# COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARING BUDGET HEARING

## STATE CAPITOL MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2008, 3:05 P.M.

#### VOLUME V OF V

### PRESENTATION BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY

#### BEFORE:

HONORABLE DWIGHT EVANS, CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE MARIO J. CIVERA, JR., CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE STEPHEN E. BARRAR

HONORABLE STEVEN W. CAPPELLI

HONORABLE H. SCOTT CONKLIN

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 JOSEPH A. PETRARCA

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

1				I N D E X	
2				TESTIFIER	
3					
4	NAME				PAGE
5	ACTING	SECRETARY	SANDI	VITO	4
6					
7					
8					
9					
L O					
L1					
L2					
L3					
L4					
L5					
L6					
L7					
L8					
L9					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
	1				l.

1 CHAIRMAN EVANS: I would like to reconvene 2 the House Appropriations Committee meeting. We have the Acting Secretary of the 3 4 Department of Labor and Industry. So can you introduce yourself for the record, as well as if you 5 6 have anybody you want to introduce, and then I want 7 to get right to the questions. ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Okay. 8 My name is Sandi Vito. I'm the Acting Secretary of the 9 10 Department of Labor and Industry. 11 Behind me are the Deputy for Unemployment 12 Compensation, Pat Beaty; the Deputy for 13 Administration, Allen Cwalina; Deputy for Safety and Labor Law, Bobby O'Brien; Deputy for Unemployment 14 15 Compensation, Liz Crum; and Executive Director of the Bureau of Occupational Rehabilitation, Bill Gannon. 16 17 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Okay. 18 And we are doing this as a joint hearing with 19 my good friend -- he and I got elected together --20 Representative Bob Belfanti. Is Bob around? Where 21 is he? Oh; there he is. I just wanted to make sure 22 Bob was here. 23 Now, who is your counterpart on the 24 Republican side?

REPRESENTATIVE BELFANTI: Representative

25

DiGirolamo, and he's not in today.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Oh; DiGirolamo. DiGirolamo. 3

So this is a joint hearing with the Labor Relations Committee that we do this oversight in terms of the department, and I would like to start off with the first question.

The cost of doing business in Pennsylvania, can you specifically tell me ways that the Labor and Industry Department has found to make it less costly to do business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Well, first, through the Governor's strategic sourcing initiative, we avoided \$20 million in costs since 2005, and as you know, that relates to bulk purchasing of supplies, equipment, et cetera.

In addition, we have engaged in a number of cost-saving mechanisms, things like eliminating cars for employees who do not drive significant distances, reviewing our use of wireless. So we can name over \$11 million in avoided costs just this year.

In addition, we have had some Federal cuts which have necessitated us to review programs such as workforce development, where we have actually had to

close CareerLinks because of the lower costs.

2.0

Last year, we received a 6.6-percent cut in our overall budget. You will see this year there's a 4.4-percent increase, and that increase is largely attributable to an increase for OVR, without which we will not be able to draw down all of the Federal funds to which we are eligible.

So I can say confidently that we have cut costs wherever we could and are really operating at a barebones budget.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: How about UC taxes?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: UC taxes. Actually, we have actually lowered the cost of doing business in Pennsylvania in two key areas.

UC taxes have gone down from 5 percent to 4.7 percent for employers. In addition, employers on average will receive just over a 10-percent decrease in their workers' compensation premiums. So in fact, we have actually lowered the cost of doing business in Pennsylvania.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: The Republican Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative Mario Civera.

24 CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 I'd like to ask you about SWIF.

Based on the number of insurers in the State of Pennsylvania compared to -- because that's our last resort from the business community. If they go to SWIF for workers' compensation insurance, what would you say, right now, where does SWIF hold the insurance market?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: It's about 13 to 15 percent of the insurance market. The private insurers make up about 67 percent of the market, and then self-insured is about 22 percent of the market.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Okay. With the situation where people are trying to get workers' compensation insurance, has that market tended to go more with the State than it has been in the previous years, or is it basically staying the same?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: It's relatively stable, although we have seen a gradual decline in the number of customers at SWIF over the last 3 to 4 years.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Why is that? Because we haven't changed anything as far as the Pennsylvania laws dealing with the workers and all, so why would you see a decrease? Is the private market becoming more competitive, or---

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: I believe there has actually been an increase in private insurers coming in to do business in Pennsylvania, and there has been more coverage in the private market. So there's essentially an increase in the number of and percent of coverage by private insurers.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Okay.

