

March 7, 2019

**VIA EMAIL**

Office of the County Commissioners  
Joshua G. Parsons, Chairman  
Dennis P. Stuckey, Vice-Chairman  
Craig E. Lehman

150 N. Queen St.  
Seventh Floor, Suite 715  
Lancaster, PA 17603

Dear Lancaster County Commissioners:

I am contacting the board extremely concerned, disappointed, and stunned by recent actions and public comments made by the board regarding my office.

During my 11 years as District Attorney of Lancaster County, I have worked cooperatively with every board of commissioners and other elected officials. While that has not always involved seeing eye-to-eye, conversations were had, resolutions were discussed, and progress was achieved – all to the benefit of the taxpayers we are elected to serve.

Recently, however, this board has chosen to follow a path of only corresponding with my office through media releases and legal filings which are misleading the public and fashioned so to impugn a reputation for integrity I have spent a career building.

I refer to recent events, specifically media reports exacerbated by public comments from the Board of Commissioners (BOC) regarding my office and alleged improprieties. Those comments included outright falsehoods on subjects which the BOC made no attempts to take up with me. Had you done so, I am confident each “issue” could have been quickly resolved.

I speak specifically of three storylines: employment action involving one of my employees; the disclosure of data regarding civil forfeitures; and the use of a forfeiture-funded work vehicle.

Regarding the employment action, this board breached a long-standing practice in this county to not discuss HR matters and certainly not disclose employees involved in such processes. Not only was the employee’s name disclosed by the BOC, but it was suggested that I acted with political motivation; when in fact I acted in concert with the recommendations of the county’s Human Resources Department – *your HR department*.

Regarding civil forfeiture data, had this board verbalized a strong desire – or any desire - to view the records, I would have worked with you. Despite your attacks, I am extending the extraordinary offer that this board reviews said records on condition that anything necessary to protect law enforcement and safety is not revealed.

Regarding the forfeiture-funded vehicle, the lease was expressly authorized by the County Controller in an official document over three (3) years ago. That this board was not aware of such when making bold public accusations of impropriety is hard to believe. If it was known, then the attack was simply deceitful.

More importantly than the attacks, I write this on behalf of the taxpayers and residents of Lancaster County – whom we all were elected to serve.

This community deserves a set of elected officials they can depend on, who work with the public's best interests as their guiding priority. Apprising residents via media of alleged discrepancies - without even cursory inquiries into the facts - and launching investigations without any legal authority to do so does little to achieve that goal. In fact, it works directly to the contrary.

The public has a right to expect our leaders to at least attempt to discuss a matter of concern or a question before resorting to legal filings and/or casting clouds of misbehavior in the media. This board has instead chosen what should be the last resort: the path of legal filings and blatant attacks on my office using a media conduit. Because you have chosen that path, I am reluctantly forced to respond in that same arena. Providing the public falsehoods via the media stains the hard work exerted by my staff and myself and tarnishes the integrity and fairness with which we all approach our daily duties. It cannot go on.

To elaborate further on the three storylines, my disappointment is heightened because this board had all the facts available to them had they had any interest in them, but instead made the comments and took actions in conflict to those facts.

Specifically:

- This began when this board then made a statement that an employment matter in my office, which you *knew had been resolved* at that point, had taken place. The BOC then unfairly identified the employee. You then went even further and speculated that the matter was political, directly impugning my integrity.

The truth, that you have never told the public, is that you knew that every decision regarding the employment matter happened with input and recommendation from HR, it was demonstrably not political, and there is no complaint. Your misleading statements are a failure of responsibility to the truth, this office, the employee, and the public.

Despite all of the above, I am again extending an offer: I am more than willing to release everything I possess regarding the matter, but this board must secure the proper legal clearance, waivers from the employees, and agree to indemnify the office as needed. Let me be very clear: there is no question that full disclosure will remove every cloud of suspicion you have woven.

- Regarding the forfeiture records matter, this board has never once come to me with a single question, concern, or an expressed desire to review said records. Instead, the first I heard of the board's alleged concern with the matter is via a court filing in which you team with a news agency in seeking these records.

The far more efficient act, on behalf of the taxpayer, would have been to reach out to me directly and simply *ask* to see such records or express your concerns. I would have certainly offered an explanation.

What I will not do is breach the state forfeiture law and publicly release what is protected. However, I extend the offer that this board reviews said records on condition that anything necessary to protect law enforcement and safety is not revealed and that you sign appropriate confidentiality agreements so that what cannot be released to the public is not.

