| 1 | |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| 2 | House Committee on Finance |
| 3 | Public Hearing |
| 4 | R&D Tax Credit |
| 5 | Pittsburgh Technology Council |
| 6 | 2000 Technology Drive |
| 7 | Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15129-3112 |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | Date: Wednesday, March 26, 2008 |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | Reporter: Donna M. McMullen, RMR |
| 25 | |

| 1 | Committee Members: |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | Representative David K. Levdansky (D) Finance Committee, Chairperson |
| 4 | 39th Legislative District Allegheny County (part) |
| 5 | Washington County (part) |
| 6 | |
| 7 | Representative Chris Sainato (D) 9th Legislative District |
| 8 | Beaver County (part) Lawrence County (part) |
| 9 | |
| 10 | Representative Tim Seip (D) 125th Legislative District |
| 11 | Berks (part)and Schuylkill (part) Counties |
| 12 | Representative Dante Santoni, Jr. (D) 126th Legislative District |
| 13 | Berks County (part) |
| 14 | |
| 15 | Representative Dan Frankel (D) 23rd Legislative District |
| 16 | Allegheny County (part) |
| 17 | |
| 18 | Representative William C. Kortz, II (D) 38th Legislative District |
| 19 | Allegheny County (part) |
| 20 | Representative Daryl D. Metcalfe (R) 12th District |
| 21 | Butler County (part) |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| 1 | INDEX | |
|----|---|------|
| 2 | SPEAKER | PAGE |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | Introductions/Opening Remarks Representative Levdansky | 4 |
| 5 | Representative nevdansky | I |
| 6 | Brian Kennedy, Vice President of Government Relations and External | |
| 7 | Affairs, Pittsburgh Technology Council | 7 |
| 8 | Dr. William Hsu, Vice President and Chief Technology Officer | |
| 9 | Kennametal | 23 |
| 10 | Sean Rollman, Chief Financial Officer Plextronics | 30 |
| 11 | Joseph Jacobson, Chief Financial Officer | 30 |
| 12 | Akustica | 35 |
| 13 | Larry Sweeney, Vocollect | 44 |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

| 1 | |
|----|--|
| 2 | PROCEEDINGS |
| 3 | (10:15 a.m.) |
| 4 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Good morning. |
| 5 | I want to welcome everybody, both members and people |
| 6 | that are testifying in the audience to this meeting of |
| 7 | the House Finance Committee. My name is David |
| 8 | Levdansky. I'm a legislator from the 39th District |
| 9 | down around Clairton and Elizabeth and over into |
| 10 | Washington County, around New Eagle and Finleyville, |
| 11 | in that area. And we're having this hearing today on |
| 12 | House Bill 2250, which is legislation I think of vital |
| 13 | importance to Pennsylvania's business community. |
| 14 | So much of our Pennsylvania businesses |
| 15 | operate in not just a national, but a global |
| 16 | economy. And the key to our companies' |
| 17 | competitive edge is their ability to invest in |
| 18 | research and development. And the technologies |
| 19 | and processes that come out of that enable our |
| 20 | companies to stay competitive in the global |
| 21 | marketplace. |
| 22 | This legislation that we're having a |
| 23 | hearing on today would increase the research and |
| 24 | development tax credit from the present level of |

45 million and increase it to 75 million. It

| 1 | would also increase the set aside for small |
|----|---|
| 2 | businesses from 8 million to 15 million. It would |
| 3 | make some other changes in the utilization of the |
| 4 | tax credits I think to make them more useful to |
| 5 | the business community. So I want to thank you |
| 6 | all of you for being here. |
| 7 | Let me first call on the members, and we |
| 8 | apologize for being a little bit late. We had a |
| 9 | couple of stragglers from the other end of the |
| 10 | state arriving a little bit late, and we |
| 11 | appreciate them being here. Let me start by |
| 12 | having members introduce themselves starting from |
| 13 | the far left. |
| 14 | REPRESENTATIVE DAN FRANKEL: I'm Representative |
| 15 | Dan Frankel from here in the City of Pittsburgh. My |
| 16 | district just neighbors this area Second Avenue. |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. KORTZ: Good morning. |
| 18 | My name is Bill Kortz from Allegheny County, the 38th |
| 19 | District, West Mifflin area. |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE TIM SEIP: Representative Tim |
| 21 | Seip. I represent parts of Berks and Schuylkill |
| 22 | Counties, the Cabela's and Yuengling district. |
| 23 | REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM KORTZ: And Pottstown. |
| 24 | REPRESENTATIVE TIM SEIP: The Pottsville |

Maroons, the real 1925 World Champions.

| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE DANTE SANTONI: I'm Dante |
|-----|--|
| 2 | Santoni from Berks County, also the Reading area. |
| 3 | REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS SAINATO: I'm |
| 4 | Representative Chris Sainato. I represent the 9th |
| 5 | District in Lawrence County, and I have a small |
| 6 | section of Beaver County. |
| 7 | REPRESENTATIVE DARYL METCALFE: Good morning. |
| 8 | I'm State Representative Daryl Metcalfe from Butler |
| 9 | County. I represent the 12th District and Vice |
| L O | Chairman from the Republican side of the committee. |
| L1 | Yesterday I sat on Dave's very extreme left and was |
| L2 | introduced last, and today I sit on the extreme right, |
| L3 | thought I'd get introduced first, missed it again. |
| L4 | But good to be with you. The token Republican to |
| L5 | your back here today. |
| L6 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Back where you |
| L7 | belong. |
| L8 | REPRESENTATIVE DARYL METCALFE: Good to be |
| L9 | here. |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: That's |
| 21 | inappropriate there. Let me thank Brian Kennedy and |
| 22 | the people at the Pittsburgh Technology Council for |
| 23 | hosting this. I can't think of a more appropriate |
| 24 | place for us to be having this hearing on this |

legislation than here in the offices in the area where

| 1 | I think | it's | key | to | technology | and | development | here | in |
|---|---------|-------|-------|------|------------|-----|-------------|------|----|
| 2 | western | Penns | sylva | ania | a, Brian. | | | | |

What I'd like to suggest is to

have Brian, if you could introduce the people from

your panel, have each of the members give their

testimony. And then I would ask that the members

hold their questions until all the panelists have

had a chance to offer their prospectus to us, if

that's okay.

MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just as a brief introduction of myself, I'm Brian

Kennedy, and I'm the Vice President of Government

Relations for the Pittsburgh Technology Council.

As a quick background, we are a trade association representing innovative companies in southwestern Pennsylvania, 1400 companies from the 13-county region. And I don't think we could have assembled a more appropriate panel of testifiers this morning.

With me today is the Chief Technology

Officer for Kennametal. It's a small company

located here in western Pennsylvania, William Hsu.

We also have Sean Rollman, the Chief

Technology Officer of an exciting company that's

making revelations in the clean technologies space

called Plextronics.

company.

- We have Joseph Jacobson. He's also the

 Chief Financial Officer of Akustica, and
- 4 Akustica's doing some great things in the MEMS
- 5 space.

And I'm also very pleased to have with us
this morning Larry Sweeney who's one of the
founders of Vocollect, which is one of the fastest
growing companies, technology companies here in
southwestern Pennsylvania. He's going to tell you
about some of the great things going on at that

We're really pleased to have each of these people. I think you're going to be excited to hear about some of the things going on in the companies, about the jobs that they're creating, and really about the real-world technology challenges that their companies are solving.

You're going to know these companies in some way or another and use some of their products for sure. So with that, if you'd like me to begin my testimony.

On behalf of our CEO, Audrey Russo, and our 1400 member companies, I'd like to bring you greetings. I'm particularly pleased this morning

to welcome you to southwestern Pennsylvania, which was recently recognized in the MoneyTree Report, which was done jointly by the National Venture

Capital Association and Price Waterhouse Coopers, and they ranked southwestern Pennsylvania as the second fastest growing region in the country for venture capital activity.

And that's just fantastic news. It's in no small part because of some of the things that the state legislature has done in supporting the availability of venture capital and supporting groups like Innovation Works and the Pittsburgh Life Sciences Greenhouse and some of the other things you have done.

Pittsburgh is really turning around, and let me just tell you a little bit. Pennsylvania right now has 700,000 employees working in venture-backed firms across Pennsylvania. In terms of raw employees, we're behind only Texas and California in terms of employees working for venture-backed companies.

Here in southwestern Pennsylvania in 2006

19 firms raised nearly a quarter of a billion

dollars in venture capital to help fund their

commercialization efforts. So, there are some

| 1 | great | things | going | on | across | the | state, |
|---|-------|--------|-------|----|--------|-----|--------|
|---|-------|--------|-------|----|--------|-----|--------|

2 particularly here in southwestern Pennsylvania.