2.0

The number of offices that cover SWIF in the State of Pennsylvania, how many do we have compared to like, I know we have one in Philadelphia, we have one in Harrisburg. I mean, is it a fair, equal---

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: We have full coverage, and to be honest, Representative, I cannot remember the exact number of offices, but I can get back to you with that. But we do have coverage across the Commonwealth.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: And the fund itself, how is the fund dollar-wise doing as far as the SWIF fund that that money goes into?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: The actuarial report shows that we have not a safely distributable surplus. However, we do have sufficient funds currently to cover our projected liabilities.

CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Okay. That's all.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Chairman Robert Belfanti,
Chairman of the Labor Relations Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE BELFANTI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The focus of my questions is concerning the rise in immigrants who are working illegally in the Commonwealth on various construction projects and the inability of us to do much about it until it's too late.

The Feds are very slow in reacting to complaints about this. I know Secretary Schmerin did help conduct a raid in my district because of child labor being used. But the department is pretty much limited to intervening only when you can prove there is a violation of the Child Labor Act.

Now, I'm not sure if there have been discussions at the top levels in L&I about how to more quickly enforce the work stoppages on commercial and industrial workplaces where people who cannot even speak English and certainly, you know, do not have papers, therefore, they are very likely not paying workers' compensation, they are not paying unemployment compensation, they are not paying their 1-percent wage tax, and it's completely unfair to legitimate contractors to have people like this out

in the field. So that's part A of my question.

I'll let you respond to that, and then I'll go to

part B.

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Well, our Bureau of Labor Law Compliance investigates all complaints, and sometimes those complaints involve either unfair wage practices and/or the hiring of illegal immigrants.

In those cases, they investigate them. If a company is found to be paying lower than minimum wage and/or not abiding by fair labor standards, they are cited.

In addition, I know on several occasions that bureau has sent information about the use of illegal immigrants to the Federal government and has actually cited employers for those violations.

But as you say, that bureau is complaint driven, so we only respond when we get the complaints.

REPRESENTATIVE BELFANTI: We have some legislation that is still in the ice-cream machine churning around. We are trying to get input from all the stakeholders, which would require a license for contractors -- nonresidential, so commercial and industrial contractors -- thereby if they have something to lose, they have to have a license in

their job trailer or in their headquarters on site, and if they don't, they are not allowed to work.

They are not allowed to be on site.

So again, this has been a complicated ordeal, and I know that many of the Administrations have been against any new licensing laws, but it seems unusual to me that a barber needs to have a license, somebody who clips your toenails needs to have a license, but someone who is doing a \$15 million project doesn't need to be licensed.

And this is not a union or a nonunion issue.

This is an issue where, if you are a legitimate

employer and you are paying your taxes -- you are

paying your unemployment and workers' compensation,

your SSI, your wage tax -- you get a license.

Now, if the Bureau of Wage and Labor

Standards or one of your other agencies goes to a job site and finds that there are 5 or 10 or 15 persons on the job site that would not meet the criteria for legal employees, that now we have a license to yank. Without that, they have nothing to lose.

It is just like, I guess, the local VFW or the Elks Club, even though they are great organizations, they apply for a liquor license, and if they are violating certain laws, that license can

```
be pulled or suspended for 10 or 15 days. And my
1
2
    question is, if we have the ability to yank a license
    for 60 days, first offense; a year, second offense;
3
    and three strikes and you're out, you can't work in
4
    the State, would that not be a great deterrent to the
5
    amount of illegal and unfair contracting, unfair to
6
7
    our contractors and our employees? Wouldn't that be
    something that the department would favor?
8
            ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Well, currently we
10
    have the ability to bar contractors if they violate
11
    prevailing wage or other labor laws from seeking
12
    public projects.
13
            I would need to look at the legislation and
    have our department look at the legislation
14
    regarding, you know, sort of preventing them from
15
16
    doing business in Pennsylvania. I'm not sure what
    the legal issues involved in that would be.
17
18
            However, we are always happy to talk to you
19
    about proposed legislation.
2.0
            REPRESENTATIVE BELFANTI: Thank you, Mr.
    Chairman.
21
22
            CHAIRMAN EVANS:
                              Representative Ron Miller.
23
            REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Thank you, Mr.
24
    Chairman.
25
            My question goes to the Self-Employment
```

Assistance Program.

