr. Gaborek: Well, they wrote a letter.
Mr Dye: Okay.
Mr. Gaborek: Yeah, see the grandmother -- once I was at the grand- -- the mother said, it blows my mind, the grandfather said, blows my mind, and (REDACTED) himself says, don't do anything to hurt Father Joe and that. And he continued to come and do work at the church but this time never on his own. He always came with his mother's

boyfriend. And I even -- he even invited me to -- like I said, he was like about a half year shy of being 18. He invited me to his graduation.

Mr. Dye: There's no question here that he thought very, very highly of you?

Mr. Gaborek: Yes. And it bothers me to today, you know, that I think about it. But what was done was done. But he was --

Like I said, when his mother wrote the letter and I went to see Bishop Hogan, I read the letter, and he says, Joe, it says in here about, you know, touching or fondling her son. Did you or didn't you? And I says, yes. He says -- and this is where Bishop Hogan said to me, he says, well, he says, do you need help in that matter? Do you think you need a -- I says, no. I says, I told him, no. I says, I just -- it was an indiscretion on my behalf. I says, it won't happen again. But I went away. He sent me to the seminary. He always believed that your seminary is like you nest egg. He says, well, I'm going to send you on a retreat. And it ended up like six weeks. He said, get ahold of a counselor, get ahold of one of the priests, spiritual director and have some good talks with them and that and we'll go from there.

Mr. Dye: Do you remember where that retreat was at?

Mr. Gaborek: Right there at Orchard Lake.

Gaborek explained that Orchard Lake was a school for boys. The school lacked any psychological or psychiatric treatment facilities and did not address his desire to have sexual intercourse with children. Gaborek's dispatch to Orchard Lake was quite literally a vacation. Gaborek indicated in hindsight the welfare of the children was not the primary concern of the institution in the following exchange before the Grand Jury:

Mr. Dye: When you're dealing with -- this will be my last question -- but when you're dealing with Canon law and the bureaucracy of the Catholic Church, because it's an institution made of men, fallible, versus, right, scripture, which is supposed to be upon which the Catholic Church is based, and you're dealing with obligations to protect children, you know, better a millstone be cast around your neck and cast into the sea than to harm a little one, if your right hand offends you cut it off because it's better to lose that hand than your whole body be cast into hell, right?

Mr. Gaborek: Right.

Mr. Dye: I mean, these don't seem like scriptures to me that say, let's make sure we send the child molester to Orchard Lake, you know? I mean, there seems to be a real clash here between those interests.

Mr. Gaborek: Yes. Well, I think, Dan, the thing is today it's the child. The emphasis is on the victim, the child. If the child is victimized, you deal -- that's the essence. It's like you protect the child, you do everything you can --

Mr. Dye: What was the emphasis then?

Mr. Gaborek: I think like you said, the essence probably as you -- as I look back at that, it was like you protect the institution, you protect the priest, teacher. See, because that went on probably in schools that way, whether it be Catholic, public. I think that the child was put more or less down like saying, okay, the victim will get over it or something; I don't know.

The Grand Jury found the Gaborek case to be a particularly heinous example of the Diocese exercising authority and influence to cover up the sexual abuse of a child at the hands of a Diocesan Priest. The victim of Gaborek's assault again reported the matter to the Diocese in 2005. He noted he recalled being interviewed by the Pennsylvania State Police regarding the allegation, but "nothing ever happened." An unrelated incident involving Gaborek's alleged sex with a dog was nol prossed in 1989. Gaborek was prosecuted in Cambria County for corruption of minors in 1998. However, the Diocese did not defrock Gaborek until 2004.

NAME:	Fr. Bernard Grattan
DATE OF BIRTH:	February 14, 1944
STATUS:	Dismissed from Priesthood
ORDINATION:	May 3, 1975

ASSIGNMENTS:

05/1975-05/1977	St. Joseph's Church, Renovo, PA
05/1977-05/1978	Holy Rosary Church, Juniata, PA Chaplain at Altoona Hospital
05/1978-06/1988	St. Patrick's Church, Newry, PA
06/1988-06/1995	St. Patrick's Church, Gallitzin, PA
*06/1994	Saint John Vianney's Institute (returned to St. Patrick's Church 01/1995)
06/1995-04/2002	Chaplain at Altoona Hospital
04/2002	Medical Leave
06/2004	Dismissed from priesthood

Father Bernard Grattan is believed to have molested numerous young males over his 25 years as a priest with the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. In 1982 Grattan offended on a child from St. Patrick's school while serving as a parish priest at St. Patrick's parish in Newry, Pennsylvania. Grattan would take the 13 to 15-year-old child into his parish office and unclothe him. Grattan would then fondle the boy's genitals until he would ejaculate onto Grattan's hands. Grattan then licked the ejaculate off his hands. Over a two-year period Grattan sexually abused the boy again and again. The sexual abuse expanded to include oral sex. Grattan also made the boy perform sex acts on Gratton.

One of the most recent complaints was made to the Diocese in 2008. As is typical of the efforts of the Allegation Review Board, Sister Marilyn Welch acted more as an investigator against the victim than an advocate for the claim or the abused. Welch makes the following note about the victim in her report, "This man is very troubled" and then complained about the number of times the victim calls her or cancels an appointment. Welch notes that the victim "Called on April 9 and went through the whole scenario again." At another point in her notes she characterizes his discussion with her as crying and rambling and speculates that he may be under the influence of alcohol. The Grand Jury finds this to be unacceptable and yet another example of the fraud that the Diocese perpetrates upon victims of child sexual abuse by characterizing this woman as a

"victim advocate" and by pretending that the Allegation Review Board does anything more than make liability assessments to protect the Diocese.

Welch's conduct is even more offensive when the history of Grattan's assignments is reviewed. Bishop James Hogan and Bishop Joseph Adamec were aware of allegations against Father Grattan. Bishop Hogan permitted Grattan to remain in ministry where he offended on additional children. Bishop Adamec reviewed Grattan's conduct upon becoming Bishop and moved him to a less high-profile position as Chaplain at Altoona Hospital. While acting as chaplain, Grattan sexually offended on an incapacitated patient. Adamec finally removed Grattan from the priesthood after the victimization of yet another member of the public.

On May 19, 2015, Grattan was questioned under oath before the Grand Jury. Grattan admitted to molesting children while serving as an active priest. The following exchange is a portion of that questioning:

Mr. Dye: So let me ask you --To go back to the incident with the young boy, how old was that boy whose penis you touched?

Mr. Grattan: I think about 14 or 15.

Mr. Dye: Do you remember what you were doing at the time, was it teaching the classes, was that working with the altar boys? What were you doing?

Mr. Grattan: Oh, he was an altar boy.

Mr. Dye: Okay.

Mr. Grattan: Yes.

Mr. Dye: And where did that happen at?

Mr. Grattan: It was -- It happened in my car.

Mr. Dye: And where was your car at that time?

Mr. Grattan: It was at the rectory.

Mr. Dye: Which rectory was that? What rectory?

Mr. Grattan: St. Patrick in Newry.

Mr. Dye: Do you remember how the boy responded to that?

Mr. Grattan: Yes. It was very adult. He said, Father, we shouldn't be doing this, and I said, I know we shouldn't, and I stopped.

The Grand Jury finds both Bishops Hogan and Adamec endangered the public. Hogan endangered children by leaving Grattan in ministry as a parish priest and Adamec endangered the public by assigning Grattan to hospital ministry. During questioning before the Grand Jury Grattan admitted to coming into contact with children, families, grieving Catholics, and various members of the public while in his capacity as Hospital Chaplain. He admitted his contact with these unknowing potential victims was completely unsupervised by any member of the Diocese. Grattan explained of the many duties he would engage in, some would be providing last rights to the dying or deceased. While serving as a chaplain, Grattan sexually assaulted a physically disabled patient while on a home visit.

NAME:	Fr. Leonard Inman
DATE OF BIRTH:	May 7, 1928
DATE OF DEATH:	June 1, 2001
ORDINATION:	May 27, 1961

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1961-06/1963	St. Rose of Lima Church, Altoona, PA
06/1963-08/1967	Part time teacher at Bishop McCort High School
09/1967-05/1968	Catholic Charities, Altoona, PA
05/1968-06/1971	Catholic Charities, Altoona, PA
06/1971-01/1986	Cathedral of Blessed Sacrament, Altoona, PA
*01/1986-01/1987	"Nervous Exhaustion", Saint Luke's Institute
01/1987-08/1989	St. Peter's Church, Somerset, PA
1989	St. Charles Immaculate Conception, retired

Father Leonard Inman was a priest in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. Inman raped at least one child and paid other young men for sex while he served at the Cathedral of Blessed Sacrament from 1971 to 1986. In at least one instance Inman forced a minor to engage in oral sex within the rectory of Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament.

The search warrant executed by the Office of Attorney General on the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown found very few records related to Father Inman. However the Grand Jury was able to obtain these records through other means and information from other reliable sources. The Grand Jury found that materials from the "Secret Archives" of the Diocese indicate that then Bishop Hogan was very much aware that Inman was raping children as a priest at the Cathedral. Even knowing the alleged victim was a vulnerable and underprivileged 16-years-old boy, Hogan conspired to obstruct a police investigation and denied police access to the Cathedral in the course of their investigation.

The Grand Jury discovered that the 16-year-old victim provided the Altoona Police with a statement on January 27, 1986, saying (Grand Jury Exhibit 65):

"He is a white priest, around in his forties, black hair, he wears glasses, his lips are kind of funny, I can't tell you how but they are funny to me. He wears a priest suit, he wears a brown coat and a brown hat. He usually has on a undershirt and underpants. He has a gold ring on both hands. He wears a gold wrist watch with diamonds on the watch. That is about it."

When questioned by police as to what occurred, the victim stated:

"I think it was around Christmas, about four years ago when I was about 11 years old... He took me inside the Cathedral, down in the basement. He took off his clothes and I

took off mine. He blew me first, he laid down on the carpet on the floor and told me to get on top of him. I knelt above his head and he blew me until I came in his mouth. He (the priest) swallowed it. When he blew me he had me call him dirty names. I called him dick, asshole, cunt, bobbies. Then he paid me forty dollars and I left."

Inman raped the boy numerous times in the Cathedral starting when the victim was 11-years-old and ending when the boy reported it to police. Inman provided the boy with money after each assault. The victim described the location inside the Cathedral where he was often abused stating that the assaults occurred in the rectory of Cathedral, in a storage room where Christmas decorations were kept, and once in a *"long black funeral-like car."* The victim also stated the priest took pictures of him with a camera that *"makes pictures right away, you take the picture and it comes out and you shake the picture"*. In some of the victim's encounters with Inman he would show the victim photos of naked girls which he kept in his desk drawer in a cigar box under some papers.

The Grand Jury learned Altoona Police took the victim's statement and corroborated it by interviewing numerous young men who stated that Inman would regularly take walks around the Cathedral in the evening and offer them money for sex. Police were able to confirm that Inman was paying 18-year-olds for sex and that he could be observed doing so if surveilled. Altoona Police Chief Peter Starr and his investigators asked to search the areas of the Cathedral as described by the victim but were denied access after the Bishop consulted with a defense attorney, Richard Consiglio, Esq. Police planned on having a cooperating witness wear a recording device, commonly known as a wire, in the area Inman stalked for prey. The wire was not successful because Inman suddenly stopped trolling the ally for sex.

Peter Starr, the Police Chief of Altoona during the Inman investigation, testified before the Grand Jury on January 23, 2015. Starr explained the failure of the wire as follows:

> *Mr. Dye: Let me stop you there, sir. I mean, as a law enforcement official you're meeting with this Bishop. By then the Diocese had already put up some roadblocks relative to searching the church and things like that. Did it not jar you to hear this guy, to hear a Bishop tell you, I knew about your police activity? I knew you tried to do a wire?*
> *Mr. Starr: Well, yeah, it did, but you know the reason he knew about it from what Monsignor Saylor told me was that Attorney (REDACTED) aunt was a nun in the convent across the street from the Cathedral Church, and according to*

Monsignor Saylor, Attorney (REDACTED) called his aunt and said, you better get ahold of Father Inman because the police are doing an investigation on him and he may end up getting arrested.
***
Mr. Dye: Okay. So once Saylor told you that, that this attorney had basically turned a police investigation, did you try to start an investigation into that attorney's conduct?
Mr. Starr: No. No, I did not.

The Grand Jury was unable to confirm Mr. Starr's belief as to how Inman knew of a police wire. However, the Grand Jury did find alarming evidence that the Altoona Police themselves turned a blind eye to Inman's crimes. Testimony from Richard White, a former Altoona police officer and current Chief of Police of Blair Township, indicated the investigation into Inman was dropped following Hogan's involvement and his meeting with Altoona Police Chief Peter Starr. White indicated he was told not to pursue the case by his superiors. Peter Starr was asked why the Inman case was not pursued in the face of substantial evidence of criminal conduct, Starr stated:

"So the next day I get a call from Monsignor Philip Saylor of the Diocese, and he says, hey, he says, Monsignor – he said that Father Inman just got in his car and left for an institution in Baltimore that deals with homosexual and pedophilia priests."

The Grand Jury attempted to ascertain why an individual would be able to escape accountability simply by seeking treatment in Baltimore, Mr. Starr stated the following:

Mr. Dye: As I'm going through this statement – quite frankly – we'll go through it—but as I went through this packet, I mean, I'm seeing a pretty—I mean by today's standards, 1986 to 2015 standards, I'm seeing what looks like a pretty expertly run investigation by your guys back in 1986. I mean, they're getting the facts out of this kid. They're getting corroborative information that would justify a search warrant, such as there's Christmas stuff in this room. I mean this is a top-notch investigation.

What confuses me though is, and I don't want to jump the gun here, but when we get to the end, towards the end, this thing just goes dead. All of a sudden reports stop being generated and there's no follow-up. How did that happen?
Mr. Starr: This, what you're reading here is what initiated the request for the wiretap.
Mr. Dye: Okay.
Mr. Starr: Once that wiretap was initiated and approved by the District Attorney's Office, Inman left town. Nobody knew – you know, Monsignor Saylor told me he went someplace in Baltimore that was there for wayward priests.
Mr. Dye: Okay.

Mr. Starr: And I hadn't seen him again until after I had left the police department and I was at a restaurant one time and he came in with some elderly woman. And he saw me and he was all grins and I just turned around and walked away from the guy.
Mr. Dye: Okay.
Mr. Starr: But he passed away shortly after that.
Mr. Dye: Okay.
Mr. Starr: So I don't know where he – after he went to Baltimore, nobody seems to know where he went to.
Mr. Dye: Well, I mean, I want to be clear. You're not saying that the investigation died because he left the state, or is that what you're saying?
Mr. Starr: No, I'm just saying that we—we didn't know where he went. There's the 180-day rule in Pennsylvania and we wanted to get him back here, and we never did see him again after that.
Mr. Dye: But charges were not filed either?
Mr. Starr: No, we didn't file the charges on him, no.
Mr. Dye: But I mean, clearly charges could have been filed?
Mr. Starr: They could have been.
Mr. Dye: A warrant could have been issued for his arrest?
Mr. Starr: Or would have been issued for his arrest.
Mr. Dye: And even if this guy was in Albuquerque he would have been picked up on that warrant and brought back to Pennsylvania to face trial?
Mr. Starr: If the District Attorney would approve the extradition costs, yes.

The Grand Jury was able to conclude that the Altoona Police *chose* not pursue the Inman matter. There is no 180 day legal or procedural provision which would have prevented Inman's prosecution. There is no creature of law or reality which would have prevented Inman from facing justice... other than the decision made by the Altoona Police to not pursue a predatory priest within their jurisdiction. Additionally concerning was former Chief Starr's assertion that his investigation had been obstructed and compromised but he failed to investigate how or by whom.

The truth lies in the notes taken by Bishop Hogan regarding Inman's crimes. Hogan noted that after first consulting a criminal defense attorney and then meeting with the police, Inman would be sent to treatment. Hogan made sure the Diocese avoided public scrutiny and Inman avoided accountability. Similarly in 1985 Hogan mailed a letter to suspected predatory priests warning them that police were running surveillance on areas where priests were known to solicit children and young men for sex. The Grand Jury found Inman was one of those priests. Father Leonard Inman died in 2001.

The Grand Jury finds that Inman was actively engaging in prostitution and oral intercourse with minors at Cathedral of Blessed Sacrament, Altoona. Altoona Police were aware of allegations and investigated the matter. The Diocese sought to protect the image of the institution rather than protect children or hold Inman accountable. No charges were ever filed in no small part due to the undue influence of the Diocese over local officials.

NAME:	Fr. Robert Kelly
DATE OF BIRTH:	March 2, 1948
STATUS:	Suspended from active ministry
ORDINATION:	July 13, 1974
ASSIGNMENTS:	
08/1974-05/1978	Our Lady of Victory, State College, PA
05/1978-01/1979	Our Mother of Sorrows, Johnstown, PA
01/1979-09/1980	Chaplain at SCI Rockview
09/1980-1982	St. Benedict Church, Johnstown, PA
1982-1984	St. Joseph's Church, Bellwood, PA
	Our Lady of Lourdes, Altoona, PA
10/1984-08/1985	Our Lady of Victory, State College, PA
08/1985-1986	St. Mary Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA
1986-09/1987	St. Patrick's Church, Gallitzin, PA
09/1987-08/1989	Immaculate Conception Church, Lock Haven, PA
08/1989-08/1992	North American College, Rome
*08/1992- Unknown	Guest House Treatment Facility
*1993	Saint John Vianney Institute
06/1993- Unknown	Charleston, SC
1994	Office of Propagation of Faith, Hollidaysburg, PA
Unknown - 1995	St. Rose of Lima Church, Altoona, PA
2001 – 02/2015	St. Peter & Paul Church, Philipsburg, PA
02/2015	Suspended from ministry

Between 1975 and 1977, Father Robert Kelly was a parish priest at Our Lady of Victory in State College, Pennsylvania, when he sexually abused a 12 to 13 year-old boy. Kelly would take the boy to drive-in movies, drives to the mountains, and spend time with the boy. Kelly would kiss the boy and touch his body. Kelly reached into the boys pants on more than one occasion. Kelly provided the boy beer at the rectory and attempted to sleep with the boy but he refused. In 1978 Father Kelly attempted to offend on another 14-year-old child who rebuffed him when Kelly maintained a lingering "hug."

In 1993 the Diocese acted on a complaint from one of Kelly's victims. Documents from the Diocese characterized Kelly's problem as "pedophilic" and "sexual." Following an evaluation it was recommended that Kelly could live in a rectory after a year and that he should avoid contact with young people "such as altar boys." Kelly was subsequently returned to ministry as a parish priest. He served at both St. Rose of Lima in Altoona and at St. Peter and Paul in Philipsburg, Pennsylvania prior to Bishop Mark Bartchak suspending him in February 2015. Bishop Joseph Adamec possessed the same information Bishop Bartchak had when Bartchak removed him in 2015. However,

Adamec saw fit to return him to the flock. The Grand Jury finds this to be horrifying. A man unfit to be around a child was tasked to tend to their souls.

Prior to his suspension, Father Robert Kelly was subpoenaed and questioned regarding his conduct as a priest, before the Grand Jury and in the presence of his attorney, on February 10, 2015. After swearing an oath to tell the truth Father Kelly terminated questions when it became clear that the truth was not on his side. Kelly had been accused of sexually assaulting minors. In contrast, Kelly stated that a sexual assault allegation had been made against him and provided the following account in part: "*But at any rate, he was a senior in college at one point, and he come up to me at that -- he would have been 21 or 22 at the very least -- after a Mass one Sunday, and he mentioned he was going to be graduating the next week. And I said, well, congratulations. I didn't even know what he had been majoring in. I said, would you like to go out for a pizza, and he said, sure. I said, what day -- I would be free this day or this day, you know, of this coming week. So we went out for a pizza -- and I remember this distinctly. We came back to the church and I said, would you like a Coke or a beer? He was already over 21. And he said, sure. And the way things were built, we had what we would call a common room. It was on the second floor of the living quarters. No one else was in it at the time. I said, I don't know what we have, so we went upstairs through the house. And I said, what would you like? He took a soda and I had a beer and we went immediately down to my office. And I sat at the desk and he sat across the desk from me and we chatted about what degree he was getting and what he had hoped to do, maybe a half hour or so. And when he was going out of the office through the front door outside, I put my arms around him and gave him a hug from behind. And I remember doing that. And that's the only time I remember doing that. And like I said, he was graduating from college. That was -- I was stationed at Our Lady of Victory four different times. I was living there for various reasons, and that's the third time in 1985 or '86. A priest had left there and the Bishop asked me, because I knew people well there, to go back and fill in for a while. And I explained that to the review board after he had been there, and they just more or less accepted it. And what I heard afterward was that the Diocese provided kind of a lump sum of money. There were somewhere between 15 and 20 clients of Attorney Serbin. And he was a retired judge I believe from Pittsburgh who was going to*

meet with each one of these people, clients, and decide what amount of money from the lump sum of money would be given to each one, and they all agreed that that would settle it. And what I heard afterwards was that this young man got -- it ranged from $20,000 to I don't know how much a person, and that he got the lowest amount. And I haven't heard – I never heard anything directly from him and haven't heard, you know, anything about that since then."

