COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARING BUDGET HEARING

STATE CAPITOL MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2008, 2:00 P.M.

VOLUME V OF VI

PRESENTATION BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

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 TIM MAHONEY

HONORABLE KATHY M. MANDERINO

HONORABLE FRED McILHATTAN

HONORABLE DAVID R. MILLARD

HONORABLE RON MILLER

HONORABLE JOHN MYERS

HONORABLE CHERELLE PARKER

HONORABLE JOSEPH A. PETRARCA

HONORABLE SCOTT A. PETRI

HONORABLE SEAN M. RAMALEY

```
1
    BEFORE (cont'd.):
       HONORABLE DAVE REED
 2
       HONORABLE DOUGLAS G. REICHLEY
       HONORABLE DANTE SANTONI, JR.
 3
       HONORABLE MARIO M. SCAVELLO
       HONORABLE JOSHUA D. SHAPIRO
 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
                                  JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER
                                  NOTARY PUBLIC
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX	
2	TESTIFIER	
3		
4	NAME	PAGE
5	SECRETARY DENNIS YABLONSKY	4
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 CHAIRMAN EVANS: I would like to reconvene 2 the House Appropriations Committee meeting. We'll have you introduce yourself for the 3 4 record. SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Certainly. 5 Dennis Yablonsky. I'm the Secretary of the 6 7 Department of Community and Economic Development. CHAIRMAN EVANS: You received high praise 8 today from the President of Penn State. 9 He was 10 speaking highly of you, laying the groundwork for you 11 this afternoon. He said, give Dennis anything he 12 needs. 13 Mr. Secretary, as you know, what the rules are is that we go right to the questioning. 14 This is your second time coming before us, because you came 15 before us and talked a little bit about the 16 Governor's economic stimulus plan. 17 18 I would like for you to take a few minutes 19 to again talk about the importance of the economic 20 stimulus plan in conjunction with the redevelopment assistance. 21 We had Global Insight that came before us. 22 23 SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Right. 24 CHAIRMAN EVANS: They talked about that we

are a low-debt State.

25

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Right.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: The Treasurer, in an unofficial role as an investment banker, somebody said to her, you're a former investment banker. She said, you know, once an investment banker, always an investment banker. I put those words in there. She also said there was low debt. And my understanding, you know, we had a crucial point about kind of protecting the progress that we have made in economic stimulus.

I'd like for you just to kind of talk about the thinking and the recommendation that you made to the Governor in this budget about trying to keep Pennsylvania moving forward and why you think using the RCAP, \$750 million in shovel-ready projects, and the other kinds of things that you have recommended, because the whole idea is how we maintain our business community and business environment and continue to grow jobs.

Can you take some time and talk a little bit about that?

22 SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Certainly,

23 Mr. Chairman.

2.0

There are two of the three elements of the proposed Protecting Our Progress stimulus package

that DCED made recommendations on.

2.0

The first one that you mentioned are various elements of the program that are designed to address the pent-up demand for construction infrastructure and brick-and-mortar-related projects, RCAP being one of those; the energy bill another; the Rebuild PA a third; the Business in Our Sites a fourth; and Jonas Salk a fifth.

The thinking here is that in a current downturn in the economy, we're trying to do things to protect, as you said, the progress that we have made. One of the best and fastest things we can do is get brick-and-mortar construction projects going.

Why? They create construction and engineering jobs immediately. They have to buy supplies -- steel and cement and other things which have an impact. And then they have a downstream positive impact on the business climate in terms of site preparation -- roads, bridges, et cetera, et cetera.

And in all of the recommendations that we made, we were able to identify a pent-up demand of ready-to-go or what's been referred to as shovel-ready projects that, if additional funding were available, could get started this calendar year

and have an immediate effect on the economy.

The other part of the stimulus that the department made recommendations on were things to incent Pennsylvania businesses to create jobs now rather than wait, and things to incent Pennsylvania businesses to make investments in equipment, in working capital, and in construction now rather than late. And that includes the increase in the job creation tax credit, the reduction in the rates on business lending programs, and the extension of the KOZ program.

And all of those things are a part of the final proposal that is in front of the General Assembly now for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Are you able, you or your department, to give us some sense of what the potential job opportunities that you just described will mean? I mean, short term? long term? Will it upgrade employment? Will it attract a number of businesses? expand businesses? Are you able to kind of qualify that in terms of numbers?

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: In a couple of cases.

I mean, the Salk initiative, for example, we've specifically quantified about 12,000 jobs that would be created as a result of that. And those are

high-paying jobs, typically \$50,000 and above per year with benefits.

