COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BUDGET HEARING

STATE CAPITOL
HARRISBURG, PA
MAIN CAPITOL BUILDING
140 MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 2020

OFFICE OF THE BUDGET

BEFORE:

HONORABLE STANLEY SAYLOR, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HONORABLE MATT BRADFORD, MINORITY CHAIRMAN HONORABLE LYNDA SCHLEGEL-CULVER HONORABLE SHERYL M. DELOZIER HONORABLE GEORGE DUNBAR HONORABLE JONATHAN FRITZ HONORABLE MATT GABLER HONORABLE KEITH J. GREINER HONORABLE MARCIA M. HAHN HONORABLE DOYLE HEFFLEY HONORABLE LEE JAMES HONORABLE JOHN LAWRENCE HONORABLE JASON ORTITAY HONORABLE CLINT OWLETT HONORABLE GREG ROTHMAN HONORABLE JAMES STRUZZI HONORABLE JESSE TOPPER HONORABLE JEFF WHEELAND HONORABLE RYAN WARNER HONORABLE MARTINA WHITE HONORABLE DONNA BULLOCK HONORABLE MORGAN CEPHAS

HONORABLE MARIA DONATUCCI HONORABLE ELIZABETH FIEDLER

HONORABLE MARTY FLYNN

Pennsylvania House of Representatives
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

1	(Continued)
2	HONORABLE EDWARD GAINEY HONORABLE PATTY KIM
3	HONORABLE STEPHEN KINSEY HONORABLE LEANNE KRUEGER
4	HONORABLE STEPHEN MCCARTER HONORABLE BENJAMIN SANCHEZ
5	HONORABLE BENJAMIN SANCHEZ
6	COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:
7	DAVID DONLEY MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
8	RITCHIE LAFAVER MAJORITY DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
9	ANN BALOGA
10	MINORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TARA TREES
11	CHIEF COUNSEL
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX
2	TESTIFIERS
3	* * *
4	NAME
5	
6	JEN SWAILS, SECRETARY, OFFICE OF THE BUDGET6
7	OFFICE OF THE BUDGET
8	CURMITTER MRITTEN TECTIMONY
9	SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY * * *
10	
11	(See submitted written testimony and handouts online.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

you.

* * *

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: I call the Appropriations hearings back to order. And I'll ask the Madam Secretary, Jennifer Swails, who is our Budget Secretary, to rise and raise her right hand.

(Whereupon, Budget Secretary Swails was sworn in.)

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Thank you, Jen.

So we'll get started off with our first questioner of the day, Representative Dunbar.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

Good to see you again, Secretary.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Good to see

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: I'm sure you're pleased as heck to be here with us.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Thrilled.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thrilled.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Anyway, we've had a lot of discussions the last few weeks about a

lot of different things, and just to highlight a few of them, we heard on the expenditure side, we heard Secretary Rivera talk about pupil transportation, \$549 million dollar line item, \$200 million of it is from the prior year that we still have to pay out. We also heard from the DHS Financial Director yesterday where we were talking about the Medicaid assistance long-term care line item, and he had said something about a spring estimate that's coming that will be shocking, which makes you a little bit nervous when someone says shocking.

1.3

2.0

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Did not make me comfortable.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Sure.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: None of us, really. And there's no increase really on that line item right now to account for whatever shocking thing is going to happen. On the revenue side, minimum wage proposal, the Governor's proposal, says \$133 million of additional revenue. The IFO's estimate was \$50 million, which was last year, but they said it would be a similar number this year.

We also had a revenue estimate for combined reporting that Revenue Secretary estimated \$238 million increase to revenue, where last year, the exact proposal was going to cost us \$7 million. On top of that, we have, you know 25 or so deleted line items with about \$25 million that are legislative adds, per se, that aren't counted for.

1.3

So the question is, is this budget in balance?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Well, as proposed it is. Certainly, things, as we move forward, can change. We certainly don't anticipate we will get everything that we ask for. And that's part of the, you know, this is the starting point of where we go from here. But to your point, we have several revenue proposals included in the budget, and we also have several initiative proposals that would cost money. So it really depends on, you know, where we land in final discussions.

We are ahead of estimate right now in revenue, but we do have to be cautious on if that continues. And we did have gross receipts -- a tax payment that occurred in February.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: That is early -- \$50 million early.

1.3

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Projecting into March, what does that look like for March?

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Right.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: So I think
we'll continue to watch that, as we do, very
closely. And as I said, we'll just, you know,
continue those conversations with the legislature
and see where we land to get a balanced
budget.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And that's the whole thing, landing the plane, how are we going to land the plane.

So do you believe that the DHS line item, as it's presently constituted, is going to be sufficient?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: That's the information I have at this time. I think, you know, as most are aware, we provide updates on those specific lines throughout the year. We provided an estimate in October. We received another estimate in December from the Department. That's what we used to put into our budget request. We -- as mentioned, we will again

receive an estimate in the spring. It's -- it seems like their, you know, estimates are always off, but what's driving that is people. And we can only estimate how many people will come and what the severity will be. The aging population and those lines associated with that, while we have implemented Community Health Choices to try to bend that cost curve, it's not going to happen overnight. You know, those waivers, aging waivers and home and community-based waivers, I mean, they were growing -- the trajectory was like this. We're trying to just get that to go a little bit.

And as we, you know, our population continues to age, it's a continued concern, both on the revenue side, as less people, you know, are working and are retired, but then as they need more services.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And do you believe that corporations will willingly, knowingly, voluntarily remit corporate taxes under combined reporting nine months earlier than they have to?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Well, I mean, that's the estimate that Revenue presented, and

1.3

they certainly know better than I do. But you 1 know, as we mentioned, we received a GRT payment 2 early, so who knows why they made that early in 3 February versus March. 4 REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Yeah. And like 5 you said, we are \$250 million ahead, but \$50 6 7 million of it is GRT. So we still at least are \$200 million ahead. 8 Do you believe that the zeroed out line items will be added back? 10 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I think that's 11 generally the case. It's, again, a conversation 12 with the legislature on their value. And as we 1.3 prepare a budget, we have to focus on, you know, 14 which lines we can fund, and then we have that 15 discussion with the legislature and the ultimate 16 funding lines. 17 REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: 18 Have you ever heard the term kabuki dance? 19 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I believe I 20 21 heard it yesterday. REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And --22 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I don't 23

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Me neither, and I

generally use it.

24

actually, realistically, I had to look it up.

And I was a little bit nervous when I did because sometimes you put stuff in a search engine, you don't know what you're going to get.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Who knows what's coming out of there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: But I will say this, I mean, the minority chair has referred to a lot of the actions we've taken as a kabuki dance. And I would like to say that given the budget that we have in front of us, which is not really totally workable, it's kind of unrealistic where we're at right now, that this truly is the kabuki dance because what we're stuck with is a situation where, to land a plane, as you say, and as we have more involvement in it, to land a plane, what we're going to have to do is address some of the additional spending that is in this budget, the \$1.4 billion additional spending to land the plane. And at that point in time, then, it's somehow our fault, and it's a budget cut.

Ironically -- and I know I'm out of time, but briefly, I did want to say one last thing.

When I was looking up kabuki dance and I was doing a search, I also looked up the definition

of overspend because the good Chairman has told us repeatedly how disingenuous we were with the term overspend. And the definition for overspend is to spend more than expected or the allotted amount, which I think we have been using it correctly. You know, and you can place blame wherever you want to. I voted for the budget, too. I mean, I'm not going to be disingenuous. I'll be realistic. I voted for the budget, too, but --

1.3

And you can use whatever term you want to explain it, but it is an overspend. And if that's what helps you dance, then that's fine. But I do appreciate your time. It's always good to see you, Secretary.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Our next
questioner is Representative Fiedler.

REPRESENTATIVE FIEDLER: Good morning.
Thank you for being here.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Good morning.

REPRESENTATIVE FIEDLER: So we are all, I think, troubled by the conditions in many of our schools, lead, asbestos and other toxins, both from a human perspective and certainly as we hear

2 3

4

5

6

7 8

10 11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

from medical professionals about the health costs that people would face when it comes to cancer, asthma, other health challenges.

Can you please talk from a financial perspective about why it makes sense to invest the money that the Governor has proposed in remediating these conditions now?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I think in general, to your point, we always want our children to attend school in a safe and free of toxin environment. And we certainly don't want to have them sick and have costs related to their sickness. So I think those general concerns are why it's important for us to invest the dollars now and get the dollars to the schools to address this situation and not allow it to continue any longer.

REPRESENTATIVE FIEDLER: Thank you. And certainly by, if we chose not to address those conditions, they would still exist, right? wouldn't magically remedy themselves, they would continue to deteriorate?

> BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Correct. REPRESENTATIVE FIEDLER: And be more

costly.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Right.

1.3

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE FIEDLER: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Topper.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Madam Secretary, right here next to Representative Dunbar. Good to see you.

Last year during the budget process, overspending or supplemental spending has certainly been an issue over the last few years. And so one of the ways that we tried to remedy that in the General Assembly was by passing a reform which requires the Governor to notify the House and the Senate of possible overspending or supplemental spending by State agencies. It was Act 15 of 2019. It was in the administration -- the Admin Code that we passed during the budget.

And we did receive a letter in October, which was the timeline that we had requested, about the additional supplemental spending.