Even Kelly admitted he had no relationship with the young man to warrant giving the alleged victim so much personal attention; he explained that he felt any allegations against him were an attempt to achieve financial gain. But when questioned by the Deputy Attorney General about behavior this Grand Jury found to be consistent with grooming, Father Kelly chose not to answer (victim identity has been REDACTED):

Mr. Dye: And what do you think (REDACTED) motive to lie would have been? Did I get the name of the victim right, (REDACTED)? What do you think his motive to lie would have been at the time?

I know after the fact we can say, well, there was an attorney and the attorney was going to make big money for everybody. When he first comes forward -you have this positive interaction with him with pizza and a beer and a soda and a hug at the end. Why make this up?

(Defense Counsel for Father Kelly approached the witness)

Mr. Dye: Sir, sir, sir. You cannot advise him unless he asks you for your aid. Wait, let the record reflect that the attorney left his chair and engaged the client mid-question. If Father Kelly wishes to consult with his attorney, he can put that on the record. Do you wish to consult with your attorney?

Mr. Kelly: Yes.

Mr. Dye: Please do so.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Dye: So sir, I'm going to repeat my question, what his motive to lie would be?

Mr. Kelly: Can I say something to my attorney?

Mr. Dye: Go ahead.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Kelly: On the advice of my attorney I'll plead the Fifth on that one.

NAME:	Fr. George D. Koharchik
DATE OF BIRTH:	November 28, 1948
STATUS:	Suspended from active ministry
ORDINATION:	May 4, 1974

ASSIGNMENTS:

05/1974-02/1984	St. Clement Church, Johnstown, PA
02/1984-06/1986	St. Joseph's Church, Portage, PA
06/1986-09/1987	St. John the Evangelist, Bellefonte, PA
09/1987-06/1995	St. Casimir Church, Johnstown, PA
10/1987-06/1995	St. Emerich Church & St. Casimir Church, Johnstown, PA
*1994	Dr. Reis and Dr. Pecoe for evaluation
06/1995-06/1999	St. Joseph's Church, Portage, PA
06/1999-06/2006	St. Mary's Church, SCI Huntingdon (St. Dismas)
06/2006-11/2012	St. Catherine of Siena, Mt. Union, PA
08/2012	Placed on restrictive ministry
*09/2012-10/12	Saint John Vianney Institute
11/2012	Resigned as pastor

The Grand Jury has concluded Father George Koharchik is certainly a child predator. Koharchik's victims allege he would grope children during travel in his vehicle while listening to Bill Cosby comedy albums. Molesting children entrusted to him after desensitizing them to sexual discussion by Bill Cosby tapes in which a "penis" is discussed appears to be Koharchik's *modus operendi*. Koharchik testified before the Grand Jury on March 17, 2015. During his questioning Koharchik indicated the latest time period he would have had sexual contact with a minor was 1994. Koharchik estimated he was "close to" 12 children. A portion of his testimony is as follows (the names of identified victims have been REDACTED):

> *Mr. Dye: Was it more confidence or comfort in the fact that the children would not report that behavior?*
> *Mr. Koharchik: I don't know whether or not comfort or confidence would be the right word for it, but certainly the hope perhaps that it hadn't affected them.*
> *Mr. Dye: So then is it safe to say then that you did not view your interaction with these minors as predation? In other words, you did not view these as predatory acts; you viewed these as acts of love, acts of emotional connection?*

Mr. Koharchik: Emotional connection. I didn't think of it certainly as predatory. I don't know that I would speak of it as acts of love.

Mr. Dye: In terms of, you know, the names we went through here today, the (REDACTED) brothers -- what were their names again?

Mr. Koharchik: (REDACTED) and (REDACTED).

Mr. Dye: Okay, in terms of (REDACTED) and (REDACTED) and (REDACTED) and (REDACTED) and (REDACTED), certainly when these individuals say that there was some contact with their intimate parts, with their privates or some intimate part, that was true, and that was done with some sense of sexual gratification, correct?

Mr. Koharchik: I guess, yes.

Mr. Dye: You guess or yes?

Mr. Koharchik: Yes.

During a contentious exchange regarding Koharchik's indecent contact with minors, Koharchik admitted to sleeping, showering, wrestling, having children sit on his lap and "patting" the buttocks of young boys. While Koharchik denied any sexual contact with minors since 1994, he admitted to continuing to spend time alone with minors in the course of his pastoral duties. The following exchange was typical of Koharchik's telling responses to more aggressive questioning:

Mr. Dye: Did you have any of them sit on your lap in those scenarios?

Mr. Koharchik: Probably, yes.

Mr. Dye: Did you obtain an erection in any of those scenarios?

Mr. Koharchik: I don't think so.

In a twist of perverse irony, the Grand Jury learned that Father George Koharchik served on the presbytery council during the period of the Luddy trial. At the time the presbytery council was concerned that efforts were not being made to treat Luddy with the fraternal love he was due as a fellow priest.

NAME:	Fr. William J. Kovach
DATE OF BIRTH:	March 10, 1929
STATUS:	Retired
ORDINATION:	May 21, 1955

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1955-05/1957	St. Joseph's Church, Renovo, PA
05/1957-06/1959	St. Michael's Church, Clarence, PA
06/1959-06/1961	St. Stephen's Church, Johnstown, PA
06/1961-06/1962	St. Patrick's Church, Newry, PA
06/1962-08/1988	St. Michael's Church, Clarence, PA
*07/1988-08/1988	Saint Luke's Institute
08/1988-07/2001	Most Holy Redeemer, Revloc, PA
07/2001	Retired from public ministry

Father William Kovach was accused of molesting a minor male in approximately 1982. Kovach admitted his conduct to Bishop James Hogan but was permitted to continue in ministry and to have contact with children. Hogan's notes of the Kovach matter were held within the "secret archives" of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown, obtained from the court of the Luddy litigation and made a Grand Jury exhibit in this investigation. On March 17, 2015, Kovach appeared before the Grand Jury and was questioned, the following exchange is a portion of that testimony:

> *Mr. Dye: Why did you -- and again, you know, best of your recollection, but here I'm looking at Bishop Hogan's notes from his meeting with you where he's trying to decide what to do with these allegations and what to do with you. In his notes he indicates that you admitted the conduct. Did you admit the conduct to Bishop Hogan?*
>
> *Mr. Kovach: Yes.*
>
> *Mr. Dye: Why did you admit the conduct to him?*
>
> *Mr. Kovach: Because it happened, that's why.*

Kovach was questioned in detail regarding his duties within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown even after he had admitted to Bishop Hogan that he had molested a child. Kovach's answers to that questioning before the Grand Jury are as follows:

Mr. Dye: And this is important. I want to make sure we're clear on this. You have an interaction with Bishop Hogan where it's laid out there are allegations of attempted sodomy, fondling. He noted immoral familiarity, that there was -- that you had taken your clothes off in front of this child. You have this interaction with Bishop Hogan where all this is laid out. You're crushed, you admit it, and you want to get better, correct?

Mr. Kovach: Yeah.

Mr. Dye: And he leaves you at Saint Michael's; is that accurate?

Mr. Kovach: Right.

Mr. Dye: So now we are getting beyond the contact. This is important to note, when you go back to Saint Michael's are your duties diminished or are they the same?

Mr. Kovach: Well, they're about the same, yes.

Mr. Dye: About the same. So talk about those duties. What were you doing? Were you conducting Mass?

Mr. Kovach: Yes

Mr. Dye: Were you interacting with members of the church?

Mr. Kovach: Yes.

Mr. Dye: Were you counseling members on spiritual issues?

Mr. Kovach: Yes.

Mr. Dye: Were you engaged in any teaching of minor children?

Mr. Kovach: Yes.

Mr. Dye: Were you having – and I guess by extension you were having contact with minor children?

Mr. Kovach: Yes.

Mr. Dye: And to be clear, this is you've sat down with the Bishop and there has been an agreement that you have had inappropriate sexual contact with a minor, but now you're back at Saint Michael's doing the exact same thing?

Mr. Kovach: Right.

Mr. Dye: And if you recall, whenever he says that you resolved to change and that you have this desire to get better and that you were no danger to the flock, what

steps did you take to better yourself? Were you involved in counseling? Did you seek any treatment?

Mr. Kovach: No.

The Grand Jury concluded Father Kovach was a child predator who had been enabled by the Diocese. Whether to avoid personal or institutional embarrassment or scandal; Bishops James Hogan and Joseph Adamec kept Kovach's secrets for him. No one called the police.

Mr. Dye: And are you still currently a priest?

Mr. Kovach: Yes.

Mr. Dye: I'm not trying to be offensive, but you were not defrocked or anything like that?

Mr. Kovach: No.

Mr. Dye: Sir, I want to ask you – I know you have counsel here today – prior to today, has anybody ever sat down with you to discuss issues involving pedophiles in the Catholic Church?

Mr. Kovach: No.

Mr. Dye: You've never had investigators come to you and talk to you about that?

Mr. Kovach: No.

Mr. Dye: Police officers never came to you?

Mr. Kovach: No.

Mr. Dye: And you were never subpoenaed to a courtroom to talk about it?

Mr. Kovach: No.

Before the close of his testimony Father Kovach testified that the Church was an incredibly powerful entity during his time in ministry. Deputy Attorney General Dye asked Father Kovach if he ever expected to hear from the police following his admission to sexually abusing children. Kovach replied:

Mr. Dye: Did you expect when you met with the Bishop, did part of you think, well, I'm going to be hearing from the police or I'm going to be hearing from somebody else next?

Mr. Kovach: No.

Mr. Dye: You felt that it was over?

Mr. Kovach: Right.

The Grand Jury notes the culture the Diocese created. An active priest groomed and engaged in sexual intercourse with a 16-year-old child and never expected anyone to report it. Father Kovach was unconscionably accurate. Business as usual in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown continued on.

NAME:	Msgr. Anthony M. Little
DATE OF BIRTH:	June 20, 1954
STATUS:	Suspended from active ministry
ORDINATION:	May 8, 1982

ASSIGNMENTS:

1982	Our Mother of Sorrows, Johnstown, PA
1987	Cathedral of Blessed Sacrament, Altoona
	Penn State University, Altoona campus
1990	St. Mary Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA
1992	St. Edward's Church, Barnesboro, PA
1992-1993	Most Precious Blood, Emeigh, PA
1995	St. Therese Church, Altoona, PA
2002	St. Patrick's Church, Newry, PA
2013	Placed on restricted ministry
*11/2014-02/2015	Saint Luke's Institute

Father Anthony Little is alleged to have sexually abused a male minor numerous times prior to being placed on restricted ministry in 2013. Little admitted before the Grand Jury that he provided the victim privileges for many years. Those privileges included a residence, electronics, money and various other amenities.

Bishop Mark Bartchak placed Little on restricted ministry in March 2013 based upon the victim's disclosure. Little testified before the Grand Jury that he could not think of any reason as to why a person he had invested so much time and attention in would make the allegation. Little sought to clarify that he had purchased a new television, DVD player, and other amenities for the house in which the victim stayed. Little claimed that they were not meant for the victim.

The Grand Jury does not accept Little's account that he purchases many expensive items to idly sit within a home he owned. In particular Little noted he had purchased a new video game system for his home. However when asked if he played video games Little replied "No."

Little is a master manipulator. Attempting to separate the victim from family and friends Little was a near constant presence in the victim's life. Witnesses recall Little whispering into the victim's ears during family gatherings and visits. The intense trauma of victimization may never permit the victim to testify against Anthony Little.

NAME:	Fr. Francis E. Luddy
DATE OF BIRTH:	April 3, 1942
STATUS:	Dismissed from Priesthood
ORDINATION:	May 20, 1967

ASSIGNMENTS:

1967-1969	St. Mark's Church, Altoona, PA
1969-1970	St. John Gualbert Cathedral, Johnstown, PA
1970-1972	St. Patrick's Church, Johnstown, PA
1972-1975	Cathedral of the Most Blessed Sacrament, Altoona, PA
1975-1980	St. Therese's Church, Altoona, PA
1980-1987	St. Mary's Church, Windber, PA
*05/12/1987	Foundation House Servants of the Paraclete -Treatment Facility

Between 1969 and 1984 Francis Luddy molested, groped, masturbated, sodomized and performed oral sex on at least 10 children between the ages of 10 and 17. The crimes occurred throughout his entire ministry as a priest within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. It is not a stretch of the mind or reality to state that if Francis Luddy was having contact with children, they were in danger of becoming victims of child sexual abuse.

Perhaps no single priest is a better representation of the misguided direction of church leadership than the mishandling of the Father Francis Luddy matter. Faced with an onslaught of evidence that Luddy had raped the church's most vulnerable souls, church leadership chose to wrap themselves in lawyers and litigation rather than hold Francis Luddy accountable. The Grand Jury heard evidence of presbytery council members who discussed the need to settle the shameful matter of Luddy's conduct out of court without a trial. However, Bishop Adamec forcefully refused. Adamec rebutted concerns about Luddy by stating that the "bright lights" would be on the Diocese. But Adamec knew that Francis Luddy admitted to molesting as many as ten catholic children while serving as a priest.

Bishop Joseph Adamec was fully aware of Francis Luddy's sickening admission to having molested at least 10 children when Adamec and the Diocese disseminated a press release on August 5, 1992 excoriating a single allegation by an individual who had elected not to proceed with civil litigation. Bishop Joseph Adamec, the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown, and their legal counsel misled catholic congregants and the public stating:

"These defendants [Hogan, Adamec, the Diocese, etc.], as well as Father Luddy, have, from the commencement of this lawsuit, denied all of Mr. Hutchinson's claims as being baseless and without merit, as well as claims asserted by Mr. Hutchinson's brother, who has filed a similar action in the Court of Common Pleas of Blair County."

Make no mistake, the Bishop of the Diocese rushed to celebrate the dismissal of a single legal complaint alleging Francis Luddy had sexually molested a child, while knowing with certainty that Francis Luddy had admitted to molesting the very children to whom the Bishop bore the most responsibility. The Grand Jury notes that the chilling impact of such a victory lap on the victims of child abuse throughout the Diocese is incalculable.

The Grand Jury can find no evidence of a criminal prosecution of Francis Luddy other than records of a dismissed case in Somerset County. No criminal charges were filed in Blair County even though Luddy confessed to regularly molesting children during a high profile civil lawsuit in the 90's. The absence of a law enforcement response to the high profile exposure of an enabled child predator is concerning. Records of the Diocese insurance providers note that a conclusion was made that local law enforcement lacked the intelligence and/or resources to likely pursue these types of matter.

It was also Luddy's civil jury that found Bishop Hogan and the Diocese "knew that (Luddy) had a propensity for pedophilic behavior." A 1.2 million dollar verdict was awarded. The conduct of Bishops James Hogan and Joseph Adamec was questioned throughout the Luddy litigation. Again, these findings were publically reported and yet unpursued.

When testifying before the Grand Jury on November 18, 2014, Monsignor Philip Saylor testified that under Bishop Hogan the threat to the children within the Diocese was so well known and institutionalized that there was both open discussion and procedure for the occurrence:

Mr. Dye: So to be clear, there are two significant leaders of the lay community here. You've got a sheriff and a President Judge (Thomas Peoples), and they're coming to you saying you have to do something about these pedophile priests?

Mr. Saylor: Right.

Mr. Dye: And you would tell the Bishop?

Mr. Saylor: Right.

Mr. Dye: And based upon your earlier testimony, on occasion he would send them to a rehabilitation center in New Mexico?

Mr. Saylor: Right.

Mr. Dye: If they would come back and re-offend again, then he might suspend them?

Mr. Saylor: Yes.

Many of Luddy's victims live daily with the weight of their tortured childhoods crushing their thoughts. By contrast, Luddy's enablers lived or died with the accolades of the faith and faithful they failed. Luddy is currently in poor health and residing in New Mexico.

NAME:	Msgr. Thomas Mabon
DATE OF BIRTH:	July 14, 1926
DATE OF DEATH:	July 28, 2015
ORDINATION:	May 25, 1967

ASSIGNMENTS:

Date Unknown	St. Joseph's Church, Renovo, PA Teacher at high school
1963-1964	St. Patrick's Church, Gallitzin, PA Teaching at Bishop Carroll High School
1964-1967	Asst. Principal, Bishop Carroll High School
1967-1969	Asst. Superintendent of Schools for Diocese
1969-1987	Superintendent of Schools for the Diocese
1973-1976	St. Boniface Church, St. Boniface, PA
1976-1993	St. Mary's Church, Hollidaysburg, PA
1993-2001	Our Mother of Sorrows, Westmont, PA
*08/06/2003	Dr. Pacoe counseling
10/30/2003	Typed letter from Bishop Adamec -Msgr. Mabon no longer on administrative leave, can return to active ministry

In 2003 Bishop Joseph Adamec returned Monsignor Thomas Mabon to active ministry following an allegation that Mabon had molested an altar boy while a parish priest at St. Mary's Church in Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania. This return to ministry occurred after Mabon received "treatment" in which Mabon would be required to self-report those things that he felt were issues. Unsurprisingly, this report gave Adamec the cover he felt he needed to return Mabon to ministry.

In 2005 a report was made by another Mabon victim. She indicated that while she attended St. Mary's Church in Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania, Mabon would often have her run errands for him. The victim did this because her mother was a faithful Catholic and made sure all of her children were raised Catholic. The victim's mother took great pride in her daughter's service to their parish.

One day while the victim was in the sacristy, Mabon touched her genitals and breasts. Five other times he engaged in similar conduct. During future encounters he would rub himself against her front and back and ejaculate in his pants. On at least one occasion he asked the victim to touch his penis, which she did. After she turned 17-years-old he asked her for oral sex but she refused. Mabon relented and instead offered her Budweiser beer and continued in his previous style of sexual child abuse. Eventually she stopped attending church to stop the abuse. The victim never reported because she

recalled that Mabon had told her "if you tell, everyone would believe you instigated it and that's your fault."

The Grand Jury finds James Hogan and Joseph Adamec, the Bishops of Altoona-Johnstown, had a responsibility to these children. These, like so many others, are the children the Bishops failed. These are the children that predators, like Thomas Mabon, destroyed. These victims deserved peace of mind and security in their parish. As Mabon's victim notes "I want to know he is not a priest able to do this to others."

NAME:	Msgr. Joseph D. Maurizio
DATE OF BIRTH:	August 22, 1945
STATUS:	Incarcerated
ORDINATION:	November 11, 1987

ASSIGNMENTS:

1987	St. Rose of Lima, Altoona, PA
1988	Our Mother of Sorrows, Johnstown, PA
1989	St. Michael's Church, Johnstown, PA
1990	St. John's Church and St. Mary's Church, Windber, PA
1991	St. Casmir Church and St. Emerich Church, Johnstown, PA
1993	St. Andrew's Church, Johnstown, PA
1996	Good Samaritan Medical Center and Memorial Medical Center, Johnstown, PA
2003-09/2014	Our Lady Queen of Angels, Central City, PA

On April 9, 2015, the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District released a statement stating:

Joseph D. Maurizio Jr., 69, a priest at the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown, was originally charged by criminal complaint and arrested on Sept. 25, 2014. He has been in custody since his arrest.

According to allegations in the indictment and complaint, each year between 1999 and 2009, Maurizio traveled from Pennsylvania to Honduras to assist a non-profit organization that provides services to children there. While he was in Honduras, Maurizio provided money or candy to minor boys in an orphanage and engaged in unlawful sexual activities. Maurizio is also charged with possession of material depicting minors engaging in sexually explicit conduct.

Following search warrants executed on Sept. 12, 2014, at the rectory at Our Lady Queen of Angels Church in Central City, Pennsylvania, and a farm owned by Maurizio in Windber, Pennsylvania, law enforcement seized various computers and electronic devices, including a hard drive allegedly containing images depicting minors engaging in sexually explicit conduct.

The Grand Jury found evidence that a report was made to the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown in 2009. A monsignor in the Diocese contacted the FBI in an effort to confirm an investigation was taking place. The Diocese engaged in an effort to investigate the complaint and hired their own translator to translate the victims' claims. Documents obtained from the Diocese show a high ranking Diocesan official concluding the alleged conduct was "impossible." Maurizio was convicted in 2015.

NAME:	Msgr. Francis B. McCaa
DATE OF BIRTH:	December 21, 1924
DATE OF DEATH:	May 24, 2007
ORDINATION:	May 22, 1948

ASSIGNMENTS:

07/1948-06/1955	St. John Gualbert, Johnstown, PA
06/1955-06/1961	Our Lady of Lourdes Church, Altoona, PA
06/1961-12/1985	Holy Name Church, Ebensburg, PA
*12/10/1985	Evaluation with Dr. Karl Ludwig
03/1986-03/1993	Veteran's Hospital, Martinsburg, WV
*10/1992	St. Alphonso Retreat
03/1993	Retired from ministry

Father Francis McCaa was a monster. Between 1961 and 1985 while serving as parish priest at Holy Name parish in Ebensburg, Pennsylvania, McCaa groped and fondled the genitals of numerous children who attended the Holy Name School or served the parish itself, often as altar boys. The innocent boys who McCaa sexually abused were between 8 and 15 years old. Yet, McCaa was highly respected within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown and was given the designation of Monsignor as a sign of that respect and trust.