Innovation, which is what we're here to talk about today, plays a key role in that. There

is a lot of work remaining though.

Before I start my testimony, I'd just again like to thank you, Chairman Levdansky, for holding this committee here in Pittsburgh. I'd like to thank each of the committee members for traveling here to talk about how the public sector and the private sector can work together to help make Pennsylvania the world's strongest economy.

To be sure, the benefits of promoting the innovation economy are clear. Here in southwestern Pennsylvania we're now home to more than 7,000 technology firms in various fields, including advanced manufacturing, life sciences, information technology, environmental technology, which, by the way, is one of our fastest growing clusters, and the advanced materials cluster.

Combined those firms now represent more than 10 percent of all businesses in the region, but they employ 17 percent of all employees, and at \$11 billion they account for almost a quarter of our annual payroll.

| 1 | Let me say that again. We're 10 percent |
|---|---|
| 2 | of all businesses in the region, but almost a |
| 3 | quarter of the payroll. These are some great |
| 4 | jobs. As you might imagine, employees that |
| 5 | support this industry are among the region's |
| 6 | highest paid. |

2.1

For example, in the software industry, 9300 employees are earning an annual salary in excess of \$75,000 annually. So, when we're talking about family-sustaining jobs here in Pennsylvania increasingly we're really talking about innovation economy jobs.

As we look to the future of the role innovation is going to play in our economy, it's going to determine the outlook for our citizens and really for our government. To understand this let me talk a little bit about the manufacturing issue and some of the challenges that face now Pennsylvania's manufacturing economy and how innovation impacts that.

You might know that in 2004

Pennsylvania's Industrial Resource Centers joined forces with Team Pennsylvania, and they commissioned Deloitte to do really one of the most exhaustive studies that's ever been done on the

state of Pennsylvania's manufacturing economy.

One of the problems that they identified and something that really kind of surprises you and you really have to look into was the productivity of our workers was actually lower here in Pennsylvania. Now, when you look at it by gross product produced per worker it was at \$86,000 per worker and is somewhat below \$96,000, which is the national average.

So, it was kind of puzzling. We couldn't really get our arms around what that meant. And what really Deloitte concluded is it has nothing at all to do with the workers themselves. It has a whole lot more to do with the products that the workers are producing.

In Pennsylvania, our manufacturing sector really tends to be focused on commodity industries. Commodity industries, as you know, compete largely on price and are particularly vulnerable to global competition. And as prices go down and manufacturers don't find more efficient ways to produce their products their productivity rates as measured are going to also decline. And this leaves them in difficult positions and with difficult decisions to make.

| So to combat this dilemma and avoid the |
|--|
| so-called "race to the bottom," manufacturers |
| must, and in many cases are, working to develop |
| both innovative new products that are less |
| susceptible to low-cost competition and innovative |
| new manufacturing processes that increase their |
| ability to remain competitive in their existing |
| markets as well as the emerging market. |

Pennsylvania's economy has already made some great progress in moving towards a more innovation-focused economy. In fact, according to a report compiled by the State Science and Technology Institute, SSTI, there was more than \$7 billion, there was more than \$7 billion of annual industrial research and development activity going on in Pennsylvania, so not university research, industrial-funded research.

When you look at that in gross dollars that ranks Pennsylvania ninth in comparison to the rest of the states. When you normalize that, however, when you look at states on their gross products, their gross state products and you compare it to their R&D spending, we fall to 19th.

Obviously still that's above average, but there's considerable room to grow in terms of

| 1 | encouraging more industrial research and |
|---|--|
| 2 | development, to improve their process to become |
| 3 | more efficient and to develop new products so they |
| 4 | can increase topline revenues and grow here in |
| 5 | Pennsylvania. |

So as we look to accelerate the important transition to reverse the loss of manufacturing employment, there are many roles that the state can play. As it relates to the tax code, for example, we must quickly remove some of the components of our tax climate that are harmful to the growth of manufacturers. And on those issues, we're making some progress, including capital stock and franchise tax.

We're on track to have that tax eliminated by 2011. We really think we need to keep on track and get rid of that uncompetitive tax. Also net operating losses, we're one of the only states that caps NOL's. Those are two things that are just making us uncompetitive, and we have to fix that.

To enhance our competitiveness and to actually give us an edge on some of our competitors, the tech council is actually promoting two other ideas: One, move to a single

| 1 | sales | factor | for | the | CNI; | and, | two, | to | create | а |
|---|--------|--------|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|----|--------|---|
| 2 | very s | strong | resea | arch | devel | Lopmer | nt tax | C1 | redit. | |

There will be plenty of opportunities to discuss the single sales and NOL issues, and perhaps the council will talk about those whenever we get an opportunity. But today I'm going to limit my testimony to the importance of improving and expanding Pennsylvania's R&D tax credit.

As a brief background, for those of you who might be new to the credit, it was originally created in 1997 as a way of keeping pace with other states in their efforts to capture increased industrial research and development activity within their borders and the great jobs and the results, of course, that that R&D results in for their manufacturing economy.

Pennsylvania's credit was modeled closely after the federal government's policy, particularly in that it rewards companies. It does not reward companies merely for investing in R&D.

So just because you do an R&D does not mean you get a credit. In fact, only companies that increase their expenditures on research and development tax credits are eligible. And, in

| 1 | fact, | only | that | increased | amount | is | what's |
|---|--------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|----|--------|
| 2 | eligik | ole fo | or the | e credit. | | | |

Right now when it was created it was intended to be a 10 percent tax credit. So, for example, if you increased your R&D expenditures by a million dollars over your historical spending levels, you in theory would be eligible for a 10 percent tax credit on that one million dollar increase, even though you might have been spending ten million and you increased it to 11 million, you're only eligible for a tax credit on that one million dollar increase.

And the General Assembly has done some pretty creative things in the last few years, and I'll talk about them later, but small businesses are actually eligible for a 20 percent tax credit.

Now, what's happening is that because

Pennsylvania caps the amount of credits at

\$40 million per year, companies are not actually

receiving a 10 percent tax credit. So this year

the state received qualified applications in

excess of \$95 million for the R&D tax credit.

Now, right off the top, 8 million of the 40 million is set aside for small business, and we're very happy about that. But what that means

| 1 | is that on average not small businesses, the |
|---|--|
| 2 | mid-size companies and the larger businesses are |
| 3 | getting only 37 percent this year of what they |
| 4 | applied for. |

So instead of having a 10 percent tax credit what we really have is a 3 percent,

3.7 percent tax credit, effective tax credit,
unless we address the cap.

You've done some great things for small businesses. You've created a set-aside pool of \$8 million, you've let them claim a 20 percent tax credit, and you also allow them to sell unused tax credit. So there are a lot of small businesses who are just in their start-up mode who don't have tax liabilities.

But they can now get this tax credit. If they can't use it they can sell it. It puts that money right back into the commercialization of their products and their growth here in Pennsylvania.

As a result, these changes have resulted in strong growth and participation from small businesses. In fact, from 2004 to 2007, their participation increased from 81 firms who claimed over just over \$1 million to 193 firms last year

who claimed almost \$7 million in tax credits.

So you're looking at a pretty sizeable

increase in both the number of firms participating

and the amount of credits they're claiming, and

this is great news for our economy.

Again, as I said, the smaller, not small businesses didn't fair as well because of the cap. So for this reason and a few others I'm here today to ask you to support House Bill 2250 introduced by Representative Levdansky before your committee, as we speak.

Among other changes, this legislation would increase the cap from \$40 million to \$75 million. It's going to bring us a whole lot closer to meeting the actual demand for credits, and it's going to create a much stronger incentive for companies to consider further increases in the credit or in the research and development.

So, let me just simplify this. What we're trying to do with the R&D tax credit is we're trying to give companies a greater reason to take a risk here in Pennsylvania. The nature of R&D is you don't know what's going to come from R&D. It's very high risk and the processes often take a lot of times. But we want, as a

The problem with our R&D tax credit right now is that it's not reliable. Dr. Hsu cannot go to his fellow management team and say, listen, if we spend a million dollars next year more on R&D at Kennemetal, we can expect to get a \$100,000 tax credit.

As a matter of fact, he doesn't have any idea how much he's going to get because the state can't tell him until all the companies have applied, and they then award the extra credits proportionately.

So we really need to help Dr. Hsu make his case and give him the tools that really we intended to give him when we created this credit back in 1997.

I might mention quickly that the credit this legislature has done many things to improve the credit over the past five years. Just five years ago the credit was at 15 million. It was capped at \$15 million, but good bipartisan support, we increased it, we doubled it to 30 million, and then three years later we increased it to 40 million.

