

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 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 Inman 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 sacred 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, analyzed 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