Similarly, on the energy proposal, we've quantified about 13,000 new jobs, once again, high-paying jobs that would be associated with that.

On construction in general, construction jobs are good jobs. They have benefits associated with them.

So in some cases, we've got very specific quantification; in other cases, the quantification will come project by project when we take applications and review these things on a competitive basis. But there's no doubt in my mind that there will be a significant measurable return on the investments here.

And as you also mentioned, I do believe that while some of these programs require debt, debt has an appropriate role, particularly when you're investing in long-term assets. I mean, one simple accounting principle is you match benefits with costs, and these kinds of assets have multiple-year life. And all of the numbers that I've looked at indicate that Pennsylvania is in a debt position that is able to absorb this additional debt without pushing us out of the definition of a low-debt State.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: For years, there's always been a constant debate over our competitiveness as a State, our business climate over the debate of investment versus tax reductions. And I should say up front, generally I have had a feeling that it doesn't necessarily need to be an either/or kind of proposition but in a holistic and competitive situation.

2.0

Obviously when we look at New Jersey and

New York with their deficit types of situations and

California way over to the West and Massachusetts up

to the Northeast, we seem to be like right in the

middle from our financial situation, which, from what

I've always understood in terms of the business

community, is if there is predictability and

stability, and not where you're talking about raising

taxes all the time or making the environment more

over-regulated in terms of business growth and

business development, we're in a pretty sound

competitive position.

You have been in your position now 5 years, and you started with the economic stimulus and you're moving out. How do you kind of see Pennsylvania's business climate at this particular point and where are we? Because, you know, you constantly have these

kinds of exaggeration swings back and forth. I personally think we're in a good, decent position for opportunity.

You tell me, you know, how do you see it?

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Well, I would say that
as a result of the economic stimulus package that we
all put together and approved and that our department
was primarily responsible with implementing, as well
as other things, I think our business climate has
improved relative to our competitors in particular,
and there are a number of ways to measure that.

I also believe that, as you indicated, I think the whole issue of business taxes versus investments in programs like infrastructure, I don't think it's an either/or discussion. I think that you need to do both.

I do believe and this Administration believes in business tax cuts. I mean, we've had business tax cuts in every budget that we have passed, and I think the total is somewhere in the \$1.2, \$1.3 billion range. And we have improved our tax competitiveness now to, I believe, 27th on the National Tax Foundation. And certainly relative to our surrounding States, we've improved our position vis-a-vis our business tax climate.

1 But business taxes alone or primarily as an economic development strategy, in my opinion, is not 2 the right way to go. I think they need to be a part 3 of an overall package that includes the other things 4 that businesses look at when they make decisions, 5 like infrastructure, which recently on a very 6 7 important national survey ranked to number one; like energy costs; like health-care costs; like 8 workforce. 9 10 Those are all things that come into play when businesses make decisions. And taxes, while 11 12 it's typically in the top six or seven factors, it's 13 never the first number-one factor and it's certainly never the only factor. 14 So I think prudent business taxes as a part 15 16 of an overall strategy is the right approach. CHAIRMAN EVANS: Chairman Civera. 17 18 CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 19 Welcome, Mr. Secretary. 20 SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 22 CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Mr. Secretary, in the 23 Governor's budget that we have in front of us, his 24 proposal has called for the Department of Community 25 and Economic Development to receive \$507 million

in State funds. That total includes more than \$136 million in cuts in existing State programs, which represents a 21-percent reduction in the current budget.

Do you believe this is a fair proposal? And can your department live with \$136 million in cuts that the Governor has proposed? And the \$136 million that is proposed, would you say it would have a negative effect on Pennsylvania's economy?

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: The budget that the Governor proposed is something that I submitted and that I agree to. And we were asked not only to make cuts this year, but particularly in our case, we decided to go back and zero budget.

What I mean by that is, go back and really look at every single program, which ones are necessary; which ones are not; which ones could we trim a little bit; which ones need more money. And there's a long list of cuts and changes in the budget, including elimination of certain programs.

So would I like to have all that money back?

Of course. I mean, could I put it to good use? I

believe I could. We're in a tight budget period

right now, and I think that I did what I was asked to

