COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARING BUDGET HEARING

STATE CAPITOL MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 2008, 9:00 A.M.

VOLUME I OF V

PRESENTATION ON DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

BEFORE:

HONORABLE DWIGHT EVANS, CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE MARIO J. CIVERA, JR., CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE STEPHEN E. BARRAR

HONORABLE CRAIG A. DALLY

HONORABLE GORDON R. DENLINGER

HONORABLE BRIAN ELLIS

HONORABLE DAN B. FRANKEL

HONORABLE JOHN T. GALLOWAY

HONORABLE WILLIAM F. KELLER

HONORABLE THADDEUS KIRKLAND

HONORABLE BRYAN R. LENTZ

HONORABLE TIM MAHONEY

HONORABLE KATHY M. MANDERINO

HONORABLE MICHAEL P. McGEEHAN

HONORABLE FRED McILHATTAN

HONORABLE DAVID R. MILLARD

HONORABLE RON MILLER

HONORABLE JOHN MYERS

HONORABLE CHERELLE PARKER

HONORABLE SCOTT A. PETRI

```
1
   BEFORE: (cont'd.)
      HONORABLE SEAN M. RAMALEY
2
      HONORABLE DAVE REED
      HONORABLE DOUGLAS G. REICHLEY
 3
      HONORABLE DANTE SANTONI, JR.
      HONORABLE MARIO M. SCAVELLO
 4
      HONORABLE JOHN SIPTROTH
      HONORABLE MATTHEW SMITH
 5
      HONORABLE KATIE TRUE
      HONORABLE GREGORY S. VITALI
 6
      HONORABLE DON WALKO
      HONORABLE JAKE WHEATLEY, JR.
7
8
   ALSO PRESENT:
      MIRIAM FOX
9
      EDWARD NOLAN
10
11
                                DEBRA B. MILLER
                                    REPORTER
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX	
2	TESTIFIER	
3		
4	NT 7 M TO	D A C E
	NAME CECRETARY TAMES B CREEDON	PAGE
5	SECRETARY JAMES P. CREEDON	4
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
1
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Good morning, Mr.
2
    Secretary.
            The House Appropriations Committee would
 3
4
    like to convene the hearing.
            We have the Secretary of General Services
 5
    before us, but what is more exciting, Mr. Chairman,
6
7
    is this is the last week, isn't it?
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: That's right. I'm smiling
8
    on that one.
9
10
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Mr. Secretary, what we
    basically do, we don't take testimony; we kind of
11
12
    go right to the questions from members of the
    committee.
13
            I would like to start off with, can you, in
14
    a very specific way, talk about how your department
15
16
    has done savings relating to the Commonwealth of
    Pennsylvania from things such as energy, other kinds
17
    of ways, procurement, things of that nature? Can you
18
    talk about what kinds of savings have been to the
19
20
    taxpayers?
21
            SECRETARY CREEDON:
                                 Sure.
                                        I would be happy
22
    to do that, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, everyone.
23
    I'm glad to kick off your last week.
24
            The savings is really probably the most
25
    critical function for DGS, since we are sort of the
```

back-room operation of the entire Commonwealth governmental business.

We have the opportunity to save money in multiple areas. I will mention a few of them for you this morning, and let me start with the energy side.

One of the things that the Governor has been pursuing is an aggressive energy agenda, and one of the requirements he asked of DGS is that we set an example and manage our energy very effectively and also reduce our costs in the process.

We have been successful in reducing the consumption of energy in DGS-operated buildings by about a little bit over 10 percent now. Over goal is to go to about a 20-percent reduction. That means about a \$1.6 million per year operating savings just from that reduction alone.

We are also in the process of doing a number of what are called ESCO projects. Those of you who may have offices in the--- I don't think there are any House offices in the North Office Building, but in the Irvis Office Building, we are starting to see the real beginnings of the ESCO projects in your offices.

These are projects where we have energy companies come in and do things such as change out

1 | the windows and put in windows that are insulated.

2 | They come in and they take water conservation

3 | measures. They help us with lighting controls. And

4 we anticipate that we will save about \$44 million

5 | through the development of these ESCO projects.

Just to put this in perspective, too, beyond dollars. The BTU consumption reduction alone is equivalent to enough BTUs to power about 23,000 homes throughout the Commonwealth. And from an emissions reduction perspective, the fact that DGS, through these initiatives, has been able to reduce our consumption, it is equivalent to taking about 20,000 cars off the road.

So there are, in addition to the hard-dollar savings, there are also some very serious environmental savings as well.

Another major area for savings for us is on the purchasing side. You have often heard the note that the Commonwealth has about \$4 billion in our procurement operation. We have been successful now in saving about 212 and growing of dollars through our smart buying, our strategic sourcing initiatives.

In addition, we have a COSTARS program, which takes the concept of the smart buying and broadens it, opens it up not just to small businesses

but also opens it up to municipalities and school districts.

2.0

We have a little bit over 5,000 participants in that program. They did about \$195 million worth of spend in that program last year, and we estimate that they saved about \$15 to \$20 million by operating within our program.

The other area of savings is on the public works side. Probably the measure we are most proud of is, in 2002 the Commonwealth was running a change-order rate on our construction projects that was almost 20 percent, unheard of in the construction industry. Through the hard work of the folks in public works last year, our change-order rate is now down to 4.5 percent.

It is avoided cost in capital dollars of probably about \$50 million. That is \$50 million that we either don't have to borrow or can be put into other capital projects.

So those are just a few of the major cost savings initiatives that we have been involved in.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: I know the Governor made a commitment toward minority participation. Can you talk a little bit about what exactly and where are things in terms of procurement, involvement in terms

of contracts? Things of that nature -- minority participation?

SECRETARY CREEDON: Sure.

One of our goals was to take our level of minority- and women-owned business participation from what we had said at the time, which was probably about 2 percent, and actually as we have gone through the numbers, it probably was under 1 percent in 2002 and the early part of 2003.

We have now got over our goal of 10-percent participation. Our mission now is to try to sustain those numbers.

That participation rate is divided. About 60 percent of it is women-owned businesses and about 40 percent of it is minority-owned businesses. And interestingly, we track this quarter to quarter.

That 60/40 split almost stays right on each and every quarter.

This 10-percent spending represents last year about \$45 million in spending directly to minority- and women-owned businesses. And keep in mind, while we spend \$4 billion through procurement, we have to look at those percentages based on what the annual available spend has been, what we have been able to effect that year.

So last year, actually the number of RFPs that we issued was down a little bit. We only had about \$450 million worth of spend that we could directly attribute to reach our 10-percent goal.