So there's definitely a precedent and

| 1 | there's | strong | bipartisan | support | to | increase | the |
|---|----------|----------|------------|---------|----|----------|-----|
| 2 | cap on t | the cred | lit. | | | | |

I want to talk about a couple of the 3 other things the legislation does that we consider 4 to be more technical, of a more technical nature. 5 6 One of the things is that companies who are 7 allowed to sell the credit, they are now being asked to hold the credit for one year from the 8 date that it's awarded before they're allowed to sell. 10

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let me tell you how this works. In 2007, these companies are doing research and development. They apply for the credit for the work they're doing this year in September of next They're awarded the credits in December of year. 2009.

So small businesses who want to sell the credit, they have to wait until December of 2010 to sell the credits. Now, remember, they're doing their R&D now. The budget for their R&D was made in 2007, not 2008.

So, there's a three-year lapse really from the decision-making time to increase R&D expenditures to the time where the credit can actually have benefit.

| l | This legislation that eliminates that |
|---|--|
| 2 | one-year hold. We're very pleased with that. We |
| 3 | think it makes a lot of sense. I think if you |
| 4 | look at it, I think you'll agree that it's a |
| 5 | common sense policy that probably has outlived its |
| 5 | usefulness. |

The other thing we'll ask you to take a look at, not in this legislation, but we'd like you to take a look at is the definition right now of small businesses. Right now small business, for the purpose of this set aside, is defined as a company with \$5 million or less in net assets, and that's it. Nothing about their employment, nothing about their revenues. And this is a really unorthodox approach to defining and characterizing small businesses.

So what we would suggest is for the committee to work with the Department of Community and Economic Development and really try to come up with a more accurate way of defining small businesses because the result is that right now small businesses are not claiming the \$8 million that's available for their use. They're only claiming 7 million. A few years ago they were only claiming 2 million.

| 1 | And a lot of it is because of this |
|----|--|
| 2 | definition, how we characterize small businesses. |
| 3 | And what's happening is real small businesses in |
| 4 | the eyes of existing statutes are not being seen |
| 5 | as small businesses. So we'd like to see you work |
| 6 | with the Department of Community and Economic |
| 7 | Development and come up with a more traditional |
| 8 | way of defining small businesses and one that |
| 9 | allows us to fully leverage the small business set |
| 10 | aside. |
| 11 | So as I conclude I'd like to again thank |
| | |

So as I conclude I'd like to again thank you on behalf of our 1400 companies for evaluating this. I'll tell you that we have 88 companies who benefited from the R&D tax credit over the past few years.

And as you consider this issue and other issues, we hope you'll consider us and our member companies as an important resource in your deliberations. Thank you again.

So, next I'd now like to introduce one of our esteemed panelists this morning. It's

Dr. William Hsu, who again serves as the Chief

Technology Officer of Kennametal, which is really,
as you'll soon hear, is going to be one of our

region's anchor manufacturing firms. It's at the

- top of the food chain and is really doing a lot to help drive the economy.
- 3 With no further ado, I introduce
- 4 Dr. William Hsu.

- 5 DR. WILLIAM HSU: Thank you, Brian.
- Mr. Chairman, Honorable Representative Levdansky and distinguished members of the Finance Committee. I usually go by my nickname Bill instead of my formal name William. So, I am Bill Hsu, Vice President and
- And, Mr. Chairman, I'm really delighted
 by your good grasp of what the reality is. In
 your short opening statement you actually have
 taken the key point I wanted to relate to the
 committee anyway, but I think I will now give you
 a bit more details.

Chief Technical Officer of Kennametal.

17 But the reality is that we are as a 18 global competition, and we are using R&D to drive the competitive edge, not for ourselves, but for 19 20 In fact, I cannot think of even a our customers. 21 better paid commercial from you because I've paid 22 mine. And our available position to the customer 23 is engineering your competitive edge is the very 24 opening statement that you make, so I'm delighted, 25 Thank you. Mr. Chairman.

Kennametal is the leading global supplier of tooling solutions, engineered components and advanced materials that are consumed in our customers' manufacturing process. We improve our customers' competitiveness by providing superior economic returns through the delivery of advanced technology and application knowledge that master the toughest of materials processing demands of our customers.

Companies producing everything from airframes to coal, from medical implants to oil wells, and from turbo charges to motorcycle parts recognize our extraordinary contributions in the value chain.

We are a 2.4 billion global corporation representing 14,000 employees. Seven of our facilities are right here in the Commonwealth employing nearly 1,500 people where we also have our world headquarters in our global technology center.

In fact, Kennametal is the only publicly held corporation in our industry still headquartered in the United States. Our major competitors are companies in Israel, Sweden and in Japan, and we are competing for businesses at the

global stage. We win market shares customer by customer, application by application through our state-of-the-art technologies. We have to invest heavily and continuously in R&D application knowledge in order to satisfy the demanding needs of our customers.

We help our customers enhance their competitiveness in their market space against low-cost manufacturing countries by improving our customers' throughputs and lowering their unit production cost continuously. So that's why our valued purpose stature is "Engineering Your Competitive Edge."

To do this effectively, we created a breakthrough technology group in our corporate research center in Latrobe recently to work on cutting edge solutions for our customers.

Kennametal has more than a thousand highly trained and experienced research scientists and development engineers. We average more than 40 U.S. patents every year recently and have been named three times best practice partner by American Productivity and Quality Center on three different areas: On R&D Productivity, Innovation and Product Development Portfolio Management.

A measure of our commitment to R&D is our 1 2 realization of 47 percent of sales from products less than five years old in the fiscal year 2007. 3 This is up from 17 percent of the late '90s, which 4 5 is all because of the R&D investment we have put 6 in recently. Additionally, since 2005, we have 7 increased our investment in R&D by \$5.8 billion. A commitment in investment resulted in very 8 9 tangible successes. Over the past few years we grew our revenues from \$1.7 billion in fiscal year 10 11 2003 to \$2.4 billion the last fiscal year. This 12 growth, half of it suddenly is because of the 13 economic cycle, but the other 50 percent is 14 definitely coming from the hard-won share gains 15 against our competitors in the global marketplace 16 through our superior new products. So, that's how 17 we drive growth, and that's why we have to 18 continuously invest in R&D.

In today's competitive business and climate and with the competition, both community and economic development are at an all time high.

It is more important than ever that business and government work together to meet the challenges of not only a global economy, but the impact of a global economy on our own state.

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1 | It is important to note the following |
|---|--|
| 2 | with regard to the Commonwealth's business facts: |
| 3 | The manufacturing sector is the largest |
| 4 | contributor to Pennsylvania's economy generating |
| 5 | 15.1 percent of the gross state product, and |
| 6 | directly adding nearly \$74 billion in value every |
| 7 | year. |
| 8 | Nearly 660,000 Pennsylvanians are |
| 9 | directly employed in manufacturing. Pennsylvania |

2.1

Nearly 660,000 Pennsylvanians are directly employed in manufacturing. Pennsylvania manufacturers sell almost 21 billion worth of goods overseas representing 94 percent of all Pennsylvania exports.

Large manufacturers, including
pharmaceuticals and corporations, such as
Kennametal, are at the forefront and industry
leaders in the sectors we serve helping
manufacturers creating their products, and we are
the driving forces behind R&D.

The Commonwealth's R&D tax credit is the discussion of today, but the more important question is how effective is it in assisting large companies. The answer from Kennametal's perspective is that it is an unreliable and unpredictable tool, but a tool that would be greatly valued if its full potential would be

| 1 | realized. Keep in mind that we have to invest |
|---|--|
| 2 | regardless, but then with the help from the state, |
| 3 | we can be even more competitive in the global |
| 4 | stage. |

Since the inception of the R&D tax credit, it was promised that a 10 percent credit would be established. With revisions to the program, corporations such as Kennametal are waffling to take advantage of the program because we cannot use it as a definitive tool to increase our R&D efforts, but nevertheless, we still have to invest.

It is important for this committee to take the next step to make the necessary capital investment for the future of the Commonwealth to deliver on what was promised when the R&D tax credit was established, and that is to provide the definitive 10 percent of credit.

Currently Pennsylvania is ranked 42nd for economic competitiveness by the National Tax

Foundation's corporate tax index last year.

Currently Pennsylvania's corporation net income tax of 9.99 percent is among the highest rate of its kind in the nation.

Further, the tax is calculated based on

70 percent of company sales, 15 percent of assets and 15 percent of payroll. This disadvantages, this discourages capital growth and hiring. Even worse, in out of state companies, such as one of Kennametal's principal competitors that sells in this Commonwealth, which we know is happening, but has no presence here, is advantaged over those who choose to locate in Pennsylvania.