```
1
    do, which is to prioritize where things should go.
2
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: So basically what I'm
3
    hearing from you then is that you support the
4
    Governor's proposal and the $136 million in cuts?
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY:
                                   I do.
 5
            CHAIRMAN CIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 6
7
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Galloway.
            REPRESENTATIVE GALLOWAY: Thank you,
8
    Mr. Chairman.
9
10
            Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for being here.
            I'd like to speak briefly about your effort
11
12
    to extend the KOZ/KOIZ program.
13
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Certainly.
14
            REPRESENTATIVE GALLOWAY: I represent one of
    the most successful KOIZ sites in the State, in
15
16
    Fairless Hills, especially when it comes to
17
    alternative energy and things like that. That's been
18
    a huge success.
19
            My question specifically is, how does it
20
    affect existing sites? Is the extension for new
21
    sites? Is it for existing sites? Is the tax-exempt
22
    status going to be extended to the sites that are
23
    already there and the companies that are already in
24
    the sites?
25
            Thank you.
```

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: You're welcome.

2.0

The basic proposal is, the KOZs that are out there, there's a percentage of the land that was designated to KOZ that has been developed; businesses have moved in; they've taken advantage of the tax breaks. We're not proposing extending any deal for an existing business. If they've moved in, they got their deal. When their time comes to an end, it expires.

But there's a percentage of these zones that have never been developed. They're still empty, and nothing has been developed on them. It's that percentage of zones, that undeveloped property, that we are proposing should be extended by 7 years.

The KOZs -- and there are KOZs, KOEZs, and KOIZs -- but some of them expire this year, some expire in 2010, some expire in 2013, and some expire in 2018, and we're proposing to extend all of them by 7 additional years.

REPRESENTATIVE GALLOWAY: Thank you.

And just a quick follow-up, Mr. Chairman; one last question.

Could you speak to the success of the KOIZs across the State in relation to the amount of economic development money that's been put into

1 them? 2 SECRETARY YABLONSKY: I can partially answer 3 that question, and what I mean by that, I have a 4 report that we get regularly that shows how many jobs have been created, how many jobs have been retained, 5 how much capital has been invested, and there are 6 7 3,552 companies who have taken advantage of the KOZ 8 program in the State. And I can tell you that there are literally 9 10 dozens of projects where we have competed with other States that offer aggressive tax cut benefits, that 11 12 without the KOZ program, we would not have been able 13 to win those deals. The part of your question I can't answer is 14 how much it has cost us. That is a number that the 15 16 Revenue Department keeps that is not shared with our 17 department. So I don't know the answer in terms of 18 the cost. 19 REPRESENTATIVE GALLOWAY: 20 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Siptroth. 22 REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Thank you, 23 Mr. Chairman.

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Representative, how

Mr. Secretary---

24

25