Nearly every known victim indicated that Father McCaa sexually offended on them in almost every interaction which would permit physical contact. Numerous former altar boys reported that McCaa would make them take their pants off under their cassocks. He would bring the boys in, sometimes in a group, and reach under their religious vestments to touch and squeeze their genitals. On other occasions he would inspect them to make sure they had followed his instructions and grope them. Sometimes he would push his finger into their anuses before sending them off to engage in a church function. One victim reported having his genitals fondled while in confession. Another victim, an altar boy, reported being humiliated in front of other victims when told by McCaa "if you ever use this I'm going to rip it off" while gripping the victim's penis. Most children didn't report out of fear or embarrassment. In some cases children tried to report their abuse to their parents, many of whom were devout Catholics, but were not believed. As one victim stated, when he told his mother that Monsignor McCaa was putting his hands inside the child's pocket and touching the genitals, his mother slapped

said "Monsignor was just being friendly." The Grand Jury aches at hearing the hopelessness these victims felt when being offended on by a pastor they were taught to respect and honor.

McCaa obtained access to his victims through his role as parish priest. At least one boy became McCaa's victim when the priest became involved with the family after the death of his father. Many of the boys took solace in one another as they shared collective sadness and fear. The Grand Jury finds McCaa was as deadly a predator as any child molester can be. There were no limits to how low Francis McCaa would sink to feed his sickening hunger for innocence. McCaa offended on children within the Holy Name church usually within the sacristy and sometimes in the rectory. In other cases the priest offended on victims while taking their confession.

McCaa's victims report they would warn each other about McCaa's assaults. But tragically McCaa was a formidable figure and the boys felt like there was no escape. In many cases they stood together while being victimized and watched their friends being victimized as well. At least one victim committed suicide. Some report difficulty in personal relationships or damage to their sexuality. Others report having flashbacks "when hearing church bells" and doubting their faith in God.

The Grand Jury has no doubt that many young lives were torn apart by Monsignor Francis McCaa as he used his position and authority to murder the dignity of these children. The Grand Jury has identified as many as 15 victims who suffered at McCaa's hands.

While Francis McCaa may have been a devil in disguise to some members of this congregation, his true nature was not hidden from the eyes of his victims... nor was his true nature hidden from Bishop James Hogan. However, unlike his victims who sought to be saved from McCaa's torment, Hogan enabled it. Bishop Hogan knew that Francis McCaa had engaged in sex acts with multiple altar boys by 1985. Hogan met with representatives of the District Attorney's Office under District Attorney Gerald Long. Bishop Hogan kept detailed notes that he had met with two Assistant District Attorneys, Patrick Kiniry and Dennis McGlynn, to discuss the unpleasant reality that McCaa's conduct was at risk of becoming public. Hogan noted that the prosecutors stated that it was a "delicate situation" for the District Attorney and the Cambria County Courts.

On October 28, 1985 Bishop Hogan met with a group of parents. He wrote that the parents were outraged due to "inordinate familiarity with their altar boy sons" whose names and ages he noted. Hogan complains, "How the parents got together, and how the story first leaked I'm not sure." Hogan summarizes the parents' complaint that McCaa was groping their sons' genitals as "Nimia Familiaritas ubi Agitur Tactibus Genitalibus." Hogan's scripted hand writing concludes with a footnote that one parent had spoken to a child care official and was told that the incidents were child abuse. The unnamed official told the parent to go to the police or the D.A. The Bishop concludes, "In the best interests of the Church (publicity, etc.) they chose this course."

On November 25, 1985, Bishop Hogan met with a representative from the District Attorney's Office. Hogan's secret records, written in his own hand, included the following memorialization of that meeting:

On two occasions when (Monsignor McCaa) called, speaking of his plan to return, I had to remonstrate and gave reason. Disappointedly, he agreed.

On Monday, November 25, I met with Pat Kiniry at (Holy Name rectory) in Ebensburg, Pennsylvania. I felt that I needed advice (regarding) reporting of the situation brought to my (attention) on 28 October 1985. And, apart from that, any & all counsel (regarding) handling of the situation. (Regarding) reporting, there seems to be no need for concern. It has been reported to the D.A.'s office by the parental group. Apparently, they are irritated by the fact that I have not met their demands or at least expressed (a) decision prior to this. Even P.K. considered that they didn't afford me much time. I had mistakenly hoped that, with Monsignor away, the time factor would help to defuse the intensity of their reaction. Obviously not, for to the Asst. D.A. who interviewed them, the filing of a complaint was threatened.

My outline of the case was scarcely necessary for Mr. K. both Mr. Long & he seem to have all the allegations furnished. Concerned a bit over "more names can be brought forward" – despite Monsignor's denial. Mr. Long, together with the (assistant) who (received) the group, are to meet with the parents on Mon., Dec. 2 at 10:00 a.m. They will try to defuse. <u>But</u>, while the D.A. may refuse to sign the complaint, the issue could be taken to one of the 4 Judges – who might or might not order the D.A. to sign. The officials must be careful not to whitewash if complaint is filed with lads support, no option! Bad as may be!

Plan discussed & agreed upon. 1) By no means should Monsignor return at this stage! 2) Provide Mr. Long w. Priest Psychiatrist's report (in the mail!). 3) Try to arrange a visit of Monsignor to & with Dr. Carl Ludwig, (Roman Catholic). routs in JO!, Psych. Service Sewickey Hosp., Pittsbg. – recommended by Pr. in Miami. 4) Available to meet group – e.g. Tues. at Rectory, if Mr. Long deems it helpful or necessary? Yes! Mr. K. will let me know. I am prompted to send along to Mr. Long a few observations – e.g.or appended.

A timeline of McCaa's assignments shows that shortly after this meeting with Cambria County officials McCaa was sent for "treatment". Father McCaa was temporarily replaced by Father Martin Cingle pending a priest being permanently assigned. Cingle is named in this report and admitted contact with a minor's genitals before the Grand Jury. Within a year of Hogan's meeting with the District Attorney's Office, McCaa was reassigned as a hospital chaplain in Martinsburg, West Virginia. Hogan provided McCaa a glowing recommendation for his new post.

On September 14, 2015, the Grand Jury sought answers from former District Attorney Gerald Long, now a Senior Common Pleas Judge. Judge Long stated that he had no knowledge that his assistants had met with officials from the Diocese. He indicated that as the District Attorney at the time, any agreements as to case disposition would have or should have been made by the District Attorney himself. Judge Long could not explain the conduct of the prosecutors on his watch and remarked only that they were both "pretty strict Catholics."

The Grand Jury can find no evidence that Francis McCaa was ever prosecuted for his conduct. On January 12, 2016, Deputy Attorney General Daniel J. Dye, Supervisory Special Agent Gary Tallent and Special Agent Jessica Eger met with Common Pleas Judge Patrick Kiniry in his chambers at the Cambria County Courthouse in Ebensburg, Pennsylvania. Judge Kiniry recalled the meeting with Bishop Hogan and indicated that he met with the Bishop at the request of District Attorney Gerald Long. Kiniry recalled that the allegations were that a priest was "messing around" with children and that Hogan had concerns about "what to do with the priest." An agreement was made that Hogan would transfer the priest to another location. Kiniry indicated the decision to not pursue charges would have been District Attorney Long's decision.

Kiniry was asked by Special Agent Tallent if this meeting with Bishop Hogan was unusual. Kiniry replied, "You have to understand, this is an extremely Catholic county." Kiniry explained that he attended Catholic school, Catholic Church and was an altar boy. He recalled his excitement in meeting the Bishop. Kiniry stated, "Being Catholic is engrained in you." When asked about the decision to transfer the priest to another location, Kiniry stated, "Back then the Diocese moved the problem, that's just

how it was." He surmised it would be treated differently today in that "today" it would be investigated and the priest would possibly be arrested.

McCaa died in 2007. The number of victims of Francis McCaa may never be known. Many of the victims estimate the number of victims to be in the hundreds.

NAME:	Fr. Martin McCamley
DATE OF BIRTH:	November 8, 1936
STATUS:	Retired, living in Orlando, Florida
ORDINATION:	May 9, 1962

ASSIGNMENTS:

1962-Unknown	St. Patrick's Church, Johnstown
1970	Summer only, St. Columba's Church
1977-1988	Our Mother of Sorrows, Johnstown
	St. Columba's Church, Johnstown
	Vice Principal Bishop McCort High School
1988-Unknown	St. Clement Church, Johnstown
1992-Unknown	Church of the Visitation, Johnstown
1995-Unknown	Our Lady of Victory, State College
*2001	Evaluation with Dr. Jubala
*2003	Evaluation with Dr. Jubala
06/2004	Retired from ministry

Rev. Martin McCamley, served in many of the parishes of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. He was also the vice principal and former music director at Bishop McCort Catholic High School. In 1981 Bishop James Hogan was notified that McCamley had been accused of fondling the genitals of a 16-year-old boy. Concerned about scandal and church image, Hogan dismissed the complaint outright. In fact, Hogan permitted the accused child molester to serve as the vice principal of Bishop McCourt Catholic High School. The Grand Jury finds that Hogan's actions endangered children throughout the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown for another 25 years.

In 2001, a victim told Monsignors George Flinn and Michael Servinsky that McCamley would touch his genitals when spending the night at the victim's home prior to 1977. McCamley would put his hand down the victim's pants as they watched television. At the time the victim was 13-years-old. McCamley was a sexual partner of Father James Bunn. After Bunn stopped coming to the victim's home, McCamley started visiting. The Grand Jury concludes this was coordinated on the part of McCamley and Bunn. Bunn had offended on the victim successfully. Once Bunn had satisfied himself, McCamley took advantage of a victim he believed to be compliant. This poor child had experienced sexual abuse at the hands of two priests who claimed to be sacred ministers of God on Earth.

In 2008 another victim came forward. The victim indicated that McCamley sexually offended on him while McCamley was a parish priest at St. Patrick's Church in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. McCamley would grant the boy special privileges when he served in choir. He would take him to eat at restaurants and on trips to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. McCamley sexually abused the boy in the rectory of the church as well as in the car when traveling. He would touch the boy's thighs and body. The victim was inititally afraid to tell Father McCamley to stop because "he was a priest" and he thought it was "ok." However, when Father McCamley attempted to shove his hand into the victim's pants the victim resisted. McCamley was infuriated that he had been rebuffed and he began to retaliate against the boy by criticizing him in choir.

McCamley was not a stellar addition to the Diocese and ample grounds existed to have him removed. McCamley's proclivity to engage in impermissible sexual conduct was an open joke amongst diocesan officials following a sexual encounter which resulted in McCamley being taken to the hospital with a bleeding rectum. However, rather than removing a priest who was clearly unfit for ministry, McCamley was permitted to remain in ministry through his final transfer to Our Lady of Victory parish in State College, Pennsylvania in 1995. McCamley was evaluated in 2001 and reevaluated 2003. He was permitted to retire in 2004 and currently resides in Orlando, Florida.

NAME:	Fr. Regis Myers
DATE OF BIRTH:	May 15, 1926
DATE OF DEATH:	January 13, 2011
ORDINATION:	May 22, 1954

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1954-06/1963	St. Mary's Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA
08/1955- Unknown	Part time instructor at Altoona Catholic High School
06/1963-06/1991	St. Catherine Siena Church, Duncansville, PA
06/1991	Retired, Senior priest

On March 24, 1997, Monsignor George Flinn provided Bishop Joseph Adamec a memo in which he explained that the Diocese had been contacted by an individual who was once a 15-year-old postulate of the Third Order Regulars of the Franciscan Friars. Father Myers was at the Third Order's Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania monastery as visiting confessor. The victim reported numerous encounters with Myers as a young boy. Myers asked to meet with him after confession. Myers encouraged him to live with him at his rectory in Duncansville under the auspices of being his housekeeper. Myers came into the victim's bedroom and told him to sleep in Myer's bedroom. Myers called him into his room while Myers was nude and invited him to shower with Myers.

The Grand Jury finds these allegations disturbing. However, there is little documentation to clearly determine whether the Diocese took these allegations as credible. What is concerning is that the Diocese did not involve law enforcement but rather attempted to put the victim into contact with Father Myers. This is not the first time the Grand Jury observed this bizarre decision on the part of the Diocese to put the alleged abused into contact with the alleged accused. Often this is done to further some type of so-called "apology." The Grand Jury finds this to be a dangerous practice as it is equally possible such contact will further harm the victim or allow the possible predator to continue to manipulate the victim in an effort to protect the predator from exposure. It is the later potential the Grand Jury concludes the Diocese endorsed. If the victim and victimizer can work out the discord, the Diocese would rather be ignorant than liable.

NAME:	Fr. Daniel F. O'Friel
DATE OF BIRTH:	June 3, 1935
DATE OF DEATH:	December 15, 1981
ORDINATION:	May 27, 1961

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1961-06/1963	St. John's Church, Johnstown, PA
06/1963-06/1967	St. Rose of Lima Church, Altoona, PA
	Part time instructor Bishop Guilfoyle High School
06/1967-07/1970	Asst. Principal Bishop Carroll High School
	St. Patrick's Church, Gallitzin, PA
07/1970-08/1974	Principal Bishop Carroll High School
	Mt. Saint Ann Church, Ebensburg, PA
09/1974-12/1981	St. Mary's Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA

While Daniel O'Friel was principal at Bishop Carroll Catholic High School, he befriended a student who was interested in joining the priesthood. O'Friel became aware that the 16-year-old was romantically seeing a fellow female student. O'Friel would provide the student a ride home on an almost daily basis. During that time O'Friel would ask questions about his contact with the girl like "did you undo her bra" or "did you kiss." During these conversations Father O'Friel would unzip his pants and the victim's pants and they would touch each other's genitals. Father O'Friel joked with the victim that the conduct was an "easy way to go to confession." The final assault occurred when the victim began to yell at O'Friel and jumped out of the car. The victim reported the incident to the Diocese in 2004.

Another allegation was made against Father O'Friel during his time as Principal of Bishop Carroll Catholic High School. A 15-year-old student went to confession in Father O'Friel's office. O'Friel became obsessed with details of the 15-year-old's physical contact with his girlfriend. O'Friel started to touch the victim's genitals and then exposed his own genitals. The victim recalled throwing up in the bathroom and having O'Friel's semen on his hands. Another incident of sexual abuse occurred in Principal O'Friel's car.

The Grand Jury notes that this second victim struggled greatly with his abuse. In many ways the sexual abuse undid him. The victim suffers from extreme emotional and psychological disturbances. Sadly, when he attended college in State College, Pennsylvania he went to seek counseling from another priest identified in this report,

Father Robert Kelly. Unbeknownst to this victim, Kelly had faced numerous allegations of sexual child abuse himself. When the victim broke down Father Kelly suggested that he spend the night at the rectory. While sitting on a bed next to Father Kelly, Kelly pushed his head into his lap. The victim doesn't recall the remainder of that evening but was hospitalized shortly thereafter.

The Grand Jury finds the commonality between these two reports credible. The Grand Jury finds these reports of unaffiliated individuals, which demonstrate a common *modus operendi* on the part of Father O'Friel, to substantiate these claims. The Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown possessed file after file of similar allegations against a significant number of their priests. Father O'Friel is an example of the kind of child predator that could thrive in the midst of the Diocese unknown thanks to its efforts to silence outrage.

If one wonders just how difficult it must be for sexual abuse survivors within the Diocese, one must only look to O'Friel's second victim. Abused by O'Friel and propositioned by Kelly - that victim was seeking counseling from Father Coveney. As this report exposes, Coveney is also a suspected child predator.

NAME:	Fr. John Palko
DATE OF BIRTH:	August 4, 1941
DATE OF DEATH:	May 31, 2005
ORDINATION:	May 20, 1967

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1967-09/1973	Holy Name Church, Ebensburg, PA
09/1973-11/1980	St. Anthony's Church, South Fork, PA
11/1980-06/1988	St. Mary's Church, Gallitzin, PA
06/1988-06/1993	St. John Cantius and St. Mary's Church, Windber, PA
06/1993-05/2005	St. Mary's Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA

The handling of the Father John Palko allegation is an example of the fraud that is the Allegation Review Board. On May 3, 2002, Monsignor George Flinn took a call from an alleged victim of sexual assault. On May 10, 2002, after a series of failed attempts to make contact, Bishop Joseph Adamec and the victim spoke by telephone. The victim reported that while she was 16-years-old and a student at Bishop Guilfoyle Catholic High School she had been "taken advantage of" by Father Palko.

Palko began grooming the victim when he took her on a trip to Boston. During the drive she shared things with Father Palko and began to trust him. At some point she went to speak with him at St. Mary's Church in Gallitzin, Pennsylvania. The victim was kissed, fondled and Palko penetrated her with his penis. These encounters occurred at least 3 times. The victim reported at the time she felt it was consensual but in hindsight realizes she was only a 16-year-old girl and he was an adult.

The Diocese never removed Palko from ministry. Instead, the Diocese engaged in an active investigation of the victim. Diocese records demonstrate a clear bias and effort to intimidate the victim through process and "confrontation." Bishop Joseph Adamec asked the victim if she would be willing to "meet with Father Palko face-to-face in order to confront him." Internal Diocesan records attempt to note inconsistency by the date that the victim was a junior at Bishop Guilfoyle Catholic High in contrast to the date that Palko started at St. Mary's Church. No notes indicate any investigation of Father Palko's history or conduct.

While Bishop Adamec was portraying a concerned Bishop who was invested in the victim's best interests by phone, Adamec made sure to report any and all information he gained from the victim to an attorney. While Adamec listened to the victim's prayer,

Adamec made sure that Father Palko had legal representation. While the victim asked Adamec to intervene on her behalf because her parents were upset she "brought the incident up", Adamec sought to insulate the Diocese and sent Palko to have an "evaluation" based upon Palko's self-report. The Grand Jury finds, as noted throughout this report, the Diocese shrinks behind these self-reported evaluations as justification for poor judgement and reckless conduct. The evaluation is useless, as noted by the Bishop "there is nothing in the data that would shed light on the allegations." The Grand Jury notes such data is entirely based upon Palko's "denial."

In the end nothing came of the victim's allegation. The Diocese's Allegation Review Board Policy allows it to obtain multiple statements from a victim. Multiple oral statements to various persons within the Diocese, then further Diocesan requests for a "written" statement from the victim are not uncommon. The Grand Jury finds in the Allegation Review Board the Diocese holds all the rights, and the victim holds only the right to be harassed and questioned.

In this case Adamec's insistence on an additional victim statement to be provided "in writing" resulted in no action being taken. The victim hadn't conformed to Adamec's made-up process for justice as he saw it. Father Palko continued in ministry until his death in 2005. Adamec and the Allegation Review Board never called the police. As in so many other instances, the truth fell back into silence.

NAME:	Fr. Gerard Ream
DATE OF BIRTH:	May 22, 1928
DATE OF DEATH:	April 18, 2008
ORDINATION:	May 8, 1954

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1954-10/1961	Our Lady of Victory Church, State College, PA
10/1961-06/1963	St. Aloysius Church, Cresson, PA Teacher Bishop Carroll High School
06/1963-06/1964	St. Mary's Church, Frugality, PA
06/1964-06/1965	Chaplain at Mercy Hospital, Altoona, PA Teacher at Bishop Guilfoyle High School
06/1965-06/1967	St. Bonafice Church, St. Bonafice, PA Teacher at Bishop Carroll High School
06/1967-08/1972	Principal at Bishop Guilfoyle High School St. Michael's Church, Hollidaysburg, PA
08/25/1992	Resigned as Principal
10/1992-06/1995	Corpus Christi Church, Dunlo, PA
06/1995	Senior Priest, Retired

Father Gerard Ream was a religion teacher at Bishop Carroll Catholic High School while serving as a parish priest at St. Bonafice Church in St. Bonafice, Pennsylvania. Ream took an interest in one of his female students in 1966. The student was dealing with many teen-age issues and family discord. Ream began counseling the teenager and providing advice. The teenage student invested an enormous amount of trust in Father Ream. Ream aided the student in her admission to college, provided her money, and invited her to collect-call him weekly.

As time passed Ream reminded the student how thankful she should be for his assistance and told her that he deserved a lifelong friendship and total devotion from her due to his gracious aid. When the young woman arrived at college Ream came to visit her and insisted she visit him on her return home. At that time Ream engaged in sexual intercourse with the girl. The sexual meetings continued when Ream could meet with the girl. Diocean records provide no reasons but Ream was transferred to another church and school in 1967.

Ream became possessive of his victim when he learned she had fallen in love with a boy at college. Using what he had learned in counseling her, Ream attempted to manipulate her into continuing a relationship with him. Ream began to harass the victim

by telephone, often calling in the middle of the night. The victim changed her number and became very frightened as to what Ream may do to her for "abandoning" him.