The R&D tax credit and corporate tax structure reform are intimately related. We need to do both. A major issue we are currently dealing with is the escalation of raw materials and energy. That means we have to invent manufacturing processes that will get us the finished products as much as possible with minimal secondary or posterior finishing process.

The advent of these new near net shape technologies require us to invest heavily in new plant capability, and that's why in the last two years our capital investment, which is increasing the assets, have gone from the traditional, about \$30 million a year, to the last two years of \$80 million a year ago, and \$130 million this year. And the current corporate tax structure punishes us for doing the right thing, to stay

- 1 competitive in the global marketplace.
- 2 So, in summary, it is important to
- 3 recognize the impact of the global economy on the
- 4 Commonwealth. It is even more important that
- 5 Pennsylvania is well positioned to remain
- 6 competitive and support corporations with global
- footprints that remain rooted in Pennsylvania.
- 8 It is critical for the Pennsylvania
- 9 legislature to recognize that every little bit
- 10 helps. The expansion of the R&D tax credit for
- large corporations is a key for Pennsylvania
- companies to remain a driving force in R&D. And
- more importantly, it is a small step in helping to
- 14 influence a business tax structure that has not
- been encouraging to business growth. Thank you.
- 16 Thank you very much.
- MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: We're going to hold
- questions until the end of the panel. So, our next
- 19 testifier is Sean Rollman. Again, the Chief Financial
- Officer for Plextronics, and I think you're going to
- 21 enjoy hearing about his company.
- 22 MR. SEAN ROLLMAN: Okay. Thanks, Brian.
- Thanks to the committee for giving me an opportunity
- to tell our story. Plextronics' story is certainly
- one of a much different spectrum than Kennametal.

We're only a few years old and have just grown to 50 employees.

We were founded a few years ago off technology and a discovery at Carnegie Mellon University. We're an early stage company that develops and produces conductive inks for printed electronics. Our customers will take those inks and produce printed LED displays, LED lighting to replace incandescent and fluorescent light bulbs, and more significantly make printed solar cells that can be printed onto existing applications.

Our customers, such as Philips, Sony, GE, Sharp, Samsung, LG, they envision the world within 18 months to maybe three years where you will go to a Best Buy and Circuit City, and you'll buy a television that isn't LCD or plasma. It's an LED television that can be rolled like an architectural drawing and thrown under your couch when you don't want to watch it or see it anymore.

We are working with the Department of Defense right now to develop flexible displays to deploy to over 300,000 soldiers by the end of 2009 that will be on the sleeves of their uniform.

So imagine a quarterback in a football game where the soldiers will have a GPS map on

| | their | displays | and | will | move | and | need | to | carry | 10 |
|---|-------|-----------|-----|-------|------|-------|------|----|-------|----|
| 2 | to 15 | pounds of | dev | vices | for | those | maps | | | |

And we're also working with the

Department of Energy to use our technology to make

printed solar cells that will be deployed on the

goggles or the helmets or on the shoulders of

those uniforms that could power those devices.

So our technology can take a very small amount of power and emit light, and it can take light to emit power. In a sense, that's the effect of what our conductive ink does.

A few years down the road after that we envision solar cells where you would instead of go Best Buy and Circuit City and buy those lighting products that I've talked about you will go to Home Depot and Lowe's and buy roof shingles or windows that you can install in your home and remove the need to pay your utility bill to your First Energy or PPL or whomever your power company may be. So, we're working with large companies to develop that product.

But the key is, as I mentioned, we're an early stage company still developing those products, and we've had success developing, generating some revenue and garnering some

investments from large companies and venture

capitalists, but we're still a small growing

company.

Today we're at 50 employees. We've grown five fold over the last three years from just nine a few years ago. We have benefited greatly from the R&D tax credit. Over the last four years we've spent over \$10 million in pure research and development cost, and that has so far earned us a little over \$500,000 of R&D tax credits. And we've been able to use that to deploy back into hiring our folks.

2.1

Two particular issues that Brian had mentioned that affect a company such as ours is the small business definition and the waiting time it takes to sell those credits. Up until 2006, we qualified for the small business definition, and we were able to get a 20 percent share of what we were eligible for, and which has greatly benefited us to be able to sell those credits to large profitable companies who wanted to use those credits, and then we could deploy that cash into new hiring.

In 2007, because our assets are now over \$5 million, we're now classified as a large

| 1 | business effectively, so we are subject to the |
|---|--|
| 2 | same disproportionate sharing as a company the |
| 3 | size of Kennametal would be. |

And our asset base is large not because we have yet turned a profit or because we're making billions in dollars of revenue, it's large because we were fortunate enough to find investors. And so, therefore, the cash from those investments we're using to hire employees and pay our people for this R&D gets us over that hurdle of \$5 million in assets.

So, we will, from Plextronics'
perspective, the small business definition, we
think is somewhat askewed a bit to a company such
as ours in its early stage for those investments.

And also the waiting period, I can give you a real life example. Just two weeks ago we were able to secure the selling of our R&D tax credits that we earned back in 2005. We applied for those 2005 credits in September of 2006. They were approved by the state. We had to wait until December of '07 to be able to sell those credits, and we were able to find a buyer of those credits just a few weeks ago. And we sell that at a discount because there's an incentive obviously

| 1 | for | the | buyer | to | use | those | credits | and | save | money |
|---|------|------|-------|----|-----|-------|---------|-----|------|-------|
| 2 | on t | heir | taxes | 5. | | | | | | |

But it took us nearly 36 months after we 3 had made the spending in R&D to be able to secure 4 5 those R&D tax credits. So, again, from Plextronics' perspective, the small business 6 7 definition and the waiting period to monitor those credits are the two things that affect companies 8 like ours the most. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

25

MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: Thanks, Sean. Next we have Joseph Jacobson, who is the Chief Financial Officer of Akustica.

Just before Joe starts, I've mentioned that there is a copy of the most recent report from the Department of Revenue on the R&D tax credit in all of the packets, and in the back of that you see who gets the credits and how much they are.

MR. JOSEPH JACOBSON: First of all, I appreciate the opportunity to testify here today. Akustica is a similar situation with a very small start-up company, and we have benefited significantly from the R&D tax credit.

But similar to the situation that you 24 just heard, being a small company in the start-up environment, we have a similar situation. Being that we just recently also got our R&D tax credit that we had sold, but again, that process started back in 2005. We benefited from that to the tune of about \$500,000, which was a significant benefit to the company at the time to put into more R&D type investment, to invest more in capital, but also to invest in hiring more people to grow our company.

So that money that we do get back goes directly back into the company itself, so it is a very beneficial type of arrangement. It's just the time it takes from once you've spent that initial R&D to actually receive the benefit. It's significantly long. And from the standpoint in terms of what we're doing in trying to grow the company, the quicker we can get that money, the better we can invest it.

Also, the same situation relative to our size, we are, by nature, in terms of the definition, a small business. However, we do go through several rounds of venture funding, so when that funding does come available, a similar situation, our cash goes up significantly. It doesn't mean that our sales go up significantly.

| 1 | It just means that we're sitting on cash that we |
|---|--|
| 2 | could use to further commercialize our product out |
| 3 | to our customers and out to other types of |
| 4 | suppliers. |

So from that standpoint I think in terms of really identifying what a small business is relative to whether it be revenue or the number of employees will be a much better indication of that.

Akustica. We were founded in 2001, headquartered here in Pittsburgh. What we produce is something quite revolutionary. It's a single-chip MEMS sensor that goes either in cell phones or laptops is its primary application.

Currently we have 65 employees of which four are currently in Taiwan. Our major customer base is in the greater China area because these are where most of our cell phones and laptops come from.

So in 2006 we turned our first revenue. We basically shipped roughly 200K units. We went up to 2.8 million this year and we're projected to even go up to 30 million in 2008.

So to give you some sort of indication in

| 1 | terms of what we are and what we do, if you look |
|---|---|
| 2 | over to the left, that little dot there is the |
| 3 | actual dye size that we produce. What that dye is |
| 4 | is actually a microphone, okay. |

And we then put that into packages which then go into like the laptop that you see there that allows communication through your laptop. So your laptop becomes a communication device. I don't know if you witnessed via the internet, you can do Skype and do phone calls over the internet. Well, this allows you to take that as a laptop and have digital quality sound via a phone conversation over your laptop.

So, what we're seeing is, in terms of everybody has one of these (indicating), has one of those (indicating) and numerous other devises, but to integrate it all into one device via the microphone is beneficial to both our customers and even the general public, okay.

Basically, we have engineers working on designing these products here in Pittsburgh.

We're actually just across the river here in the SouthSide Works, and those engineers are basically what drive most of our company right now.