```
1
    are you today?
2
            REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Mr. Secretary, how
3
    are you today?
 4
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY: I'm well. Thank you.
            REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH:
                                       Good.
 5
            I have a question regarding the shift of
6
    funds from the TPAs to the rural marketing program.
7
8
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY:
                                   Right.
            REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: And I have some
9
10
    very deep concerns about the competitiveness and the
11
    distribution of funds through the RMP versus the TPA
12
    program and wonder whether it might not be best to
13
    allow TPAs to join resources and use their dollars in
    a regional initiative, if they would be so inclined
14
    to do, rather than have, you know, this pushed at
15
16
    them.
            The other thing that I understand -- and
17
18
    correct me if I'm wrong -- through the TPA program,
19
    that is required to have matching local funds as well
20
    where as the RMP does not. So in essence, there will
21
    be even a greater loss of dollars for the promotion
22
    of tourism.
23
            So if you could help me out there, I would
    certainly appreciate that.
24
25
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Certainly,
```

Representative.

The line item, the tourist promotion assistance line item, frequently referred to as the matching funds for the TPAs, we've proposed a \$3 million reduction there this year and a corresponding \$4 million increase in the regional marketing initiative line item.

The philosophy behind that is that when the matching fund TPA line item was established 20, 25 years ago, it was established as a formula-driven approach and entitlement, if you will, for the TPAs. It was before there was any hotel tax available, and there has been a significant increase in marketing and promotion money available for the TPA since that hotel tax was enacted. So I think the bill was put in place with an intent prior to the current set of circumstances.

Our philosophy is, we believe in the current environment that regional -- as you suggested; I agree with you -- regional approaches to marketing and tourism are better than county-by-county approaches. So what we're proposing is a shift gradually, or hopefully even faster than gradually, a shift away from the formula-driven funding for the TPAs to a competitive, regional approach, and that is

embodied in this particular budget.

2.0

And I will tell you that we're working with the committee chairs, Representative Tangretti and Representative Nailor, and their committee to work on a revision to the bill, the actual statute, that would reflect some of these things.

Regarding the match, you're correct. The TPA line requires matching, which the RMI doesn't require. We typically get matching in the applications, but it's not technically required.

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Okay. So in your opinion, will there actually be a net loss of funds by instituting the RMI program over the TPA program?

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: No, there would not.

I mean, overall, there would be a net increase of funding to them by \$1 million with more money going to the regions that come together and less money probably going to regions that go it alone.

I mean, I'd like to point out also that frequently people equate the TPA line with the tourism line, and there are actually a number of lines in the budget that affect tourism. And there's a major program in the stimulus, the First Industries

Fund, that has \$50 million carved out for tourism projects. We've had 66, I think 66 projects funded through that program.

So over the last 5 years, there has actually been a relatively significant increase in the amount of money that the Commonwealth is putting into promoting tourism, and the numbers reflect that in terms of hotel rooms sold, revenue, et cetera, et cetera.

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Okay. One other question concerning my particular district.

The Mountain Laurel Center for the

Performing Arts is, again, under financial straits,

and I was just wondering if you were aware of that,

number one; and number two, if there may or may not

be any additional funds to again look at funding that

particular facility?

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: I'm only vaguely aware of it, Representative, but we would be happy, of course, to sit down. Any of those types of destinations, we'd be happy to sit down and analysis their situation to see what, if anything, we can do to help them.

REPRESENTATIVE SIPTROTH: Okay. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Mr. Secretary, you just helped Professor/Representative Tangretti's stock go up when you mentioned his name.

He's here with all his students, so we want to make him look good. So when you mentioned his name -- Tom is the Chairman of the Oversight

Committee of his department. I don't know if he told you that. Now I did. I just gave a little teaching moment, Tom.

Representative Dave Millard.

12 REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Thank you,

13 Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, with the formula that is used with specific implementation to TPAs, with any change -- and you alluded to this, that you're in discussions with Chairman Tangretti and Chairman Nailor on this -- will the net result at the end of the day be more money, more of a percentage, for Philadelphia and Pittsburgh? And this is my concern, because I represent a rural area that last year, if it had gone through with the formula change, would have been at the short end of the receiving line.

So my question is very specific: Is it more

```
1
    for Philadelphia and Pittsburgh and less for the
2
    rural areas?
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY: The answer is, I don't
 3
4
    know, because until we work through the particulars
    with the committee and the committee chairs and how
5
    they want to handle this, it's impossible for me to
6
7
    speculate how the formula would affect any one area
8
    or any one TPA.
            REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Okay. Thank you.
10
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY: You're welcome.
            REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Thank you,
11
    Mr. Chairman.
12
13
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Scott
    Conklin.
14
15
            REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Thank you,
16
    Mr. Chairman.
            Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I'm hiding over
17
18
    in the corner over here.
19
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Yes?
20
            REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Actually, I just
21
    have a couple of questions for you.
22
            One, could you give me a little insight on
23
    the PennTAP funding, where it's going to be at for
24
    this year?
25
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY: As I recall, we zeroed
```

out the PennTAP funding in this year's budget, and it is not -- don't take that as disrespect or in any way a lack of confidence in that program. We happen to think it's a good program. But in a budget year like this where we're trying to effect priorities, we felt that this is a program that could compete for funds in other areas.

For example, the Ben Franklin Technology
Development Authority has a technology pot of money
that we take competitive proposals every year and the
board decides where it goes. And we have funded
PennTAP out of that line before, and I think that's
our intention going forward, is to let them continue
to compete.

REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Thank you.

And my second has to do with the First Industries Fund.

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: One of the questions that I have for you, one is, can you tell us a little bit more about the Governor's initiative on the First Industries Fund as a stimulus? But most of all, I'd really like to equate that to the agricultural and tourist community.

One is, what can we look for? Two is, how

much has it really brought back since 2004? And what are the major projects that folks such as myself can look at that we can use in our communities?

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Sure. That's a good

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Sure. That's a good question.

The First Industries Fund, as the name implies, was designed to support two of our, what I think of as legacy industries, tourism and agriculture, which historically, particularly agriculture, had gotten very little access to State economic development money. We changed that in 2003. The Governor directed me to open up all of our programs to ag, and we did that right away.

But with your support, we were able to put an additional \$150 million -- \$10 million in grants for planning projects and \$140 million in low-interest loans and loan guarantees -- that are available for ag and tourism projects.

I would have to say that this program has been an unqualified success. We've committed \$86 million of the \$150 million, so there's still money left. There have been 228 agriculture projects all over the State. There have been 66 tourism projects.

And these moneys go directly to farms and to