We have had some success with that in the workforce investment area of the State where I live, and I notice in this year's budget that the funding is totally cut for it. It was \$3 million in '06-07, and then it was \$500,000 last year. Is there no support for this program within the department? Why is it cut?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: In the past, it has received significant legislative support.

When we look at the priorities -- as I'm sure everyone on this committee is all too familiar; we are living in a very constrained fiscal environment -- each year the Governor has to make decisions about his proposed budget.

When we look at the efficacy of programs,
Self-Employment Assistance, while for many people it
provides both supplemental income and the opportunity
to build a successful small business, on average, the
wages and the outcomes are not as good as some of the
other programs.

So again, it was cut as part of the proposed budget. I would anticipate that the Legislature and the Governor's Office will be in a significant amount of negotiations, and the priorities will get worked

out through that process.

There is, however, as you note, demand for the Self-Employment Assistance Fund. It was not included in this year's proposed budget because of the outcomes.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: So we are debating whether the outcomes are sufficient for this program? Because we're seeing pretty good outcomes; that's why I'm wondering.

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Well, what we have determined in terms of the objective measure of the outcome is that anecdotally, there are significant successes. However, when you look at the overall numbers, for many individuals who go through the program, they are not able, you know, to earn a family-sustaining wage through the small business that they set up.

So compared to other programs, the outcomes are not as good. Nonetheless, it's really up to the Legislature in its negotiations whether it restores those funds or not.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Kathy

25 | Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you.

2.0

Thank you, Madam Acting Secretary. I don't know the right way to say that.

Representative Miller basically asked my question; however, I would like some additional follow-up, and it is okay if you send it later in writing.

But I would like to be able to objectively review the data that you are saying the department has reviewed, because one of my questions was going to be -- I mean, I understand the whole, you know, we do this every year; the Governor views this as a legislative priority, et cetera, and my question was going to be, how does the department value it? And you have kind of told us that.

I would like to see the data as to outcomes and how it compares to other programs that are within the department's budget. I think that would be helpful.

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: I'm happy to provide that for you.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay.

The second question. With regard to the line item for independent living, the centers for independent living, I mean, again, I know the same

kind of battle about legislative priority versus

Administrative initiative, et cetera, but I would

like the same kind of evaluation, either verbally or

in writing, in terms of what you think the value of

what it is we fund in that line item for centers for

independent living are. Because again, from a

legislative perspective, I think with both of those,

many of us view them as very valuable, because we see

how they affect our communities. If you have a

different analysis that you are using, I would like

to see that.

2.0

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Well, on the centers for independent living, let me say that the success of those programs is undisputed. They provide crucial assistance for Pennsylvanians with disabilities in terms of leading independent, productive, you know, meaningful lives. So I think there's no dispute on the success of those programs whatsoever.

I think, as you know, the Governor's proposed budget proposes funding for the nine centers for independent living at the statutory minimum. Last year, the Legislature added another \$50,000 for each center for independent living.

Again, we understand that the budget is a

1 negotiated process, but let me be very clear that we are very supportive of the centers and very confident 2 in the way that they spend that additional money. 3 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Katie True. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE TRUE: On that note, the centers for independent living and what 8 Representative Manderino mentioned, if I may, I'm 9 10 glad to hear that you don't dispute that and I was going to ask you if there was a problem, because I 11 12 applaud you for your cost-cutting. So I was going to 13 ask you, you know, if you felt there was a problem, and obviously you do not. 14 So I guess my comment would be, to my good 15 16 friend, the Chairman, our majority chair of 17 Appropriations, Representative Evans, if perhaps as 18 we go down the path of negotiating this budget, 19 perhaps you would be an advocate for all the members, 20 because I think we all feel the same way, to stop or 21 perhaps ask the Governor to not hold programs like 22 this hostage. 23 I personally believe, and I'll say it 24 publicly, that we do this with negotiating tools. 25 There was no reason to make that cut. This is not a

personal thing to you; this is politics, and I would just ask ever so politely, Chairman Evans, if we could please argue about new programs, new funding, new borrowing, but let's be very responsible and return these centers to the level we should, and I would just politely ask that you would do that on all of our behalf, because I know you are concerned also.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you.