We're predominantly engineering based,

| doing the next round of development of these |
|--|
| products. We're starting to get more into the |
| commercial aspect of it, hiring more people on the |
| supply chain standpoint, not so much engineering, |
| but how do we take these products to market. So |
| that's really our next challenge. |

The next page kind of shows you an understanding of scale in terms of what we do.

You can see there on the left as far as what our product is relative to the size of a human hair.

And that was our first generation product, so we are now shrinking that even smaller, so it's probably roughly about an eighth of the size of what you see there.

So where do we bring value to the marketplace? It's really in terms of our integration, that is, in the sense that we can integrate a single microphone into a single chip. It's not a multiple chip solution.

Our performance, digital quality, our cost, by being a single chip solution, we can offer a much more competitive cost, and our actual size, our ability to shrink those microphones down.

This technology actually came from CMU.

| 1 | Our first product, like I said, was digital |
|---|---|
| 2 | microphone chips for laptops. We now are shipping |
| 3 | in volume to Dell, Gateway, Fujitsu and other |
| 4 | ODM's that produce these laptops within the |
| 5 | marketplace. But right now Dell has incorporated |
| 6 | our product into every single laptop that they're |
| 7 | going to sell. |

Our next generation of product we're actually going to do an analogue version of this, which would be used within cell phones, you know, iPhones. Any type of communication device that would be used by our customer.

So the whole MEMS revolution is really starting to explode. It was about a \$5 billion market in 2005 and expected to go to 12 billion in 2010. So we believe based on us coming into the marketplace at this point there's a tremendous upside opportunity for us to commercialize this.

Now, where we've changed the game in this relative to our competition is that we base the platform in terms of what these microphones and analogue chips are based on is on a standard CMOS platform.

What that means is that's kind of the vanilla approach that is used to develop

| L | semiconductors around the world. It's been highly |
|---|---|
| 2 | commercialized, therefore, you can get it at a |
| 3 | relatively low cost. From that we put the MEMS |
| 1 | top on it, package it and send it out. |

We actually own no manufacturing. It is all outsourced. So we're using places in Texas, China, Taiwan and so forth to produce our parts.

This actual experience in pioneering all of this was the work of Ken Gabriel, who is our chairman and CTO of our company. He started at MIT and was last at CMU. So, him and Jim Rock are the ones who started the company, and Jim is on the Technology Council.

So, again, because of our ability that we don't own any manufacturing facilities gives us a lot more flexibility and also give us the ability to identify certain type of suppliers that we can pick and choose in order to get the best cost available because it is a competitive marketplace with a semiconductor industry.

So we're not tied down to our own capacity, so that gives us a lot of flexibility, able to turn products quickly, and of not having to have that huge capital investment that is required.

| 1 | So, again, our strategy is basically |
|---|--|
| 2 | trying to commercialize in terms of what that |
| 3 | CMOS, MEMS products are, leverage of that platform |
| 4 | to do more designs of low cost innovative |
| 5 | products. And, again, we're continuing to recoup |
| 6 | and retain talent within the Pittsburgh area. |

Myself, I was recruited out of Phoenix,
out of a large semiconductor company, and just
relocated to Pittsburgh here January 1st. So it's
kind of -- it's a good day because the sun's out
for me so. But, again, that's going on in terms
of trying to find that talent to bring to the
company, as well as looking at the local
university, engineers and so forth.

So predominantly the people that are part of our company do come from the Pittsburgh area, but we are recruiting from outside so. It just tells a little bit in terms of our supply chain, like I said, we are completely outsourced, so we use foundries in Germany, in Texas. We use other companies in Japan and Canada. So, our parts do get a lot of air miles on them in terms of the process that they go through in order to be produced, but everything is coordinated and done here out of Pittsburgh.

But, again, as we continue to grow -- and we already have a presence in Taiwan, and just because most of our customers are basically in China, again, that's where these end products are produced, we are looking at expanding our presence internationally. But the heart and soul in terms of where the technology comes comes completely out of Pittsburgh.

Again, that's kind of a little basis in terms of what our company is. Again, we are in a start-up mode in the standpoint that, honestly, we haven't turned a profit. We're still in an operating loss situation. We spend roughly about \$10 million from an operating expense standpoint, which about 50 percent of that is salaries alone in terms of engineers we have working here in Pittsburgh.

The remaining part of that for the most part is based on technology and new development that we're doing to move to the next platform to make us more competitive in the marketplace. But, roughly about 20 percent is all the overhead that goes with that in terms of all the lawyers and the office supplies, to rent and everything else that we pay that goes directly to global economy.

| 1 | So, again, like I said, from a tax credit |
|----|--|
| 2 | standpoint, our biggest issues that we have from a |
| 3 | small company is again the time frame involved, |
| 4 | especially to sell those credits to when you |
| 5 | actually receive the dollars into the company. |
| 6 | And the designation of a small business in terms |
| 7 | of its net asset value, which again, like I said, |
| 8 | based on our next round of investing, if we were |
| 9 | to cut off that level right now, we would qualify |
| 10 | as a small business. So, thank you. |
| 11 | MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: Thank you, Joe. Next I'm |
| 12 | really pleased to introduce you to Larry Sweeney, who |
| 13 | is one of the founders of Vocollect, and if you're |
| 14 | heading back to the turnpike today you can actually |
| 15 | see Vocollect's headquarters located right off to the |
| 16 | left, between Squirrel Hill and what, the Forest Hills |
| 17 | exit? |
| 18 | MR. LARRY SWEENEY: Right at the Rodi Road |
| 19 | exit. It's up on the left. |
| 20 | MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: You'll see there, they have |
| 21 | a great facility. They're growing. And we're very |
| 22 | pleased to have Larry with us here this morning. |
| 23 | MR. LARRY SWEENEY: Thanks, Brian. Thank you |
| 24 | everybody, this morning. First, I have to apologize. |

I got thrown into this at the last minute. I hopped

| 1 | off a plane, the early hours of Monday morning from |
|----|--|
| 2 | Korea, and they told me yesterday I needed to do this. |
| 3 | Do what? So, I apologize if I'm not 100 percent |
| 4 | prepared. But a little bit about Vocollect, who are |
| 5 | we and where are we from. |
| 6 | Well, a little over 20 years, three guys |
| 7 | left Westinghouse and had an interest, had an |
| 8 | idea, and had brown hair, actually (indicating). |
| 9 | I can relate a lot to the stories of Akustica and |
| 10 | Plextronics. Certainly we've been there. We |
| 11 | started in a machine shop, in an office above a |
| 12 | machine shop in North Versailles. |
| 13 | Today Vocollect, we cracked a \$100 |
| 14 | million market revenue in 2006. We have over 400 |
| 15 | employees worldwide, about 40 in Europe, about 40 |
| 16 | outside of Pittsburgh, in the United States. We |
| 17 | have about eight in Japan, and the rest are all |
| 18 | right here in Pittsburgh. |
| 19 | What do we do probably you're asking? |
| 20 | Well, you've all been in the grocery store late at |
| 21 | night, Sears, Lowe's, whatever. You see people |
| 22 | walking around with a hand-held terminal, has a |
| 23 | little screen on it, a little keyboard. |

to that, but it's a wearable computer, no screen

24

What Vocollect does is something similar

no keyboard. So, instead of reading a prompt on
that screen I hear it in my headset. Instead of
pressing keys on that terminal I speak, and it
understands what I say.

Now, apply that to the warehouse, any distribution operation. There's a back-end system that understands all the products that come in the door, where they're located in the warehouse and what needs to go out that day.

This voice front-end allows workers to interact in realtime at that warehouse management system and perform their job instead of carrying paper, instead of carrying one of those hand-held devices. So, it allows them to be more productive because now I can actually work and talk at the same time instead of having to stop and read a piece of paper. And more accurate. More accurate because it constantly checks that I'm at the right location, doing the right thing at the right time.

So what do we sell? We sell productivity accuracy. Our biggest customers, the three top retailers in the world: Wal-Mart, Carrefour out of France, Metro out of Germany. So, we have a global presence.

This year we expect that our revenues --

| 1 | and they've been growing this way will come |
|----|--|
| 2 | more from outside the United States than inside |
| 3 | the United States. We're growing globally. |
| 4 | What are our challenges? Well, our |
| 5 | challenges are we need to stay ahead. We own |
| 6 | about 80 percent of the market that we're in, |
| 7 | which is really unusual, but we're in a great |
| 8 | spot. |
| 9 | And how do we stay there? Well, we stay |
| 10 | there because we innovate. We spend a lot of |
| 11 | money on research and development. As an example, |
| 12 | 2006, we just got over \$100 million market in |
| 13 | revenue. We spent \$20 million in R&D. |
| 14 | Twenty percent, that's a huge amount for a company |
| 15 | like Vocollect, but that's how we do it. |
| 16 | We know we're products driven. We know |
| 17 | we need to stay ahead of the competition. There's |
| 18 | new competition that comes out of Germany, France, |
| 19 | Italy, probably Japan shortly. So, we're always |
| 20 | looking to stay ahead globally against this |
| 21 | competition. |
| 22 | Now, we targeted the supply chain, okay, |
| 23 | in the distribution end and warehousing. We're |

working down that chain into the retail stores.