```
1
    tourism operators for working capital, for their --
2
    if it's a tourism operator, maybe they need to buy
 3
    equipment to upgrade or add rooms to a bed and
    breakfast.
4
            We've had a lot of interest on Route 6.
 5
    the advertising we did for the Pennsylvania Wilds
6
7
    resulted in an overwhelmed situation for rooms up on
    Route 6, and so we've been trying to put more
8
9
    restaurants and more hotel rooms up there, as an
10
    example.
11
            On the agriculture front, people have been
    able to protect farmland, bring more cattle in,
12
13
    expand their barns, buy new equipment, a whole range
    of things. Like I said, 226 projects. We work very
14
    carefully with the Department of Agriculture on this
15
16
    to vet all these things.
17
            And I think if you were to go out and ask
18
    anybody about this, you would hear a very positive
19
    bit of feedback on this particular program.
2.0
            REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Thank you,
21
    Mr. Secretary.
22
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY: You're welcome.
23
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Representative Dan Frankel.
24
            REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Thank you, Mr.
```

25

Chairman.

1 Good afternoon, Mr. Secretary. 2 SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Good afternoon. REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: 3 Secretary 4 Yablonsky, we're back at the table of year three, 5 Jonas Salk Fund, you know, something I've supported and many other members have supported moving forward. 6 7 During these past 2 years, you know, I and I think 8 probably many members have been approached by research institutions throughout Pennsylvania about, 9 10 you know, moving this forward and getting prepared to put some shovels in the ground to build some 11 facilities. 12 13 Do you have a sense at this point -- I mean, I have a sense. Certainly I know of some projects in 14 Pittsburgh that are on the verge of taking place, and 15 16 Philadelphia. I've been at Fox Chase. They are anxious to move forward. 17 18 Do you have some sense of how much pent-up 19 development in terms of research institutions is 20 waiting there for us to move forward with this 21 proposal? 22 SECRETARY YABLONSKY: I do, Representative.

23 That was part of, when we were putting the 24 stimulus together, the question was asked, if we were 25 to spend this money or make this money available, would something actually happen? And we went through a pretty detailed process with all the institutions and identified \$750 million worth of new construction projects that would start this calendar year.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Okay

2.0

SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Some in Pittsburgh, some in State College, some in Philadelphia, and a couple of others that would start this calendar year. There's another \$750 million that will probably start next year. But there's \$750 million ready to go right now if we had the funding.

And I will tell you that the pressure on these institutions is growing. The NIH budget looks like it is going to be flat next year. That's effectively a cut in an inflation-oriented environment. The competition for those NIH funds will increase, and the universities will tell you that hiring the faculty and having the facilities and equipment for them to be competitive is what they need.

So we're ready to go, and hopefully Salk's time has come.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL: Well, I certainly hope so. I mean, you know, it's one of those proposals that's very hard for me to understand

```
1
    saying no to. It doesn't involve tax dollars.
2
    research institutions have agreed to, you know,
    diverting some of the CURE funds.
3
            Those who don't want to do it have gotten
 4
    some reassurances. I know I've worked closely with
5
    the University of Pittsburgh, which had some initial
6
7
    concerns, but those have been addressed as well.
8
            I certainly hope that we're prepared to get
    this done this year.
9
10
            Thanks very much.
11
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY:
                                   Thank you.
12
            REPRESENTATIVE FRANKEL:
                                      Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
13
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Mr. Secretary, I'd like to
14
    thank you for coming before the House Appropriations
15
16
    Committee with your questions. And I'd like to thank
17
    you for the last 5 years, you know, what you've given
18
    to the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
19
    and I know I personally appreciate working with
20
    you.
21
            SECRETARY YABLONSKY:
                                   Thank you.
22
            CHAIRMAN EVANS: Again, to the members,
23
    we're going to recess until 3:30. We have PHEAA
    coming to us at 3:30, and I encourage all members to
24
    come back at 3:30.
25
```

```
We'll recess until 3:30. Thank you very
1
2
    much.
 3
             SECRETARY YABLONSKY: Thank you very much.
 4
             (The hearing concluded at 3:00 p.m.)
 5
 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