The victim reported the incident in 2008. The Diocese records bear little mention of her report to them. A copy of her letter was provided to the District Attorneys of Blair and Cambria Counties. No data was available to the Grand Jury as to the outcome of the victim's report.

NAME:	Fr. William Rosensteel
DATE OF BIRTH:	February 12, 1943
DATE OF DEATH:	June 26, 2007
ORDINATION:	May 24, 1969

ASSIGNMENTS:	
06/1969-11/1969	St. Leo's Church, Altoona, PA
11/1969-05/1973	St. Patrick's Church, Johnstown, PA
05/1973-02/1986	St. Mary Immaculate Conception, Altoona, PA Part time religion teacher Bishop Guilfoyle High School
02/1986-06/1988	St. Patrick's Church, Gallitzin, PA
06/1988-07/2002	St. Patrick's Church, Newry, PA
07/2002-05/2007	Holy Rosary Church, Altoona, PA
05/2007	Resigned from parish after accusations

Father William Rosensteel's list of victims is long and tragic. Rosensteel began sexually assaulting a boy in the early 1970's when the boy was approximately 9-years-old and Rosensteel was a parish priest at St. Patrick's Church in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. The abuse continued until the boy was approximately 15-years-old. The victim recounted he became involved in various church duties as an altar boy at the request of his father who was a devout Catholic. His parents took enormous pride of their son's service in ministry. The victim explained he kept the secret of his sexual abuse for his parents' sake and reported it only after they died. The victim described that the assaults occurred almost constantly and every time he served Mass. On some occasions Rosensteel would ask the victim to accompany him to St. Francis Seminary or into the rectory of St. Patrick's Church in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. During the assaults Rosensteel would hug, kiss and grope the victim. As the assaults escalated he would try to force his tongue down the victim's throat and shove his hands down his pants. The victim was sexually assaulted to such a degree that it became nearly synonymous with actual church ceremonies.

Father Rosensteel would often spend time with Father Dennis Coleman. Coleman is identified in this report as a known child predator. Rosensteel and Coleman would play sexually explicit comedy albums for the victim and other boys. The sexual abuse continued for many years.

A rift began in Rosensteel's relationship with the victim when he took him to the St. Francis Seminary and the victim refused to go into the sauna with Rosensteel and two

other men the victim recalled as priests or clergy. The victim was under the impression that Rosensteel had planned to have them all offend on him and decided to wait in the car. The victim paid a price for angering Rosensteel. Rosensteel began to tell his parents he was a bad child and needed drugs to make him more compliant. As a result the victims' parents had him treated for Attention Deficit Disorder.

The victim reported that Rosensteel had a group of older boys with whom he was very close. The boys had a strange relationship with Rosensteel and Rosensteel enjoyed their company. As the victim began to break away from Rosensteel the older boys began to harass him for refusing Rosensteel's invitations. They told the victim not to "cause trouble" and on one occasion the victim was raped by one of the boys who stated "this is for Father Rosensteel."

The victim reported the incidents to his parents as a child and they chose to not believe him. The victim's report to the Diocese came in 2006. Having built the courage to finally report his childhood hell, he contacted Sister Marilyn Welch, the diocesan victim advocate. The advocate for victims recorded an interaction with this broken man noting the following:

We left the possibility of the review board open at the end of the conversation. (REDACTED) was very upset and was crying. At times his speech was garbled due to crying or possibly because he was talking on a cell phone. He agreed to think about it and I will call him again in a week or so to discuss the case further. I feel that he is in a very fragile state at this point. He doesn't seem to know exactly what he wants to do about the case. He does not have a lawyer.

The Grand Jury again concludes the "victim advocate" for the Diocese is an advocate for the Diocese against the interest of victims. Where the victim advocate can shuffle a victim into the Allegation Review Board without the involvement of legal representation for a victim she does so. Money is offered. Confidentiality and release claims are signed by victims and the Diocese to avoid public scrutiny. This type of "advocacy" is not advocacy at all but investigation and information gathering to assess the liability of the Diocese. Again and again the Grand Jury observed evidence of this type of cover-up cloaked in the guise of advocacy. The Grand Jury learned that this victim was the tip of the iceberg; in early 2007 additional victims came forward.

On March 2, 2007, the Diocese was told by another victim of Father William Rosensteel that he and potentially 8 other boys were sexually abused. The victim was an altar server at St. Patrick's Church in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. He explained that Rosensteel would invite boys to sleep over at the rectory. Rosensteel was a young, vibrant and popular priest. He would take the boys on trips to Canada and Pittsbugh, Pennsylvania. When overnighting with the children, Rosensteel and the children would all sleep in their underwear. Rosensteel would pick one boy to sleep in his bed. Rosensteel would engage in "passionate deep throat tongue kisses" and fondle their genitals. Rosensteel would invite boys into the shower with him and touch their buttocks. After nearly 20 incidents of sexual abuse the 12-year-old boy managed to break his ties to Rosensteel. To this day the victim thinks back and wonders how a young priest could walk around holding the hand of his victim in the parish. The victim told his mother of the abuse in the mid-1990's at the height of the publicity regarding clergy sexual child abuse. His mother contacted Monsignor George Flinn. The Grand Jury could find no evidence within the Diocesan records that Flinn recorded that call or took any action.

On May 15, 2007 another victim came forward. This victim reported being one of the 8 boys. He corroborated much of what the other victim had reported. He added that Father Rosensteel used to like to play a "kissing game" in which Rosensteel would engage in "french kissing" between himself and two boys. In June 2007, an additional victim came forward. He reported sexual abuse at the hands of Father William Rosensteel and stated that he thought it was became Rosensteel loved him.

The Grand Jury heard from various witnesses on this matter. Specifically, the Grand Jury heard from witnesses who recalled Rosensteel meeting with Diocean officals to be informed of his suspension from ministry. Rosensteel is attributed with stating that the disclosure of sexual child abuse on his part had "done him in." Rosensteel was aware of the various opportunities to continue in some fashion following an investigation. However, no witness could recall a report to law enforcement being made. One witness, a priest, opined that he felt the treatment of Rosensteel was cruel and that he could have been dealt with more kindly rather than by public disclosure of his sins.

The same month Father William Rosensteel's fourth victim came forward he committed suicide. Rosensteel died from multiple injuries caused by the 190-foot drop

from a bridge crossing over the Stonycreek River in Cambria County. Bishop Joseph Adamec issued a release following his death stating "There was hope that the final determination would allow him to retire with some type of ministry." Of the suicide, the Diocese spokesperson stated "Bishop Joseph is deeply saddened by the news about Father William Rosensteel. It is difficult to comprehend a priest taking the action that he did." No comment was made to the victims of Rosensteel's crimes, many of whom reported that his conduct killed their faith and ruined their lives.

NAME:	Fr. James F. Skupien
DATE OF BIRTH:	June 1, 1941
DATE OF DEATH:	February 11, 1996
ORDINATION:	May 19, 1966

ASSIGNMENTS:

06/1966-06/1968	St. Joseph's Church, Portage, PA
06/1968-05/1969	Cathedral of Blessed Sacrament, Altoona, PA
06/1968-08/1972	Asst. Principal Bishop Guilfoyle High School
05/1969-08/1972	St. Mark's Church, Altoona, PA
08/1972-01/1982	Principal Bishop Guilfoyle High School
09/1977-09/1983	St. Joseph's Church, Williamsburg, PA
09/1983-1995	St. Joseph's Church, Bellwood, PA
1995	Retired

James Skupien, priest and principal of Bishop Guilfoyle High-School in Altoona, was caught by police partially clothed in his car with a young man in 1981 near state game lands in a location known for amorous teenagers and underage drinking. Skupien was in a diocesan vehicle. Skupien told police officer David Metzger he was counseling the young man. Skupien later told church officials he was operating a tractor on a farm and fell into a pond.

While Metzger indicated he believed the boy to be 18 years of age, no further investigation was done at the expressed direction of the Cambria County District Attorney according to the testimony of David Metzger before the Grand Jury on January 23, 2015. Metzger testified "And I had called the District Attorney's office in Cambria County and they said, let it go." Metzger did contact Monsignor Philip Saylor and inform him of the occurrence. Metzger testified:

"The conversation was -- like I said, it really bothered me myself because at the job level that this man was at in a high school, and he was sitting back -- you know, you counsel somebody in your house or whatever, but back in the wood- -- there was no crime committed. So it was just bothering me morally and so what I did was I went out and talked to Monsignor Saylor about it. He said that they have a -- they knew about him, that they even have a retreat that they sent these priests to. He even made a story about one of them -- they're not allowed to have phones or anything, but he had mentioned about one story where a priest was at this retreat and he somehow got a phone and contacted some young kids and met them while he was even at the retreat. But I never knew anything that, you know, that that was going on. But like I told him, it was more or less I was more concerned because he was a principal of a high school."

What Metzger perhaps didn't know is that Bishop Hogan had gotten involved. Hogan's notes from the "Secret Archives" entitled "Memorandum Secretum" state "While kept from P.D. (police department) report, and in media, there is a degree of awareness and discussion within local P.D.'s (police departments)." Hogan noted that "Chief M." was "thanked for his discretion."

The Grand Jury concludes that at the time Skupien was found with the unidentified young man in his car, he had already engaged in sexual child abuse with at least one minor. It is possible that a robust effort to investigate Skupien, rather than the actions that were taken to protect Skupien, Hogan, and the Diocese would have uncovered his previous victim and prevented further victimization.

The Grand Jury identified the individual in the car with Skupien in 1981; almost 35 years later. The individual was a struggling and disadvantaged 18-year-old (identified as X for purposes of this report). Skupien had engaged in a long term oral sex-for-cash arrangement with X after hiring X to work for him. Skupien would pay X for oral sex at locations which include the rectory of St. Joseph's Church in Williamsburg, Pennsylvania and at various "make out" locations. When Officer Metzger interrupted Skupien near the state game lands in 1981, Principal Skupien was engaged in purchased sex with X in a diocesan vehicle. X reported this to the Diocese in 2008. X wondered why a priest would do that to a troubled 18-year-old and specifically inquired "Why Bishop Hogan did nothing when the police reported it to him?" The Grand Jury can offer that answer. Hogan cared more about the reputation of himself and the Diocese than whatever Father Skupien was doing in that car in 1981. But this was not the only crime James Skupien would get away with.

In 2008 a victim came forward with a specific allegation. Skupien had forced him to engage in oral sex in between 1968 and 1971. The victim alleged that the conduct had escalated and that his mother had found evidence of his contact with Skupien on his clothing. Skupien had molested a child while serving as both a priest and school official within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. Hogan's concern was "discretion." Skupien died in 1996.

NAME:	Fr. Joseph Strittmatter
DATE OF BIRTH:	January 11, 1931
DATE OF DEATH:	August 21, 2014
ORDINATION:	May 26, 1956

ASSIGNMENTS:

05/1956-06/1959	Teacher, Johnstown Catholic High School
06/1959-07/1961	Sacred Heart Church, Altoona, PA
07/1961-07/1963	St. Agnes Church, Lock Haven, PA
06/1963-04/1967	St. Therese Church, Altoona, PA
04/1967-04/1981	St. John's Church, Acosta, PA
04/1981-09/1987	St. Matthew's Church, Tyrone, PA
09/1987-06/1992	St. Mark's Church, Altoona, PA
06/1992	Medical leave

Some years ago Joseph Strittmatter was accused of molesting young girls in his capacity as a parish priest. Between 1961 and 1969 Strittmatter would fondle and touch a 6-year-old girl while acting as a parish priest at St. Agnes Church in Lock Haven, Pennsylvania. Strittmatter would force her head into his lap. It is believed the abuse continued into the child's teens. The Diocese was made aware of this sexual abuse in 1991. Bishop Adamec left Strittmatter in ministry until June 1992. When interviewed on another allegation sometime later, Strittmatter explained that he molested the child because he was never "taught" about sex. On February 19, 1993 at the behest of Bishop Adamec, Monsignor George Flinn noted that he "told Joe not to minister publically."

In 2002, Monsignors Flinn and Servinsky interviewed Father Strittmatter regarding another allegation. In that interview Strittmatter admitted to molesting another 8-year-old girl stating, "In her mind she might think it was inappropriate." The priest clarified, "I can't remember individual acts. But I was trying to learn about sex." The child predator had now admitted to two separate victims. Monsignors Flinn and Servinsky did not call the police. Bishop Adamec never notified law enforcement.

FBI Special Agent Adrienne Isom noted that various forms of sexual deviancy are often present in those with a sexual interest in children. Perhaps it's not a surprise that Father Joseph Strittmatter was accused of masturbating to a female parishioner while in confessional between 1987 and 1992. The parishioner reported that she became unable to go to confessional and contacted Monsignors Flinn and Servinsky following the alleged

incident. Shortly thereafter the congregation learned that Strittmatter would be going on "medical leave." Diocese records do not indicate he ever returned to ministry.

If one questioned the exceptional damage that is caused to faithful Catholics by the priests listed in this report, one needs to look no farther than Joseph Strittmatter. The Grand Jury heard from numerous devout Catholics speaking to their deep and abiding concern for the wellbeing of the Church and the faith. These Catholics seek to have the misconduct of the priests and Bishops in this report addressed and assurances this kind of conduct will not be tolerated by law enforcement or the Church. While perhaps not as heinous as the victimization of children, the victim of Strittmatter's conduct in the confessional haunted the victim. Cognizant of the sacred role confession holds within her faith, the victim asked the Diocese if her Strittmatter induced confession phobia would cause her to "go to Hell." Strittmatter's other victims suffer from a lifetime of emotional and psychological trauma. The Church itself becomes a symbol of pain.

The Grand Jury notes with grave concern that the exact number of Father Strittmatter's victims may never be known. Father Joseph Strittmatter, who had been active in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown for over 30 years, stated "I remember *some* of these... I am not denying this." Strittmatter died in 2014.

NAME: Fr. Benedict Wolfe

DATE OF BIRTH: January 6, 1916

DATE OF DEATH: April 20, 1997

ORDINATION: June 7, 1941, Glenmary Home Missioner, Ohio

Incardinated to Altoona-Johnstown Diocese December 5, 1978

ASSIGNMENTS:

10/1962-07/1990 St. Stephen Church, McConnellsburg, PA

Father Benedict Wolfe sexually molested a 17-year-old girl who was visiting family friends in the McConnellsburg, Pennsylvania area in 1979. At the time Wolfe was the parish priest of St. Stephen parish in McConnellsburg.

Wolf opened the parish rectory to the victim and her family while they were in the area. It is believed the victim was visiting family friends who were members of the parish or close friends of Wolfe. Initially Wolfe gave her a private room for "privacy" but would come up to visit daily during her stay and sexually assault her. The victim recalled Wolfe stating that her breasts were "the rosebuds of her youth."

After the victim returned home to Ohio, Wolfe contacted her repeatedly by letter asking that she return to McConnellsburg and find employment in a nearby school. The victim contacted the Diocese while in therapy years later. There is no record of any action taken by the Diocese on this matter. Wolfe died in 1997.

NON-PRIESTS: Miscellaneous Findings

The Grand Jury became aware of misconduct on the parts of non-priests as well. Allegations of sexual child abuse were levied against a teacher, a choirmaster, a coach, and members of affiliated religious orders.

The Grand Jury found records of the Diocese protecting a teacher who was also in line to become a deacon. That individual is discussed in the portion of this report dedicated to Bishop Joseph Adamec. The others seem to have been reported to the Diocese after the allegations were brought to light at the place in which the accused served. In those cases the Grand Jury did not find evidence of continued service within the Diocese, however, the individuals were often released or returned to their religious order without the Diocese notifying police or law enforcement of their conduct.

The Grand Jury concludes that these individuals were viewed as their home institutions' problem. Their removal from Diocesan activities solved the only problem the Diocese was concerned with – exposure and publicity. No effort was made to make sure the accused were held accountable or investigated for their alleged conduct.

SECTION III

LEADERSHIP OF THE DIOCESE OF ALTOONA-JOHNSTOWN

A. Bishop James Hogan

The biography of the deceased Bishop James Hogan is a minor footnote on the public website of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown.

Bishop James J. Hogan (1966-1986)
Birth: October 17, 1911; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Priestly Ordination: December 8, 1937; Rome
Retired at age 75; Resided in Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania, until his passing
Death: June 15, 2005; Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania

However in life Bishop James Hogan was a powerful figure reflecting all the power and prestige of the Roman Catholic Diocese over which he presided. One of Hogan's underlings testified before the Grand Jury, in speaking of the power he wielded in Altoona, Monsignor Philip Saylor stated:

> *Monsignor Saylor: ... For example, in Johnstown I would basically pick the mayor; I would pick the chief of police. I would – you know, I became a very active citizen you might say and people trusted me.*

All matters involving the misconduct of priests, affiliated religious, and deacons were handled by the Bishop or surrogates acting under and with his authority. In fact, Monsignor Saylor testified before the Grand Jury on November 18, 2014 that where priests were involved with misconduct the police and civil authorities would often defer to the Diocese. Such was the power of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown under Hogan's reign:

> *Mr. Dye: And I think that's maybe the crux of what I want to get to here today with you is there's – you've laid out, even in your own involvement, a lot of overlapping between police and government agencies –*
>
> *Monsignor Saylor: That's right.*

Mr. Dye: -- and the Diocese. When these officers would come to you tasked with enforcing the criminal law, investigating crimes, when they would come to you, the President Judge, this officer, the sheriff, are they saying to you, hey, you guys need to get this under control? Is that their message?

Monsignor Saylor: That was their message, yeah. Now remember, that included the President Judge of Blair County. (Thomas Peoples)

Mr. Dye: I understand. I understand.

Monsignor Saylor: It included the sheriff.

When questioned further at a later point that day Monsignor Saylor didn't distance himself from his earlier answers, Saylor embraced the idea that the Catholic Church was hand-picking community leaders. Saylor explained:

Mr. Dye: How would that happen though? Would the mayor call you up and say, what do you think of this candidate for chief?

Monsignor Saylor: Well, sometimes that would – yeah. For example, in Johnstown I appointed the Chief of Police. I appointed the Fire Chief.

Mr. Dye: Now when you say "appointed" you don't mean –

Monsignor Saylor: The mayor would have them come to me and I would interview them and I would tell him which one I would pick.

Mr. Dye: Okay.

Monsignor Saylor: And that's – he would pick that person. And that happened in Johnstown and in Altoona.

While such statements seem implausible in a free nation, former Altoona Police Chief Peter Starr was questioned on this point. Starr's response could not have been clearer:

Mr. Starr: And Monsignor Saylor was pushing for me. He was the author of the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese Catholic Church paper called the Register. And politicians of Blair County were afraid of Monsignor Saylor, and he apparently persuaded the mayor to appoint me as the Chief of Police.

With such overwhelming access and influence over influential and powerful people it might be expected that the Diocese and Bishop Hogan would use that influence to aggressively pursue those who would hurt the most innocent members of his flock. Yet Hogan saw no obligation of faith or law to the children of his parishioners. The following exchange occurred under oath on September 28, 1988 between a civil attorney for victims of sexual assault and Bishop James Hogan pursuant to a deposition in the course of the Luddy litigation.

> *Q: Did you not consider it a moral obligation after Father Luddy has admitted of sexually molesting this child from age 11 on to notify the police authorities?*
> *Bishop Hogan: I saw no moral obligation to refer that to the police. No. Having checked with—*

Hogan never finished his answer as he was instructed not to answer by his attorney. The depositions of Bishop James Hogan and related materials from the "Secret Archives" plainly show that Hogan had knowledge of priests who had molested children within the diocese or held a sexual interest in children. Hogan would send these individuals to unlicensed catholic treatment facilities then, in many cases, return these child molesters to ministry within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. Hogan was questioned about the duty of a Bishop in that same deposition:

> *Q: Would you agree that any child within your parish would be a concern of yours in terms of the emotional and mental health of that child as part of the flock?*
> *Bishop Hogan: Yes, of course.*

A review of the depositions of Bishop James Hogan leaves the reader struggling with the complete disparity in statements indicating "concern" for his Church's children in contrast to his frank report of the minimal efforts taken to "treat" a child molesting priest prior to their prompt return to a role which almost guarantees the victimization of children. Children were molested in staggering numbers on Hogan's watch. Grand Jury exhibits of "Secret Archives" notes show that Hogan kept detailed notes on child molesting priests yet continued to leave such priests in some form of ministry. Bishop Hogan and the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese had specific knowledge that Father Francis Luddy had committed acts of pedophilia in the late 1960s. The Diocese had supervisory authority over Father Luddy and knowledge of his "propensity for

pedophilic behavior," they both had a duty to prevent foreseeable third party victims from being intentionally harmed by Father Luddy. Even the Pennsylvania Supreme Court has opined on this point in one of the many times the Pennsylvania Courts addressed the Luddy litigation stating:

They knew that placing him in a position in which he would have contact with children would afford Luddy ample opportunity to commit further acts of abuse, which would likely result in extreme harm to the children under his supervision. Knowing all of this, Bishop Hogan and the Diocese had a duty to take appropriate precautions to prevent Luddy from molesting any more children, e.g., by assigning him to a position in which he would not have any contact with children, by ensuring that he sought treatment for his disorder, or by terminating his employment altogether.