However, in the Act, we had asked for a written statement detailing the amounts requested and the need for the additional appropriation. But in the letter that we got, all we got was the amounts and the line item. Is there a reason we

a

didn't get -- we feel we didn't get part of what was statutorily required.

Is that how you see it or --

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I was advised that's what I was required to give. We did follow up with anyone that had questions about those line items. We met with several Appropriations staff and the Chairman on his questions. We received a lengthy letter requesting some clarification, and we responded.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: And I do -- I have that response, that it was -- your response was that the administration submitted the required potential changes to the General Fund amounts included in the general appropriations, as specified in the statute. The legislation requires a written statement detailing the amounts requested and the need for additional appropriation, and this met the requirement as per are our legal interpretation of the statute.

So I, again, wanted to make sure that I understood it and went back and looked. And I believe that the spirit would have required not just the line items and the amounts, but the spirit of the statute would also require that

detailed explanation.

1.3

2.0

Would that be something, moving forward, that we could expect?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: We could provide some additional information.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Okay. Thank you.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: It isn't an

official request, though, it's an estimate.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Sure. And I think what we -- what is very helpful in terms of what Representative Dunbar has alluded to is not just the amount, but why is it needed, why the supplemental spending. When we go through the budget and we're trying to put together these numbers, it's all estimates to a certain degree.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Revenue estimates, expenditure estimate, but there are reasons behind those estimates. We want to make sure we're not pulling numbers out of thin air.

And along those lines, yesterday, of course -- I think everybody is going back to that word shocking, you know, that we all heard when it came to the demographic challenges that DHS is facing, the growing senior population. But

again, as we talk about the reality of addressing those challenges, the Community Health Choices line item was the same. It's been the same -- it's the same for the next 18 months.

So I'm trying to reconcile the growing demographics that you and Secretary Miller have acknowledged, the term shocking, in terms of what will be coming out in the spring estimate, and the fact that it doesn't seem like the numbers are reflecting that we appreciate exactly how fast that demographic is growing.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I think, particularly, in that line, there is a rolled payment of about \$380 million that would not be in that number. So to say it doesn't increase is not totally accurate.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: So we are accounting for -- we feel that we're adequately accounting for that demographic rise.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: At this time, it reflects that. Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Okay.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: But we certainly will get an updated number in the spring.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1.3

2.0

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative McCarter.

much, Mr. Chairman.

And again, thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here. Let me ask two different questions here.

One is a question that, surely, over the last seven years that I've been here, each budget year seems to be more complex, both from the revenue side and from the spending side. When we look at these budgets, are there specific recommendations you can give us that -- as legislators -- that we can help with to come up with strategies that might make this process both more transparent and more beneficial, I think for the public, and for us, as well, to be able to understand the budget process?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Well, I think
we try to lay it out as clear as possible in both
the budget book and then follow it up with
hearing materials that go into the agencies with
far more specific details of those -- what's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

driving those costs and those lines. If you think there's something additional we should be doing, we're happy to discuss that.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTER: Okav. I think one of the things that, you know -- again, trying to explain this to the public when we go back to our districts, one of the things in the budget, the cost drivers, for instance, in the Department of Human Services, as we heard yesterday and as we know, are the seniors and the growing trends that are there.

And looking into the future, would more longer term planning be something that the administration sees as something that would be beneficial, not looking at one year at a time, but at two years, something in a longer plan?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: You know, I think we have out-year projections, but I mean, to your point that we already -- we provide updated numbers in those areas that are the main cost drivers, three or four times throughout the fiscal year, and they change every part of that year. So projecting out two years would still be -- which we do, it would still be, you know, pretty far, I guess, of an estimate of how many

24

25

individuals we would serve at that time.

1.3

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTER: And looking at a second thing then, in tying that in, obviously situations change. And now, with the Covid-19 epidemic taking place, as Budget Secretary, how would you describe, in a sense, the planning and actions you're beginning to think about as a result of what an epidemic of this proportion that we're now looking at could have on the current budget and future budgets, as well?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. So we're certainly monitoring what's happening at the Federal level. And from our Federal contacts, we believe there will be some funding allocated soon. We expect that Pennsylvania would receive approximately or at least \$50 million related to that. At this time, we are working -- in communication with Dr. Levine on a regular basis, as well as PEMA. They work together to monitor this situation.

And we did recently purchase some lab equipment to ensure that we could do testing here, working with other lab providers to make sure that they can get up and running on their lab testing. And it's an ongoing process that we

^

make sure we're monitoring and have plans in place for the, you know, operations of the government to continue in event of an outbreak.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTER: Can you speak to that a little bit in terms of continuation of government and anything, the types of things that, you know, we are planning in that direction.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. I mean, we certainly don't anticipate the need will occur to shut the government down, but if there's an isolated incident that we would have to close a location, we can move workers to a different location. There are work-from-home options that are available. Each agency has what's called a COOP plan. And you know, with acronyms, I can't think of what that means. I'm sure it's like continued operations or something like that, but every agency has one. We're making sure everybody is familiar with it and that it's up-to-date.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTER: Thank you very much.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTER: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

1.3

2.0

2.4

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative white.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

At the Department of Education budget hearing, one of our Committee members noted that many school districts are currently refunding outstanding debt because of the historically low interest rates. Reductions in PlanCon reimbursement payments result when school districts lower their interest costs or retire their debt early.

Rather than simply incurring new debt for lead and asbestos remediation projects in schools, would it be possible to repurpose voided PlanCon payments for such projects?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: The PlanCon does not allow for -- only 25 percent of PlanCon expenditures can be used for remediation. And I don't believe there is sufficient funding there that would address it in the level that we're planning to address it with our proposal.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: The Governor, you know, proposed this \$1 billion dollar capital

budget itemization RCAP eligibility program. 1 Do you know how the administration 2 arrived at this billion dollar figure. 3 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. 4 I mean. when we hear about -- I mean, certainly we've 5 heard most from the city of Philadelphia, but 6 it's not simply a Philadelphia issue. Their 7 estimates are much larger than \$1 billion, so 8 this is really just a starting point to address these needs across the State. 10 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: I'm sorry. 11 Philadelphia alone has a billion dollars in need? 12 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: More than a 1.3 billion dollars in need. 14 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: It's my 15 understanding that it's \$170 million in need. 16 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: That is not 17 what we've heard. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Okay. And who told you that it was a billion dollars from 20 Philadelphia. 21 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I can't think 22 of who told me at this point, but I'll get back 23 to you. 24

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Okay. I would

25

appreciate that.

1.3

2.0

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Thank you.

Over how many years does the administration plan on spending this \$1 billion dollars?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I don't know how long once -- you know, the application period would have to open, grants would have to be issued. And there's -- I'm not sure if there's a time frame on that being complete, but the project has to be completed before the money is distributed.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: And are you planning to go to market for a single billion dollar bond or break it up over several years?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: So you know, we need to amend the debt bill as well as the itemization bill. And our plan would be to go to market for not just that debt, but other debt that we have the opportunity to refund at that time to save some dollars. So I think to answer your question, it would be \$1 billion at once.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: And are there any particular criteria for a school district to get

funding?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I mean, they would have to submit a project proposal and it would have to be reviewed by our RACP team.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Our school districts that have already remediated their lead and asbestos issues eligible for money reimbursement?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: No.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: And you said the RACP team is going to be deciding who is awarded the money, as well?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yes. They would have to review those applications.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Since the RACP requires a project to be listed in the capital itemization bill, don't you feel that this form of issuance is going to delay the time frame for the moneys to be issued?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: No. There's an itemization bill out now and could be amended to include this information in it.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Again, the -Secretary Rivera had indicated that the required
50 percent match for RACP projects could be

_

-

subject to negotiation; is this accurate? 1 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. 2 I think there are several different things that can be 3 used to meet that obligation. It doesn't have to 4 be just cash. It can be assets, as well. 5 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Does it mean that 6 there will be a reduced or no local match for 7 8 these projects? BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: No, I don't believe so. 10 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Will every school 11 that applies receive funding? 12 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I quess it 1.3 defends on how much need there is out there and 14 how many dollars we can distribute. 15 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: So if there isn't 16 enough funding, then how will the determinations 17 be made as to which school districts will receive 18 19 funding? BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I guess they'll 20 21 be reviewed by projects and how critical they are. 22 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Is there going to 23 be a more definitive proposal provided to the 24

General Assembly of what the Governor is

25

suggesting, because it's really just like this 1 general broad billion dollar, you know, debt 2 structure? 3 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. I think 4 there's language that we'll need for both bills, 5 and we'll get that to the General Assembly. 6 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Okay. Do you know 7 at approximately what point in time you'll be 8 able to get that to us? BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Soon. I'm not 10 in charge of the legislation. 11 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: That's fair. 12 But in terms of the actual proposal itself and how 1.3 distribution of the funds will be provided to the 14 school district, I think that's important for us 15 to be aware of --16 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: 17 Sure. REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: -- prior to 18 19 initiating any kinds of legislation. Is that something that you'll be able to 2.0 get to us sooner rather than later? 21 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yes. 22 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Preferably before 23 the end of March. 2.4 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: 25 Soon.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: That would be great. Okay.

1.3

2.0

Thank you very much, Chairman. I see my time is up.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Cephas.

REPRESENTATIVE CEPHAS: Thank you, Chairman.

And thank you for being here today and representing the Governor's commitment and investment in so many challenges that we're dealing with across Pennsylvania.