We have retail applications. We're working back

24

- 1 up that supply chain to manufacturing.
- That's great. We're growing globally,
- 3 but what else do we do? Well, about two years ago
- 4 we started Vocollect Healthcare Systems taking the
- 5 same idea of voice and applying it to healthcare.
- Where did we start? Well, we chose to
- 7 start in the long-term healthcare facilities
- 8 directing the work of nurse's aides in these
- 9 facilities. Mr. Jones needs to be turned every
- 10 two hours, he needs his meds in an hour. He needs
- 11 to have his vitals taken.
- 12 All of this is tracked and driven by
- voice. The eventual goal and vision here is every
- 14 nurse will have a voice system associated with
- them to direct their work because, guess what?
- The nurse patient ratio keeps going the wrong way,
- 17 and they need a lot of help to be able to maintain
- 18 that level of care.
- 19 So when you think about it voice can be
- applied in a lot of different areas, right? We
- 21 chose distribution as our starting point. We're
- 22 now branching into healthcare, but everybody
- sitting here can think of, wow, there's about nine
- 24 different areas where I think I can apply
- 25 something like voice to make people more

| 1 | productive, more efficient, more accurate. |
|----|--|
| 2 | We see that, too. That's our challenge. |
| 3 | Our challenge is how do we continue to grow? How |
| 4 | do we continue to understand one of the new |
| 5 | applications in our new businesses? |
| 6 | I believe in 2007 we received a tax |
| 7 | credit of, at least in here it says about |
| 8 | \$277,000. I think we were eligible for about 750, |
| 9 | a difference of about a half million dollars. |
| 10 | I know where we put that. We put it into |
| 11 | finding those new markets. We're doing a lot of |
| 12 | that work today, but, wow, that really is the |
| 13 | engine for Vocollect's growth in the future is |
| 14 | understanding where we can apply our products, our |
| 15 | technology, developing those products, and then |
| 16 | applying them and really taking advantage of the |
| 17 | benefit of those for our customer base. |
| 18 | So that's the Vocollect story in a |
| 19 | nutshell, real quick. I just wanted to let you |
| 20 | all know how it all works for us. Thank you. |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Thank you very |
| 22 | much. I appreciate your informative presentations. |
| 23 | Do members have any questions? |
| 24 | Representative Sainato? |

25 REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS SAINATO: Thank you,

| 1 | Mr. Chairman. I must say this is very informative, |
|---|--|
| 2 | each one of you, when Brian says it will be really |
| 3 | interesting. I'm into electronics and all this stuff |
| 4 | that you're talking about, so I mean it's like, wow, |
| 5 | it gets you feeling good inside when you start talking |
| 6 | about all this stuff that you're planning, especially |
| 7 | with no more LCD's. I just bought one of those at |
| 8 | Christmas. So, now you're telling me I should have |
| 9 | waited a couple of years, Sean. |

But, no, I mean, it is amazing, and I

don't think a lot of people realize what's being

done here at the center, in our region when it

comes to this. And this is just so important that

all of you grow and keep growing, because

technology keeps changing, as we all know. And

that's really just more of a comment than

anything.

And I've been informed here just
listening to what you've done and just keep
getting the word out in the community because it's
important that people understand what you're doing
because a lot of times people don't realize what's
being done right here in Pittsburgh. So, thank
you, Mr. Chairman.

25 REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Thank you.

1 Representative Frankel.

morning. I want to get maybe your prospective, and I know we're here to talk about the R&D tax credits, but obviously we have in front of us proposals for a whole spectrum of business, of tax cuts to change the environment, and a very difficult environment for us right now, as Pennsylvania probably is headed in the direction of many of the other states across the country that are experiencing significant revenue shortfalls, below the projections.

So we don't have the opportunity, really, to probably enact the full vision, I think, of a tax policy to make us more competitive in the end.

Where do you put -- and it's interesting because we have, really, three different levels of maturity in terms of companies here, to very young companies, one extremely mature, but innovative company, one that's currently middle range here in terms of growth.

We're looking at, obviously, phasing out capital stock, the franchise tax, reducing corporate net income tax. We're looking at lifting the cap on net operating loss, carry forward, and R&D tax credit, among the kind of

| 1 | portfolio. We have to prioritize, obviously. I |
|---|--|
| 2 | have to think this is a very good place to start, |
| 3 | but where do you see this tax heading in that |
| 4 | portfolio? Understanding you'd want to see the |
| 5 | whole thing, I'm sure, in terms of your individual |
| 6 | companies, I can make some assumptions. I would |
| 7 | think that Plextronics and Akustica probably would |
| | |

find this one to be the most useful one.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But we have to make some choices in allocating the credits and the amount of money we have to budget for this. Maybe you can give us your prospective of where you see this in terms of the priority in terms of tax policy and what we're considering.

MR. LARRY SWEENEY: I guess speaking as a Pennsylvanian, I'd love to see it go into the -- and not speaking Vocollect, but speaking as Pennsylvanian -- I'd love to see it go into the research tax credits. I mean that's where we get companies off the ground. That is the hardest hurdle to get over.

And if it wasn't for the Ben Franklin money that we received in the early years, we wouldn't be here today. I'll be quite frank.

That was instrumental in Vocollect getting to the 25

point where not where we were self-sufficient, but it got us to the point where we could raise the revenue, raise some capital. So, tax credits are huge in those early years getting over those early hurdles.

MR. JOSEPH JACOBSON: Yeah, I'm going to agree from our standpoint in terms of most of the dollars that went into our company are developing next generation product. Again, with our introduction of the microphone out into the marketplace, the competition was much larger, much stronger, is currently on our tail, driving to find, make something very similar to what we have. They have the benefit associated with a much better distribution system, additional working capital, so forth. So, they can compete on a price much better than we can.

So for our long-term longevity, from a company prospective, we really depend upon what we put into R&D. And, you know, we talked about in terms of what we're doing, as far as shrinking that microphone down smaller and smaller, but there also are several other applications besides this that we are working on relative to sensors and so forth that lend itself to this technology that would also be revolutionary.

| 1 | So I see from our standpoint, over the |
|----|---|
| 2 | next five years, to spend a tremendous amount of |
| 3 | additional R&D. And where that really comes from |
| 4 | is again a lot of our processes are outsourced. |
| 5 | That R&D spend will go into people. Hiring |
| 6 | engineers and to bringing people in if not from |
| 7 | outside Pittsburgh, from inside Pittsburgh. |
| 8 | So, from any sort of advantage we get |
| 9 | from this R&D tax credit, honestly, that goes |
| 10 | right into payroll. |
| 11 | MR. SEAN ROLLMAN: You're correct, |
| 12 | Representative. For a company like Plextronics, the |
| 13 | R&D tax credit certainly benefits most directly to a |
| 14 | company like us. We do encourage capital stock tax |
| 15 | now. In fact, a significant amount for a company like |
| 16 | ours because we are in the early stage. |
| 17 | And I would also echo Larry's comments, |
| 18 | the money that comes from any kind of economic |
| 19 | development activity is critical for companies |
| 20 | like us or in ours two or three years ago. And |
| 21 | our story is exactly true. Innovation Works was a |
| 22 | critical funder of Plextronics, and I know we |
| 23 | would not for a fact be here today if it weren't |

So, any kind of economic development

for that funding a few years ago.

initiative can benefit those companies getting off the ground.

DR. WILLIAM HSU: From a more mature corporation, bigger corporation like PPG and Kennametals, and our prospective has to be a more balanced approach. Ultimately, the acid test is to whether you make enough money to pay tax to begin with, right? You know, you can give all the credits to all the start-ups, which are very good. Eventually 20 years or later, when you plant a tree, like later the tree will bear fruit and give you shade and all that, but until you get to a point that they can really contribute, you have to wonder, do you continue to support those for the credits at an expense of the bigger corporation? Because, ultimately, you ended up killing the Golden Goose, right?

And the example I just cited, we know the reality is that we have to continue to invest because we cannot play the commodity game. If we're going to play a price game against our competition we would have folded shops long ago.

We cannot against the low-cost countries.

And the only reason we are surviving and we are thriving is because of the value adding contributions in terms of products. We can't help

| 1 | our customers to improve their competitiveness, |
|---|---|
| 2 | and that's the win/win situation. It is so |
| 3 | important that we come up with all of these near |
| 4 | net shape technologies that we can actually lower |
| 5 | our manufacturing cost more than we actually |
| | |

lowered the price.