In turn, I expect you immediately rectify your previously damaging comments by informing the public that everything you saw was in line with the law. All of which is already confirmed in annual audits by

the Controller's Office and the state Attorney General: complete compliance with the law regarding all uses of these funds.

You will also find that I devoted over \$160,000 the last few years for outreach, prevention, and education. I trust you will have no "concerns" there.

- Finally, this board knows the leasing of a vehicle – using drug dealer money rather than taxpayer dollars - was done properly and with the authorization of the County Controller.

You know that the law regarding the use of assets forfeited from drug dealers and criminals is clear. It allows exactly what was done: use drug dealer assets to fight crime, exactly as have countless law enforcement officials done across the state and nation.

Yet this board released a misleading and demonstrably false statement that I procured this vehicle in secret and without authority. The fact is that the Controller's Office not only approved the purchase of this vehicle and all expenses related to it, but there has been documentary proof of this fact for over three years in his office and mine.

The Certificate to Lease speaks for itself (and is attached): the Controller certified that he can authorize this lease for the County and the DA is authorized to execute the lease.

The fact that this critical document was omitted in the public attack and has still not been corrected is simply astonishing.

Not unlike other DAs in Pennsylvania and the nation, I have access to a work vehicle. This is not unique, many DAs and members of law enforcement have taxpayer-funded work vehicles. In fact, the entire DA's Office in Philadelphia apparently has taxpayer-funded vehicles and there is no outcry that anything nefarious is taking place. This vehicle is not even funded by taxpayer dollars.

With respect to the trips identified by a media outlet in which no mileage was claimed, each was work related, to include: the Sentencing Commission, the Governor's Office, PDAA, Animal Cruelty, and law enforcement.

I spent my career responding to events all over the county at all days and times of the week and simply have not and do not ask for any expenses for many of those events. The truth is that over my entire career, I have vastly underreported travel reimbursement expenses I was entitled to receive.

With respect to mileage specifically, I contacted the Controller months ago to bring to his attention what were some overpayments on mileage expense reports and *I asked* the department to take appropriate steps to correct any errors so that I could make things right. I explained how the error was made, to include the fact that I used multiple personal cars as well as the work vehicle. The matter was resolved, any overpayments were rectified, and the county made whole. The Solicitor and Controller approved the resolution and it is a non-issue. The BOC now trying to make it an issue is incredibly misleading and far from "transparent."

Moreover, I have completely lost count of all the homicide scenes, incidents, and meetings I have attended over the past almost 28 years, almost all in a personal vehicle, for which I simply never claimed any mileage despite being entitled to that reimbursement. The bottom line is, and as part of a complete picture, I have saved the county considerable funds by not making claims for substantial reimbursements I was entitled to receive.

In closing, I will continue, as I have for my 28 years as a public servant of this county, to spend all my efforts staying on that track of integrity and fairness, acting within the best interests of the taxpayers who elected me to serve them. I hope my colleagues, fellow elected officials, will continue toward this common goal and purpose.

Sincerely,

Craig W. Stedman

District Attorney of Lancaster County



**CERTIFIED RESOLUTION  
AND INCUMBENCY CERTIFICATE  
TO LEASE OR FINANCE**



X The undersigned hereby certifies that he/she is Controller of the County of Lancaster, that the following resolution was passed in accordance with the organizational documents and operating procedures of said entity, and that said resolution has not since been revoked or amended:

Resolved that CRAIG W. SEDMAN  
LANCASTER COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE is duly authorized to lease and/or finance from any factory authorized Toyota, Lexus or Scion automotive dealership or dealerships ("Dealer"), and Dealer's intended assignee, Toyota Motor Credit Corporation, Toyota Lease Trust, or Lexus Financial Services ("Lessor/Creditor"), under one or more leases/installment contracts, vehicles, and/or equipment, and upon such terms and conditions as the representative(s) hereinafter authorized, in their discretion, may deem necessary and advisable.

Resolved that the Authorized Signature(s) below is/are a sample of signatures of the authorized representative(s) as witnessed by the duly elected or appointed officials of LANCASTER COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURES:	NAME:	TITLE:
X <u>(Signature)</u>	<u>CRAIG W. SEDMAN</u>	<u>District Attorney</u>
X _____	_____	_____
X _____	_____	_____

The Lessor/Creditor is hereby authorized to act upon these resolutions until written notice of their revocation is delivered to the Lessor/Creditor.

X I, Brian Hurter, Controller of the County of Lancaster, a County Government organized under laws of the state of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of resolutions of duly authorized officials of LANCASTER COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE.  
In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 21<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2016. X

X (Signature)  
Name: Brian Hurter  
Title: Controller