We have a lot more to go, though. A couple of measures we have taken. We now have lifted the points available in a procurement from about 10 percent for your MBE/WBE participation to now 20 percent.

We are also aggressively pursuing more participation by firms to participate in our program, because we find that as much as we want to see our numbers grow, if we don't get minority- and women-owned businesses participating in our programs, we can't grow the program.

We are also involved in improving our enforcement capabilities so that when companies say there is going to be minority- or women-owned participation, that by the time they operate the contract and complete the contract, that the level that they committed to is there.

And also, we are involved now with DCED in looking at this, not so much as how do you involve companies within the procurement process, but how can we tie in with DCED from a small business

1 perspective, bond programs, business assistance 2 programs, so that if you are fortunate enough to be part of a Commonwealth contract, can we give you some 3 4 assistance in business planning, maybe tax planning, 5 other areas, so that you are successful in the 6 contract? 7 And the last year, I will mention quickly, 8 we are also increasing our presence within the Hispanic community. This is an area within our MBE 9 10 spend that has been historically low. 11 We made some structural changes. 12 eastern regional staff has recently opened up a 1- or 13 2-day-a-week office in the Lehigh Valley so that they can be more involved with the Hispanic community, 14 both in the Allentown and Bethlehem and Easton area 15 16 but also over into Reading, and that we can start 17 seeing some more involvement in the Hispanic 18 community in these programs. 19 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Chairman Civera. 2.0 CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 Welcome, Mr. Secretary. 22 SECRETARY CREEDON: Good morning. 23 CHAIRMAN CIVERA: I was just wondering, 24 because I guess about 2 months ago or 3 months ago an 25 announcement was made in regard to the State Building in Philadelphia, that it was sold. I visited that building many times, and I know that it wasn't in the greatest condition, but I did notice that every part of that building was occupied and it was mostly all State employees.

What happened to the State employees in the departments that were in that in the southeast, and what happened when you sold? Did you own the property? Did the State own the property? What did we do with the money? I was just curious---

SECRETARY CREEDON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: ---because, I mean, that is a focal point, that that is the State Building, and there were certain different departments there, and now they are scattered, my understanding is throughout the city. Could you give me some update on that, please?

SECRETARY CREEDON: Sure. They are not scattered throughout the city. As a matter of fact, they are still in the building. The building has an agreement of sale but has not been sold yet. We anticipate about this time next year we should be moving.

We have an agreement of sale to sell the building for about \$25 million. I think it is a

little bit over \$25 million. We just signed a letter of intent to move to lease space at Eighth and Market Street. Actually, two locations. One is at Eighth and Arch and one is at Eighth and Market Street in the center-city business district. The employees who are based in the Philadelphia State Office Building will move to one of those two locations.

The Eighth and Market Street location will be primarily DPW as well as the Public Utility

Commission, the Insurance offices, and really be kind of the areas that are, with the exception of DPW, which, by the way, is not a county assistance office in this location, is not an area that has a lot of traffic from customers, from the taxpayers.

The reason we are opening an additional facility at Eighth and Arch Street, that is going to become the Customer Service Center. So that is where the Department of Revenue be will. That will be Labor and Industry, workmen's compensation offices and hearing offices, the Department of Health for Vital Records. So for the individuals, it will be a little bit easier access, although both have great public access within the city of Philadelphia.

The transaction you mentioned about the building needing a lot of investment, if you take the

avoided investment costs of renovating a building, combine the recovery, the \$25 million in the sale proceeds, and you take the fact that we have been able to negotiate a very aggressive low market rate based lease at Eighth and Market Street. We anticipate over a 20-year planning period. The Commonwealth will save just about \$30 million.

So to answer your question, we have not moved yet. They will still all be in one location; they will not be spread throughout the city, except for the separation of the Customer Service Center and the base operations.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: How are those locations determined? The reason I asked the question is that I represent Upper Darby.

Upper Darby Township is right next to the city of Philadelphia and has the transportation system, probably it is the hub of the southeast, where you can get in and out of Delaware County or Philadelphia by going on it, and I was always wondering--- Plus, we don't have a city wage; Philadelphia does.

How are those locations prioritized and picked? You know, is it the city versus the suburban communities, or could you give me some idea?

SECRETARY CREEDON: Well, for the situation involving both the Pittsburgh State Office Building, which will be happening shortly in the same model as Philadelphia, we made the commitment to the city officials that we are not going to leave the center-city area. And actually, through a lot of discussions I had with the Philadelphia delegation, both the House and the Senate, the view was that they prefer we find a new location within the central business district, even within the city of Philadelphia.

Both the sale and the lease were conducted through an RFP process. The sale was authorized by legislation, which the General Assembly passed, I think, in July of last year, and it was a competitive process. I think we had about five or six bidders for the sale of the building, and we had about five bidders for the lease space for the building.

But the commitment was made that, we had been in downtown Philadelphia for as long as we have had offices in downtown Philly, we were going to stay in downtown Philly.

Now, what we do, however, what we do look at is when we are out in, let's call them the more suburban areas or the suburbs, and it is tough to

```
1
    define that sometimes in southeastern Pennsylvania,
2
    we do make a commitment, though, that we do, as much
    as possible, put our facilities in downtown
3
4
    locations. And I think it was 91 percent of the
    leases that were rebid or relocated last year by DGS
5
    were placed in downtown locations.
6
7
            But downtown can be defined, and it can be a
8
    small town. What we are trying to avoid is going out
    into greenfield developments, out into industrial
9
10
    parks. Sometimes the agencies love it there because
    there is plenty of parking, and as I always say, the
11
    sun always shines and, you know, there is no snow and
12
13
    everything is perfect. But we prefer to put people
    in Williamsport and in Allentown and in Conshohocken
14
    and in Erie and put people in downtown locations
15
16
    where they can have an impact.
                              Okay. Well, you need
17
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA:
18
    transportation, and that is how you --- I agree with
19
    that. Okay. Thank you.
2.0
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Katie True.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE TRUE:
                                   Thank you, Mr.
22
    Chairman.
23
            Good morning, Mr. Secretary.
24
            SECRETARY CREEDON: Good morning.
25
            REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Can we talk about bids
```

and no bids?

SECRETARY CREEDON: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: My husband is a small businessman. This is an important issue for us, because he is a small general contractor and he has to bid on everything, in order to, you know, bid against other folks, and it just seems to work out very well if you have the low bid. And I know under discussion you have a project that you are going to extend a bid without putting a bid out there for other people to jump on board.