Just to follow up on a couple of things that were said about lead and asbestos, I have a school in my district, Cassidy Elementary School, which is one of the schools that are in the worst condition. We had a young girl, Chelsea Mungo, who wrote a letter to myself and the Senator pretty much asking why is there such a disparity in the condition of her school building than it is less than 10 miles away from Lower Marion High School.

So I want to go on record in saying I appreciate your commitment. That \$170 million is just for immediate concerns that we have in our

school buildings. And I can probably attest to that we do have over a billion dollars worth of concern in buildings that have been built as old as 1956. So I want to first go on record and thank you for that commitment.

I want to switch gears a little bit to the issue of gun violence. The Governor mentioned a young man that lost his life out in western PA, to no fault of their own -- no fault of his own -- to gun violence, and this has been a constant issue across Pennsylvania. Just in my district alone -- I'm going into an emergency meeting this Friday -- we had five shootings just within the last four days.

Our mayor locally is presenting his budget address today, where he is investing over \$10 million in the issue of gun violence, and it's essentially an issue where it's all hands on deck. So I wanted you to take some time to talk through some of the proposals that you're committing to in this budget season around the issue of gun violence. And I do want to thank the Governor for stepping up in a big way to make this a priority issue.

He was just in my colleague's district,

Representative Kinsey's district last week talking about the issue of gun violence in our school buildings. But you know, this is just an issue that has been impacting us across Pennsylvania, not just with homicides or in our school buildings, but in our religious institutions. You have suicides are up. You have domestic violence that's up. So it's an issue that we all are dealing with in our urban, rural, and suburban areas.

So if you can spend some time talking about some of the investments that the Governor is making this time around, that would be great.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Sure. So \$6 million is included in this proposal for -- to be in PCCD's Gun Violence Prevention for municipalities and local entities to apply for. That's funding -- that program already exists, and an additional \$4 million for the Attorney General's Philadelphia Gun violence Task Force. And he's also calling on, you know, to work with the legislature on additional regulations that we can secure guns and lost and stolen, background checks, things like that.

And this is, you know, the focus, to your

point, on those bad actors, not the people who
have guns and care for them safely and use them
for recreation. It's those individuals who are
doing wrong, bad things with those guns and not

making that difference. I think we have go get smarter on crime, more strategic, investing in technology, investing in grassroots organizations on the ground that are trying to tackle this issue with us. And I just want to go on record in saying I appreciate the commitment to this effort and knowing that we are all hands on deck and working together to move the needle on this issue.

Thank you.

taking care of them.

1.3

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Culver.

REPRESENTATIVE CULVER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Over here, Madam Secretary. I have two questions I have for you this afternoon -- or this morning. First one, having to do with State Police and the municipal fee charge back.

The Governor's budget proposal again calls for a municipal service fee that is projected to generate about \$136 million to cover State Police agency staffing and operation costs. Unlike that from the prior flat fee proposal, this proposal reportedly is predicated on station coverage costs based on incidents and coverage area and considers other factors, like population and income.

1.3

As you probably already know, it's been fairly public, the formula, and each municipality is able to figure out, you know, what they believe their charge back would be. I represent 28 municipalities, and there is great disparity, vast and varied, between what each of them would be charged. It is hard to explain, when you are neighboring municipalities, why one is being charged several hundred thousand and one is being charged \$15,000.

There are certain things we can explain, but that is just a very large disparity. So there's great concern about how they're going to be able to meet the charge back and how they're going to pay for it. So my question is, is the Governor proposing any changes to current statute

1.3

to allow municipalities to generate the funds necessary to pay for the costs of the Pennsylvania State Police charge back?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Not that I'm aware of.

REPRESENTATIVE CULVER: Okay. So what tools, I guess, currently exist in statute, that you're aware of, that would generate the funds for them to pay the charge back.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: You know, local municipalities manage their own budgets and determine how to pay for those budgets. I wanted just to correct you on -- or clarify on what the criteria is. It isn't based on incidents. I just wanted to clarify that. It is based on State Police coverage, municipality population, income level, whether they're full, part-time or -- full-time or part-time.

So I just wanted to clarify that.

REPRESENTATIVE CULVER: And I still get that, but I mean, there's still a great disparity between what some are being charged and some aren't and they're neighboring. So it's causing a little bit of panic. It's also causing them to pay more attention as to what are the State

Police providing to us. And they're actually marking it and tracking it now.

And the other thing they want to know is, if we're required to pay for it, will we be getting services, you know, like our local ordinances enforced, will there be more State Police, will they be able to respond more timely? And the answer to all of those in the hearings were no.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. I mean, this is to maintain the police force that we have now, given that we have a reduction in dollars coming from the Motor License Fund. So without this fee, or without this income, we have concerns that we won't be able to have the necessary number of cadet classes.

REPRESENTATIVE CULVER: And I understand that. I just think they need a more dedicated, more constant flow of funding. So I just want to change course real quick --

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE CULVER: -- before I run out of time.

Community Health Choices, Representative

Topper earlier asked if the appropriation request

was adequate. I think this is the third time in this hearing that we'll be asking this question, but the budget document shows not a single new senior from now until the end of June 2021 in Community Health Choices. So that's exactly -- in the budget document, 362,373 seniors from now until June of 2021. I'm a little confused because we're already asking for supplements this year.

1.3

2.0

when Secretary Miller was here, she said that that was the fasting growing population in PA. Yet from now until June of 2021, we are saying there are 362,373 seniors. That's it. I don't understand how that makes sense.

How are we not asking for more money or not budgeting for more money?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. I'll have to look into the details of that model and see why there's not -- or what's driving that static population there and get back to you.

REPRESENTATIVE CULVER: I mean, just because I think -- I believe this is the second year we've asked for a supplemental, people are asking questions back home. And I don't know if that makes sense or looks very responsible when

we know it's the fastest growing population. 1 know we have the silver tsunami -- I think it's 2 already started, not even upon us anymore. 3 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. 4 REPRESENTATIVE CULVER: It's already 5 So I just -- I need to understand this. started. 6 So we are expecting no growth from now until June 7 of 2021 in Community Health Choices? 8 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I'm going to have to look into it, on why they're showing that 10 population there. 11 12 REPRESENTATIVE CULVER: 1.3 14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

So my request is that we look at that carefully because the public isn't crazy about us asking for supplements when we already know the data is going to require that. So I would just ask that we take another look at that and make sure we are being responsible to the taxpayers, to the community that needs the service, and that we're able to provide what we need. So thank you for your time.

> BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Sure.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Krueger.

> REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

1.3

2.0

Thank you, Madam Secretary, for jointing us here today. You're the final testifier in three weeks of hearings. And we've had some-BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I'll leave soon.

REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: Once you answer all of our questions on the record. Thank you very much.

There are things in the Governor's budget proposal this year that I appreciate, and there are some areas where I've got some concerns. I appreciate this year that the proposal doesn't include a proposal to raid restricted environmental funds to balance the budget for the DEP and DCNR. I appreciate that the Governor is attempting to do something about the toxic school environment that we've got here. I appreciate that we're continuing to fund health care for our most vulnerable citizens and increasing support services for folks on the intellectual disability waiting list.

I reach out to my constituents. I've done a telephone town hall. I've been in conversations. I've had a senior breakfast in

the times that we've been in hearings. And there is one issue that I've heard about over and over again from the folks that I represent in Delaware County, and it's the State Police fee.

1.3

I represent a number of municipalities.

Most of them have their own local police force.

These municipalities, boroughs and townships spend between 40 and 60 percent of their local municipal budget on their local police force.

And folks have good relationships with our police. These are police officers who put their lives on the line. They're working really hard and people don't mind, in large part, paying for local police because they know that someone is going to be there if they're ever in need.

However, the proposal to start charging a fee for every municipality, even those who have their own State Police, is very, very frustrating. So can you tell us, last year there was a proposal that the Governor had to charge a per capita fee on municipalities who were not paying for their own local State police. My one borough that doesn't pay for their own local police told me that they'd be fine with that. They were willing to pay a fee, and they thought

the Governor's proposal was fair.

1.3

How did we get to a new proposal that's going to charge everybody, regardless of local taxes paying for police?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Well, I will say that the feedback I received was that no one was fine with that. You know, we heard a lot of pushback on the fact that, you know, for example, State College has a local police force. However, there are obvious incidents there that our local police force -- and there are incidents there because of a college town and things like that, where State Police come in, and wouldn't it be fair to address it across the Commonwealth to all municipalities.

So you know, I think the issue is, no one likes the fee, right? But my difficulty, and the State Police's difficulty is we have this funding mechanism that is going away and reducing. And we need to figure out a way to fund this. So this is our third try at trying to make it more fair -- from the feedback we've heard -- a more fair formula to address that. And you know, happy to discuss if anyone has any other ideas on how to get these dollars for State Police.

REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: With all due 1 respect, I believe that this proposal is 2 fundamentally unfair, worse than the previous 3 proposals. And I hope when we get to a final 4 budget vote that it's not included. I -- I'm 5 hearing particularly from local elected officials 6 7 in Aston Township in my district who say that there's virtually no State Police presence there 8 on a daily basis. It's fundamentally unfair to ask them to cover this cost. We need to find 10 another solution, and I look forward to future 11 proposals that do that. 12

Thank you, Madam Secretary.