Hutchison v. Luddy,742 A.2d 1052, 1059 (Pa. 1999).

B. Bishop Joseph Adamec

The public website lists the biography of Bishop-Emeritus Joseph Adamec as follows:

The Biography of Bishop-Emeritus Joseph V. Adamec

Joseph Victor Adamec was born on August 13, 1935, in Bannister, Michigan, and baptized in the village church of St. Cyril on September 1, 1935. His parents immigrated from Slovakia; - father Michal in 1913 and mother Alzbeta in 1921. As his father made his way to Michigan, he worked in various coal mines, including one at Scalp Level, PA. During that time, he attended Mass at SS. Cyril and Methodius Church in Windber, PA, within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown.

His early education took place at various public schools, starting with a one-room country school house. These included Ashley High School, during which time he served as president of his class for three of the four years and graduated Valedictorian in 1953. During his two years at Michigan State University, studying journalism and foreign languages, he served as co-editor of the dormitory newspaper.

The decision to study for the priesthood was facilitated by his contact while at Michigan State University with the now Jozef Cardinal Tomko, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, who at the time was Vice Rector/Economo of the Pontifical Nepomucene College in Rome. There he studied for six years, earning a Licentiate in Sacred Theology at the Pontifical Lateran University. He was ordained by Aloysius Cardinal Traglia in the Church of Saint Anselm in Rome on July 3, 1960, for the former diocese of his parents, the Diocese of Nitra in Slovakia.

Following the completion of his studies, Father Adamec returned to Michigan where he

served his home diocese of Saginaw in various capacities. He filled a number of positions under three Diocesan Bishops and one Bishop-Administrator. After serving as Assistant Pastor in three different parishes, he became a Notary of the Diocese of Saginaw under Bishop Stephen S. Woznicki in 1965, fulfilling responsibilities of Assistant Chancellor, Secretary to the Bishop, and Master of Ceremonies. He continued in that position under Auxiliary Bishop Aloysius A. Hickey (now Cardinal Archbishop of Washington D.C.). Bishop Francis F. Reh appointed him Secretary to the Bishop and Master of Ceremonies with residence at the Bishop's House in 1969. Two and one half years later, he became Chancellor of the Diocese, having charge of the diocesan offices, which position he held for six years.

In 1977, he was appointed Pastor of Saint Hyacinth Church in Bay City, Michigan, and served that 1300 family parish for almost 7 years. Besides being Pastor of the parish Catholic grade school of 400 students, he also served as Pastor of All Saints Catholic Central High School during his later years in Bay City. He assumed the pastorate of SS. Peter and Paul Parish with 1100 families in Saginaw, along with its Catholic grade school, in 1984.

In 1980 he was the recipient of the "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice" medal. This decoration is awarded in recognition of service to the Church and Pope, dating back to 1888 and Pope Leo XIII. The Holy Father named him a Prelate of Honor with the title of Monsignor in 1985.

During his 9 year, two parish pastoral experience, he had worked with five associate pastors, along with other staff, and supervised four priest interns in their formation for the ordained ministry. Twice he was elected by the priests of the diocese to serve the six member Diocesan Personnel Board, having been associated with that body by appointment or election from its establishment. He served on the diocesan priests' committee advising the Diocesan Office of Education/Formation and served as coordinator of the diocesan celebrations commemorating the 50th priestly anniversary of retired Bishop Francis Reh.

Bishop Joseph was elected National President of the Slovak Catholic Federation by the Slovak Catholic community of United States and Canada in 1971, which position he held for seventeen years until his resignation. This organization, founded in 1911 in Wilkes-Barre, PA, federates major Slovak, Catholic fraternal societies, the Conference of Slovak Religious comprised of 13 religious communities, the Conference of Slovak Clergy in the United States, and numerous other organizations and individuals. He is currently its episcopal moderator. The organization has as its purpose the addressing of common religious/pastoral concerns of Slovak Catholics in the United States. He is also a member of the Slovak League of America and is a 4th Degree member of the Knights of Columbus.

Bishop Joseph's father died in 1984 on his 97th birthday and his mother in 1991 at the age of 97. His only brother is also deceased. He has numerous cousins of various degrees in the Republic of Slovakia.

Monsignor Joseph V. Adamec was named Bishop of Altoona-Johnstown on March 12, 1987. His Appointment was made public on March 17, 1987. He was consecrated on May 20, 1987, in the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament at Altoona, PA by Jozef Cardinal Tomko.

The Bishop is a former member of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops' Ad Hoc Committee for Aid to the Church in Central and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and served as a member of their Joint Committee of Orthodox and Roman Catholic Bishops.

Under Bishop Joseph's stewardship as the overseer of the Diocesan Church of Altoona-Johnstown, the following milestones occurred:

- *Liturgical renewal was adopted.*
- *The permanent diaconate was revitalized.*
- *A Lay Ministry Formation Office was established.*
- *Directives for marriage preparation were issued.*
- *Responsibilities of the diocesan administrative offices were adjusted.*
- *Guidelines for parish and finance councils were issued.*
- *A Diocesan Finance Council was established.*
- *The structure of the Diocesan Presbyteral Council was revised.*
- *Deaneries were restructured and the role of deans was redefined.*
- *The Foundation for the Roman Catholic Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown was established.*
- *A continued effort for a sound economic base affecting the three diocesan Catholic high schools has taken place.*
- *A diocesan office for youth ministry was established.*
- *Religious education programs are continually being strengthened.*
- *A process of preparation for the Sacrament of Confirmation at a later age has been put into effect.*

Among his pastoral activities, the Bishop made annual visitations within the Diocese not only to the parishes, but to the correctional institutions (six state and one federal), the seven college and university campuses, the three diocesan high schools, and a number of other institutions. He co-sponsoring two annual ecumenical services Lutheran Bishop Gregory Pile and the late Metropolitan Nicholas Smisko of the Orthodox tradition. The three Bishops issued a document of expectations to assist pastors when they deal with individuals of different religious traditions who are preparing for marriage.

In 1994, Bishop Joseph began a process leading to parish reconfiguration and priest redistribution. After extensive consultation, decisions led to merging some parishes and clustering others.

Bishop Joseph is fluent in three languages: English, Slovak, and Italian, while understanding several others. Among his interests are photography, sailing, model trains, and writing.

Bishop Joseph served as Diocesan Bishop until January 14, 2011, when he was named Apostolic Administrator of the Diocese. On that date, Monsignor Mark L. Bartchak, of the Diocese of Erie, was appointed eighth Bishop of Altoona-Johnstown. Bishop Adamec served as Apostolic Administrator until Bishop-Elect Bartchak's ordination and installation on April 19, 2011.

In his retirement, Bishop Joseph resides in Hollidaysburg and assists at Saint Mary Parish in Hollidaysburg.

In contrast to the glowing biography of Adamec displayed to the public, his biography in the handling of sexual predators was abysmal. On November 4, 1993, Adamec was deposed in part as follows:

> *Q: Was there a point in time after you became bishop of this Diocese that you reviewed the personnel files of the Diocese?*
> *Adamec: No, I have not.*

And later in regards to the "secret archives" Adamec explains:

> *Q: At any time after May of 1987, did you review the secret archives?*
> *Adamec: Yes.*

Adamec goes on to explain the contents were reviewed in preparation for litigation, however, he then states when asked about the location of the "secret archives" that "I think what I said was I reviewed the contents *considerably* when I was ordered to produce them." Much later in his deposition the "secret archives" are further defined in the following exchange:

> *Q: When you arrived in May of 1987, did you find that there was a "secret archive" in existence in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown?*
> *Adamec: Yes, I did.*
> *Q: What form was it, physically: a safe, a box, a room?*
> *Adamec: It was a safe.*

Adamec goes on to explain that he became aware of bills related to Luddy's treatment for sexually assaulting children. Adamec explains he took no efforts to investigate the Luddy matter or ensure the safety and wellbeing of the flock relative to Luddy. Adamec explained " I didn't consider it necessary to do any further investigation" even though he was aware of Luddy's admissions to sexually assaulting children. Adamec reviewed Luddy's psychological evaluations and explained that these documents would have been maintained in the "secret archives" or in Luddy's personnel file depending on the dictates of the sensitivity of the information. Adamec made no effort to identify Luddy's victims

or their ages or identify the priest who molested Luddy as a young seminarian. Adamec testified that Hogan's handling of Luddy had been done "properly and effectively". On August 5, 1992, Adamec oversaw a press release regarding the withdrawal of a lawsuit against the Diocese and Luddy alleging sexual abuse. Adamec publically called the suit "frivolous and meritless" though he had reviewed Luddy's psychological evaluations and had read Luddy's admissions to molesting numerous children over his years of service as a priest. Adamec attempted to take cover in the concept that he was calling that single claim "frivolous and meritless". Adamec was additionally deceptive in court filings, signed by him, in which he asserted that the Diocese had no "inherently defective or deficient policies or customs" relative to the litigation of child sexual abuse and alleged cover up by the Diocese.

Adamec was asked: *Q: When you arrived and at some point reviewed these secret archives, isn't it true that you became aware that there were other priests other than Francis Luddy that sexually*—Adamec interrupted *"Yes."* The questioned was finished:

> *Q: Just to finish the question, who had sexual involvement with children?*
> *Adamec: Male.*
> *Q: Yes.*
> *Adamec: Yes.*

On January 6, 1994, Bishop Joseph Adamec's deposition continued. Adamec admitted to possessing knowledge of Father Dennis Coleman's sexual misconduct involving minor males. Adamec admitted to discovering the nature of Father William Kovach's sexual misconduct with a child. Adamec confessed to becoming aware of an allegation of sexual contact with a child against Father Joseph Bender. Adamec interviewed Bender, as he tended to do in these circumstances, and confirmed the allegation. Likewise in his capacity as Bishop, Adamec became aware of allegations against Monsignor McCaa, Fathers Leonard Inman and Robert Kelly. While Adamec implies his knowledge of Inman was only ministerial and after the fact, he acknowledges he returned Father Robert Kelly to service as parochial vicar at Our Lady of Victory Parish in State College, PA. While it does not appear that Adamec or Hogan ever bothered to report the sexual abuse of children to the police, Adamec did make clear he orally reported these matters to the Diocese's insurance company. Adamec goes on to note that some records were destroyed

noting "the bishop puts into the secret archives what he feels needs to be preserved". Adamec tended to make his own summary notes of treatment reports and then destroyed the originals stating "I thought this was sufficient". Adamec's statement was in response to being questioned about the destruction of records related to admitted child molester and priest, William Kovach.

Perhaps Adamec viewed Luddy as Hogan's problem, but if so, Adamec had a Bender problem. Adamec received a letter regarding Bender's crimes dated August 29, 1991. Bender's victim explained that while Bender served at Immaculate Conception Catholic Church, Dudley, Pennsylvania from 1969-1971, Bender was molesting children by "fondling, foreplay, masturbation, and oral sex". Bender's victims were altar boys who he transported to his cottage in Cypher, PA. Bender would take these children to the west coast on vacation as well. The victim noted that Bender would engage in these acts until he orgasmed. Adamec left Bender in service at a Roman Catholic parish within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown knowing of his conduct. Adamec encouraged Bender to retire in March 1992. Adamec did not notify the police. Bender died in 2000.

Another example of how Bishop Adamec's reign placed institutional perception over children's protection was told to the Grand Jury by former Bishop McCourt principal William Rushin. Rushin spoke of the case of Deacon Thomas Lemmon. Lemmon was born February 12, 1965 and committed suicide on March 5, 2003. Lemmon was ordained as a Deacon on May 27, 2000. From 1987 until 2003 Lemmon was employed at Bishop McCort Catholic High School as a Religion and Computer Science teacher. Between June 12, 2002 and March 5, 2003 Lemmon engaged in a sexual relationship with a minor female.

While not a Diocesan Priest, the sad handling of Deacon Thomas Lemmon's sexual interest in a minor is a chilling example of how far church leaders would go to protect the institution from scandal at the cost of the well-being of children. Rushin was able to provide another example of Adamec's priorities. In one incident where Rushin attempted to expel a student for misconduct he was contacted by the Bishop's office and told he was not permitted to expel the student because the student was the victim of sexual abuse at the hands of a priest. Rushin responded that the mother of the child had told him that the child was a victim of a priest, but that he had to maintain order in the

school. The representative of the Bishop's office became irate stating "they're under a confidentiality agreement; they're not supposed to be telling anyone that!"

Rushin had observed Lemmon having contact with female students that seemed unprofessional. Lemmon's behavior seemed to be unusually friendly and as though he was interacting with peers rather than his students. Rushin planned to fire Lemmon due to Lemmon's continual violations of Rushin's orders to stop fraternizing with female students. Rushin got a call from the Bishop's office. He was not to fire Lemmon. Lemmon was going to be ordained as a Deacon.

In 2003 Lemmon absconded to Canada with a minor female student with whom he was having sexual contact. Lemmon invited the girl to commit suicide with him. On March 5, 2003 Lemmon killed himself by jumping off a hotel balcony.

Challenging the Bishop: A victim

To better understand the efforts to which Joseph Adamec would go to protect his public image and as well as the image of the institution, the Grand Jury would note the case of Martin Brady.

The Reverend Martin Brady operated within the Diocese with the permission of Bishop Hogan and was a member of the Franciscan Friars Third Order Regulars. Documentation from the Third Order Regulars obtained by search warrant identified Brady as a known child predator. This was confirmed by one of his victims before the Grand Jury on November 14, 2014. That witness is also a priest and is identified as "Brady Victim" for purposes of this document. A former open critic of the Diocese, he testified:

Mr. Dye: Now, let's get to sort of the most disturbing part, or one of the many disturbing parts of this, is that you indicated that you were actually a victim of sexual abuse within the church, correct?

Brady Victim: That's correct.

Mr. Dye: When did that occur?

Brady Victim: It was during my four years at Bishop Carroll High School in Ebensburg.

Mr. Dye: How old were you then?

Brady Victim: Well, I was high school age, between the ages -- you know, 13 to 17.

Mr. Dye: And roughly what years would that have been?

Brady Victim: That was 1976 to 1980, yeah.

Mr. Dye: And what happened?

Brady Victim: Well, you know, Father Brady, he's a rather big man, but he befriended me, just was real friendly with me, and he would always want to come up and hug me. And then the hug would become the hands wandering over it and squeezing my butt and my thighs and whatever. And, you know, at first I'm thinking what's wrong with this guy? I just want to keep away from him; but it was every time he -- you know, every time he saw me he wanted to give me a hug and start touching and feeling me and stuff. And that went on pretty much all through high school. And then I know -- the one occasion that I brought up with the Diocese in particular was he invited me to the rectory and we had some alcohol, because I thought it was cool to drink. I was 16, you know, and it's a real cool thing to have a glass of whiskey with Father. And then he's sitting on the couch, and before I know it he's got his hands in my pants, you know, grabbing me and fondling me and stuff. So I jumped up and said, you know, I don't like that, and kind of put a stop to it there. But I really find these things distasteful to talk about. But still he would continue the hugging and the groping and things. And he said, well, you don't like that? And I said, no, not really; you know, because he'd come up and hug me. The guy was like six-foot-five and 300 pounds, so it was like being given a bear hug. And I would just go limp. I would just go limp when he did it. And I just kind of hoped he would leave me alone. That's all I really feel comfortable talking about now.

Mr. Dye: I understand. Can you tell the Grand Jury whether or not it went further or did he become more aggressive in his advances?

Brady Victim:. No, I think it just kind of stopped at that level.

Mr. Dye: Okay. Was this a one-time incident or did it continue over years?

Brady Victim: You know, the hugs and the touching and feeling and all that, that was all through high school.

This witness also explained that he believed the problems of predatory priests were not limited to the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown but existed throughout the Catholic Church and noted his own experiences as a Catholic priest. While the witness acknowledged that priests would often discuss or joke about another priest's sexual interest in young boys, the witness spoke at length regarding the near total authority of the Bishop and Bishop Joseph Adamec's efforts to quell dissent.

The witness detailed a conference in which Adamec chastised priests for speaking out publically. Additionally, Bishop Adamec was described as "angry" when the witness informed Adamec in 2002 that he had considered suing the Diocese himself due to his own experiences with abuse.

Mr. Dye: Now within the --I'm sure there are some Catholics amongst the Grand Jurors, but obviously not everybody here is Catholic. Within the Catholic Church, what does the threat or does the act of excommunication mean to a Catholic?

Brady Victim: Well, it means you're kicked out of the church, and as many Catholics believe, being in the church is a necessary part of salvation. So if you're excommunicated and kicked out of the church, it follows that you're going to go to hell.

Mr. Dye: Who has the power to excommunicate somebody?

Brady Victim: Well, generally the Bishop does in his Diocese, and people above him. The Pope could excommunicate someone.

Mr. Dye: So in function and process then, the Bishop of a Diocese has the power to damn a person to hell by excommunicating them?

Brady Victim: Yeah; essentially, yeah.

Mr. Dye: Were you threatened with excommunication?

Brady Victim: Yes, I was.

Mr. Dye: Tell the Grand Jury about that.

Brady Victim: I went to seek legal counsel, because I was abused in high school, and seeing how the Diocese had treated these cases and covered them up, I wanted to have it all brought out. I wanted it brought out in the open to see how the Diocese handles with sexual abusers and victims, and so I hired an attorney. And right after I hired the attorney, he filed some papers. Right after those papers

were filed the Bishop learned about it, and the Bishop called me into his office, and he had the number two man in line read me the penalties for suing the Diocese. And he was reading me the penalties, and he was saying the penalties are up to and including excommunication. And so I'm sitting in a chair and I'm thinking, oh, great, now I'm excommunicated from the church. So I'm thinking -- I was just sitting there in shock. Well, now I've done it, you know, I've gotten myself kicked out -- not just kicked out of the priesthood, kicked out of the church, and I'm going to be excommunicated. And so I'm sitting there in shock. And I think -- I said, oh, Monsignor, by the way, those other people that sued the church, were they excommunicated? And he laughed and he said, no, (REDACTED). I was reading the 1917 Code of Law to you. Those penalties no longer apply. So he was telling me that I was excommunicated and that was from the old 1917 Code of Catholic Canon Law. Those penalties had since been changed, but I think he just did it to scare the crap out of me so that I would drop it all. But I was under the impression that I was excommunicated and I was sitting in the chair in shock thinking, boy, now I've done it you know.

Mr. Dye: So this is -- I'm sure it is jarring for many people in the room, but you have a scenario where you have -- you're previously abused and sought counsel and have taken action under your rights as a US citizen, and the very first initial discussion is a threat of excommunication-- which by extension would send you to hell?

Brady Victim: Uh-huh.

Mr. Dye: Is that -- That's a yes?

Brady Victim: That is a yes. Yes.

Mr. Dye: So let's back up a little bit. When you brought it to the attention of the Diocese, hey, listen, Bishop Adamec -- and whether you brought it up in the form I'm bringing it up in or through your retainment of counsel, you basically put the Diocese on notice that I'm a priest here, but I've also been a victim of abuse within the Catholic Church, correct?

Brady Victim: That is correct, yes.

Mr. Dye: How did they respond to that?

Brady Victim: They -- he was very angry that I had hired a lawyer. He was extremely angry. And after they read me the penalty and I had that little discussion with Monsignor Servinsky, the Bishop came in and said, well -- he was very angry and he said, you're not going to get anything out of this, you're not getting anything, and he just left the room in a huff.

The witness explained he was accused in 2003 of improper contact with a child himself and transferred to another parish. Thus the witness's experiences include that of victim, advocate and accused. He is currently suspended.

Challenging the Bishop: A layperson

In the earliest stages of the Grand Jury's investigation, the Grand Jury heard from Mr. George Foster. Foster is a businessman in the billboard advertising business and a devout Catholic who attends a church within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. George is a proud father and concerned Catholic. His efforts to expose the conspiracy of silence within the Diocese are nothing short of heroic.

Foster explained that he was initially concerned about what he saw as immorality occurring amongst the priests. Foster felt that rather than being good examples to the congregations they served, they were public embarrassments to an ancient and sacred religion. Foster was aware of reports of sexual activity, alcoholism, embezzlement and other types of misconduct that caused him concern for the wellbeing of the Church. Foster's mantra was simple, if a priest was unfit for ministry they should not be permitted to minister.

Over time Foster's concerns narrowed to a specific issue. Foster's discussion with other concerned Catholics and his brother in the clergy led him to conclude that there was a shocking secret sitting in broad daylight but hidden by the shadow of the Bishops. Foster discovered that priests were molesting children and the Bishops were doing nothing, or worse yet, hiding the conduct from exposure.

After writing an editorial in a local paper Foster began to receive telephone calls stating that certain priests in the Diocese were pedophiles. One victim of sexual child abuse perpetrated by a priest even came to see George personally to report his abuse at

the hands of Father Bernard Grattan. Other family members and victims soon followed. George found himself in an avalanche of humanity all claiming that priests were molesting young boys in the Diocese.