So, it would be a win/win because we can then sell the same products with better performance to our customers.

In the meantime, my margin does not erode so that actually forces into all these capital investments, right? And all of these things that we talk about, if you don't make those kind of tax reforms, we end up basically taxed twice. You tax us on the revenue and then we improve our competitiveness, we improve our asset base, you tax us again, you know?

So, it's kind of a very difficult situation. So from the big corporation point of view, even though you said you have to make some priorities, my encouragement is to at least with those two points of view, that the credit and the overall tax restructure, I think you need to address them both in a fair-handed manner.

Otherwise, the big corporation will suffer, I will

| 1 tell | . you | that. |
|--------|-------|-------|
|--------|-------|-------|

You know, our competitors, like this

company that we're dealing with in Israel, how

much of a government subsidy did they get? I

mean, you just cannot even begin to imagine. That

is the battle we are dealing with.

MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: I just had a couple of quick thoughts. I'll be very quick about it.

From the Pittsburgh Technology Council's point of view what we would like the General Assembly to focus on is in terms of prioritization are those tax policies that either hurt our competitiveness or could improve our competitiveness as it relates to attracting and retaining manufacturing and technology companies.

So, in some regards, everyone is paying the second highest corporate in income tax rate in Pennsylvania, and I'd love to come before you and tell you that that's something that we need to fix this year, but we recognize that lowering the rate is a very expensive proposition.

So from a prioritization point of view what we've done is targeted a very narrow agenda, to say listen, you know, what you should be focusing on with your limited resources is on

| 1 | removing some of the competitive things that hurt |
|---|---|
| 2 | manufacturers and in putting some in that help |
| 3 | them. |

Single sales factor, for example, rewards companies that are manufacturing products here in Pennsylvania, but selling them into the global marketplace. The fiscal note on that is relatively small in the grander scheme of things.

The net operating loss is something -there's only one other state in the country that
limits NOL's, and it's just bad for manufacturing.
It's bad for start-up companies, so we've targeted
the single sales and the NOL, and then last, we've
talked about the research and development tax for
this being one of those that we can improve.

so we really have as a trade association and I think as a business community come forth with a prioritized approach, with the priority being on those companies that are at the top of the food chain that are employing other

Pennsylvanians and that are supporting the local governments, the county governments and state governments, your tax revenues. And that's really today, it's your manufacturing and your technology economy.

| 1 | REPRESENTATIVE DAN FRANKEL: Thank you. |
|----|--|
| 2 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Representative |
| 3 | Kortz. |
| 4 | REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. KORTZ: Thank you, |
| 5 | Mr. Chairman, and thank all of you for the information |
| 6 | today. I have a couple of questions. |
| 7 | First off, all of you said you like the |
| 8 | tax credit, you want it to go forward, and you |
| 9 | would like the bill, you'd like it being improved. |
| 10 | The question I have is some of you have |
| 11 | said that you want to sell these off. |
| 12 | Why not use them all, carry them forward |
| 13 | and use them? Larry, start with you. Why |
| 14 | wouldn't you want to use it all up? |
| 15 | MR. LARRY SWEENEY: I think we do. |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. KORTZ: You do. But |
| 17 | I heard some people say they sold them. |
| 18 | MR. SEAN ROLLMAN: We monetize them. It's |
| 19 | really just a financial association of time value of |
| 20 | money. We foresee profits within the next two to |
| 21 | three years, but depending on the NOL caps and |
| 22 | limitations that that imposes, rather than realizing |
| 23 | 100 percent of that credit two or three years from |
| 24 | now, I'd rather get 90 cents on the dollar today and |

use that cash to hire people rather than waiting a few

| 1 | years. |
|----|---|
| 2 | So for a company like an early stage |
| 3 | company that's the reason why we would make that |
| 4 | financial decision. |
| 5 | DR. WILLIAM HSU: We use it. |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. KORTZ: You use it? |
| 7 | DR. WILLIAM HSU: We use it completely. We |
| 8 | don't monetize it. |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. KORTZ: The next |
| 10 | question I have and maybe it's a little bit off |
| 11 | base but your competitors reengineering the |
| 12 | products, obviously you've got to stay one step ahead |
| 13 | MR. LARRY SWEENEY: Yes. |
| 14 | REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM KORTZ: I would suspect |
| 15 | it's mostly off-shore competitors, take your product |
| 16 | and figure out how those things work, and then try to |
| 17 | really jam into your market. |
| 18 | Will this tax credit help you to stay one |
| 19 | step ahead? |
| 20 | MR. JOSEPH JACOBSON: Most definitely. I mean |
| 21 | it's, again, it's cored directly into, like I said, |
| 22 | from a people standpoint, designing that next |
| 23 | generation product. Interestingly enough, I mean our |
| | |

greatest competitor actually is a U.S. company. Now,

we have patents that protect our technology of what

24

- 1 we've done.
- 2 REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM KORTZ: All they have to
- 3 do is change it a hair, right?
- 4 MR. JOSEPH JACOBSON: Exactly. I mean,
- 5 right --
- 6 REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. KORTZ: Make it blue
- 7 instead of red.
- 8 MR. JOSEPH JACOBSON: Right. It's a little,
- 9 you know, slight modification can mean that they can
- 10 come into the market standpoint. But definitely, I
- mean, it is going into that next generation. We are
- 12 already looking in terms of how products we would then
- take to market two years out at this point.
- 14 REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM KORTZ: Okay, thank you.
- 15 REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Representative
- 16 Tim Seip?
- 17 REPRESENTATIVE TIM SEIP: Thank you,
- 18 Mr. Chairman. I want to thank all of you gentlemen
- 19 for your testimony. It's very enlightening. And Joe,
- I'm very encouraged and find it very refreshing that
- we're actually exporting technology to China. Thank
- 22 you.
- MR. JOSEPH JACOBSON: Yes, we are.
- 24 REPRESENTATIVE TIM SEIP: That's wonderful to
- 25 hear. Getting back to I think Brian had said that

| 1 | we're looking at a really two-fold approach here. You |
|----|---|
| 2 | want to try to make products that are innovative and |
| 3 | good to sell and market, but at the same time we want |
| 4 | to make them more efficiently. |
| 5 | And in my legislative district we have a |
| 6 | landfill right now pumping methane gas down to a |
| 7 | textile mill. Maybe one of those industries that |
| 8 | we talked about is getting priced out of the |
| 9 | market, but they're able to save \$2 million on |
| 10 | their oil bill by hooking up this methane gas. |
| 11 | And I think we're trying to address some |
| 12 | of your concerns from that side of the house with |
| 13 | our energy package and doing things like that to |
| 14 | help you reduce your costs. |
| 15 | So, I don't really have any questions. I |
| 16 | just wanted to throw that comment out. Thank you, |
| 17 | Mr. Chairman. |
| 18 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Thank you. |
| 19 | Representative Metcalfe? |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS SAINATO: Go ahead, Daryl. |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Representative |
| 22 | Sainato. |
| 23 | REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS SAINATO: Just yesterday, |
| 24 | I thought it was very interesting at our hearing |

yesterday, and I would just like to know what effect

| 1 | it has on you on work force development. Are you |
|---|--|
| 2 | finding any problems with your employees as far as |
| 3 | finding people to work in your industry? |

I mean, they said yesterday 35 percent of high school seniors are dropping out or people are dropping out before they graduated, and they were having problems with people in just the skills of showing up on time for work, behaving themself at work, and doing things. Are you experiencing that?

MR. LARRY SWEENEY: It's one of our greatest challenges finding people to fill the void, fill the holes as we grow. Each quarter our CFO gets up in front of the company and shows the numbers and the trends. It's revenue and it's bookings and it's profits, and it's all this thing, and it's head count. And that's the one thing we're always behind on. It's a very difficult market, at least in Pittsburgh, to find good people, professional people.

DR. WILLIAM HSU: Yes, we have the same problem. And we could get people, but typically it takes a long time. And we have to do a national search. And imagine with all the universities here. You say, well, it shouldn't be that much of a difficulty, but we have problems.

| l | And when you come to wage row people, the |
|---|---|
| 2 | work ethics, a lot of the time, I don't know what |
| 3 | it is, but it just seems the people, the younger |
| 4 | people have an entitlement kind of a mind set, |
| 5 | which is just not going to work in the long-run |
| 5 | because they're very hungry people oversea. They |
| 7 | would very much like to have the manufacturing |
| 8 | plant. |
| | |

9 So, yeah, we do have those development 10 issues.

MR. SEAN ROLLMAN: Because of how small we are we're somewhat immune to that problem so far. Also, because of the national demographics of our employees, we've brought in of our 15 employees, nearly 40 percent of them are from outside of the region, another third of them are not American-borne citizens. So, we've had success in bringing those employees to here.