And I guess it is kind of convoluted here, and I'm sorry about that, but when you did the outsourcing, when the Governor first came in and you started outsourcing, we lost a business in the city -- they happened to be my constituents -- and they were very concerned about how the bid process worked. And this was a longstanding business that now is out of business, and they are still unhappy about it, and I hear from them on a regular basis.

But combining that whole mentality, I would like to know how that is working, number one, and I would like to know, you know, just to hear from you on the record the way of doing business without asking bids, other than it has a smooth transition

and so forth and so on.

I personally believe that the bidding process is a good thing, and I would just like you to comment about that.

SECRETARY CREEDON: And so do we.

The way you successfully run a procurement operation is to have maximum competition possible, and let me begin by talking maybe first about the strategic sourcing initiative which you mentioned, and then let me talk specifically, I believe it is about the Unisys contract, which I think is really the question.

Let me begin on strategic sourcing. The program continues to go very well, but I have to emphasis, while it is called strategic sourcing, a lot of people have called it sole sourcing -- quite frankly, incorrectly.

Strategic sourcing is an extremely competitive process that drives the cost of goods and services down for the taxpayers. What it does is it looks at the Commonwealth as a whole, from how much do we buy altogether as opposed to having individual buying decisions made in very small groups of agencies, or sometimes very small agencies.

Let me give you an example. In the past, an

agency that needed a copier basically could go out to a series of contracts that had been bid, but had some prices on them and had some requirements on them, and pick whichever one they could, quite frankly, afford.

Our approach has been to say, we expect to buy across all our agencies 300 copiers this year or a thousand copiers this year through a very competitive process to a number of different companies: What is your price going to be for copiers? So we drive the price down for the most cost-effective copier available for the Commonwealth, and then the agency must buy that type of copier.

So it did have some impact on some businesses throughout the Commonwealth who had been used to doing business on a small basis with some number of agencies, and actually the Senate is completing a pretty comprehensive study on the impact of strategic sourcing on some of those businesses.

We have been working--- We supported the study, supported the resolution, which was introduced by Senator Wonderling. Our Deputy for Procurement, Curt Topper, has been working with the committee to really help us get an understanding of it as well to see if there are some structural changes we need to make.

As I transition over to Unisys, let me be very clear that the idea that the Rendell Administration is not competitively bidding projects is completely incorrect, and let me give you a statistic, and I have a chart.

In 2001-02, there were almost a thousand sole source contracts authorized by the previous Administration. I read in the paper this morning that the previous Administration was very, very, very conservative in authorizing sole source contracts. It was an anonymous source, I believe. We are averaging about 300 per year. So if they were very, very, very conservative, I guess we must be very six-times conservative.

The idea, the way we look at some of these business models is competition can come in two ways. The first way competition can come is to make the decision that based on the product or based on the service that we need to acquire, that it makes sense to do an RFP, or in some cases a strict bid, to a number of different companies, and we do that in, I would say, probably about 80 percent or 85 percent or maybe even more of our situations.

At other times, when you have a service such as IT services, Prison Health Services, sometimes

information technology consulting, and you have an infrastructure that is built up within the organization that, quite frankly, is going to cost a lot of money to transition to a different system, you ask yourself whether you can create competition without going out to the marketplace, where you might get a different vendor, you might get a better price, but you are going to spend a lot of money transitioning from your current vendor to a new vendor.

In the case of Unisys, the analysis was done with the investment that we have had since 1999 in working with Unisys in the Data PowerHouse. And if you have ever had a chance to go out and see the Data PowerHouse, you would understand the level of investment that is there.

The decision was made, well, before we go to the market -- and again, keep in mind what I said, "before we go to the market" -- let us see whether we can work with the existing vendor to get a price reduction that will preserve the investment we have made currently in that infrastructure, avoids the very expensive transition costs, plus the disruption to a very key system to operate this Commonwealth, and if we can get that level of savings that we want,

which in the case of Unisys is \$240 million over the life of the contract, then let us move in that direction.

In the case of Prison Health Services, it was the same situation. To disrupt the health network and the equipment setups in all of the prisons throughout the Commonwealth would be a cost to the taxpayers. So the way we looked at it was, does it make sense to negotiate a better contract with Prison Health Services, save those transition costs, and get a better price, which in the case of Prison Health Services we will save \$55 million.

And keep in mind, with Unisys, the contract would not have ended for another 2 years, so what we did was, we had two choices: If we were going to rebid this, we would have to pay more money than we have to for 2 years under the contract, or we can negotiate a contract extension that would get us an immediate \$50 million of savings over those first 2 years. So when we looked at that business model, the "let's stick with Unisys and negotiate that contract" model won.

In some situations, you go back and you say, no, we are willing to incur the transaction costs, the transition costs to a new vendor, and we are

going to go out and ask the marketplace for some pricing. But we are certain that the savings and the pricing that we are going to get from Unisys is well within what we would have received by going out into the marketplace.

We are not out here just to give this to a company because it makes sense to stick with a company; we want to make sure it makes the most economic sense.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: Thank you for your explanation. I appreciate it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Greg Vitali.

REPRESENTATIVE VITALI: Thank you, Mr.

15 Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Secretary, for coming 16 here today.

I wanted to go back to your initial topic, which was the ESCOs, the energy service companies, and first I would like to congratulate you and the Governor for employing these energy service companies. It is a progressive concept which I, frankly, was not aware of until the current legislation on conservation started to move through the Legislature.

As you mentioned, these are companies that

go into government entities, schools, businesses, and look for ways to save money by installing energy efficient needs.

As chance would have it, I took a tour of one of your contracts, the Plymouth Meeting armory on Thursday, and an energy service company, Ameresco, led that tour and showed me some of the energy savings they did in your armories throughout the State.

I bring this up because they frankly went on and on, and there was a little bit of criticism of DGS with regard to the negotiation of that contract. The sense was that they were being undercut as far as their ability to do an effective job. And I may be getting my facts muddled, but they talked, I believe, about a facility in Coraopolis where they made the point that as we speak now, they were contracted to do some work on that project, but the windows are still, you know, 6 inches open because that wasn't part of the deal. So on a cold day, they weren't acting in the most energy efficient fashion because of, I think probably from their perception, too hard a negotiating with regard to the contract.

So that leads me to sort of two questions:

A, maybe hearing DGS's side of the story as far as

contract negotiations; and B, if the fault lies with the Legislature in not providing you enough moneys to do this correctly, to employ the ESCOs correctly, maybe some suggestions for us as to how to fund this very progressive concept.

SECRETARY CREEDON: Sure. Let me begin with your second question first, and then I'll come back to the negotiating too hard, which I never really mind being criticized for.