George asked one victim "why are people coming to me?" The victim explained that people had read George's editorial and that he had stood up to the Bishop in public. George's fellow Catholics had decided he wasn't afraid of the Bishop. Foster explained to the Grand Jury that at that time he couldn't understand why people would think that. George noted, "I only answer to God... Bishops don't bother me." Victims provided Foster with letters they had written the Diocese year after year reporting child abuse or requesting that an offending priest be removed from ministry. Foster even went to the Blair County Courthouse and reviewed the documents admitted in the Luddy case. Foster told the Grand Jury they were "eye-opening." Yet, nothing was done. Foster explained how outraged he became upon learning the Bishops had taken no action, stating:

"The reason I became so involved is this, it made me mad. And I believe at Bishop Hogan's time there were a lot of child molesters running around, should have called the police, should have gone to jail, should have thrown them out. There's no discussion about this. He was terribly wrong, ignorant, I don't care what the excuse is

So here we were x number of years later and I'm like, well, wait a second. Why didn't he (Adamec) address any of these other names? Why didn't he ever address some of these other problems that are going on? You saw what they did, how they devastated the Diocese. Why didn't – The comments or how stuff was handled casually was a bit much for me."

Foster again and again found evidence that jarred him. When reviewing the letters of victims, as well as the courthouse's Luddy files, he found clear and credible allegations of sexual child abuse were made against various priests. Foster couldn't believe no one had done anything. Foster wondered, "Where were the police and the Bishops? He noted the files were accessible to the authorities, "they're unsealed." Foster became aware that the Bishop even attended the trial. Luddy's civil trial happened in the open and in daylight. Foster was baffled as to why no one acted. Foster testified that he read Luddy's confession to molesting numerous boys and saying one in particular he

didn't molest because he was "too ugly." George Foster complained that he couldn't imagine why the Diocese was fighting so hard for a priest that had admitted to molesting children. Foster concluded something was terribly and dangerously wrong. Foster detailed that the violation of trust that was occurring, stating:

"What if you're a teacher and you're a child molester? We're a little bit emphatic on it because here's someone that we've given our kids to that's violated that trust. What if you're a doctor and you're sleeping with your patients? You have violated that trust. What if you're a psychologist and you're sleeping with your patients? Well, in many ways a priest is also like a psychologist. They're a spiritual counselor. You go to them with your problems. You go to them with your issues. Likewise if you're Catholic you go to them with your confessions."

George Foster slowly became a novice detective. He decided he wasn't going to make a claim to the Bishop if it wasn't true. Citing scripture, George told the Grand Jury he wasn't going to "bear false witness." George took more calls. He interviewed more people. Over time Foster began keeping files on individual priests. As word got out that George Foster, the man that has billboards was investigating some Diocesan leaders and priests began to get nervous. As Foster testified, they "Thought I was crazy " and explained that they believed he might just start putting what he knew on billboards. Things took a strange turn for Foster the more he investigated. He began to get calls from police officers providing him information. The officers told him he was on the right track. The officers said that people knew, but it was being covered-up.

In the course of his investigation Foster identified Fathers Bunn, McCamley, Grattan, Kelly, and Carroll as child molesters. The Grand Jury finds George Foster was right. A concerned Catholic businessman had done what so many hadn't; he built cases against monsters to protect children.

Foster's efforts came at a price. He was told his family might be in danger. He knew that Adamec had threatened others with excommunication to silence them. But George was undeterred. He explained his strength of conviction to the Grand Jury:

"The Catholic Church, and I don't know if any of you guys are Catholic, but the laity which is me, are the church militants. That's who we are. We have the responsibility to take those matters into our hands that deal with us. And I said, you know, I'm not commenting on priests. The priests are the sewers of the world. The suck

away the sin and that dirt gets left on them. Lots of good priests. Lots of good people, terrible, hard life, loneliness. I'm not making excuses, there are some things you just don't do, but those priests are living that life. So I'm always sensitive to what they have to go through.

But as a Church militant, we have something that they don't know about. Now people talk about simple stuff. Oh, they don't know what it's like to have sex. Well, they obviously do here, but I'm saying, they don't know what it's like to raise children. When you're a parent, you know what's right and wrong. We bring that to the Church. There is not a lay parent that I talked to that had a question of what you do with a child molester. No one, no one sat there and said, oh, I'd just be real confused on how to handle this. Every parent knew the answer, and that's the gift we bring. But we're the Church militants. We're supposed to help get things done."

On or about June 21, 2002, Foster took his concerns to Bishop Joseph Adamec. Adamec acknowledged that he knew of the allegations and priests Foster named. Foster laid out the admissions of the priests, the letters of the victims, and accused priests that were still in ministry. Foster specifically noted accounts that priests had gone on trips with children and had slept in the same bed as the child. Adamec remarked, "haven't you ever slept in a bed with your child?" Following the meeting Foster sent Adamec a letter memorializing their conversation. Line by line George Foster explains that there have been and may be child predators in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. He invited the Bishop to "correct any inconsistencies." The Bishop responded in his own letter but he neither acknowledged nor denied the contents of Foster's letter. He corrected minor and irrelevant details. One error was that Foster had said the Bishop had called the priests his "boys." Adamec believed he had said "my guys." George Foster had made his great push with the victims support at this back. Adamec didn't budge. Nothing changed.

George Foster was contacted by the Office of Attorney General in late 2014. Meeting with the investigating team at a hotel in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Foster turned over his files and laid it all out. Foster smiled, "I'm glad someone is finally doing something."

George Foster came to the Bishop to seek redress for what he saw as an epidemic within the Church. The Bishop chose to respond with threats and attempted to silence a critic. However, behind closed doors Adamec took steps that showed the widespread nature of the problem. Adamec created a pay-out chart. A guide used to direct the

judgments of the Diocese in the payment of claims and in the purchase of silence. The chart appears as follows:

LEVEL OF ABUSE		RANGE OF PAYMENT
I.	Above clothing, genital fondling	$10,000 - $25,000
II.	Fondling under clothes; masturbation	$15,000 - $40,000
III.	Oral sex	$25,000 - $75,000
IV.	Sodomy; Intercourse	$50,000 - $175,000

The chart is footnoted with "Factors to consider for valuation within a range." Those "factors" are: number of occurrences; duration of abuse over time; age of victim; use of alcohol or drugs; apparent effect of abuse on victims (psychosis); and other aggravating circumstances.

The Grand Jury notes the cold bureaucracy of this chart. The problem Bishop Adamec denied in public was a problem he secretly acknowledged to himself and the Diocesan insurance. The epidemic of priests offending on children was so significant that the Bishop privately perceived a need for a scale of "payments" to the victims of child sexual abuse.

The Grand Jury predicts that interested parties to whom this report is adverse will claim that many times payments occurred after the civil statute for suit had expired. The Diocese will likely claim this is demonstrative of their goodwill to those who were abused by their priests. The Grand Jury has observed another function. With these payouts came a onslaught of confidentiality agreements or waivers of liability releases. Those who find themselves exposed by this report were not gifting money to the abused; they were buying silence and protection from public scrutiny. The Grand Jury finds this was the primary interest of Bishop Joseph Adamec.

The Grand Jury took testimony from Bishop Mark Bartchak. Bishop Barchak succeeded Bishop Adamec as head of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. For all the tragedy and evil in the files of the archives, Adamec had a brief conversation in his living room with Bartchak on the subject during the transition. No detailed briefing was had. Adamec left Bartchak to figure it out on his own.

Bishop Joseph Adamec was given the opportunity to explain his actions to the Grand Jury on November 18, 2015. The following exchange occurred:

Mr. Dye: Now I see that you're here in the trappings of a priest, and I would just ask, are you now or have you ever been a Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown?

Bishop Adamec: Yes, I –

The Bishop's counsel conferred with the Bishop. The Bishop Emeritus of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown exercised his right to refuse to answer questions on the grounds of incriminating himself.

C. Bishop Mark Bartchak

Bishop Mark Bartchak's term as Bishop of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown is relatively young. The power of the Bishop in the Diocese is nearly absolute. Bishop Bartchak acknowledged the responsibility of any Bishop to protect the welfare of the public. The Grand Jury commends Bishop Bartchak for the cases in which it has identified action in reporting allegations of child molestation to authorities and removing accused child predators from ministry. Bartchak's removal of George Koharchik, Martin Cingle, Robert Kelly, and Anthony Little were positive steps in the direction of securing the children of the Diocese. The Grand Jury thanks Bishop Bartchak for his response in the Cingle matter to the Deputy Attorney General's request.

The Grand Jury is concerned the purge of predators is taking too long. However, Bishop Bartchak explained he has attempted to prioritize his review of Diocese materials and remove active or current priests. He was unaware of the number of historical predators in the Diocese when he appeared before the Grand Jury. Bartchak explained that this was due to an ongoing review in which he has involved legal counsel in the review of Diocesan files. We conditionally accept this explanation in hopes that an earnest review prioritizing protecting the children over the institution is in effect.

Bishop Bartchak is not Bishop Hogan or Adamec. Those men wrote their legacy in the tears of children. The Bishop must continue, as he says he is, reporting allegations of child abuse to law enforcement immediately. We encourage the current Bishop to create a real and meaningful victim assistance program. Provide real confidentiality and

involve qualified experts in the review of allegations.

The legacy of Bishop Bartchak has yet to be written. The onslaught of attorneys the Grand Jury had to wade through in obtaining its evidence is concerning. There are certainly signs that the institution could revert to the protection of image over truth. The Grand Jury encourages Bishop Mark Bartchak to take bold action in correcting and rectifying the wrongs exposed in this report. The current Bishop has a choice. We pray he chooses wisely.

D. Monsignors George Flinn & Michael Servinsky

Reverend Monsignor George B. Flinn was ordained December 17, 1966 at Saint Peter Basilica, Vatican City. He was appointed the Assistant Chancellor on August 1, 1972. Bishop Hogan appointed Msgr. Flinn the "Assistant Bishop's Representative" to the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference on December 31, 1981. He served more than 22 years as the representative for both Bishop Hogan and Bishop Adamec.

He became the Chamberlain to His Holiness on December 10, 1982. He was the Chancellor from August 3, 1987 to September 1, 1992. He was appointed the Vicar General for Pastorial Life by Bishop Adamec on September 1, 1992. He was also the Chair of the Priest Personnel Board for the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown.

The Grand Jury found that Monsignor Flinn was a primary operative of Bishops Hogan and Adamec. Flinn's notes within the Diocesan files show that Flinn often operated as the primary "investigator" into allegations of sexual child abuse for or with the Bishops. Flinn would often play the role of the Bishop's enforcer making sure accused priests kept a low profile. Often Flinn would take a report of abuse from a sexual abuse victim and assure the victim it would be "addressed." In reality Flinn was simply the arm of the Bishop carrying out the Bishop's will. More often than not that mission was cover-up.

On April 20, 2005, Msgr. Flinn gave the Invocation to the United States Congress. Msgr. Flinn died September 6, 2009.

Msgr. Michael Servinsky was ordained in 1970. Servinsky spent the majority of his service to the Diocese as a member of the Bishop's Office. He was first appointed to the Bishop's office by Bishop Hogan, reappointed by Bishop Adamec and Bishop

Bartchak. He began as a Notary and eventually acted in the capacity as tribunal judge. He was appointed the Judicial Vicar in 1989. Servinsky worked closely with George Flinn as his assistant. Following Flinn's death Servinsky replaced Flinn as Vicar General. Servinsky was involved in the investigation of numerous allegations of child abuse by Diocesan priests.

Bishop Bartchak relieved Msgr. Servinsky of his duty as Vicar General on September 4, 2015. Servinsky was given the opportunity to explain his role before the Grand Jury in December 2015. Servinsky elected to exercise his right against providing testimony which may be incriminating.

SECTION IV

THE ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD

The Grand Jury report has already touched upon the payouts devised by Bishop Adamec to quiet the outrage of the abused. Bishop Adamec created an additional protocol within the Diocese. A board of hand selected operatives who answer to the Bishop. This group is called the Allegation Review Board.

The Allegation Review Board was launched in an effort to convince the public and sexual child abuse victims that the days of a mysterious Bishop deciding how to handle a scandalous and heinous report of child molestation and sodomy were over. The Allegation Review Board claims to determine the credibility of an "allegation of abuse." In reality, the Bishop still exclusively makes the decision how or what to do with a report of child molestation. Nothing has changed but the trappings of how a report is procedurally made.

Victims of child sexual abuse who believe they are reporting to a board of unbiased or neutral observers would be sadly mistaken. Investigations into victims are commonplace. Unbeknownst to the victim the investigation is often initiated by the "victim advocate" whose reports read more like police reports than the compassionate aid of anything that would remotely resemble advocacy. Victims must endure questions as to whether there are witnesses, mental health problems, or other personal issues. Additionally, the priest's assignments are investigated by the "advocate" once she gleans details of the assault from the victim. If the victim reported an assault in a particular year at a particular parish, the "advocate" will then look to see if the priest was assigned to

that parish in that year. The "advocate" points any error out in her report - even in cases where the discrepancy is mere months. These investigations also seek personal or compromising or damaging information on victims. In one case the Allegation Review Board sought the gynecological records of a victim following the victim's testimony.

If the intrusion into privacy wasn't enough to deter a victim from reporting, one only needs to realize the so-called process of verbal reports followed by written reports followed by whatever additional inquiry the Board sees fit. A victim of sexual abuse or sexual violence may recount the traumatic events to a panel of unqualified fellow Catholics as many times as this Board or the Bishop feels is appropriate. If the victim fails to do so, compensation and a finding of "credibility" can be withheld. By contrast the accused priest need only deny the events and have a glance taken at his personnel file. The imbalance in favor of the Diocese and the accused priest is total.

The Board members are selected on ambiguous "qualifications." The Grand Jury learned they are often selected on who the Bishop "likes" or if they are "good Catholics." Medical background might be a basis for appointment. However no specific qualifications are required other than the presence of a member-priest. The Grand Jury learned that one member must be an active priest, and the Bishop may sit in to observe. In fact, the Allegation Review Board never met without Bishop Adamec personally present.

The Diocese will not apologize or take responsibility for it's dark history. The Diocese blames the men and avoids institutional responsibility for a failure to act and protect. When darkest moments of a victim's life are laid bare before the Allegation Review Board those details are forwarded to lawyers whose interest is solely protecting the Diocese. Exact details are sought from victims, sometimes details from decades prior to the appearance before the Board. And while that Board's record for recommending payments to victims is robust, the alternative for the Diocese is public exposure of yet another predator priest or possibly the attention of additional victims coming forward. The Allegation Review Board is fact-finding for litigation, *not* a victim service function of the Diocese.

In reality the Allegation Review Board is only as real as any Bishop may want it to be. There is no confidentiality or privacy and no right to see what documentation the

Diocese may have in support of the allegation. The Diocese takes significant direction from attorneys retained to protect the Diocese from criminal and civil liability. Reporting to police in the modern Diocese may occur, but rest assured Diocese attorneys have vetted any Diocese action first. In the course of this investigation, witness after witness appeared with a Diocese approved attorney. One witness had an attorney appear to "represent" him before the Grand Jury, over his own objection. That matter had to be resolved by the Supervising Judge.

The Grand Jury credits the Diocese for offering $10,000.00 in counseling for victims with that cap possibly removed in certain circumstances. However, numerous Diocesan records show that the Diocese encourages the use of Diocese approved counselors. Secular counselors are not preferred.

Real change will come to the Diocese when the institution engages in transparency and acknowledges its failure. The victims of sexual child abuse need to hear the Diocese apologize, admit to the past, and confess it was wrong. Only then can true healing begin. The Diocese's response to this report will be a telling moment in whether the Diocese is moving in the right direction. The Grand Jury attempted to seek information regarding how reports by the Allegation Review Board are handled, and in particular how one report was handled when it was reported to Allegation Review Board member Father John Byrnes. Father Byrnes was called to the Grand Jury to testify but elected to exercise his 5th Amendment protections against testifying.

SECTION V
BEHAVIORAL ANALYSIS

In July 2015, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) graciously agreed to aid the Office of Attorney General and the 37th Statewide Investigating Grand Jury with additional analysis. The FBI's Critical Incident Response Group (CIRG) at the National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime was provided thousands of pages of Grand Jury transcripts and evidence. On November 2, 2015 Deputy Attorney General Daniel J. Dye and Special Agent Jessica Eger met with FBI analysts and agents for a briefing at a CIRG facility in Quantico, Virginia. The FBI's exceptional devotion to this case is noted by the

Grand Jury. The FBI's analysis and mapping of offenders and enablers provided a useful tool in the Grand Jury's analysis of this case.

On November 17, 2015 Supervisory Special Agent (SSA) Adrienne N. Isom of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Critical Incident Response Group, National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime, Behavioral Analysis Unit 5, testified before the Grand Jury. Supervisory Special Agent Isom is an experienced federal officer whose vaunted actions have been noted by multiple awards for her achievement, performance, and distinguished service. In 2009 Isom received the "Heroes of Heart" award for her participation in the FBI's Children of the Night operation; one of the largest and most successful investigations of child prostitution in United States history. Isom regularly lectures and trains law enforcement on issues related to child exploitation, abuse and trafficking. Isom holds a Bachelors of Arts in Criminal Justice, a Master's Degree in Criminology and a Master's Degree in Forensic Psychology.

SSA Isom began her testimony explaining how the Behavioral Analysis Units of the FBI can aid and assist law enforcement in their investigations and prosecutions.

MS. ISOM: The Behavioral Analysis Unit is a group of subject matter experts that focus on different crime problems or different issues. So we have units that are designed to address counter-terrorism and counter intelligence issues and cyber matters, threats, crimes against children and crimes against adults and we provide operational support to local, state and federal law enforcement agencies who are investigating those types of crimes depending on which of the units you are working with. So those operational services could include exactly what I'm doing today, testimony in support of an analysis, or educational testimony in a court of law. It could include something as simple as an investigator contacts us and asks us to help them build an interview strategy to interview an offender or a suspect in one of their cases and we have a number of different services that we provide to our law enforcement partners.

MR. DYE: You mentioned that this was a relatively large, voluminous amount of information. In your experience was this significantly large? Does this stand out in any way, shape or form?

MS. ISOM: Yeah, thousands upon thousands of pages. It's the most information -- outside of any of my own investigations in the field, it's the most information I've reviewed at the Behavioral Analysis Unit on any one case.

Prior to a more detailed analysis of the facts of the Grand Jury's investigation into the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown, SSA Isom explained how the actions of child sex

offenders can be analyzed and investigated by understanding how these offenders operate. In that analysis, common themes or behaviors amongst child sex offenders or predators can be found. Isom explained:

MS. ISOM: The Child Sex Offender Continuum is something that was developed by folks at the Behavioral Analysis Unit and the reason it was developed, when you're speaking of child sex offenders you often hear terms like pedophilia or pedophiles depending on who the presenter is. In law enforcement we prefer not to use those terms because those are clinical terms used by psychologists and psychiatrists. So we needed away to define and explain some of these characteristics about child sex offenders so the continuum developed. It used to be years past that there were two separate categories, situational offender and preferential child sex offender; but we quickly realized that human behavior does not fit into neat little boxes and categories thus it became a continuum. So it is possible that offenders can have some of the characteristics of both sides and fall somewhere in the middle. Just to go through them, what we consider situational offenders are those that act out and sexually abuse or exploit a child due to power and control needs. Typically they're trying to address their basic sexual desires. They are often sexually and morally indiscriminate so we'll see a pattern of just anti-social conduct over a period of time, maybe a voluminous criminal history, something of that nature. We often see in these types of offenders that stress will impact their offending. So, for example, it may be the offender loses their job that particular afternoon and then because they are frustrated and stressed out about that they physically or sexually act out and abuse a child. We also see that sometimes based on inadequacies or their inability to maybe have an acceptable relationship with another adult or address some of those concerns. We see them as emotional and opportunistic, so this is the type of offender who may not have preyed on children for a very long time and at one particular time on Friday afternoon at 3:00 they see a child and they act on that. The thing that really differentiates between situational and preferential child sex offender is that in situational offenders we don't see this real preference for a child victim.
Now, contrast that with preferential child sex offenders, at least a couple of whom I'll be speaking about today. The characteristics of that type of offender is they are more fantasy driven and it's more need based behavior. So we're seeing that they have a sexual interest in children and a lot of their conduct surrounds that sexual interest in kids. They often have this pattern of behavior that can be seen long-term. So especially when we get our cases at the Behavioral Analysis Unit and we start combing through material such that we did with this case, you can recognize behavior years past if you have that inclination that it's been long-term and persistent over time.
These are your offenders that we see are your primary exploiters of children, the ones that are coming out in the media where you're having 30, 40, 50 victims at a time. We also often see that they have multiple deviant sexual interests. So it could be they have a sexual interest in children. We also sometimes see a sexual interest in animals, other sorts of interests such as voyeurism, exhibitionism, things like that. They tend to be more compulsive and fixated on their sexual interest in kids than your situational offenders who are acting much more opportunistic in nature. The preferential child sex offenders also often we will see child pornography or child erotica images or materials that support

their sexual interest in children. We will also often see grooming behaviors that they are engaging in order to gain access to a child and groom them into sexual contact. Then, as I mentioned before, the hallmark of a preferential child sex offender is really that they have a true sexual preference for children. I can talk a little bit about the exclusivity now if you want.
MR. DYE: Sure.
MS. ISOM: One thing that is important to remember about even preferential child sex offenders, since that's where we'll probably be spending a lot of the time today, is that preferential child sex offenders may not be exclusive. So it is not uncommon for us to look at cases where a preferential child sex offender is married and in what might be considered a normal sexual relationship with a partner, whether that's male or female. I think that oftentimes and even myself prior to becoming involved in law enforcement and in this field, I probably would have been likely to believe that if you're a preferential child sex offender that you would not have a sexual relationship with an adult because your true sexual interest is in children and I just want to make it clear that's not necessarily the case, that sometimes the offenders will also have adult sexual relationships, as well.