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Owlett.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Secretary, for being here today. I had a couple of questions about transportation. I'm sure you agree that making sure that we have adequate funding to transport our students to and from school is very important to all of our school districts, would you agree with that?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: Do you anticipate any costs of transportation going up between now and the next five years?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I don't know.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: I mean, would it
be reasonable to say --

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I don't know. I imagine it would go up.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: That it would go up. I mean, every year, we seem to have a bump in that.

How much input do you have with other secretaries when they propose some of -- they send you their budgets and their requests. How much pushback do you give them on some of their requests in their budgets?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Well, I mean, ultimately, I guess I have that decision on what we can fund and what we can't. That goes for all agencies, I imagine. There are -- you know, not me solely, of course, but other members of the Governor's team. But you know, the agencies submit what they feel they need, and then we have to review all of them and determine what we can actually fund.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: So my question is on the pupil transport, on page E15-10 in the Governor's book, budget book, it actually states that we're going to level fund transportation for our students for the next five years, all the way to 2025, level fund, no increase. And we're already \$157 million that we're saying we're short this year.

1.3

So why would we level -- why would we put level funding in the budget for the next anticipating for the next five years if we know it's going to cost us more even this year?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: It comes down to resources at the end of the day. And we do provide the funding to the school districts that they need. It just is on more of a rolling cash basis.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: So when is the day of reckoning? When are we going to finally realize, wow -- because it's going to get worse every year. Obviously, it's going to be more and more.

when is the final day that we have to say, you know what, we value this, we're going to put money in the budget for it? When do we

finally have to do that?

1.3

2.0

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I guess that's for us to discuss moving forward.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: I think that would be something I would love to talk more about. And it kind of, in a sense, goes back to this kabuki dance that we've all been talking about, which is now --

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Everyone's favorite word.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: -- which is now -- this is the hot topic, which I can --

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: That is

Chairman Bradford's favorite --

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: Yes.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: -- some sort of a game for that --

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: Yes. I would say there's no dancing going on over here. You wouldn't want that. But I would -- I would like to caution -- you and I are both new at this process. I think last year was your first year. Last year was my first year. I've learned a lot. You've probably learned a lot over this year, but it seems to me that this process that we go

through every year, where we talk about projects that we want to do and new initiatives, that's all fun, but when it comes right down to actually providing the funds that we know we're going to have to provide, we don't do that. We don't do that in the budget. And I will say that's frustrating for me because I want to utilize the best of my time and utilize it to the best of my ability. So when I come and we really get an unrealistic proposal -- I would say, if we pass this today, as it was proposed today, the amount of cuts to our health care folks, you know, and all of the research that we're doing, to agriculture and to our transportation, just to name a few, I mean it would be staggering to what would really happen.

So is this a realistic budget proposal?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I would say

yes.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: I mean, there's nothing that you would change? I mean, after all of these hearings that we've had --

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I would make it rain money and then I would change a lot of things.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: That's right. Me too.

1.3

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: But otherwise, in real life, no.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: Yes. But I mean, the realistic -- the truth is that we'll take this proposal, we'll look at it. We look at the projects that we all got to talk about. And they're all good things that we all want to do, but at the end of the day, we have to make sure that we fund the things that we are responsible to fund. And the good folks of the Commonwealth want us to invest their money wisely and make sure that we continue to fund the obligations that we are responsible to do.

So I guess my message would be, I hope that next year we can have a more realistic -- and maybe fund some of these areas, instead of cutting agriculture, instead of not funding areas that we know we are going to have to fund, that would be my request. So -- but I appreciate you being here, and I appreciate what you do for us here in the Commonwealth.

Thank you.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative 1 Donatucci. 2 REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Thank you, 3 Mr. Chairman. 4 And thank you for being here, Madam 5 Secretary. 6 The coronavirus has now come to America. 7 It's been reported in a few States. With the 8 increasing threat of the coronavirus, many Pennsylvanians plan to utilize our new mail 10 voting process during our upcoming election in an 11 effort to avoid crowds and to stay disease free. 12 would the administration support 1.3 additional funding to accommodate the anticipated 14 increase in absentee and mail-in voting? 15 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I think, you 16 know, as I mentioned before, we're looking to 17 PEMA and to Dr. Levine and other agencies to let 18 19 us know what costs would be associated with the coronavirus. So we're looking at all of that. 2.0

REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: All right.

I'll change course here.

21

22

23

24

25

Does the Budget Office anticipate level funding for the Tobacco Settlement Fund programs, like last year?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yes.

1.3

2.0

2.4

REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Yes, okay.

And then one more, the Pennsylvania Agriculture

Surplus System, PASS, works to help support

efforts that bring surplus agricultural products

to Pennsylvania to those in risk for hunger.

with recent and proposed changes in the SNAP Program at the national level, what are some key aspects of the program that are expected to change as we seek to continue combatting hunger in Pennsylvania?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Changes to the SNAP Program or changes to the PASS Program.

REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: To the PASS Program.

propose an increase to the PASS Program. It's a great program where it allows -- farmers allow food banks to come in and harvest their leftover crops and use them at the food banks. What has happened in the past is there has been more demand than there's been funding. So we think it's important to increase the funding for this program and utilize the fresh, you know, vegetables and fruits that are available for the

food banks.

1.3

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Delozier.

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Secretary, for being here. A lot of varying questions on many different issues. I have a question with transportation and the shift that we have in dollars that are going to be making a huge gap. We are talking about Act 44 and the shift that we have.

we did a task force last summer and came out with some good recommendations, and I think some good legislation that would help with some of these gaps that we see coming down the road.

My concern is that it doesn't seem in the Governor's proposed budget that he has assisted in recognizing that we do have this gap coming, not only in transportation -- and I talked yesterday with the Secretary about the trach relief and the issue that we've -- and I know we've worked together on that and providing a little bit of a band-aid, but that's also a gap

coming down the road that was not addressed in the budge.

So with the transportation issue, we have, you know, the turnpike is building to a \$13 billion debt with \$450 million going -transferred to PennDOT each year. And that will change in 2021. So we will have that gap of dollars in PennDOT. The Motor Licensing Fund is used for many things that are not transportation-related necessarily, and we're trying to change that, which are all good goals, but we need to start that plan now. So my question, directly, is the fact of what is the Governor's plan or what is he proposing, which is nothing in the budget.

So what is it that his plan and proposal may be in order to recognize this gap that we have coming down the road?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. I think, ultimately, that's partnership with the legislation for us collectively to decide how we fix that.

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Okay. So there's no plan at this point that the Governor has?

1.3

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: No.

1.3

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Does he support the legislation that we put forward to start that plan with the pieces of legislation that we put forward from our task force?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I'm not certain.

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: You're not certain of the legislation in and of itself.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I'd have to check. I will have to check what the status of the legislation is.

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Okay. Would you be able to get back to us as to whether or not the Governor supports the ideas that we had put forward of being able -- because it is a recognition that we have this coming, and so many times in State government, our government process is catch-up. And we know this is coming, so we need to be proactive in looking at that. And a frustration that I have and I think is shared by many, especially those that I'm hearing from in my district, is we have a budget proposed for \$2 billion more spending, but we're not addressing the gaps that we know are coming.

As I mentioned the trach issue, as I mentioned the gap coming from this, these are gaps we know. And I know people will say, you know, we can't tax and spend. We need to know what we're doing. We need to spend within our means. We know both of these gaps are coming and the Governor doesn't seem to have a plan. that's concerning when he makes a proposal that we should take into consideration that it's necessary.

The ability for us to take a look at the \$2 billion and where that goes, as well as the fact that that transfer, does he have any -- I know we talked about the State Police and everything else -- is there any plan for doing that -- transferring those PSP dollars to the General Fund?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: PSP dollars that are coming from --

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: State Trooper dollars that are coming from the Motor Licensing Fund that will transfer -- those dollars back to the General Fund?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: The hundred -no, there is not.

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

25

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Okay. So that 1 just added to another gap there. And that's not 2 something we have to do, but that's something 3 that the general population and the general 4 consensus is that we should be doing, looking for 5 ways to transfer that. So that's not as imminent 6 as the transfer dealing with the turnpike or the 7 trach issue, but both of which -- I think all 8 three add up to quite a very large ticket item that we have coming down the pike. So I would 10 ask for that consideration and then take a look 11 at the legislation that we've put forward for 12 suggestions as to how we can possibly make those 1.3 changes. 14 So thank you very much. 15 **BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS:** Thank you. 16 REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you, 17 Representative. 18 19 Next will be Representative Gabler. REPRESENTATIVE GABLER: Thank you, 20 Mr. Chairman. 21 Good morning, Secretary. How are you? 22 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: 23 Good morning. REPRESENTATIVE GABLER: I wanted to 24

return to a conversation that we had started

25

yesterday with the Department of Human Services.

And there was a conversation that was had, and
there was a member of this Committee who made the
statement that somehow the General Assembly
underfunded the Department of Human Services,
based on the administration's request, by about
\$800 million.

1.3

2.0

Now, I'm trying to do the math on this to see how these numbers line up, because I think there was an acknowledgement made during our discussions yesterday that you could make an argument for \$230 million. And I would say it this way, is that there was a discussion about Community Health Choices, and that that appropriation, as agreed to, was about \$172 million lower than what was requested in the spring update.