Representative John Siptroth.

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and just a comment regarding the two previous Representatives.

Regarding the centers for independent living,
Northeast Pennsylvania certainly serves my district,
and they have a terrific program there. And I would
echo the sentiments of Representative True that we do
not in any way, shape, or form cut that particular
program and hope that you will support that when we
get to the negotiation process, Madam Secretary.

I have one other very deep concern, the residential Uniform Construction Code. When the act was passed -- and this may be before your time, and maybe one of your Deputies can help you out -- but

municipalities were offered the option to use third-party inspectors. There seems to be a lack of consistency in the third-party inspectors.

Now, we have had an extremely high growth rate in Monroe County, where Representative Scavello and I both represent that district, and I hear complaints constantly from the developers that it seems like municipalities are imposing more restrictions than what the residential Uniform Construction Code calls for in a lot of instances, and there appears to be no consistency when a developer moves from one municipality to another.

So I would ask that your department try to look into that, and, you know, if we need to set up some new guidelines, then so be it. But the system isn't working entirely as it was designed to work when the law was passed.

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: A couple of comments.

The first comment is, there are statutory ways in which municipalities can adopt standards that would be above the UCC, and they have that right by statute at the present time. It is actually reviewed by L&I.

I think the most important comment I can make relative to your statement, Representative, is that

there's a piece of legislation sponsored by

Representative Buxton which would create a Uniform

Construction Code Advisory Board, and we are very

much in support of that.

We need to issue new regulations when the International Construction Code is changed, so that should happen sometime in 2009. That advisory board, I think, will help us work through and develop more consistent and, in some cases, more Pennsylvania-appropriate regulations related to UCC. So that is something that we would be very much in favor of.

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Okay. Thank you very much.

Coming from local government, I do appreciate and know that municipalities can impose reasonable other conditions, but what is happening is, it's not an enforcement of a local municipal ordinance. This is just done arbitrarily through these third-party inspectors, and I think that that's where our problem lies. And I don't know if Representative Scavello will sustain this or not, but I think that that's what needs to be looked at very, very carefully.

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: And as you know, I think we certify the third-party agencies.

1 I would hope that if there are specific instances, you would please bring those to the 2 attention of the department, because we will look 3 into it. 4 REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: 5 Okay. Thank you 6 very much. 7 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Craig Dally. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Thank you, Mr. 10 Chairman. 11 Good afternoon, Madam Secretary. ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Good afternoon. 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: I have two issues, and these things come up occasionally from constituents 14 dealing with the State Workers' Insurance Fund. 15 One issue involves a constituent of mine who 16 17 has a business in Pennsylvania but does work in New 18 Jersey. He has insurance through a private carrier 19 in New Jersey to cover his New Jersey operations, but 20 SWIF is insistent upon charging him once again for those same employees in Pennsylvania, even after he 21 22 supplied SWIF with a copy, you know, evidence of 23 insurance, and when he does public works projects in 24 New Jersey, they want New Jersey workers' comp 25 insurance.

So what I need is a contact person from you in your agency that I can sit down with and go over that issue, as well as the next one that I'm going to tell you about.

2.0

That involves a manufactured-home community, where in that instance the company is being billed for all the subcontractors that work on-site, and these are people that are operating under fictitious names. I mean, they are clearly separate business entities, and he is being surcharged for the labor portion of those contracts for their workers' comp, and I don't know where the authority under the statute comes from for that.

I mean, it's not a sense where, you know, he is 1099ing people. I mean, he's actually getting invoices and paying them on an invoice, and, you know, these are separate business establishments.

So those are just two issues which have caused a great deal of consternation with my constituents.

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Let me look into both of those, and I will also give you a name of somebody so we can work through some of the issues.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay.

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: I'm a little more

```
1
    familiar with the independent contractor issue, and
2
    the concern has been that, you know, in many cases --
    and it does not sound like that in your case.
3
4
    However, I know in a lot of cases, there are
    employers who are deeming actual employees as
5
6
    independent contractors---
7
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:
                                    Right.
            ACTING SECRETARY VITO: --- and I think if you
8
    have seen the national press, there has been a
9
10
    number, by the IRS, a number of employers cited for
11
    doing that.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:
                                    Right.
13
            ACTING SECRETARY VITO: But that doesn't
    sound like that's the case in your example, but we
14
    should look into it, and we will certainly sit down
15
16
    and talk to you about that.
17
            REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:
                                    Okay.
                                           That would be
18
    great, because I did have another constituent where
19
    the other issue was with a trucking firm, and I think
20
    that ultimately ended up being litigated, I think.
21
    It is on the independent contractor issue. But okay;
22
    I appreciate that.
23
            The other question that I have is, in
    yesterday's Patriot-News, it was pretty enlightening.
24
25
    It indicated that Deloitte Consulting had received
```

\$441 million from the State in the last 5 years, and this included \$68.4 million for the development of a workforce development system.