But we don't need money from the Legislature to do ESCO projects. That is actually the key to doing ESCOs, that we are able to do these. We pay the contractor through the savings we receive through the utility reductions. So we don't have to hit the capital budget and we don't have to hit our operating budget for those savings. So it is not that we need a little bit extra to do a little bit more.

Getting back to the two armories, quite frankly, I would have to do a little bit more research, I think, on those two negotiations. We did delegate a number of projects to the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs to have them get started to do them. I'm not quite sure why they wouldn't have included a maximum amount of projects.

The way the process works is that the

companies bid on a scope of services and show the level of savings that they anticipate that they can achieve. So when we do the analysis, naturally our first choice is to go for the maximum amount of savings, but they have to be realistic projects that are truly going to work and that can be guaranteed by the company.

As to why DMVA would not have chosen to do windows or to be more aggressive, I'm not really sure, because as long as the company was willing to guarantee the energy savings as a result of those projects, you know, if it was a DGS negotiation on that contract, we certainly would have done it to maximize that scope.

But if you can let me go back and talk to DMVA, talk to our energy officers, see if they are familiar with those contract negotiations, I will see what I can find for you.

REPRESENTATIVE VITALI: It would be very much appreciated.

SECRETARY CREEDON: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE VITALI: Because it was a DGS negotiation according to the representative,

Ameresco.

If you could get at the Coraopolis project

```
1
    and the window issue, I would be curious, or maybe
2
    get word through the Appropriations chair on it.
    would be interesting to get your perspective on this,
3
4
    having had the other side's perspective.
            SECRETARY CREEDON:
                                 Okay.
            REPRESENTATIVE VITALI:
                                    Thank you.
 6
7
            SECRETARY CREEDON: Let me look into that a
    little bit for you.
8
            REPRESENTATIVE VITALI: Thank you.
10
            CHAIRMAN EVANS:
                              I would also like to
    announce that this is a joint hearing held with the
11
12
    State Government Committee, the chairperson,
13
    Representative Babette Josephs, who is here, and I
    think--- Is Matt Baker here? He is the chairperson.
14
            What I would like to do, she has a question,
15
16
    Representative Babette Josephs, the chairperson.
17
            REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS:
                                      Thank you very
    much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for making it a
18
19
    joint hearing.
20
            And welcome, Mr. Secretary. It is always a
21
    pleasure to work with you, talk to you.
22
            As you know, I have been very interested in
23
    terms of contractors. The businesses we contract
24
    with should look like the people of the State, which
25
    is to say we should be contracting with businesses
```

that are owned by women, owned by minorities.

I know that we have made some progress in that area. I have been involved in some conferences with small business development centers that you were very gracious to come and help us with, and I wonder if you would talk to us a little bit about progress in that area and what you see for the future.

SECRETARY CREEDON: Sure.

We made dramatic progress in the area of minority- and women-owned business participation.

We had originally thought we started about 2 percent. We actually started at about a 1-percent participation rate. We have taken that now up to that we are sustaining an over 10-percent participation rate. We reached a high of about 12-percent participation, I believe in one of the quarters in 2006.

About 40 percent of that spend is, almost every quarter consistently, about MBE companies, and about 60 percent is WBE companies. Over the last year, we have increased our requirements from a 10-percent score to a 20-percent score for your level of participation, and we have also expanded now to request participation in our real estate opportunities as well as within the ESCOs, which we

were just talking about.

And the ESCOs, with being construction projects, give considerable opportunity to minority-and women-owned businesses. As a matter of fact, the windows that are being put in in the four buildings behind the Capitol and also in the Labor and Industry and Health and Welfare Building are all being managed by women-owned companies. They are doing a great job. The papers don't blow off my desk anymore, so if nothing else, I appreciate that.

So I think we have made tremendous progress.

There is a lot more we can do. We have to find ways to sustain these levels of participation.

One of the things that some members of the caucuses have been talking to me about is, is there legislation perhaps necessary over the next several years to put some of this, what has been DGS policy, to place this in statute so that it becomes institutionalized and it can't be something that gets changed in the future and really becomes part of just the way we do business here in the Commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I would be very interested in looking at language for legislation.

SECRETARY CREEDON: If not this year, I think next year we will probably have those

```
1
    conversations.
2
            REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Thank you, Mr.
3
    Secretary.
 4
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Fred
 5
6
    McIlhattan, please.
7
            REPRESENTATIVE McILHATTAN: I have no
8
    questions, Mr. Chairman. Mine has been answered.
9
    Thank you.
10
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Scott Petri.
11
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Thank you, Mr.
    Chairman.
12
13
            Mr. Secretary, I know that you talked a
    great deal already about the utility savings, and I
14
    certainly compliment you. One thing I am trying to
15
    understand, though, you are looking in your budget
16
    for about a 7.1-percent increase, or an almost
17
    $1.4 million for utilities. How do you explain that
18
19
    in light of all the significant savings?
2.0
            SECRETARY CREEDON: The rates have gone up.
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: And how much have the
21
22
    rates gone up? So what you are saying is, the rates
23
    have gone up enough to eat away all of those savings
24
    by about $1.4 million?
25
            SECRETARY CREEDON: Not all of them, and
```

keep in mind that the impact of the ESCO projects in particularly the four buildings -- the North Office Building, the Irvis Building, the Forum Building, and the Finance Building -- they really will not kick in until well into this year. So we have to anticipate that those buildings are not going to be as energy efficient as we would like them to be, as well as the East Wing improvements. So we have to budget what we think realistically is going to be our energy costs.

2.0

In addition, the Judicial Center, which is being constructed just behind the Capitol, starts full operation sometime in the summer of 2009. So we need to start anticipating some rate increases for that as well.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Okay.

Another area I would like to explore with you is with regard to paragraph 508 of the History Code. As you are probably aware, there are some issues that have popped up as a result of the convention center and how it would be rehabilitated.

focus, paragraph 508 requires a number of things to preserve our histories and our facades: consultation, seeking advice, initiating measures and procedures, and then instituting procedures. And

But just generally and on a much broader

subparagraph (5) of 508 specifically requires that those procedures and policies that are described in paragraphs (3) and (4), which are the initiation of the measures, and the description of the procedure to be used in rehabilitating a property or changing a property have to be submitted to PHMC for review and comment.

Number one, are you aware, are most of the agencies in the State complying with this provision; and number two, has DGS itself submitted its procedures and policies to PHMC for its review? And the final question of that three-part question is, if we are not complying, how can we expect private people to comply when the general public and public institutions aren't?

SECRETARY CREEDON: I will begin with your first question, talking in general about compliance.

I believe that the agencies under the Governor's jurisdiction are complying. DGS is complying. The State System is complying.