The Grand Jury found SSA Isom's analysis of these offenders to be educational and insightful. While some may struggle to imagine such sexual abuse occurring to a child, Isom's testimony is a reminder that the reality of our world is that individuals live among us to desire to, and do, sexually assault children. Isom began her answer with a key point, sexual gratification is not static and the same for all offenders. The concept that all offenders are trying to work towards intercourse is a fallacy. Sex offenders may receive the sexual and criminal gratification they desire through touching alone. SSA Isom's explanation was captivating and informative.

MR. DYE: What are the general characteristics in terms of a child sex offender? What do you tend to see in terms of issues like the need for privacy to offend, the ability to offend in what would otherwise be considered a public situation, can you speak to that?
MS. ISOM: Sure. A couple of things, first, I think it's important to recognize that sexual gratification is relative. It's seems like a pretty simple concept, but just explaining that what I mean is I think we in society have a tendency to believe or have a certain definition in our mind of what is sexual abuse, what does that entail, what are the physical sexual acts that have to occur, and many believe it is penetration, that ultimately the offender always desires penetration and what we see at the Behavioral Analysis Unit is that is not always the case. So when I say sexual gratification is relative, there are some offenders that we see who are completely sexually gratified by simply touching a child. It does not need to lead to penetration and, in fact, some offenders that we have investigated have said I don't desire penetration, to me that's gross or not something that is interesting to me, I prefer fondling children. So it's just important, I think, to recognize that sexual gratification looks different to each one of these offenders. In terms of privacy, I think

there is also a belief out in society and, again, myself included prior to working in this job I would have believed that in order for someone to sexually offend against someone they need privacy to do that and that is certainly not the case. We have looked at many cases in our unit and my experience in the field, as well, where offenders will sexually abuse someone in the presence of another person and that can be in a public setting like a Walmart or a Target or a parking lot or that could be in a somewhat more semi-private location of their home, maybe in a bedroom but in the presence of a spouse, an intimate partner or even another child. So I think the privacy aspect is important to remember, as well, especially as we discuss some things in this case.
The other characteristics that we see in the vast majority of the offenders that we look at in our cases are the use of cognitive distortions. Cognitive distortions is just kind of, I guess, a fancy way to talk about thinking errors and these are thinking errors that we as humans all use every single day, it's just in these particular cases the offenders use them to excuse, rationalize and justify their sexual abuse of children.
Kind of the non-law enforcement example of this is, for example, if Jennifer Tillman came into the office and she had a box of donuts and she went to share all of those with everyone in the office, I look at the box of donuts and I really love donuts and so I want to take one of those donuts to eat but I have to tell myself in my mind, okay, I know there is a lot of calories, this isn't really good for me but instead what I'll do is I'll eat the donut but I'll go run three miles after work today. So I have minimized the eating of the donut in my mind, I have justified the fact that I'm going to eat a donut and made myself feel better about it. So I minimized that internal conflict that I feel about eating the donut. Sex offenders do much the same thing. Most of them have been raised in society, just like you and I, and because of that they understand their sexual interest in children is taboo and any action taken on that sexual interest in children is illegal and immoral and so many of them do experience internal conflict about that; and in order to overcome that internal conflict they have to justify, minimize and rationalize their conduct in their minds to make themselves feel better and to maintain that positive sense of self. The other thing about cognitive distortions that we see is that it does facilitate that offending behavior because if the offender is not experiencing internal conflict, then they feel a little bit more free to engage in that conduct that results in the abuse of children. The same thing with the action of others can influence behavior, as well. So we will see --the best example I can give is a lot of our child pornography investigations and cases that we review, the offenders will be communicating with one another online in chat forums and groups and things like that and they are constantly encouraging one another. Well, that's helping that cognitive distortion. It really sets that in for them and minimizes the internal conflict so it really can facilitate offending behavior.

SSA Isom was asked by Deputy Attorney General Dye about whether all assaults require privacy; because the Grand Jury was aware of alleged abuse occurring in relatively public locations. In an environment where Diocesan leadership did not aggressively pursue or report their conduct acts often occurred in parishes or church

facilities. The Grand Jury finds such brazen conduct is often part of the offender's calculation. As explained:

MR. DYE: Before we move on, just to briefly touch on the idea of how an offender can act out in a location where there is what might be thought of as no privacy, can you link the cognitive distortions to that decision to act in an environment where there is no privacy? How would the sex offender rationalize and say I'm going to offend in a mall parking lot or I'm going to offend in some of the other locations you gave us?
MS. ISOM: The offender, I think, minimizes because what they would think in that particular setting is potentially, hey, if I'm doing this in front of everyone else, if they thought it was a problem they would come forward and tell me or stop me or do something about it. So I think that the offenders believe in some cases that by engaging in that conduct in public it's not as bad, I'm not doing what the other offenders do where they take children into a bedroom and sexually assault them, I'm not abducting a child off of the street, I'm simply just rubbing up against them in public or I'm touching them in a public place, it's not near as bad as what these other offenders are out there doing.
MR. DYE: Can you opine on whether or not there are any nefarious sort of calculations such as if I act out in public it will be less likely anybody believes this ever happened?
MS. ISOM: Right. It certainly builds in plausible deniability as well because if someone says, hey, John Doe was assaulting me in a public place, the vast majority of people are not going to believe that because of course no one would ever abuse someone in a public place and so it really does build in a layer of plausible deniability for those offenders who are calculating enough to intentionally engage in that sort of conduct in public.

The Grand Jury concludes the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown was a location rampant with child molestation for decades. That widespread abuse of children was assisted by priests and Bishops who covered up the abuse rather than properly report it. Sadly, the priests to whom the children looked for guidance and protection were also in an ideal position to victimize them. SSA Isom clearly laid out what the Grand Jury observed; Bishops and priests who used the cover of their authority to hide the truth from the public. The offending priests knew there was no risk of exposure because Bishops Hogan and Adamec were covering it up. By hiding their conduct rather than exposing it, the Bishops enabled child sexual abuse.

MR. DYE: I guess my final question on this issue would be can a person's position diminish risk? Can a person have so much authority over another person they feel like there is really no risk because they are in the position of power and they are in a position of authority?
MS. ISOM: Position of trust, positions of authority we see a lot in the sexual abuse cases that we take a look at in our unit. Again, it also builds in plausible deniability, not to jump ahead to some of our opinions in this case but just to give an idea, when you have

someone that is a figure within a community, whether that be a religious figure, a prominent political figure, choose the area, there comes with that a certain reputation and expectations from us in society and I think that offenders know that. Many of the offenders choose those positions of trust and authority because they recognize built in within that again is this plausible deniability, no one will ever believe someone in my stature or someone in my position would engage in this sort of conduct because I have shown everyone what a wonderful person I am and I have chosen this craft or this trade that is helping others. So definitely it can impact.

The Grand Jury observed incident after incident of children being prepared for abuse by child predators. These predators engaged in a conduct known as "grooming." The following exchange between the Attorney for Commonwealth and the FBI agent details grooming.

MR. DYE: Let's talk a little bit about grooming. What is grooming? This is a term the Grand Jury has heard before.
MS. ISOM: The way we define it at the Behavioral Analysis Unit is it's really a constellation of behaviors. You can't identify just one. It's a constellation of behaviors that is really designed to gain the cooperation of a child to benefit or to lead to sexual gratification for the offender or another person.
MR. DYE: Is there a process for grooming?
MS. ISOM: Yes.
MR. DYE: What does that process look like?
MS. ISOM: What we see in the grooming process, at least this is how we conceptualize it in the Behavioral Analysis Unit and there are certainly other models of this out in the academic community, as well. The grooming process begins with the identification of a potential target and the criteria that we see offenders consider when they are identifying a target are availability, vulnerability and desirability.
There need not be all three, again, in order for there to be a victimization that occurs. But availability is simply what access does the offender have to the child. Vulnerability is are there any inherent vulnerabilities of the child that make them vulnerable to the abusive contact or to the initial contact by the offender, then desirability to the offender's considerations about whether or not that particular victim meets their ideals in terms of characteristics, whether there is a physical, emotional, whatever characteristics those can be. So when I say they need not have all three, when we talked about the situational and preferential offenders, a situational offender may not have a real child preference, however, on that particular day and time a child was present so they abused that child. That speaks to the availability and potential for vulnerability aspect. That's really the first phase in the grooming process we see. The next phase we see the offender is attempting to establish a connection with the victim and oftentimes that is through sharing common interests. It could be through -- just a couple of examples, the minor says I have some difficulties in my math class and the offender steps in and says, hey, I can tutor you in math, I'm really good, I've always been great at algebra, let me help you out, so that attempt to establish some sort of connection or common bond with the child.

We next see the offender gathering information about that child because, of course, they need to know as much as possible in order to get to the end goal which is some sort of sexual gratification. They have to gather a lot of information about the child to move forward. The reason that's so important is because in the next step that we often see is this fill needs and exploiting vulnerabilities. The information that they have gathered may be something as simple as there is not a father in the home, an absent father scenario where the child really needs a male role model, a male figure in their life, and the offender will step in and fill that need or something as simple as they can't afford groceries, they can't afford to pay rent, the offender will step in financially and support the family or the child. Eventually you see the offender lowering inhibitions and this can be done in several different ways. It can be through casual touching of the child, maybe just walking up and putting their arm around the child and seeing if the child rebuffs or kind of recoils to that kind of physical contact. It could be showing them pornography as a way to demonstrate the types of conduct that they hope that the child will engage in at a later point. So it can take many different forms but eventually the lowering inhibitions does transition to the introduction of sexual activity and then eventually move into victimization. A couple of important points about this demonstrative are although we show it as a process; it's definitely a dynamic process. So it doesn't always have to go in this particular order. So, for example, as I mentioned if an offender walks up and puts their arm around the child and the child recoils, then that is really telling the offender I have some more work to do. So he's up at the lowering inhibitions stage but maybe he needs to back up to the gathering information stage and kind of start again. So it's this constant assessment by the offenders of this process.
The other thing about grooming is it really does work toward the offender's benefit in preserving this whole process of child sexual abuse because by the time the offender gets to the victimization phase they really have developed generally some sort of relationship with that child which makes it -- again, we'll talk about at some point today how that impacts the disclosure process along the way. Finally, the thing to remember about this process is that the goal does not have to be ongoing abuse. The grooming process can occur for a one-time event. It doesn't have to be for long-term.

Parents reading the Grand Jury's report may consider traditional standards such as "tell an adult or teacher" if you're being hurt. However, the Grand Jury's findings expose a frightening weakness in our old standards - What if the abusers are those people? That horrifying possibility, when considered with the bottomless depravity that occurred in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown, shows just how alone many of the victims must have felt. In the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown it wasn't a possibility, it was reality. The men of God were devils in disguise. Moreover, it shows how the priests were so effective at offending and why the failure of the Bishops, who had knowledge of the conduct as well as the power to stop it, was so exceedingly reprehensible. SSA Isom's exploration of these issues is as follows:

MR. DYE: If I can ask, you mentioned about situations where the individual, the perpetrator, could establish a connection and insert themselves into a certain scenario or a certain place in that child's life. Can certain positions sort of preset the predator to be in the child's life? For example -- it's a terrible example to think of but let's say the person is a social worker and actually has an active role in the child's life or the person is the child's pediatrician and actually plays an active role in the child's life. Can a position actually aid in that process?
MS. ISOM: Absolutely. We often will see in our cases -- you can look again back at that long-term pattern of conduct and we will see that the offender has intentionally chosen roles in order to gain access to children and that may be specific role for a specific child. So if the offender sees some boy in the park or a girl in the park that they have a sexual interest in, they are going to work potentially to figure out who the kid's parents are, try to establish a connection with those parents, maybe through an offer of babysitting to get into that position of authority and trust with the child in the family, which brings me to one very important point that I didn't bring up is that the grooming process is not just for children. Offenders groom children. They also groom family members and they groom the community. So it's important to keep that in mind, as well.
MR. DYE: Not to jump ahead in the analysis; but as we talk about positions of trust, that would include positions of a priest?
MS. ISOM: Yes.
MR. DYE: You mentioned grooming of the family.
As a predator grooms the family, does he also groom the community and the institutions?
MS. ISOM: Yes.
MR. DYE: How does that happen?
MS. ISOM: Oftentimes, as I mentioned, it will occur through the position of trust and authority, so seeking those positions that give them that place where the perception is they would either do no wrong or could do no harm sort of scenario. It could also be that they will attempt to improve social perception of others so they want the community to look to them as kind of a person who is doing the right thing, very benevolent in nature, out there trying to do things to help people. They may create an illusion that they are really there just to help children, that's their whole goal, so they may work with the underprivileged community, things of that nature.
In doing all of this they are building this positive reputation. They may take on a job, for example, that no one else wants in a particular area. There is an example of this I can give later when we get to the opinion side of things.
The whole purpose of this grooming the community is because they want to build the trust of all the people in the community so when an allegation does come forward everyone's first response is, no, not that guy, he would never do this because he is in this case a priest, he's member of the religious community, he has volunteered for 15 years in saving underprivileged children from poverty. That is a goal they want, the offender, when the allegations come forward that no one will believe it happened.
MR. DYE: We talk about priests because certainly that's played a role in this case, but that could include police officers, that could include doctors, that could include anyone that would build a reputation in their community for aiding people or being a benevolent figure, things like that?

MS. ISOM: Absolutely. This is certainly not restricted to just religious figures, teachers, law enforcement, all walks of life.
MR. DYE: In terms of how society itself or parents can feed into that without even realizing it, there is a way in which parents in teaching child to respect police or respect their priest is actually furthering the abuse cycle without even knowing it; right?
MS. ISOM: Yeah, parents can certainly just through the simple modeling behavior can encourage contact with someone and encourage the child to trust someone just in their actions. A very simple example of that is if we see a parent who tells their child, oh, go ahead and hug Uncle Jimmy or go ahead and hug someone, you're really messaging to that child that it's safe to hug that person. So that's a very simple example of modeling, but it can certainly occur in the positions of trust and authority as well where the parents have an ongoing relationship with this person because they trust them. They are modeling to their child, okay, mom and dad or my mom and stepdad trust this person and so I should too.

The conduct of the priests and bishops also harmed the families of the victims. The parents of so many victims were misled by Bishops Hogan and Adamec. Their faith in those men was sorely misplaced but they lacked such knowledge at that time. The Grand Jury heard testimony of parents who said the victimization of their child tore their family apart. Blame, shame and guilt for their child's sexual abuse were a crushing weight upon them. Two parents told investigators that they'd wondered how they "missed it." In looking back parents stated they couldn't allow themselves to believe it happened. This thought process is not uncommon as explained by SSA Isom.

MR. DYE: Is it difficult with the family dynamic of applying the thing that we all know Exists, which is child molestation, to the specifics of their own scenario?
MS. ISOM: Yeah, what I think again we as society in general are aware that child sexual abuse is out there. We're certainly aware of scandals in different parts whether it's athletics, in religion and all of these different areas of sexual abuse scandals that have come out in the news media; but what's really difficult, I think, for all of us people, me included, is to apply that information to our own personal lives. So we know based on literature that's out there that the majority of sexual abuse victims are victimized by people that they know, whether that's an acquaintance or someone that they have relationship with. When we all look at those around us that we spend time with and that we allow our children to spend time with, it's still very difficult to apply those characteristics and that information to those that we trust with our children and we trust to spend time with ourselves.
MR. DYE: Put another way is that sort of manifestation of the "it won't happen to me" sort of feeling?
MS. ISOM: Right. It certainly could be that. It could be we trust -- we look around and we trust others' opinions. So another concept that is out there is this idea of social proof,

the idea that because you have provided me information about someone I'm going to trust it because I trust you. A simple thing like a plumber, if I need a plumber
I might call Mr. Dye and say, hey, can you recommend a plumber. Well, that's social proof. He's providing me some information about a plumber who he trusts and because I trust Mr. Dye, or whoever it is giving me the information, I then may apply that trust to that next layer.
MR. DYE: In terms of exploiting weaknesses in the system, is it also fair to say where a scenario may exist where people in positions of authority should be doing something or there is knowledge they won't do anything, the predators are going to exploit that, they are going to become aware there is no ramifications for my actions here and I found niche that I can work in?
MS. ISOM: Yeah, and it encourages those cognitive distortions and essentially is telling them that they have minimized the conduct because the institution, whatever that institution is, is not responding to the information and so that essentially is messaging to the offender that this must not be that serious, no one really cares about it so I can continue on and engage in this conduct.

The Grand Jury saw many examples of victims who were abused for many years but did not discuss it or report it. The offenders in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown knew what they were doing. They prepared their victims with the same devotion for which the prepared for Mass. They knew their audience was captive to their authority and persona.

MR. DYE: Let's segue from exploiting weaknesses into what can happen during the abuse process or the grooming process that is beneficial to the offender such as the fact that they are preying on children; right? Right out of the gate, the nature of who they are preying on provides some benefits in allowing them to continue preying upon them; right?
MS. ISOM: Absolutely.
MR. DYE: Can you speak to that?
MS. ISOM: Just inherent in development, emotional and cognitive development in children, they are going to have some difficulties resisting abuse because again we are all taught generally from a very early age to trust our elders and to be pleasant with one another and things like that. So all of that really does create some difficulties for a child in having to resist that type of sexual contact or at least the grooming process we talked about in reducing that. There also is some apprehension from kids if the parents are trusting of another person if the person is engaged in their life on a regular basis, that apprehension that comes in telling my parent, hey, I have a problem with this guy because he's been touching me or the way he talks to me makes me feel uncomfortable, very difficult to do. All of this benefits the offender in the long run because they understand that if I effectively groom this child they are less likely to report this abuse, if I can keep them in this process -- and the process doesn't always stop after the sexual

abuse or contact, it can go on for years and years where they are preserving the secrecy with the child for a very long term.

Supervisory Special Agent Isom applied this knowledge to specific individuals exposed by this Grand Jury report. Isom analyzed a sample of individuals who are representative of the kinds of offenders active within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. She concluded each met the criteria to be designated a child predator who had engaged in child sexual abuse.

A. Father Joseph Gaborek

Joseph Gaborek was both priest and predator. Gaborek's position facilitated his crimes. Isom's analysis noted that Gaborek engaged in grooming of the victim. Gaborek would pat children on the head and give them hugs. Through this common and repeated process Gaborek was able to normalize physical contact. The Grand Jury found numerous priests engaged in such contact which, without the knowledge of Bishops Hogan and Adamec, appeared harmless.

Gaborek had his victim spent the night at the rectory. The result of this was that both the victim and his family approved of the action because it naturally felt like a privilege had been extended. The Grand Jury repeatedly found families who permitted contact with their children because the individual requesting the contact was a priest and such interest in their family or the child was considered an honor.

Gaborek was able to fill a role for the child; the victim reported Gaborek felt like a valued family member. Gaborek was able to exploit what he recognized was a need the child felt he had. Finally, Gaborek's role as a priest and his ability to offer his victim work, promoted contact and normalized the contact between Gaborek and his victim. The seemingly legitimate reason to remain in regular contact permitted Gaborek more opportunities to sexually abuse the victim; which he did.

B. Father Anthony Little

Father Anthony Little's initial contact with his victim came in the form of counselor. Little's position of trust and authority provided him access to victims. In the course of seeking support for being bullied, Little hugged the victim and assured him that he would be able to make things okay. According to the FBI's analysis this provided

Little with an opportunity to assess the needs of the victim, discover a vulnerability, and exploit it.

Isom found Little attempted to normalize the sexual abuse of the victim by making the victim watch him masturbate. Little then assured the victim that what he was doing was normal and natural. Little was able to directly exploit his position as priest when he forced the victim to masturbate in church, then reminded the victim that no one would "believe him." This is consistent with Isom's analysis that seemingly public locations are often used because the predator has control of the environment and it attempts to increase the implausibility of the assault.

Isom found Little engaged in obvious forms of grooming by providing the victim numerous financial and material benefits to include a new car and electronics. At the same time Little attempted to alienate the victim from his family and friends to obtain more control of the victim and establish a stronger relationship.