My question to you is, what has your department gained from this investment in workforce development?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: The contract is for the development of a comprehensive workforce development operating system.

Several years ago -- and I was in fact the

Deputy Secretary for Workforce Development at the

time -- there were three areas: our Workforce

Investment Act and employment service area that

needed a new operating system, as well as the

Department of Public Welfare employment and training

system and OVR.

All three of those areas essentially needed new operating systems. Rather than do three separate contracts, we combined them into one for a host of reasons. One, it saved us money, but probably more importantly, it created much more efficiencies in our ability to serve our clients.

So because clients often moved between one funding stream to the other, it allowed essentially those providing services to share information, as

1 appropriate, obviously. 2 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: Okay. ACTING SECRETARY VITO: So we actually saved 3 4 money on that contract. I can also assure you, because I ultimately 5 6 was the person who reviewed the RFP review team's 7 review of the work, that it was done by a committee 8 of seven, all of which had program experience and were internal to the departments. It was a very fair 9 10 and competitive hearing, and Deloitte received the 11 highest score on that RFP. 12 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: And you are satisfied 13 with the end product thus far? ACTING SECRETARY VITO: They have done very, 14 very good work. 15 We have gone live. In other words, we have 16 17 started the use of all three systems, and there have 18 been, let's call them glitches in the system. 19 have actually gone out and done focus groups with 20 employers and clients, and Deloitte is making 21 improvements to the system based on customer 22 feedback. So we have been very satisfied. 23 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: All right. Thank you 24 very much. 25

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Philadelphia's best

1 legislator, Representative Mario Scavello. 2 ACTING SECRETARY VITO: He changed his residence? 3 4 REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 6 Yeah; in looking for dollars, you know, 7 anybody in Monroe, when we put, let's say the 8 municipality, we say Philadelphia County, because it helps me get more dollars for us. 10 There are a couple of comments I wanted to 11 follow up. 12 Representative Siptroth talked about, I want 13 to give you a for-instance; this happened last year, same builder. In one municipality with two -- he was 14 putting footers in. He wanted to build two houses at 15 the same time. One of the houses was in one 16 municipality and the other one was across the street, 17 18 like diagonally across. In one place he could pour the footer, in the other one he couldn't. And it is 19 20 interpretation, and that is happening. And it cost, you know, it cost him dollars. He had to bring 21 22 people back. So at some point we need to address 23 that. 24 ACTING SECRETARY VITO: I absolutely agree, 25 Representative.

1 REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Representative 2 Belfanti talked about illegal immigrants, and one location in my district had over 80 illegals working 3 in that facility. And I'm just throwing it out 4 there. I can't believe they didn't break a labor 5 law. Somehow or other there had to be some law 6 7 broken. It was last year. If you could get back to me, I would appreciate that. 8 ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Sure. 9 I absolutely will. 10 11 REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Comments on the 12 centers for independent living. 13 I remember this, because I made the comment; I have it written here: "It is obvious everyone 14 wants to see the centers funded properly, and I hope 15 that this is the last time we have to talk about 16 this, " and here we are, you know, talking about it 17 18 again. 19 I don't know why they do -- you know, 20 especially in Monroe. The Northeast Pa Center For Independent Living does a fabulous job, and why we 21 22 have to go back to this year in and year out, there's 23 really no reason for it. 24 And the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 25 the OVR, is facing a funding crisis in the near

```
1
    future. As you are aware, OVR empowers people with
2
    disabilities to become taxpaying citizens again.
    you comment on OVR's funding crisis, and is this
3
4
    additional $5 million -- and I support it; I think it
    is great -- but is it enough to address the issue
5
    pretty much on a longtime effort?
6
7
            ACTING SECRETARY VITO: As you pointed out,
    Representative, we have been sort of shy of what we
8
    need to make our Federal match for the past several
9
10
    years. This $5 million allows us, if you maintain it
    over the next few years, to draw down on the Federal
11
12
    match and will actually catch us up, so to speak,
    with our Federal dollars.
13
            So yes, this is adequate, as long as it is
14
    maintained over the next 4 years.
15
16
            REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Okay. Thank you
17
    very much.
18
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Scott Petri.
20
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Thank you, Secretary
    Vito.
21
22
            I have some questions about the Governor's
23
    veterans outreach centers, which, of course, are
24
    regionally divided across the State. As I understand
```