I have to sign off on all of the demolition approval requests from everything from an old residence hall down to some bathroom facilities in State parks, and I can tell you that each and every one of those has a letter attached from PHMC asking

for their review before there is demolition that occurs.

2.0

Let me talk specifically about the PLICO building for the convention center in the city of Philadelphia, because I think that is a little bit of a much different situation and perhaps the heart of your question.

The facility, DGS did consult with PHMC on the demolition of those buildings. PHMC had a different view in a consultant basis to us on the condition of those buildings and felt that they should be preserved.

An agreement had been reached between the Convention Center Authority and PHMC to save the facades of those buildings. That agreement would never have been signed by DGS. The Convention Center Authority signed it before they owned the buildings, before they had done any assessment on the condition of the buildings, and as a matter of fact, even before we had even reached an agreement that we were going to move ahead with the convention center expansion.

DGS owns the site that the convention center expansion will occur. We own the buildings that were in question, and our engineering analysis and the

analysis that I looked at told me we were dealing with a very unsafe situation.

2.0

We had already put protective measures up on the Broad Street sidewalk to protect pedestrians, and as we looked at the cost estimates, while we were not a party to this agreement, if we were to abide by the agreement, it would have cost the taxpayers another \$15 million to save two facades. Between the safety issues that we saw and the cost to the taxpayers, from a DGS perspective, we did not feel we could go forward and take PHMC's advice.

There are some times where I have not taken PHMC's advice. The window change-outs in the four buildings behind the Capitol here as well as Labor and Industry and Health and Welfare, PHMC wanted us to use a higher-cost alternative. I elected not to take PHMC's advice, and I think if you go and take a look at the windows, you can barely tell a difference, and we saved almost \$12 million.

And on the PLICO situation, we felt we had a safety issue. When we started demolishing it, we found out we did indeed have a safety issue.

Seventy-five percent of the clip joints that hold the facade in place on the one building had either failed or were deteriorating, and when I looked at a cost of

```
1
    $15 million to save it plus the impact that would
2
    have on additional delays on PCCA, we felt that the
    buildings needed to be demolished.
3
 4
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Thank you, Mr.
    Chairman.
5
6
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Jake
7
    Wheatley.
            REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you, Mr.
8
    Chairman.
9
10
            Good morning, Mr. Secretary.
11
            SECRETARY CREEDON: Good morning.
            REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: I wanted to go
12
13
    back for a minute, and I should say that I really
    want to applaud the Administration and you and your
14
    leadership team and Peter Speaks around the efforts
15
    to really get your hands around this issue of
16
    minority- and women-owned businesses and how we make
17
    this environment a fair ground for all to participate
18
19
    in.
20
            In saying that, I want to go back to the
    numbers that you cited, the 10 percent that you
21
22
    reached, and how you capture those numbers, how you
    monitor those numbers. I know that we have talked in
23
24
    the past about the technology that is required to
25
    help you do that in a more efficient and effective
```

way. Can you talk to me about how you currently capture those numbers and how we can better capture these numbers and be able to monitor exactly what we are doing and be able to tell the story, positively or negatively, on what we are doing in this Commonwealth.

SECRETARY CREEDON: Sure.

We currently capture the numbers by, when a contract is awarded, our first benchmark is by noting the level of participation that that contractor has agreed to place on the project. So that is our first step.

We then, through our enforcement group within our minority- and women-owned business office through the bureau, we then monitor throughout the contract whether those levels of participation are indeed being fulfilled.

And then we obviously put a great deal of pressure on the vendor to comply with what they said they were going to do.

There have been situations where, by mutual business agreement, minority-owned businesses have actually dropped out, say 2 years into a 3-year contract with a vendor, and what we have done is we have said, obviously the business relationships have

changed; you both have agreed that there needs to be a break in your business relationship; however, we expect that the vendor will be replaced with another minority or women-owned business vendor.

You referenced the challenge we have sometimes in technology. We have been looking for about the last year at whether we can afford to make an investment into a dedicated software system within DGS that would allow us to do this in a, much like some other States have, through a dedicated software system.

It is about a \$450,000 expenditure. We look at our IT expenditures very frugally. We allocate a certain amount of resources each year across each of the deputates. It is an expense that we have not really been able to afford yet. We are hoping we can within the next fiscal year as we work through our priorities within IT upgrades.

One of the things we have been able to do, though, is identify at the Office of Administration with their IT resources that we use to run our IT operation, our looking at whether we can build this type of system in-house using some type of database platform that is already in place that will be able to allow us to catalog this and then also compare the

actual spend against the SAP system, which captures the invoices and then can tell us right away whether the spend indeed did occur.

So we have the data. I feel very confident about the data. I think it tells the picture of what is occurring within the Commonwealth. Could we be better with some dedicated IT resources? We certainly could, but it is a case of balancing our spending available within the department against where those resources are.

We have a very tight discretionary operating budget that we operate from, and the deputies compete very vigorously for those IT dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And I can appreciate that, and seeing that this is the Appropriations Committee meeting and this is our annual conversation around what are appropriate spins for each department, it seems to me, in my opinion — this is critical for me, and it has been since I came in — it seems to me somehow a missed opportunity for your department to request these types of upgrades and the investment in these upgrades so that we make sure the opportunities that we are trying to provide are actually being provided in a very efficient way, that you have not even asked for savings to be a

missed opportunity in that capacity.

SECRETARY CREEDON: Well, I will note, Anne Rung is our Deputy for Administration. She said she thinks we can buy it this year. It has been a case of when we have the money available and then prioritizing across the entire deputate within our existing budget.

We have made a commitment to the Budget

Office and to the Governor to keep our spending as

flat as absolutely possible, and I would not come to

this committee and ask for additional funding if I

had not already asked for that additional funding to

the Governor and to the Budget Office.

So I think we have just been in a time of waiting until we had, much like we all do our own budget, maybe we had to save a little bit and build up the funds to do it. That is really the situation we have here.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Sure.

Now, one final train of questioning, and $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ know we have to push on.

I have been told, and maybe you can help me clarify this as it relates to the State process for how it counts MBE/WBE in a project, it asks for solicited participation and not necessarily actual

participation. Is that how you count--- Help me understand how you count the participation percentages. Is it that it is actual work being performed with MBE/WBEs with our partners -- I'm talking about on a statewide contract and so on and so forth -- or is it the solicited action for MBE/WBE participation?

SECRETARY CREEDON: Let me kind of walk through the process again.