Lastly, Little effectively groomed the community in his role as a priest. Parishioners invested in Little as representative of values they felt strongly about or felt Little demonstrated in public. Isom noted that public support for Little even after he was accused by those who were unaware of the details can cause significant harm. The victims' awareness of public support for the offender only works to further undermine victims' efforts to report or recover.

C. Father George Koharchik

The FBI designated Father George Koharchik as a preferential child sex offender. Koharchik was able to use the trust and authority of the priesthood to secretly engage in molestation, digital penetration and anal sex with children.

Koharchik began to normalize contact by "tickling" altar boys in hallways of his parish. Though seemingly innocuous this process begins to create seemingly "legitimate" ways to have physical contact with a child prior to offending on them.

Koharchik also had boys sit on his lap and steer his vehicle. This was done in the presence of other boys, this helped him normalize the conduct and normalize close physical contact. Koharchik also introduced the concept of special privileges by allowing boys to engage in an act they would normally not be permitted, in this case driving, by

sitting on his lap. Koharchik utilized other special privilege methods of grooming such as gifts, trips to McDonald's restaurant and event tickets.

Koharchik showered with boys and applied soap to their bodies. The FBI agent found this to be yet another example of normalizing both nudity and contact to confuse and condition the boys for sexually assault. In addition to showering with the boys, Koharchik would play Bill Cosby comedy tapes while traveling with the boys in which Cosby referred to the penis by a nick-name. This normalized discussion about sexual organs and permitted Koharchik to lower inhibitions with other peoples' children.

The FBI expert also found that Koharchik effectively groomed the community and family by engaging in activities the community supported such as coaching sports and being very active in the church and school. This resulted in community support when allegations were levied against Koharchik which the Grand Jury now knows chilled at least one additional victim from coming forward at that time.

Supervisory Special Agent Isom noted that Father Koharchik's role on the presbytery council within the Diocese would likely have emboldened Koharchik and permitted him to engage in dangerous cognitive distortions. By sitting on the council and being involved in discussions related to the Luddy case, Koharchik likely thought "these people must not suspect I'm doing anything wrong or they wouldn't let me do this." The Grand Jury finds this to be yet another of one of the many ways Diocesan leaders knowingly or unknowingly endangered the community.

D. Father Leonard Inman

SSA Isom dissected the loathsome behavior of Father Leonard Inman. Inman preyed on disadvantaged youth by trolling the alleyways around the grand Altoona Cathedral. Father Leonard Iman offered money for sex and engaged in those acts in the Cathedral itself. Isom found that for a young or immature child the offering of cash, though transactional, meets the criteria to be considered grooming.

Inman showed the child pornography which Isom found to be common. The display of pornography normalizes conduct and encourages the child to engage in the same or similar conduct. The offender can say that conduct, as depicted, is enjoyable and that doing it is a "good time."

Isom used the Inman case to speak to the unique role of the priesthood and religion in this investigation. The impact of engaging in such acts in a scared location creates additional layers of shame and embarrassment and heightens the fear of reporting. Additional conflict about the wrongness of the act and how it intersects with the victim's faith adds additional layers of confusion, shame and fear. Inman raped a child in the Cathedral as a priest; the victim does not separate the man from the priest, or the authority from the man. Isom concluded, in part, that the lack of an authoritative response or investigation further speaks to how thoroughly the community was groomed to respect these priests and the institution.

The Grand Jury found the testimony of the agent from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to be grounded in corroborative evidence uncovered throughout this investigation. The Grand Jury supports Agent Isom's conclusions that the authority and positions of these men within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown aided them in sexually abusing children. Make no mistake, evidence shows that in the mind of a little child the acts of a priest occurred with the authority of God.

E. The Bishops

Supervisory Special Agent Isom, of the FBI's Behavioral Analysis Unit, anylzed the conduct of Bishops James Hogan and Joseph Adamec of the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. Her conclusions were blunt but exact. James Hogan and Joseph Adamec enabled the priests of the Diocese to sexually abuse children.

Isom tackled the issue of "treatment" and the Bishop's similar methods of questioning accused priests as to whether they felt they needed help. Isom took issue with that fact that the Bishop would ask this question of the offender as though the offender himself was in a position to gauge whether or not he needed help. Isom stated:

"Now I will tell you having interviewed countless offenders, I have asked them that question, do you believe you need help, and some of them will say yes; but certainly I don't know that I would want to risk the safety of others based on the opinion of someone who I know has just admitted to me that they fondled a child."

Isom also spoke to the continued statements regarding scandal, publicity, public scrutiny, and the lack of police reporting. In fact, where police did appear deals were

brokered to avoid prosecution. Taken in total, Isom noted that such a constellation of reckless behaviors directed at protecting public perception rather than protecting children diminishes the seriousness of the offense to the offender and endangers children.

In regards to Bishop James Hogan, Isom noted that Hogan's interference with police investigations to the benefit of predators like Father Gaborek certainly supported conclusions by Gaborek and potentially other offenders or victims that the most powerful official in the Diocese condoned or tolerated the sexual abuse of children.

The Behavioral Assessment Unit characterized Bishop Joseph Adamec's approach to sexual child abuse as "laissez-faire." Isom and the group noted in particular that Adamec was mailed an anonymous letter stating that Joseph Bender had sexually abused children. When Adamec interviewed Father Bender he stated he hadn't done anything like that for 20 years. Adamec's bold effort to protect the children of the Diocese was to return Bender to ministry reasoning that if it had been serious the writer would have signed the letter.

The FBI noted other incidents where even the accused priests where alarmed that Adamec wasn't taking notes when interviewing them regarding the allegations. Adamec's statement that he would "write down what he needed to remember" would have only furthered the accused's belief that the allegation alone must be insufficient or not important.

While the Grand Jury found it was not Bishop Joseph Adamec's practice to call the police when dealing with allegations of sexual child abuse, the FBI noted a damning example of just how little Adamec seemed to be concerned with the wellbeing of the children of his Diocese. SSA Isom noted the case of Mark Powdermaker. Powdermaker was not a priest but a lay person working as a librarian at Bishop Guilfoyle High School from 1994 to 2002. On December 19, 2002 school officials began an investigation into a questionable internet story that had been printed by a school employee. In the course of their investigation they came to learn that Mark Powdermaker was using school library computers to download graphic stories of the rape and torture of female children as young as 13 years-of-age. Chat logs also showed that Powdermaker was actively discussing his desire to sexually assault and torture a child with other men online. The

Grand Jury suffered through a reading of a portion of the writings Mark Powdermaker obtained sexual gratification from. To call the stories sadistic is an understatement.

Before the end of December 2002 the school had notified Bishop Joseph Adamec via email of the investigation and its outcome. Powdermaker was resultantly dismissed from the school. However, the Diocese knew how deplorable Powdermaker's interests were. Office of Attorney General Special Agents removed the box containing hundreds of pages of Powdermaker's violent child rape stories and chats from the Diocesan offices during a search warrant on August 7, 2015. Mark Powdermaker had spent eight years amongst the teenage girls he dreamed of raping. Bishop Guilfoyle High School and the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown helped him keep his secret. As FBI Special Agent Isom noted, no one, including Bishop Joseph Adamec, called the police.

While the Bishops chose to engage in cover-up and obfuscation they certainly had the power and the ability to be transparent. Agent Isom spoke to the power of public notification when dealing with crimes that require secrecy.

MR. DYE: To touch on that point, the concept of empowering people to make the best decisions for themselves and their own families, if we look at that by engaging in the conduct that the Diocese and the TOR did -- and we have gone through all sorts of examples but minimization and what appears to be in some cases absolute cover-up of these kinds of things, is it fair to say then that is robbing individuals and families of being able to make those decisions like you're speaking about that are in the best interest of their children?
MS. ISOM: Yeah, and my recollection in reading some of the statements of some of the victims and their family members they all but said so, if I would have known this information I would have changed my behavior or I never knew that he was capable of doing something like this. If they had known, they certainly, we hope, would have modified their decisions about allowing access, not everyone. We all know of cases as investigators where parents have allowed children to still associate with predators or individuals that are preying on children; but it certainly would allow people to make more informed decisions.
MR. DYE: In regards to notification because that may be something this Grand Jury ultimately faces if they can't reach criminal charges and are left to engage in a process under Pennsylvania law that allows for what is known as a report, taking your testimony sort of to fruition, what I'm hearing is there is a benefit generally to notification?
MS. ISOM: Yeah, and I don't even mean just to law enforcement. Certainly we see a lack of reporting to law enforcement of sexually abusive acts but just notification in general. Being honest about the reasons for removal educates people.
MR. DYE: We do have collateral -- I should say we do have a codified example of that in some of the collateral civil consequences of criminal conviction in things like Megan's Law which is basically a notification requirement?

MS. ISOM: Right. In terms of like sex offender notification laws, certainly I don't think there are people out here who are going to say, absolutely, sex offender notification laws eliminate the possibility of sex abuse. I don't know of any law enforcement officer that would say that; but again it allows informed decisions.
If I know I have a sex offender on a street in my neighborhood, I'm probably going to tell my caregiver please do not walk my child down that street. It's something as simple as that. That information that I receive informs a decision I'm making about the safety of my children.

SECTION VI
VICTIMIZATION AND THE VICTIMS

The 37th Investigating Statewide Grand Jury commends the victims of sexual abuse for their bravery in coming forward to report child sexual abuse within the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. Whether reported immediately or years later, the strength of character necessary to come forward and confront their accusers is a strength those who abused them, or enabled their abuse, only pretended to possess.

The impact of child sexual abuse is profound. Our predecessors in the Philadelphia County Grand Jury investigated the Archdiocese of Philadelphia and found shockingly similar circumstances within that diocese. That Grand Jury called child sexual abuse "soul murder." Based upon our findings in the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown, we cannot disagree.

The Grand Jury explored the impact of child sexual abuse with an expert from the FBI, Supervisory Special Agent Adrienne N. Isom. The following exchange occurred:

MR. DYE: Perhaps the darkest part of these types of cases are now the emotional response, what this causes inside the victim as they struggle with the aftermath. Can you speak to what is the emotional response of the victim to victimization?
MS. ISOM: The thing that I would say we most frequently see and hear from victims are the ideas of guilt, shame and embarrassment I think are the main three, and loyalty, some of the loyalty as I just mentioned that develops; but many of these children once they get to a point -- we as humans take our experiences and then as we grow up and we age we start to apply information that we received to previous events.
So the child is growing up, may have been abused as a five or six year old but at the time didn't really recognize that was abuse. At they grow up, as they get older, they start to apply the information they are receiving to those instances and they are thinking back, oh, my gosh, that really was abusive contact. Then they feel shameful. Then they feel guilty that they didn't recognize it even though we all as adults now understand that they shouldn't have necessarily been in a position to recognize it as abusive conduct because they were five or six years old, whatever the case may be; but it really does resulting a lot of confusion, a lot of guilt and shame. Especially in those scenarios where you have the

ongoing relationships, they feel like they are destroying something that was built. We see that also a lot in homosexual relationships --again, the term relationship as you mentioned is not the best way to describe it but if we have an offender who has an ongoing sexual relationship with a minor, especially if it's a homosexual relationship, that guilt and shame is really an influence because that child is really confused maybe and doesn't understand, okay, am I homosexual, am I heterosexual and they may believe that others will judge them based on that. So it really does impact that whole disclosure process and their willingness to come forward with the information because they themselves are just confused and worried.

MR. DYE: What kind of disclosure challenges exist?

MS. ISOM: We will often see no disclosure whatsoever where they have not disclosed for years. We will sometimes see where law enforcement has come forward and talked to them and they denied there was any sort of abusive conduct. We will see incremental disclosures and then sometimes we'll even see victims who will bring forth information to law enforcement and then later recant that information later and say that it didn't happen.

MR. DYE: Again, it sounds terrible to say but we're talking about predators so it's the same kind of language one might use when discussing how a lion seeks its prey. With adolescents what makes the ideal victim?

MS. ISOM: Adolescence really is an ideal victim age range because there is a whole lot going on when you're in adolescence. I'm sure we can all think back during that phase. So all of the characteristics that we see in normal adolescence is some of what makes these victims very susceptible to sexual abuse. So in normal adolescence we all remember being curious about things and trying to kind of figure out the world as we're going along. We are in the midst of emotional immaturity, so we don't really understand how relationships exactly work and what's my role in a particular relationship. Hormones and puberty are in full force during that period of time so you go through again the curiosity aspect of things.

Sometimes that curiosity transfers into sexual activity. In the area of adolescence we see a lot of risk taking behaviors that develop and sometimes kids even get to the point where they might be described as rebellious and not following instructions by their parents or their educators, things of that nature. Kids that are in adolescence despite the fact that they may tell all of us as parents leave us alone, we don't want any contact with you, they really do have that need for attention, whether that be from a figure within their life like a parent or a role model but also from their peers. Then they are also at this age where they are trying to seek independence. They don't really want to be seen with mom or dad, they don't really want someone watching over them at all times. Then you add to that what could be present, the complicating circumstances. So if you have a child that is an adolescent who their parents are at that point that they finally feel like they can provide the opportunity for some independence, then that can certainly make them susceptible. If there are complicating factors like a lack of parental involvement in their life, if they are poverty stricken or suffering from any sort of financial difficulties. If you have a child that is feeling like they have a sexual identity crisis where they are just not sure, they are still trying to explore their own sexuality and in some cases are trying to make sure that they identify one way or the other and just the difficulties that come along with that. Certainly low self-esteem can impact it because the offenders will notice that

immediately and capitalize on that, providing a lot of compliments, encouragement, things of that nature. Then if they have been a prior sexual abuse victim it can also increase their susceptibility. So this period of adolescence really does make the kids really susceptible to victimization, and add to that the idea that abusive conduct doesn't necessarily have to hurt. Again, this is something that some people may consider kind of controversial but we all know -- we all have heard of situations where there has been some sort of horrific event where the child is definitely held down, maybe abducted off the street, tied up and horrible things have happened; but equally as horrible maybe those incidents where the offenders sexually abusing them but it doesn't hurt. So you can imagine the guilt and shame from a child who, for example, the offender is touching them and they developed an erection and the confusion that must be going on in their head as an adolescent by thinking my body responded physiologically in a certain way, it surely shouldn't have done that, that must mean I liked it but I don't really like it, what is going on in the mind of a kid who is not even cognitively fully developed at this point. It really does make them vulnerable.

MR. DYE: Before I move on to specific offender behavior in this case, let's talk a little bit about the disclosure of sexual abuse and the factors that can impact the disclosure of sexual abuse. What are the general factors that impact victim disclosure of sexual abuse?

MS. ISOM: I think the easiest one to talk about first is really the nature of the relationship between the offender and the victim. If the offender is still involved in the child's life, certainly that is going to impact that disclosure process, how often are they seeing one another, are they engaged in regular communication with the child's parents or family members, are they an educator they are going to have to see every day, things of that nature.

We see a lot of cases where children will say, including this case, where they thought they wouldn't be believed, no one will believe me if I come forward and say this about the offender, the person that's touching me. That certainly impacts the disclosure process. The other thing is keeping in mind that when children are analyzing in their mind whether or not they should come forward about sexual abuse, the recognition to them that things in their life are going to change, so especially if you have a case where it's intra-familial sexual abuse where the offender is a parent or a caregiver, the child very easily understands that if I report information about my dad or about my caregiver that person is likely going to be removed from my life if it's reported to law enforcement. Children know that. From a very young age I think we all recognize that action reaction concept. So if a child is worried about coming forward about information and they recognize that, hey, mom doesn't work and dad has been touching me, if I talk about what dad's been doing, dad is going to leave and then we don't have food on the table next week. All of these things can impact that process of disclosure including that guilt and shame and embarrassment, those factors that we talked about.

This investigation found numerous occurrences of child sexual abuse between male priests and young boys and girls. Those unique factors were addressed by the FBI's expert.

MS. ISOM: As I mentioned previously, we see many male victims or we learn about male victims that have not come forward out of fear that they won't be believed but then also fear that people will judge them based on the type of abuse that was perpetrated on them. As I mentioned, especially we have kids in adolescence that are exploring their sexuality and if they were perpetrated on by a male offender they may believe in their mind that makes them homosexual. Perhaps for them for whatever reason that is an undesirable label that they want placed on them, so we see that as an issue. We also have -- if you think about the way that men are raised in our society, men are not necessarily taught that crying is okay. Certainly it depends on the household so I'm generalizing; but if you think about the way men are raised in our society, reporting this type of vulnerability or victimization is really just not something we inherently teach people. We don't necessarily teach men in our society that it's okay to cry, it's okay to react if something bad happens to you and then talking about issues and problems is also not something that's regularly encouraged. So we have children maybe that are being raised in a family or in their life that they don't feel like they can express that something bad is going on in their life or something bad is happening to them because it would be viewed as weakness. So those are really the things that we see that are really unique to the male victims.

The Grand Jury recognizes these terrible acts which occurred throughout Pennsylvania are almost unbearable to comprehend. The truth often is. However, the Grand Jury found a solution to the question posed by these terrible acts... who can we trust? The answer is both beautiful and heartening in the midst of so much pain; we must trust our children. We must listen to our children and hear them, for they have no greater guardian or friend. As discussed before us, SSA Isom spoke to the uncertainly that surely exists in the mind of a confused and hurting child.

MR. DYE: Generally with victims -- I want to hone in on one issue here -- what happens if the child lacks either -- because the offender is in such a position of power or is so well liked or because the parent literally doesn't exist, what happens in scenarios where the child lacks the presence of someone to report to because they are so either engrossed in the identity of the predator or they don't exist?
MS. ISOM: Certainly the most obvious thing that a child has to have is someone they feel like they can trust to go forward and report to. Generally again they are doing that assessment of is the person going to believe me. So if I have only one person in my life that I can report the information to and it's grandma, for example, is grandma actually going to believe me if I go forward and say this. They really do have to have that supportive person in their life that they feel comfortable disclosing such really personal information to because, again, when a child is disclosing this type of conduct -- imagine if you are expected to walk -- as we often say, I wouldn't want to walk into a room and talk about a sexual relationship with a bunch of strangers, a sexual relationship or sexual conduct that someone has made me engage in with a bunch of strangers and sometimes that's what children see, I don't want to tell about this abusive conduct to anyone.

The Grand Jury finds that the victims of sexual child abuse often engage in delayed reporting if they report at all. The reasons for delayed reporting are numerous and understandable. The trauma of sexual child abuse on the victims and their families cannot be overstated. Victims find themselves alive and walking but feeling dead or dying.

Victims reported feeling "black inside." Many victims in this investigation did or contemplated committing suicide. The Grand Jury can say no better what a mother of a victim described. The devout Catholic mother said the sexual abuse of her son "ruined our lives."

SECTION VII

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The Grand Jury finds the acts of the predator priests and their enabling Bishops detailed in this report to be criminal. However, they cannot be prosecuted at this time. The statute of limitations for many of the loathsome and criminal actions detailed in this report has expired. In some limited cases the unnamed victim or victims are too deeply traumatized to testify in a court of law.

There is no applicable legal provision which would apply to religious ministers or church officials to permit the extension of the statute of limitations. Many of the accused are dead; answerable now only to a higher authority.

Pennsylvania law has changed since many of these offenses occurred. Some penalties have increased, some charging periods extended. The Grand Jury finds additional legislative action is required.

Abolish the statute of limitation for sexual offenses against minors.

The Grand Jury recognizes this recommendation is not new. Victim advocates and previous grand juries have recommended such action. However this Grand Jury again recognizes a terrible fact. Child predators will offend on children, consume their innocence and escape justice until there can be no temporal escape from their crimes. This report detailed an account of a 70-year-old victim who came forward to report the devastating trauma of their youth. The victims of child sexual abuse never escape their victimization; it is inequitable and unjust to allow their victimizers to escape accountability.

Open a window to allow child sexual abuse victims to have their civil actions heard.

The Grand Jury recommends that the Pennsylvania legislature suspend the civil statute of limitations on sexual abuse claims for a designated and finite period of years. This relief would allow adults who were victims of child sexual abuse to have their cases heard in a court of law. The statute of limitations in effect leaves insufficient time to seek relief for crimes that are inherently underreported or are delayed in reporting.

The Grand Jury took testimony and reviewed evidence which showed many of the child sexual abuse victims who sought relief from the Allegation Review Board alleged conduct which was beyond the civil statute of limitations. The lives of child abuse victims are permanently altered by their assaults; they deserve to be made whole.

Organizations which have a history of secrecy in regards to child abuse allegations will consider meaningful reform when their failures have financial cost. Victims deserve the opportunity to seek a full and fair settlement, not as one Church official stated, "settle for what they can get."

Possible criminal conduct should be directly reported to law enforcement authorities.

The Grand Jury acknowledges that this report details incidents of law enforcement officials falling short of their oaths. However, the Grand Jury also notes that it was the efforts of dedicated law enforcement that finally exposed these decades of sexual violation unleased on helpless little children.

The Grand Jury urges the victims of crime to report criminal activity to law enforcement. Many child predators offend again and again. These so-called men feed on innocence and are enabled by the hubris of apathetic administrators. Institutional leaders can make administrative changes with or following an action by law enforcement personnel to secure public safety. There is no member of the public in greater need of protection than our children.