it, we use Federal funds to fund that in total, and

25

how much is that a year?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: You know, embarrassingly enough, I cannot remember how much that is a year. But it's out of Wagner-Peyser funding, and if I remember correctly, it is somewhere in the neighborhood of around \$300,000. But I need to get back to you with the definite number on that.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Okay.

And then, do you know, are there any Federal proposed cuts in this area?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Representative, that is funded out of discretionary dollars. We are not required by Federal regulation or law to fund that. That was actually an Administration decision to fund those projects.

However, I will tell you that we have received significant Federal cuts in all of our workforce dollars -- a \$23 million cut in Workforce Investment Act funds and a fairly sizable cut in the Wagner-Peyser fund, which is our employment service line.

So while we have no intention of cutting those services and the funding for the centers, we are living in a very fiscally constrained environment

```
with Federal workforce dollars.
1
2
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: And what are the total
    Federal workforce dollar cuts?
3
 4
            ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Well, it's
    $23 million in the Workforce Investment Act, and in
5
6
    Wagner-Peyser, I want to say it's about $8 million.
7
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Okay. But you are
    committed to continue to fund the outreach centers
8
    nonetheless?
10
            ACTING SECRETARY VITO: That is correct.
11
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Can I assume that this
12
    program is in Labor and Industry because of the
    Federal dollars?
13
            ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Yes.
14
15
            REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Okay. Is there any
16
    reason you know of that the counties couldn't be
    allocated this money to do this same thing and still
17
    receive the Federal dollars?
18
            ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Well, I think we
19
20
    can't -- there has been discussion about us providing
    the workforce dollars over to the Veterans
21
22
    Administration. It would not be proper for us to do
23
    that because it is workforce-related dollars, and so
24
    we have Federal oversight responsibilities.
25
            However, we are in favor of combining
```

responsibilities with regard to veterans. However, you would need State dollars to replace those Federal dollars, and there has not been a willingness to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Okay.

2.0

All our counties have designated veterans services that do much of the same thing that the Governor's veterans outreach centers do. How do you coordinate with those counties so they know what you are doing and you know what they are doing?

-- and this is one of the things that we have pushed since taking office back in 2003. We have coordinated with the county offices, with our CareerLinks, which also have veterans representatives, and the vet centers. So we really have tried to coordinate those services, both in terms of outreach and the services that are provided with respect to job training and re-employment services.

We have also coordinated with Veterans

Affairs to do outreach to returning vets as they come

back into Pennsylvania so that we can provide them

with services immediately upon their return.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: A final question.

The Veterans Affairs program runs a very important program that disabled veterans are not required to pay real estate taxes. As I understand it, they are well backlogged in the paperwork, 6 to 7 months in processing. Is there any ability to use workforce investment dollars to administer that program since they seem unable to do so?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: I don't believe so.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative McIlhattan.

REPRESENTATIVE McILHATTAN: Thank you, Mr.

13 | Chairman.

Madam Secretary, a couple of questions and comments dealing with the Uniform Construction Code.

Do you folks have jurisdiction over that, especially for the opt-out municipalities?

And it has been a real challenge in the rural parts of Pennsylvania adjusting to that whole concept, because it's something new and different for us. But I would just like to say that any time I sort of have a problem with the Uniform Construction Code, there's a gentleman over in your office by the name of Mike Gensemer, and I want to tell you, that man is a first-rate public employee. Any time I have