When the proposals first come in, we have, I guess, a solicitation basis. So if it is this month that contract is awarded, that solicitation basis would then go into our database and be part of our numbers that have been reported this month. But as we monitor the actual use within the contract, that percentage which is being attributed from that contract going into our totals will then vary on a quarterly basis to reflect the actual participation.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: So I'm clear on, when you say the 10-percent number that you consistently hit each month, is that 10-percent solicited or 10-percent actual business?

SECRETARY CREEDON: It's a combination of both, depending on which month we are in. If there is a month where a contract has just been solicited

```
1
    and awarded and we are not up and running yet, it
2
    will include some solicitation; if it is a contract
    that has been in place for 2 years, it will include
3
4
    the actual participation.
            REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Okay.
 5
                                              Thank you,
6
    Mr. Chairman.
7
            Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
8
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Brian Ellis.
9
            REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Thank you, Mr.
10
    Chairman.
11
            Mr. Secretary, thank you for coming today.
12
    Just a couple of questions, real quick.
13
            The energy efficiency standards that you
    have applied to some of the buildings -- North
14
    Office, Irvis, Capitol, Finance, Forum, and so on --
15
16
    how did we pay for those?
            SECRETARY CREEDON: We paid for those by the
17
    ESCO project. The ESCO contractor, what we do is we
18
19
    pay that contractor back for the costs of those
20
    improvements.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Okay. So did we
22
    borrow money to pay for these?
23
            SECRETARY CREEDON: No, we did not borrow.
24
    Under the Procurement Code, it is not considered a
25
    borrowing when you use operating dollars or avoided
```

operating dollars to make the payment back to a third party.

REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Okay.

And then my second question, with the sale of the Philadelphia Office Building, you are moving those folks into a leased building. Have you considered across the board looking at public-private partnerships for some of the buildings that you guys operate to save costs?

SECRETARY CREEDON: Yes. As a matter of fact, the Pittsburgh State Office Building, the RFP for the sale of the Pittsburgh Building will be released this month, probably very shortly, by the RFPs for the leased space to replace the space that is in that building.

We have not looked at it in Scranton or Reading. They are very small buildings. As a matter of fact, I think the Scranton building we just bought back. It had been a public-private partnership over a long-term lease, and we just made the final payments on it up in Scranton.

We are looking at some facilities here in Harrisburg, the former Harrisburg State Hospital property, which is now called the DGS Annex, which was added to our inventory responsibilities I think

2 budget years ago now. We are looking at whether there is an opportunity there to do some type of public-private partnership where we sell part or all of the facility and perhaps lease it back.

It is interesting to me, when I was told we were going to take on the operation of a closed State hospital, I kind of expected a closed State hospital. It's a pretty active facility up there with a lot of Commonwealth facilities, Gaudenzia drug and alcohol treatment, Catholic Charities. The Department of Agruns a dairy operation on the site.

But we have, a couple of folks have approached us and said that they might be interested in some type where they take on the development, but we continue to lease part of it. So we are always looking at all those types of opportunities, and if they make economic sense, we will pursue them.

REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Do you have any kind of initial numbers on the cost savings in the Pittsburgh location?

SECRETARY CREEDON: No, I don't. The difficulty in Pittsburgh is, let me just walk you through the economics as we see them right now.

The building will not--- Well, I shouldn't say it is not. I would encourage people to bid

\$25 million for the building in Pittsburgh, but I think I'm being a little bit unrealistic. It is not going to command the same market price that Broad and Spring Garden did in the city of Philadelphia. The economics are different.

We do know, however, that the building does require about \$50 to \$60 million of capital investments, so we are going to be able to avoid that investment, and we certainly hope that our lease costs in the city because of the size and, you know, the quality of the lessor, where somebody pays our leases -- we are going to be there for awhile once we move into your buildings -- that we are going to be able to get some below market rates.

So I'm hoping, while our savings on the 20-year net present value basis in Philadelphia is about \$30 million, I'm hoping we will probably see about 15, maybe 17 in Pittsburgh, but it's really just a rough estimate at this point. Until we get out in the marketplace, we are not going to know what those numbers are.

22 REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Thank you very much,
23 Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Dally.

25 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Thank you, Mr.

1 Chairman. 2 Good morning, Mr. Secretary. SECRETARY CREEDON: Good morning. 3 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Earlier in this 4 hearing you displayed a chart that provided some 5 6 information on sole source contracts, and I was wondering if you had the dollar amount of the 7 difference. And I know those are numbers of 8 contracts; I'm just curious as to difference in 9 dollar amounts as far as sole source. 10 11 SECRETARY CREEDON: I don't believe I have that with me, but it is certainly something that we 12 13 can put together for you. REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. I would 14 appreciate that. 15 SECRETARY CREEDON: 16 Sure. 17 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: And I think you addressed the question to Representative Wheatley 18 19 before, or he addressed the question to you and you 20 addressed the answer, about minority- and women-owned contracts. 21 22 We had a hearing, and it doesn't have 23 anything to do with DGS, but we had a hearing last 24 week on the Gaming Commission, and they had hired a 25 minority contractor to give them an overview of

gaming regulations and how to start in that business.

They intend to delegate a lot of that authority to a subcontractor that was not a minority-owned business in that respect with gaming. They made recommendations to the Gaming Commission, or to the prime contractor, and the Gaming Commission actually just disregarded all those recommendations.

But that is beside the point. I'm just wondering, how do you monitor when a contract is awarded to a minority-owned business that it does indeed remain that way? I mean, it seems to me that there is mischief that could occur there in terms of, you know, subcontractors coming in and the like.

In this instance, with the Gaming

Commission, is that the prime minority subcontractor

had no experience in the job that was entailed with

the contract, so obviously they had to look elsewhere

for expertise.

SECRETARY CREEDON: Right.