And then, between a conversation between the Governor and the General Assembly, there was also an agreed-to \$60 million reduction in the request for the capitation line item. So that would add up to roughly \$230 million. So I wanted to ask if you, in your role as Secretary of the Budget, could give us some specifics as to whether or not you view the General Assembly's

appropriation as we stand right now in the current year budget as being short as per what the administration has requested, and does that up to \$800 million as claimed yesterday?

1.3

there's been some underfunding that has occurred over the last several years. And when we -- as I said, we update these estimates over, you know, three or four times a year. And at the end of the day, we have an appropriation that, you know, is established. And you know, Representative Dunbar said it's overspending what is allocated or expected. So I think definitely over what is allocated, but not necessarily what was expected.

So we certainly continue to see growth in those areas. And as mentioned yesterday, I believe, these are mandated programs. So when we -- CHC is new, so we're doing our best to estimate that. But when, you know, a disabled or elderly person comes, is qualified for nursing facility, eligible -- financial eligibility, we don't have the option to create a waiting list for these services, we must provide these services. So there has been underfunding that has occurred, but also there is more spending

than we had anticipated, as well.

1.3

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE GABLER: And I appreciate that. I want to refer back to something that Representative Delozier just said about looking at projections and trying to figure out what these demographics are. And I think the concern that I have as a member of this Committee is we're trying to put value into this process. We've spent three weeks here with members having discussions with the administration, trying to kick the tires on this budget and get down to the facts so that we can engage in the conversation that will happen over the next few months.

But one of the things that I think is very concerning is that the Governor delivered us a budget proposal in the beginning of February. And then, we have these conversations over three weeks, and here we are and we're being told that, well, there's no way to project -- there's no way to expect what's changed. And we're hearing yesterday from Human Services that we're going to get shocking numbers in the spring update.

And we heard that there's no way to have a good model on what our senior population looks like so that we can project for what's going to

come. So instead, we receive a budget proposal with a model that shows zero growth in a given population. So we have a Governor's budget proposal, we're going to expect a spring update brief that is going to significantly depart from that.

1.3

2.0

How do we put value back into this process, so that the conversation that we're having between the General Assembly and the administration yields some value? Because I'm afraid we're going to get to June and we're going to say, well, everything is irrelevant because everything has changed and we didn't project.

How can we get more realistic projections and inject them into this process, so that what we're all doing here provides a value added?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I think there's a couple things. You know, I think we do our best to do those estimates and provide those estimates. At the end of the day, it's about available dollars and where the General Assembly wants that bottom line number to be. So sometimes there is a need to put dollars into the Rainy Day Fund. Could those have gone somewhere else? Yes, they could have, but they're now in

the Rainy Day Fund.

1.3

2.0

2.4

So we have to do our best to give the General Assembly the best estimate that we can and then, you know, discuss on the priorities of what that budget looks like.

REPRESENTATIVE GABLER: And I appreciate that. And I think that the concern that I have is that we receive a proposal from the Governor, and there's a lot of messaging involved with that. And a lot of the messaging claims that it's balanced, that there's no increase in taxes, no increase in fees. But then we turn and we dig into the details and we see that in the Department of Agriculture, we don't have livestock safety and research, we don't have hardwoods development, we don't have these things that are expected to come back.

In Human Services, we're talking about areas where we have \$800 million in unaccounted for expenses when you consider the supplemental requests plus the dollars rolled forward. So I guess my question is, with all of these discussions that we've had, is the proposal delivered to us really a balanced budget?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I believe I 1 already answered that. 2 REPRESENTATIVE GABLER: I appreciate 3 that. I'm out of time, but thank you for the 4 opportunity to have the discussion. 5 REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you, 6 Representative. 7 Next will be Representatives James. 8 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, 9 Mr. Chairman. 10 Secretary, I'm over here to your right. 11 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: There we go. 12 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Good morning. 1.3 So there's kind of a theme going on here, 14 I detect. But before I ask my question, I did 15 google your bio, Penn State grad, professional 16 accountancy. 17 **BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS:** Exciting. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Huh? BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: It sounds 20 21 exciting. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Secretary, 22 Chairman Bradford wants to know if you're a 23 kabuki dancer, too. 24 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I have not 25

added that to my resumé yet.

1.3

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Hey, you guys are taking my time.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Got to add some minutes back onto the green light.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Yeah. Let's see what we can do about that.

But the point I'm bringing -- the reason I'm bring that point up is because you clearly are in the right spot at the right time to provide assistance and guidance to all of the agency chiefs, the Governor, everybody in the administration. Thank you very much.

In accountancy, precision is -- I was going to say important. It's actually critical because everybody uses those numbers as guidelines to run their program. But I detect some accounting sleight of hand in here, and specifically, here's what I'm talking about.

The proposed budget shifts about \$308 million out of '19-20 into '20-21, meaning we improperly mismanaged our budget for that year. Then going forward, medical assistance, Community Health Choices, community waiver program, collectively, is -- well, that's \$308,000. And

then, Community Health Choices is another \$388,000.

1.3

So DHS was here yesterday and they admitted, yep, there's an \$801 million shortfall. I'll use that term. CPAs in the room are cringing because they know they're not supposed to be doing this to sort of sleight of hand. They're supposed to be upfront and give useful information.

So what is your response to that?

Has anyone in the administration come to you, and with your background, did you tell them, hey, you can't do this, you've got to be honest with the taxpayers?

think we were honest. We did highlight that we showed those rolled costs forward. And I think the only difference from any other year is that I'm showing it in a budget request that we would roll costs forward, as opposed to not showing it and trying to bury it. So you know, we had this question yesterday, as well, and you know if the desire is to show the negative balance on the financial statement in '19-20, certainly, we can have those costs in '19-20, but what will really

happen is we will pay them with '20-21 revenues.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: And you're good with that?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: It's the reality of the situation.

1.3

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. I had hoped for a different answer from you because of your professional background.

It's been referenced already one time that if you add all of these irregularities up, there's roughly a \$2 billion shortfall imposed upon us by DHS, who is prepared to welcome everybody at any time for any reason, and we owe them money. I think there's general agreement that's unsustainable.

Do you have any comment about how we can get these costs in hand?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. So again, these programs are mandated that we serve these individuals. The Department does have a Health Outcomes Report that recently showed how they have adjusted the capitation rates in physical health and behavioral health over the last five years, have reduced those down by about a billion dollars. So it is -- the situation is

really that the services they provide are just increasing in need. And they have talked about that, and it's -- the aging population, it's the disabled population. And those are driving those costs.

And while they continue to try to put efficiencies in those contracts, you know, value-based purchasing and things like that, there is not a day goes by that I don't hear from someone about how our rates aren't high enough. And at the same time, they want the spend to go down. So it's a difficult discussion to have on how we should be providing all of the services we need to provide for our senior and our vulnerable population, our disabled population, and pay them an excellent rate and also have the spend go down.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Well, as long as we keep the Pennsylvania taxpayers in mind, I would appreciate that. I know they would, too.

That's all I have for the Secretary.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Lawrence.

REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, I want to revisit the
Governor's proposed transfer of \$200 million from
the Horse Race Development Fund. At the 2018
Farm Show Public Officials Luncheon, Governor
wolf unveiled a report paid for by the
Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture and
produced by the Temple Fox School of Business
entitled Pennsylvania Agriculture, A Look at the

Economic Impact and Future Trends.

1.3

2.0

The Governor lauded the report, stating, quote, I know firsthand the transformative power of agriculture. As public officials, I'm sure you see that power on display in your own communities across the State. It's because of that potential that my administration has worked so hard to invest in and grow this category, unquote.

Page 41 of this report lists the equine industry as one of only two agricultural sectors in the Commonwealth in the, quote, strong and growing category, later stating that, quote, equine sector is very important to the Commonwealth. Both the Governor and Secretary Russell Redding have made many other statements over the years, some quite strong, in favor of

dollars in the Horse Race Development Fund benefitting the equine industry.

The Governor's about-face reversal caught the entire equine community off guard and has already led to incalculable economic losses across the Commonwealth.

What would you say to farmers who took the Governor at his word and made significant private investment and are now facing choices that might include selling their farm or moving out of state?

think we have made significant investments in this industry. Over \$3 billion has gone to this industry. And you know, to say about-face, we have a situation with our limited revenues here in the Commonwealth, an increasing issue with higher education costs. And keeping young people in the State, as we just talked about, the growing cost of seniors. So I think it's important to focus on whether it makes sense for us to continue to invest \$204 million in race horsing purses or if it's time to shift that investment into higher education and students in Pennsylvania and having them stay here.

1.3

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: So Madam
Secretary, the Race Horse Development Fund is
funded through a tax on gambling in the
Commonwealth. As you know, category 1 casinos
are required by law to be cited with a race
track. This was part of the deal that legalized
gambling under the Rendell administration. It's
my understanding that senior officials from the
administration recently met with representative
from the category 1 casinos, floating the
possibility of allowing the casinos to walk away
from their historical commitment to the
racetracks.

Are you aware of any meetings between the administration and the casinos on this topic?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: No, I'm not.

REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Have you had any discussions about any changes in the relationship between casinos and associated race tracks?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I have not.

REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Would you agree that a divorce of the casinos and the racetracks would likely result in most of the track closing, devastating equine breeding across the

1.3

Commonwealth and leading to the loss of a significant number of jobs and thousands of acres of open space?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I imagine that to be true. If they're no longer required to have the race horsing, I'm not sure that they would keep them.

REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: So again, with the proposed \$200 million transfer out of the fund -- again, the Governor a few years ago said any halt breeding from payments would be extremely concerning and potentially devastating. As his Budget Secretary, have you given him any advice about the economic impact to agriculture in this Commonwealth if this proposal moves forward?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: No, I have not.

REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Wouldn't you
say that might be part of your responsibility?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I mean, I think we're focusing on the economic viability of Pennsylvania as a whole, not just the agriculture or equine industry. There is no other agriculture industry that is subsidized by funds like this one is. And again, higher education in

The

Pennsylvania, keeping young people here, which is 1 what this proposal does, is important to 2 Pennsylvania and the economy here. 3 REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Madam 4 Secretary, I appreciate your time here today. 5 And Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the 6 indulgence on the questions. Thank you. 7 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Thank you. 8 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: 9 Representative Rothman. 10 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: 11 Thank you. Madam Secretary, just to follow up a 12 little bit with my colleague's questions. 1.3 money that you're taking from the Race Horse 14 Development Fund is going to go to, I understand, 15 a Nellie Bly tuition program. And I asked the 16 Secretary of Education last week about details 17 about it. I just wanted to ask you if you know 18 19 more about it. This would be eligible for any student 20 coming to Pennsylvania, whether they're residents 21 of Pennsylvania or even residents of the United 22 23 States. BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Anyone 24

attending a PASSHE university.

25

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: And they would 1 get \$8,000 to \$10,000 a year if you take the 2 numbers, we're thinking, each year. There's no 3 means test? 4 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: No. There 5 would be. It would be based on financial 6 eligibility for a grant program. If you're grant 7 eligible through PHEAA standards, as well. 8 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: And if they stay in the State, the loan -- they don't pay it back. 10 If they leave the State, it becomes a loan. 11 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: It would 12 1.3 convert to a loan, yes. REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Interest rates? 14 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yes. I'm not 15 sure what the interest rates are. The Department 16 of Education would determine that. 17 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: How do you 18 19 collect it? BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: They would have 20 a mechanism to collect it. 21 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: And how do you 22 know they leave? 23 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I mean, I think 24 they're -- they have ability to track whether 25

they're in Pennsylvania or not.

1.3

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: And this is a grant every year for every year that they're a student?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: And where we see graduation rates at over 60 percent in a six-year period, if they don't graduate, they have to pay it back.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I believe it converts to a loan.

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: So I appreciate you saying that the Governor wants to invest, the administration wants to invest in keeping students in Pennsylvania. I absolutely agree. We're losing young people, as you know. But I would just point out to you that I think what keeps young people and what attracts young people to Pennsylvania is opportunity and jobs. By taking this money out of the Race Horse Development Fund, you're threatening 23,000 jobs.

So it would seem to me that the better route would be to create a healthy economy and opportunities for young people. And Nellie Bly herself went to New York City. But I appreciate

-- at age 23, by the way. I appreciate your answers on that.

I wanted to shift to the banking fund.

As you know, the banking fund comes from fees the banks pay. In addition to all the other taxes they pay, your proposals take \$21 million from this fund to go to general operations of DEP and -- what's the rationale for doing that?

We have lots of funds that fund environmental agencies. Why not take it from some of those funds?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: We have language in the Fiscal Code that allows us to have \$45 million in transfers, and we felt there was \$21 million available in the Banking Fund.

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Is it going to hurt the Banking Fund?

The Banking Fund is there to protect consumers, protect banks against defaults?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: It is, but we don't believe there will be any harm to any program within the banking industry.

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: And do you think that it's -- do you think that -- I guess you don't, but I think it would be more appropriate

1.3

2.0

for you to take money from the funds that are there to help the environment and take the money -- you objected to that, I just heard earlier today. One of my colleague objected to taking money out of one of the environmental funds.

wouldn't it make more sense to take money out of the environmental funds to fund the environmental programs?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: We're using those environmental funds to fund those environmental programs. And as I mentioned, the Fiscal Code language gave us the ability to determine where the \$45 million in fund transfers came from.

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: There's still a lot of money in the environmental funds, though, right? I mean, there's still considerable money.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: There is plenty in the environmental funds, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: That aren't being used or may be used in the future, but are not being used now.

Also, I just want to point out that these banks are paying lots of other taxes, as well, right? I mean, they pay real estate tax, bank

share tax, corporate net income tax? I mean, all 1 those things that -- I think this is -- and are 2 important to our economy. And if the banks are 3 the ones loaning money to the small businesses, 4 to the entrepreneurs, the people who we're trying 5 to attract. So I think that's misguided and hope 6 you would reconsider that, as well as look more 7 8 into the Race Horse Development Fund and not raiding that. And back to that, does the administration 10 have the legal authority to take the money out of 11 the trust fund? 12 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: We would need 1.3 legislative changes for that. 14 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: okay. Thank you 15 for your time. 16 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Thank you. 17 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative 18 19 Fritz. 20 REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 And good morning, Madam Secretary. 22 23 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Good morning. REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: I have two focus 24

So in the interest of time, we'll get

25

areas.

right to it.

1.3

To start, Madam Secretary, the last version of the Commonwealth's Enterprise Information Technology Strategic Plan covered 2016 through 2019.

Does the administration plan to release an updated version?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I don't even know what that is, so I'd have to check.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: Okay. Again, it's the Commonwealth's Enterprise Information
Technology Strategic Plan. If you get back to me, that would be great.

Same theme, Madam Secretary, can you address what are the administration's priorities in terms of information technology investments for the coming year and beyond? Information technology investments.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Not specifically, but I can follow up with you.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: Okay. That would be great.

Okay. We're going to shift gears.

Second query, Madam Secretary, focuses on
broadband, and specifically, the administration's

1 2 3

claim to focus on expansion of broadband access to rural Pennsylvania, but I do not see that in the State budget proposal. There is no line item to fund the Governor's proposal of broadband initiatives and only one employee, that being the Director.

This office is supposed to coordinate broadband build-out and coordinate effort to incur Federal funding, but I don't see any resources given to the Governor's Office of broadband initiatives.

Where in this proposed budget is money to fund the work of this important office, and how much is allocated?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: So as you are aware, the Governor has proposed Restore PA.

That would securitize a severance tax, and broadband would be an eligible expense under that proposal.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: Well, I'll just introduce a little factoid here that we have been unsuccessful in drawing down Federal USDA grant moneys because Pennsylvania lacks a broadband build-out strategic plan. It is a key scoring criteria in order to draw down USDA grant

dollars. We are leaving our rural folks at a 1 disadvantage. So I'll move on. 2 Here is one's takeaway, Madam Secretary, 3 from these budget hearings. There's an abundance 4 of "pork." There is questionable management. 5 There's a disregard for return on investment, and 6 there's outside special interests influencing 7 what ought to be unbiased and objective agencies. 8 But for a rural legislator, there's another clear observation. There's a patent disregard for 10 rural residents. Hard-working, salt-of-the-earth 11 taxpaying constituents in rural districts, such 12 as mine, are constantly sent to the end of the 1.3

line by this administration.

Madam Secretary for you and your boss, it is confounding beyond words and, frankly, unconscionable.

> That's all. Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative wheeland.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEELAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, good morning.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Good morning.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEELAND: State

25

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

correctional institutions, their line, there is a request for a \$75 million supplemental appropriation for 2019-20 -- or '19-20. This marks the second year in a row that the Department has needed a supplemental appropriation for the SCI line. I believe there was a \$40 million request in '18-19. With the closure of prisons and the declining prison population, the cost to operate the Department should be going down, but they continue to grow.

Why is this additional funding necessary and what led to the significant overspend currently?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: T don't think we received the dollars requested in this budget, which is why we have the request for a supplemental need, particularly on the SCI line. There is increased medical costs, which is related to that line. The fact -- we did close -- we are proposing to close Retreat. savings there were hopeful to be six-month savings, but the closure did not occur in that time.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEELAND: Okay. You had mentioned medical care cost increases.

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Department of Corrections also asks for an additional \$14.9 million in '19-20 to cover overspending in the current year, medical care appropriation. And this marks the second year in a row that the medical care line item needed supplemental funds. And there was also a request for, I believe, \$10 million supplemental appropriation for 2018-19. And furthermore, the administration is requesting an additional increase of \$5.1 million for this budget.

What's driving these funding increases?

Has the prison population, the makeup of the population changed significantly or what's driving these costs?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: We used to have some dollars available to us to address Hepatitis C and HIV, and those dollars have been exhausted. We don't have those anymore. So we were assisting -- offsetting those costs with previous year dollars, and now those dollars aren't there. We do have an increased cost related to Hep C in prisons.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEELAND: It's just beginning to appear to me that it's easier to understate the expenses and then turn right

around and ask for supplementals. 1 Is that what --2 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Definitely not 3 easier, no. 4 REPRESENTATIVE WHEELAND: But it appears 5 that's what's going on. And --6 7 BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I don't think that that --8 REPRESENTATIVE WHEELAND: -- it's very disappointing. It's frustrating. It's a sign of 10 mismanagement, in my opinion. I, in my former 11 life, was a county commissioner and we had our 12 own prison and our own prison issues to deal 1.3 with. But certainly, we would never consider 14 running our correctional facility like the State 15 is, coming back, asking for more money. 16 There's just -- it's obvious that there's 17 mismanagement there. Thank you. 18 19 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Greiner. 2.0 21 REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 22 Madam Secretary, I want to talk about 23 Restore PA to start with. And throughout the 24 hearings, there were several cabinet 25

secretaries -- DEP, DCNR, PennDOT was here, and all others, who talked about how valuable this program would be. And I was wondering whether you could provide me a list of projects. I know the Governor has been going throughout the State talking about these projects.