1 trouble with the Building Code issue, I go and sit 2 down with Mike, and I have never found a more competent and helpful individual. You need to treat 3 4 him well. He does a wonderful job for you folks in that area. 5 ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Well, that is very 6 7 good to hear. We like to hear that. 8 REPRESENTATIVE McILHATTAN: He's amazing. ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Good. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE McILHATTAN: Following up on that whole thing, you folks now are adjusting to that 11 12 whole situation. Is that a costly situation or is it 13 paying its way? Because I know I have got a couple big industrial sites and plants in my area that pay a 14 couple hundred thousand dollars, in fact, for 15 16 permits. Is that paying its way? Is it cost effective? Or how is that working out for us? 17 ACTING SECRETARY VITO: In terms of the 18 19 ability of our Bureau of Occupational and Industrial 20 Safety in their ability to provide coverage for the 21 opt-out municipalities? 22 REPRESENTATIVE McILHATTAN: Yeah, and is that 23 a loss leader for you? I mean, is that something 24 that costs you more than you bring in with your 25 permits or not?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Yes, but we are adequately funded at the moment.

REPRESENTATIVE McILHATTAN: Okay. All right.

Now, let's move on real quick a little bit to talk about the way of the Workforce Investment Board issue.

Now, I don't keep my hands on that on a day-to-day basis, but I have talked recently with my county commissioners. We are up in northwestern Pennsylvania. We are the Regional Center For Workforce Excellence. You know, that is Erie, Clarion, Crawford, Venango, Forest, Warren, and Michele Zieziula runs that operation up there.

I put a call in to Michele last week, because I was a little bit concerned about some of the things that I have been hearing, and she hasn't gotten back to me yet. And I don't mean that negative, because she's a busy person and I don't mean it that way, but since you are here today, I thought maybe I would ask you a couple of questions on that.

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE McILHATTAN: It appears to me that, I guess the Federal funding is shrinking and that whole thing seems to be pulling back. People are being laid off. There's a possibility that the

CareerLink in Clarion County that I represent may be closed.

2.0

Is this all rumor and innuendo or is this fact or fiction? What is going on there? Can you sort of give me a quick overview, please?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: There have been significant cuts in Federal workforce dollars. The funds that I talked about before, the \$23 million cut, affects all of the local areas.

I can't specifically speak to Clarion County, but I can tell you that all of the local areas have had to do a review of how they spend money and look at potential cuts, especially when you look at investments and infrastructure like CareerLinks versus being able to put money into training which helps individuals get back into the workforce.

So while I can't speak specifically to Clarion, I can tell you that it's probably not rumor and innuendo. All of the local areas have had to look at that.

REPRESENTATIVE McILHATTAN: Counties could end up without a CareerLink in their counties possibly, you are saying?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: That is correct.

25 REPRESENTATIVE McILHATTAN: I hope that

1 doesn't happen.

Thank you very much for the information.

3 CHAIRMAN EVANS: The last questioner,
4 Representative Scott Conklin.

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: That's one of the counties that doesn't have a CareerLink.

REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: And I'm not going to go into it with you. The good future Secretary and I have talked about that many times, and I appreciate your ear, although I have bent it off.

Just a quick question on autism, if you could.

Presently, today's services for autism stops at 21 for adults, and I was wondering -- I know it is under DPW -- but I was wondering, are there any plans for L&I to work with those individuals with autism to still help them to especially integrate back into the workforce more?

ACTING SECRETARY VITO: I would have to get you specific details regarding the clients served, Representative, but we have an interdepartmental task force on autism, and in that task force, folks from our Bureau of Workforce Development Partnership meet with DPW. OVR is also involved in some services for individuals with autism. So it is something that the

Commonwealth is looking at in terms of providing comprehensive services.

In terms of if we have been able to increase our services, let me get back to you with specific numbers.

REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Madam Secretary, I would like to thank you and members of your staff for coming and making this presentation before the House Appropriations Committee. We greatly appreciate this opportunity in terms of what you have presented.

I would like to thank the members of the House Appropriations Committee and the other members who have joined us from the Labor Relations Committee here.

I want to again make an announcement.

Tomorrow at 3:30, there will be PHEAA. That will be before us at 3:30, so I am announcing they will be with us at the end of all the other sessions that we have.

So we now are recessed until tomorrow morning at, I think it is 9 o'clock? 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Thank you very much.

```
ACTING SECRETARY VITO: Mr. Chairman, thank
1
2
    you.
             CHAIRMAN EVANS: Thank you.
 3
 4
 5
             (The hearing concluded at 3:45 p.m.)
 6
7
 8
9
10
11
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. Jean M. Davis, Reporter Notary Public