We have a certification group within our MBE/WBE office as well as an enforcement group, and their job is to ensure that what was said in the proposal occurs, to handle any disputes that are occurring between the prime, whether the prime is a minority vendor or the sub is a minority vendor.

```
1
            Quite frankly, our problem is not minority
2
    MBE firms subbing to non-minority subcontractors.
    Our problem is non-MBE prime contractors changing
3
    their relationships with the MBE and WBE
4
    subcontractors. I wish we had more MBE and WBE
5
6
    primes, but because of the basis of our construction
7
    industry and a lot of our procurement, we are not
    seeing as much as we would like to.
8
            But we do have an enforcement group, and
10
    that is their job, to monitor that each and every
    day, to take complaints, to investigate complaints,
11
12
    to monitor payments, to make sure people are being
13
    paid timely, particularly if they are a
14
    subcontractor. So they are the group that does that.
15
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. Thank you.
16
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Reichley.
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Thank you, Mr.
18
19
    Chairman.
20
            Sorry; we're a little cramped for space up
21
    here.
           There we go.
22
            I will try to be as concise as possible.
23
    know we are pushing up against the next group of
24
    testifiers.
25
            Mr. Secretary, your responses to
```

```
1
    Representative True's answers, the longer you spoke,
2
    the more intriguing it became to me, so I just want
    to get back to that for a second.
3
            And I think in following up on
 4
    Representative Dally's point, you mentioned about the
5
6
    larger number of contracts you showed with your bar
7
    graph, but you didn't come in today with any dollar
    estimation as to what the value of the contracts is
8
    that you released as opposed to what was in the
9
10
    Administration prior to that. Is that correct?
11
            SECRETARY CREEDON: Correct. But keep in
12
    mind, the Unisys contract was also sole sourced by
13
    the previous Administration.
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY:
14
                                      Okay.
            SECRETARY CREEDON: I think you are going to
15
16
    see, we will see when we submit the numbers, but I
17
    think you are going to see some pretty similar
    numbers.
18
19
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, is that the
20
    first time that contract had been let, though, for
    the Data PowerHouse situation?
21
22
            SECRETARY CREEDON: 1999, I believe, was the
23
    first time.
24
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Right, and then ---
25
            SECRETARY CREEDON: And it was extended in
```

2002. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: All right. you have now extended this again, without any 3 4 requests for competitive bids. Is that correct? SECRETARY CREEDON: That is correct. 5 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: I quess I'm 6 7 curious, because this does not seem to be the only 8 situation where this has happened within the Administration. I wonder if you can comment, because 9 10 there was an article posted just last night, I guess, 11 with the Patriot-News that discussed this very contract, that it is worth \$240 million over 5 years. 12 It also references the one for medical 13 services for inmates, which I think you mentioned; 14 also another one for telecommunications services. 15 Are you able to tell us who the big winners of those 16 contracts are and what the value of those contracts 17 18 are? 19 SECRETARY CREEDON: Let us see if I have the 20 total value of the Prison Health Services with me. believe I do. 21 22 The value of the telecommunications services 23 was \$50 million. That was awarded, I believe, about 3 or 4 years ago. 24 25 The Prison Health Services contract---T']]

```
1
    have to get you that, Representative Dally -- or
2
    Reichley. I'm sorry.
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: I'm Reichley.
 3
    We're often confused; I know.
4
            SECRETARY CREEDON: You're all from the
5
6
    Lehigh Valley; that's why I'm all confused.
7
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: That's right.
    the one with the mustache, if it is easier to keep
8
    track.
            SECRETARY CREEDON: You're the one with the
10
    mustache. Sorry about that.
11
12
            We will get you the value of the Prison
    Health Services.
13
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Sure. And the
14
    names of the winners of those contacts.
15
            SECRETARY CREEDON: Prison Health Services.
16
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Oh, Prison Health
17
    Services. And the telecommunications one was?
18
            SECRETARY CREEDON: Telco.
19
20
            REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Telco; okay.
21
            I guess the question I have is, in a
22
    contract with such a large amount as that, I was
23
    curious as to how that comports with the requirements
24
    of the Procurement Code.
25
            The article in the Patriot-News says there
```

seems to be three rather specific situations in which you can avoid going through an RFP situation, those being when only a single supplier is capable of providing the service, when Federal or State law exempts the contract from competitive process, or when the contract is in the best interests of the State, and I'm wondering if you are able to articulate for us today why the Unisys contract in particular met any of those requirements?

SECRETARY CREEDON: Well, it met the best interests of the State requirements, and so did the Prison Health Services contract.

And I believe, as I said earlier, our analysis was if we were able to negotiate a \$240 million reduction in the cost and a \$50 million reduction in the cost of the next 2 years -- and we would have paid an additional \$50 million if we went out to bid on this project -- and if we took in the impact of the transition out. And did we believe that by going to the marketplace we were going to get a better deal? We did not believe that we would, and if we could capture \$50 million of reductions in an existing contract, we were going to go and try to capture those reductions.

So that was the determination made on the

best interests of the Commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Did you even solicit inquiries or make inquiries to other firms that could offer the same services as Unisys as to what they were going to potentially offer the State in terms of savings?

SECRETARY CREEDON: If you look at the scope of the Unisys contract, it is not something that you could just call up and say, how much do you think you would charge us? Quite frankly, I don't think any of those competitors would have given us an honest answer. And quite frankly, they probably would have told us it was all going to be extremely low, because they want to have the competition, and then when the competition would occur, we would probably find ourselves with some numbers that maybe we wouldn't like.

I spent about 6 years of my career in the water and wastewater industry, where we bid on billion-dollar contracts to run water and wastewater systems, and I can tell you, when I was competing against an incumbent, my price was always going to be very, very low, and when I was the incumbent, what I wanted to do was be able to give reductions out 3, 4, 5 years to avoid that competition, because the cost

to my client of making that change was going to be traumatic and was going to be huge as far as changing potentially technology, changing staff, changing personnel, doing that transition.

2.0

So I think, you know, OA, who manages procurement and worked very closely with DGS and the procurement staff on this, I'm sure did market tests with the consultants that they employed to say, are we where we think the market will be? where some of these other competitors will be? Whether they talked to other vendors or not, I don't have that type of specific information.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Although it may not be required by the Procurement Code, does your office make any inquiry or evaluation into whether principles of the company that you are anticipating extending a no-bid contract to have made campaign contributions to the Administration?

SECRETARY CREEDON: No, we do not. That is not a matter of interest to us.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, I think it is a matter of interest to the general public, because as you know, I'm sure, back on February 25, there was an Associated Press article that ran a story that Deloitte Consulting had received more than

1 \$400 million in State contracts over the last 5 years 2 and detailed the fact that there had been significant campaign contributions made by Deloitte employees. 3 And in fact in sort of, I quess, a turnstile fashion, 4 there were some former Deloitte employees in the 5 6 Administration or related to folks in the 7 Administration, and I think if you proceed with these no-bid contracts, it raises that question. 8 SECRETARY CREEDON: Deloitte was not a 10 no-bid contract. Ninety-nine percent of the business 11 given to Deloitte was competitively bid. It is not 12 the same as Unisys or Prison Health Services at all. 13 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: The bulk of the money, \$360 million, went for work at one department, 14 the Department of Public Welfare. The contracts were 15 obtained through competitive bids, but this is 16 through a company that did competitive bids and they 17 still are receiving a bulk of money---18 SECRETARY CREEDON: 19 And I---20 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Well, hear me, Mr. Secretary. You know, I had asked you last year if 21 22 there was a company that felt it had been boxed out 23 because of connections to Deloitte by the 24 Administration, and when you then proceed to make a 25 no-bid contract of such a large amount to a company

like Unisys, it raises other speculations.