Could you provide me a list of what he's proposed and what, maybe, he's promised to some of the local officials?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Sure. There's no official projects have been promised. We talked about categories of projects, but the ultimate decision on what's used in Restore PA would be a conversation, and in conjunction with the legislature.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: So there's nothing -- there's not a definitive list? I know he was in Lancaster County --

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: There's a list of categories of what projects could be done, happy to get you that, but no actual projects.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Okay. I would like to see that list. But I was wondering because I know he's been in Columbia. I know he's been in some other towns. And I know

there's different, you know -- my predecessor here that spoke before me talked about broadband and different areas, and I just didn't know whether municipal officials, county officials said, hey, if we could get this funding, you're going to get this project.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: No. No.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: But I would like to see the general list. You can share that with the Chairman.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: The one thing I was wondering, how did you and the Governor, or the administration, reach the \$4.5 billion proposed number?

I mean, how do you land at that number?

Why isn't it \$5 billion, why isn't it \$2 billion?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: We determined what we would have sufficient revenue to pay the debt service for.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Well, let me ask you about that, too. This debt service -- and I'm one of those CPAs who happens to be here in the Appropriations Committee. We are talking

about borrowing \$4.5 billion of money, with a debt service of \$360 million over the next 24 years. And they talk about a -- of course, this would be paid for through a severance tax, which would generate \$700 million annually.

well, now, this is where the math gets confusing to me. If it's going to generate \$700 million annually, and our debt service is \$360, where's the extra going to go.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. Again, that would be a conversation with the legislature to determine that. This is the Governor's proposal, but ultimately, we need to have the conversation with the legislature on what the final product looks like.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: So it sounds like -- all right. It sounds like there could be play in those numbers.

We really wouldn't need to -- first of all, the tax wouldn't have to be that high, if there is one. Or else something would have to be modified if we want to -- if we want to have the debt service equal the amount we're actually spending on the project. That's all I'm saying.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Room for

discussion, for sure.

1.3

2.0

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Correct. Okay.

Now, I do want to come full circle because I guess we're almost done with these hearings, but I do have to laugh about the kabuki dance. You know, being a CPA, I tend to be more serious, take things more pragmatic. As the former speaker said, I was a county controller. And as a controller, I worked closely with my county commissioners. I couldn't overspend. And if I did overspend, I had -- would have to have that conversation.

I'm in the sixth or fifth biggest county now in the State. I think Lancaster now has surpassed Delaware County in population. And I'm just saying, so we're not a small entity, you know. And we had to deal -- I was on the prison board and had to deal with all of these issues. We have, you know, the same issues at the State as we do at the county many times with some of these things.

And you know, I hate to use the word mismanagement, but when you're \$900 billion dollars -- yeah, when you're \$900 million, not

billion, almost a billion, overspent -- I do think that's a problem, you know. And like I said, I can understand how my colleagues feel that that's mismanagement because I think there needs to be a conversation or needs to be a dialogue -- the Governor did sign this budget, you know.

1.3

2.0

And when you have these numbers and then you have -- the discussion here was we didn't look at the senior population. We instinctively -- Representative Gabler kind of stole some of my thunder today. I think, instinctively, we feel that there's going to be more supplementals, you know. And who knows what we're going to hear with the spring numbers and what have you. All I'm saying is, I hope -- I look at the budget as a very serious document. And I think we need to look at it in a way that -- we have a responsibility to the taxpayers, too. And that's all I'm saying.

You know, we've had supplementals over the years, but it does get frustrating when one of my other colleagues talked about, you know, we're taking money out of ag and health line items and what have you. And of course, we have

the transportation issue. I mean, there's a variety of things we have to discuss here and we're going to look at, but I do think -- I do think, to say -- and it came up yesterday that it was our responsibility for the overspend and the way we budgeted. And I think that -- I really do think that was not a true comment. I'll just leave it go at that, as we continue to work through this process.

1.3

2.0

I just want to leave it go at that because I do have concerns as a numbers guy moving forward. So thank you. Thank you for your time.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative
Struzzi.

REPRESENTATIVE STRUZZI: Good morning.

Good morning. Just to start things off, a very simple question, and then I will have some comments.

Like Representative Owlett, this is my second go-around on Appropriations, and same for you through this budget process. But first, to the very simple question at the very top of the General Fund appropriations, the Governor's

Office, under his line item, is asking for a 9.4 percent increase of about \$644,000.

Why is that needed, and what will it be used for?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Yeah. I believe it's just strictly related to salary increases, contract salary increases. And I believe there was some one-time prior dollars used.

REPRESENTATIVE STRUZZI: Okay. All right. And now to this entire process. And I'm not going to use the term everyone else has been using, but I'll say it's more of a shell game, trying to put stuff out there, see where the money is going to pop up. And to me, you know, being only in my fifteenth month in office, it's very frustrating. And I understand why the taxpayers get frustrated, as well.

There really isn't a lot of transparency in this process. And I have a whole list of things that I could go through. I guess you get the download of all three weeks of us sitting here and going through this process.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: I'm lucky that way.

REPRESENTATIVE STRUZZI: Yeah, I would say.

1.3

2.0

But I do have to ask, though, like all these different proposals, it makes you wonder, you know, what are we really serious about. Representative Fritz mentioned broadband, a one-person office to solve all the problems of broadband in this State, when that's such a serious issue for our rural communities.

When I was speaking with PHEAA, you know, we have the PA Targeted Industry grant program that has an 89 percent placement rate, and yet we're underfunding that by \$2 million. If we're serious about workforce and filling these job gaps, why wouldn't we just put that \$2 million in?

You have the State System and the State related systems, you know, Penn State, Pitt, we're funding all of them to lower tuition rates, and we're funding competition between the State system and the state related at a time when the State system is struggling. They've asked for \$20 million over the next five years for \$100 million, yet that's not even funded in the budget, correct?

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE STRUZZI: The State Police
-- the State Police should be focused on
protecting our communities and protecting our
families and keeping people safe, not how they
can fill their own budget gap.

I mean, I just -- some of this stuff -- and I think Representative Owlett hit it very well, these are fundamental things that government should be doing. And again, we're praying a shell game with the money. And from my perspective, again, being new, it's just super frustrating. So I think, from your perspective, and I get that -- I sense a level of frustration, as well, but I hope moving forward and in future years and as we work through this budget and we put the money back in that needs to be there, that we can come to a better process to make this more transparent for the taxpayers and really more responsible to those that sent us here to do these jobs.

So thank you.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Bradford.

1.3

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Thank you, Secretary.

And thank you, Chairman.

1.3

I want to want wrap up. And I know we've all had a good laugh at the term kabuki dance, but I want to throw something else out because I think it might also bring some humor and levity to the situation, but I think also talks to kind of what's driving this. And again, not to bring humor to it, but there's something called the Kübler-Ross model, the modified Kübler-Ross model, which I believe is typically referred to as the seven stages of grief.

And for those who know it, you know, it goes: shock, denial, anger, bargaining, depression, testing, and acceptance. And while the last three weeks has often been frustrating -- and I'm sure my friends on the other side of the aisle share that, I know you do. This is not an easy job you have and you do a great job advocating for the administration.

One of the things I take tremendous hope from -- and I actually want to recognizes, you know, Representative Struzzi and his frustration as a newer member looking at this budget

situation we find ourselves in year after year.

I've been here for 11 years. What you said, in

many ways, sounds very similar to what I feel

about this.

1.3

This process does not seem to work. It sounds like many of these meetings we talk about how we can't cut many, many things. And in fact, any revenues that are put into the Governor's budget, there is no support for. And then, we talk about all of these different budgeting techniques that are used that we don't like. And listen, I want to run through them because I don't think my Republican colleagues are wrong to point out there is a \$388 million CHC rolled payment into '21-22. There is.

The pupil transportation roll, that is a perpetual snowballing roll at this point. It is there. There's no doubt about it. We should talk about it openly, but we should also be intellectually honest enough to look ourselves in the mirror, this body, this state House, which has been doing this now for the better part of 10 years, and own what is our responsibility. That is what I call the kabuki dance, but it is also self-denial.

We can be upset about it, but when we arbitrarily cut capitation items, which has been going on forever in this building -- and again, I make the Casablanca reference. There's gambling in this building?

This has been going on forever. So it is disingenuous and again, to try to blame career officials who are doing their best and say, oh my God, you overspent, come on, we underfund these lines habitually and it is obvious. The use of fund transfers, last year was \$45 million out of environmental lines. A couple years back, it resulted in the farm show issue.

We turned PlanCon into bond proceeds. I think that's \$193 million. We securitized the Tobacco Settlement Fund at a billion five. This is a hodgepodge of things that have been done that I don't think any of us feel good about from a budgeting standpoint, but we own them. We have brought this about. And it's more than that.

You know, I think about the loan from the Workers' Compensation Security Fund. We delayed repayment of that. I think right now we're proposing to pay that back in 2024.