We have seen this, we are going to hear about it later this afternoon from the Department of Education, where two computer vendors were identified as the sole source -- I know that is outside of your department; that is with Education -- for these laptop computers, but again, it raises questions as to the integrity of the process, and certainly this performance has been a buzzword around this Capitol in the last 2 years. It would seem to behoove the Administration to take that to heart as well.

SECRETARY CREEDON: I think we do, and I think you are relying on newspaper articles that relied on anonymous sources and were intended to give a message that was incorrect.

I submitted an op-ed piece to the

Patriot-News on Friday afternoon, which I sincerely
hope they publish, which gives the facts about how
seriously we take procurement in the Rendell

Administration, and these are not being awarded on
the basis other than competition or in the best
interests of the Commonwealth.

And I think this afternoon when you talk about the computers, DGS was very much involved. As a matter of fact, I was involved in some of the

negotiations personally. That was a very fierce competition. Yes, there are two providers who won a competition.

REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Getting into the--- Now you have raised the interests of the Commonwealth.

Since you are the sole, not sole, but the major proprietor, let's say, of Commonwealth land, what is your position on the city of Philadelphia issuing the permission to the one slots venue for riparian land in the Delaware River in Philadelphia that is owned theoretically by the Commonwealth?

SECRETARY CREEDON: I have testified before the State Government Committee on this issue. Our position is that the courts will determine whether the city had the right to do that.

We were certainly prepared to deal with the issue as a riparian rights bill, as we would, and a number of other riparian rights bills which have been adopted recently by the General Assembly, and I guess the Supreme Court will give us a ruling on whether the city had the right to grant that license for the rights or not.

Interestingly, the Mayor has withdrawn those rights, so that made it an even more confusing

1 situation. 2 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: I understand that Mayor Nutter has done that, because I guess I'm 3 4 curious as to whether your department had taken a position on what the previous Administration in 5 6 Philadelphia did with the State-owned riparian land. 7 SECRETARY CREEDON: Our position was, if 8 that was a yet to be determined legal transaction and that it would move the opportunity for the gaming to 9 10 proceed within the city, we were in favor of it, and 11 we will defer to the Supreme Court to make that decision. 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: So DGS did not enter any objections to the city transferring 14 State-owned land? 15 16 SECRETARY CREEDON: No, we did not. 17 REPRESENTATIVE REICHLEY: Okay. Thank you. 18 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Bill Keller. 19 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Well, Representative 20 Reichley just---21 SECRETARY CREEDON: ---bid you right out. 22 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: That's correct. 23 knew what was coming. And I understand, you know, that subject of 24 25 riparian rights, it is subject to a lawsuit, so there

```
1
    are very few comments we can make. But I would be
2
    remiss if I didn't take this opportunity to get it on
    the record that the Legislature continues to
3
4
    reiterate, even with the passage of Acts 4 and 5 of
    this year, last week, that the only way that riparian
5
    lands can be transferred is through an act of the
6
7
    Legislature.
            As we said, the Supreme Court will determine
8
    that finally within the coming months, but it is, and
9
    I have said it a number of times, that the
10
    Legislature holds that. Only the Legislature can
11
12
    grant riparian rights.
13
            Thank you.
14
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Denlinger.
15
            REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Thank you, Mr.
    Chairman.
16
17
            You're getting better with my name every
           Thank you.
18
    time.
19
            Mr. Secretary, I just want to kind of go
20
    back to something that Representative Reichley was
    keying on, and it is a fact of history that in State
21
22
    government where States put out a lot of
23
    State-sponsored economic development, that in the
24
    out-years of Administrations, sooner or later it is
    friends of the Administration that tend to benefit
25
```

from the procurement system.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't ask this question to impugn you; in fact, I respect what you have done very, very highly and appreciate it. But what protections do you put in place within your department to make sure that it is not just "Friends of Ed" that end up getting the key contracts?

First of all, I think SECRETARY CREEDON: I'm going to extend an offer that I don't know if I made to this committee but perhaps to the State Government Committee -- I know I made it over in the Senate -- I encourage anyone who wants to understand our procurement process to come and spend a half a day or a day with our procurement team, who aren't at the Deputy Secretary level or even at the bureau level. They are the individuals who put together procurements, evaluate procurements, and make recommendations and ultimately award those procurements and then monitor the results of them. And I think you will find a group of people who have a goal to save money for the taxpayers, to provide good, effective services for the taxpayers, and to make sure agencies get the type of products that they are paying for.

Sometimes I think it is easy when the lights

go out here to forget about that offer, but I would encourage you this year, if you get a chance, for people to come and to learn how the process truly works.

Also, I will talk about the concept of ethics within the department. It is something that I take very seriously and our executive management team takes very seriously.

We have once and sometimes twice a year a program that we offer, and actually it is required for division level and above, for all employees to have ethics training from our Chief Counsel's Office, where they walk through case studies of how to handle this situation, what are the rules in this situation.

We also have in place for our top management a protection to avoid any type of conflict of interest, where we have to indicate to our Chief Counsel any family member, conflicts that might be in place, I believe going out to brothers and sisters and even to brothers— and sisters—in—law, for where we establish a preset method of recusing ourselves from any type of decisionmaking process that may occur relative to that company. That goes to the deputy level and I believe even into the bureau level.

So that is already automatically in place.

So if you see something coming across your desk or you see you have a conflict in place, there is a preset set of conditions. For example, if I would see a conflict that would come across my desk, it would immediately be sent over to Deputy Secretary Rung. I would be completely removed from the situation, and Deputy Secretary Rung would manage the decisionmaking process.

So we realize we have a lot of trust from the public in procurement and in public works and in real estate and in all the functions that we do. We take it very seriously, and we put the best protections we can.

But I do encourage you to learn about how the procurement process works, and I think you will find it is a group of individuals who are, and a lot of times they have been recruited from the private sector and are coming here and, you know, trying to do a very good job for the taxpayers, and they are not out to benefit one group of friends over another.

REPRESENTATIVE DENLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you.

I would like to thank you, Mr. Secretary,

```
one, for what you and all of your staff does for the
1
2
    people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I
3
    appreciate your responsiveness to this committee
    every time you come before this committee. And I
4
    thank the State Government Committee.
5
            We are going to take no more than a 3-minute
6
7
    break, then we're going to bring the Turnpike
8
    Commission before us, and then we will start back up.
9
            Thank you very much.
10
11
             (The hearing concluded at 10:05 a.m.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence 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. Debra B. Miller, Reporter