Representative Struzzi will be in his second or

third term by that point, and I don't want him to be any more disillusioned than he is already by the process, but I'm not confident that's the case.

1.3

2.0

I'm also not confident we're ever going to get that \$200 million from the JUA, which every year we book. And I'm not confident that we're going to pass needed legislation that the Governor is saying in his budget he needs in order to make this one work. And I throw that out just to say, you know, minimum wage. If we don't pass minimum wage -- and the House leadership has shown no willingness to do that -- that's \$123 million cost in this budget.

Or we can do what we did last year and book the savings, but not the expense. And that's just -- again, it's not bad people. It's people dealing with the political realities of a body that is led in a way that is unable to make cuts and unable to do revenue. And so this is the political reality. So to sit here with righteous indignation and blame one administration, this is across multiple administrations and it's not to blame administrations. It's to say, you're dealing

with a legislature that cannot govern and will not change.

1.3

2.0

We have to own this. This is our fault.

And to say otherwise is just disingenuous. So

I'm going to go back, and I'm going to say it's

not your professional background that's the

problem. It might just be ours. I'm going to go

back, though, where I started because here's one

thing I think there's great hope for in this

building today. This is the seven stages of

grief. And it's not to be humorous about it.

It's to recognize, initially, there was shock, and there was paralysis at learning the bad news. And then there was denial. We were trying to avoid the inevitable. And then there's anger. And we've seen some of that.

Frustration, the outpouring of bottled-up emotion. And then there's bargaining, seeking in vain for a way. And some of these budgeting techniques that we've used are reflective of that.

And then there's depression, final realization of the inevitable. And there's testing, seeking realistic solutions. I'm suggesting we might be at that point, where we

look at realistic solutions. And then, finally, full acceptance, the final stage of the seven stages of grief, where we deal with our budgeting issues in a real, honest way.

1.3

Democrats and Republicans saying we will govern, we will own this process. We will not scapegoat agencies and just make up what makes us feel better because we don't want to deal with the responsibility the people of Pennsylvania have given us. I don't want to be humorous about it or flippant about it or light about it. This is a difficult choice. We've gone through a very difficult 10 years following the Great Recession.

And many of these were brought about because we had to deal with tough budget years, but many of my Republican friends are right to say this is about as good an economy as we've had. This budget cycle, this business cycle at some point will lead to recession. We've put -- and this administration deserves yeoman credit for putting money into a Rainy Day Fund, but we should recognize that tougher days, inevitably, are ahead. And if we don't deal with these problems while the sun is shining, it will be much harder to deal with that leaky roof in rainy

days.

1.3

2.0

This is not an argument for any one solution because, frankly, for any solution to come about in this building, it needs to be bipartisan and honest and intellectually fair, but we must stop this disingenuous, trying to say it's overspending. We need to look in the mirror and have an honest reckoning with where we are as a Commonwealth, as a budget, and what ownership this legislature, this leadership has brought for Pennsylvania.

I want to thank you. I have no questions, obviously. I have tremendous concerns. I really do sincerely thank you for putting up with the legislature. On both sides, it can be very difficult. I know that you do not have an easy job. I realize we don't make it easier. I just want to thank you for what you do for the Commonwealth. You do a tremendous job.

Thank you, Secretary.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Madam

Secretary, we do joke a lot around here because
we all basically consider ourselves friends. And
it's a coping mechanism -- the pressure.

BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: All of those things, yes.

1.3

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: But seriously, I would be remiss if I didn't express real serious concerns that I and many of my colleagues have concerning this budget proposal. You know, we have these budget hearings to properly assess the merits of the Governor's budget proposal and the practicality of how it's to be implemented.

And what concerns me this year is year after year, we see less and less details in the Governor's budget policies. The lack of detail is often so stunning that we are left questioning if these proposals are really real or really a priority of this administration, or if it's just simply a process to give political cover to the Governor. The Governor's budget proposal for the upcoming year and the financial statement contained therein show that this proposal, if taken as a reality, is operating on a very razor thin margin.

And if a simple miscalculation in this budget is made by the executive branch, then the budget is out of balance and the whole house of cards comes tumbling down. During these last few

weeks, we've had State agencies come before us and perform some of the kabuki dances that my counterpart here talks about all the time in an attempt to trying to explain some of the serious inconsistencies in this Governor's budget document, one of the serious concerns that continues to be, our supplementals and overspending of this administration.

You know, it is the sole responsibility of the Governor, not this Governor, every Governor, to live within the means of the budget he agrees to and that he signs into law. that is one point that's very important, that the Governor agreed to the spending limits in his negotiations with this General Assembly. know, when we have testifiers like the Department of Corrections, who acknowledge a budget was passed and simply say to us here in our budget hearings that it creates a great deal of concern when they basically ignore -- an employee ignores his boss, the Governor, and says, it doesn't matter, you know, we didn't get what we wanted. well, his boss said this is what I agree to and this is what we'll live within.

Yesterday at our hearings, the Department

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

of Human Services sounded an alarm of an agency that has run amuck, and I mean run amuck. The Department has admitted that the overrun cost for the current fiscal year is actually over \$800 million, not the \$500 million that was reported in the Governor's budget book document. DHS has achieved this failure by pushing current year costs into next year's budget and pushing that cost that should be in next year's budget to look to the future, the kinds of gimmicks that we see all the time in these budgets that really continue to create real financial issues for the State of Pennsylvania.

1.3

DHS tries to blame and shift the blame for all of these issues to the General Assembly. The key point here that blows up their argument is we appropriated nearly every line item that DHS requested in their spring update last year. And the couple of lines that they were different from the spring update were agreed to by the Governor that we made cuts to. And I've heard that the minority chairman here states that we are to blame for this situation of supplemental spending. My hope is that he's using the royal "we" to describe the members of his own party and

a

1.3

ours because of the different sides of the aisles and the problems we create sometimes.

But when we deal with a Governor, we have every reason to believe that he will live up to his commitments, to what he has negotiated in our budget negotiations. We understand that at times, things happen in a fiscal year. Record numbers of supplementals, though, just simply needs more and more definition as to the logic.

DHS was here, and we asked numerous questions of DHS about projected spending. No answers. Yet the State Police can project their spending and different issues in what they believe should be the cost to each municipality in Pennsylvania, but yet our own DHS who has all kinds of information available to them cannot do any forecasting that's accurate to give this General Assembly a proper understanding of where we're headed with their budget.

Sadly, the overspending by the Department of DHS is really, really concerning with where we're headed with structural deficit there. And it was really shocking yesterday when we talked about the Community Health Choices when the administration and its own employees raised

alarms about the holes in the budget. You know, it really is concerning when our department, our professionals, cannot project at least within reason of what they expect to spend and what our senior population is going to cost us in the future year.

1.3

2.0

When we go to Department of Education, the administration has continued to tout the investments in education that go so far to say and praise themselves in that it's reasonable for the people of Pennsylvania to assume that, you know, maybe we have a king here, not a Governor working with the legislature on these kinds of things and they pat themselves on the back.

But the truth is, there is a huge, huge hole in pupil transportation that was acknowledged when the Secretary of Education was here, \$157 million that's going to come out of next year's budget, which means if we continue that spending without covering that pupil cost, that will eventually add up to three, four, \$500 million that will be underfunded in pupil transportation that we're not dealing with in this budget. Pennsylvania cannot continue to ignore these costs in our local school districts

because that ignoring of it will cost property taxes to rise to cover those costs and/or State taxes to rise because we are not being honest in our State budget.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And finally, I want to talk about the Governor's revenue assumptions. It's refreshing that someone in the administration finally admitted yesterday that the Governor's minimum wage proposal would result in job losses. too long, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have ignored the key fact. However, the concerning thing to a lot of us in the Governor's minimum wage proposal is the budget implications that it has. The administration is booking \$133 million in new revenue from an increase in the minimum wage. The IFO states that we'd be lucky to collect \$54 million in new revenue. So if the administration is wrong about this fact, then the whole budget is out of balance, which is really concerning.

We were also presented with unsatisfactory answers about the combined reporting, Madam Secretary. After years of making the same policy pitches from the administration, saying that the combined

reporting would be bringing no additional revenue into the State of Pennsylvania in the first year, this year, the administration takes 180 degree turn in saying that, oh, no, we're going to bring \$200 million in to cover the projected combined reporting. So again, when we talk to the Revenue Secretary about that, his explanation was very weak in justifying that explanation of what such a huge change was.

So Secretary, in closing with this, I
know you didn't create the situation we're in.
You did not create the culture of lackluster
performance and inattention within the different
departments that really seem to be running pretty
rampant right now in this administration.
However, you have the power to change the ship.
I'm asking you, and encouraging you, to write a
new script for this budget that gets those
secretaries in line with projecting real numbers,
so that we in the General Assembly know honestly
where we are headed in this administration and in
the future for Pennsylvania.

The failure to do so not only fails this General Assembly, but it also fails the people of Pennsylvania. And I think the people of

Pennsylvania deserve more transparency in where we really are headed financially with our Commonwealth. I thank you for coming here today. I thank you for your honesty and your integrity. we think all -- I think very highly of you, but we have great concerns about this budget proposal. Thank you very much. BUDGET SECRETARY SWAILS: Thank you. (Whereupon, the hearing concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the proceedings are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same.

Tracy L. Markle
Tracy L. Markle, Court Reporter