Also, 25 of our 51 employees are Ph.D.'s so the demographics of our particular company, I think, has not encountered those problems yet, but I'm sure hopefully when we have several hundred employees some day we probably will have encountered the same problems.

REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS SAINATO: That was just

something I think that was a little surprising to many of us yesterday when you're telling us just the problems. And even in your lower end employees, okay, just not having the work ethic, not showing up on time, getting into trouble, either with drugs or other legal problems outside of the work, and it's like, you know...

DR. WILLIAM HSU: Take, for example, Germany. They have a very structured apprenticeship program. So people who don't want to go to universities, they have other choices to give them the vocational skills. And typically they would -- actually not only they would go to classes, they would actually be assigned to different companies and take classes during a certain period of time, and then actually the rest of the time actually hand-on. And after they graduated typically where they actually go to work would employ them. But we don't see anything like this in this country. We just don't see it.

MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: I just had a quick, quick point onto that is as a Trade Association for companies, I'd like to tell you the No. 1 challenge facing them is the research and development tax credit, except that would be a small challenge, one this committee could address.

| 1 | But the No. 1 issue we hear constantly |
|---|---|
| 2 | and we poll companies and we bring them together. |
| 3 | It's all people, it's all talent. So, we're more |
| 4 | in the business of selling memberships in some |
| 5 | regards, and we sell memberships, it's our Career |
| б | Center, access to our Career Center is one of our |
| 7 | strongest selling points. People, probably 50,000 |
| 8 | people a month come to our website looking for a |
| 9 | job. |

Last year we posted 6,000 technology jobs on our Career Center. Today, I think we're over 1,500 current jobs posted on that job site.

People are hiring. They're hiring family-sustaining jobs. They have to, though, very often pull talent in from around the country and around the world to build these highly technical positions.

And on that front, there's a lot of work really that needs to be done here in Pennsylvania. We, one, would like to get the word out that there are jobs here in Pittsburgh, but there are folks who have left Pittsburgh and gone away, gotten some great experience, we want them to come home. Immigrants, we want them to consider locating here in Pittsburgh.

| 1 | And we think that, really, the technology |
|---|--|
| 2 | community can help stem the loss of jobs because |
| 3 | some of you may have seen last week, the Post |
| 4 | Gazette ran a report that said that the region |
| 5 | lost I think another 6,000 people. Allegheny |
| 6 | County lost 6,000 people in population. |

We had one of our internal research staff members pull data on the IRS, and we actually identified a net loss of I believe the number of \$225 million of wages from those folks.

So, when we lose people we're losing economic activity, we're losing the future of our technology companies. We need to really work to get the message out that there are positions here in Pittsburgh; that there's 6,000 alone that we filled last year on our Career Center.

But they're the types of positions that are high-skilled positions. Our companies don't have much of a problem of people not showing up to work. There is much more problem they have finding the highly-skilled talent they need.

Behavior, I think, probably the tech council is probably one of those misbehaved employees, but certainly there are jobs here, and it is a big challenge. And what you're doing to

| 1 | help create a future pipeline of workers on the |
|----|--|
| 2 | other legislation, you're talking about something |
| 3 | that the council could wholeheartedly support |
| 4 | because it does speak to the need to create a |
| 5 | future pipeline of workers in the region. |
| 6 | REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS SAINATO: Thank you, |
| 7 | Mr. Chairman. |
| 8 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Thank you. |
| 9 | Representative Metcalfe. |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE DARYL METCALFE: Thank you, Mr. |
| 11 | Chairman, and thank you all for your testimony today. |
| 12 | It's exciting to hear the technology that we're on the |
| 13 | cutting edge of, and it's good to hear American |
| 14 | innovation is still keeping us ahead in the world, |
| 15 | even when there's so many cut labor costs out there |
| 16 | around the world and the hunger that Dr. Bill |
| 17 | mentioned that's out there around the world. |
| 18 | I think that our culture has to |
| 19 | understand that we've got the most prosperous and |
| 20 | greatest nation in the world, and I think you kind |
| 21 | of get fat and happy sometimes when you're in the |
| 22 | situation for a long extended period of time, and |
| 23 | I think that's what our culture's experiencing. |
| 24 | So, I think we need that hunger back, and |

especially in our youth to understand you have to

go after it if you're going to be successful.

But I appreciate all of the testimony
you've given. It's just exciting products. My
background coming right out of high school was
military and my foundational training in the U.S.
Army working on radar and IFF to tell if you're
friendly or enemy aircraft from a vacuum tube
technology, transistor technology.

So, hearing about the ink, the conductive ink and the microphones that size and just as a former soldier understanding the capability that we would have on the military battlefield with that technology at our disposal to keep our military leading as we always have with technology on their side and saving lives through it is exciting.

But as far as our tax structure and my service in the legislature, I would agree with Dr. Bill's approach that we have to have the all encompassing tax structure reform to help all of you, both in your early stages of development and as you become successful and create more product and create more profits. We have to bring the CNI rate down, we have to finish the capital stock of franchise tax elimination, the net loss issue and

| 1 | single | sales | factor. | We | have | to | address | those |
|---|---------|-------|---------|----|------|----|---------|-------|
| 2 | issues. | | | | | | | |

And I'm all for the tax credits and
making sure that we're able to do that also, but I
think ultimately businesses will flourish when
they have a lower tax burden to deal with and a
lower regulatory burden to deal with so that they
can do what you all do best, and that's create
jobs and innovate.

So, thank you all for the work that you're doing, and I'm excited to follow the success of your companies in the future. And whatever we can do to help out of my office feel free to contact me any time.

Thank you, Brian. I enjoyed your testimony also. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Thank you,
Representative Metcalfe. Just a follow-up from
Representative Seip.

REPRESENTATIVE TIM SEIP: If I could just quickly, talking about staff and kind of going back to what Represent Sainato was saying, are you finding bigger challenges with those basic skills? I don't know, dealing with coworkers, showing up on time and those kind of things? Or is it bigger challenges with

| 1 | identifying the people that have technological |
|----|--|
| 2 | capabilities that your industry needs? |
| 3 | Because, I mean, in my mind, if I think |
| 4 | of somebody graduating from a top notch school, |
| 5 | the University of Pittsburgh, Duquesne, Carnegie |
| 6 | Mellon, I'm not envisioning somebody who has |
| 7 | trouble getting up in the morning and getting to |
| 8 | work. Maybe I'm missing something there. |
| 9 | And if I could ask Joe, you said you were |
| LO | from Arizona. I'm just curious, what made you |
| L1 | say, hey, I'm going to go to Pennsylvania and work |
| L2 | there. That's my question. |
| L3 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: That's my |
| L4 | question. |
| L5 | MR. JOSEPH JACOBSON: A lot of people have |
| L6 | asked me that question. A lot of people in Phoenix |
| L7 | asked me that question when I was getting ready to get |
| L8 | on the plane. |
| L9 | It was really the company and the |
| 20 | opportunity. I came from a much larger |
| 21 | corporation in the Phoenix area. It was in the |
| 22 | semiconductor industry, and the thought of coming |
| 23 | here, building something from scratch, getting |

involved in several different activities that you

wouldn't necessarily in a large corporation, and

24

1 the people here.

I have to say, I mean, I was a little bit hesitant coming here, to be honest, to make that move. But since I've been here, I mean, when I moved into my neighborhood, I think every neighbor came over and brought me something to eat, which would never happen in Arizona. I didn't even talk to my neighbors in Arizona. You know, I basically waved to them when you'd go in and out of your garage.

But the people here are amazing. And, you know, to your comment about, I mean, we have some lower skilled positions within our company, and we have not had issues that you're addressing.

They show up on time. They're willing to work late. We're actually having some parts that we're trying to get out now that we're actually testing here in Pittsburgh, and we have 24/7 testing going on in our facility. Not a problem working nights and everything else.

But, again, on the higher technical aspect in terms of some of our job requirements, yeah, we do run into an issue. And by the nature of our industry, most of those individuals are located, you know, in the Phoenix, California,

| 1 | Texas | area. | That | 's | where | that | technology | is, | so |
|---|-------|---------|------|----|-------|------|------------|-----|----|
| 2 | we do | recruit | out | of | those | area | S. | | |

But we also have recruited directly out

of the universities here, too, so it's kind of a

mix.

But, no, I think Pittsburgh's wonderful.

I think I'm enjoying it much more, other than the weather, which I'm getting used to. But the people here are great.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Thank you. I just want to follow up on a couple of things. One is this issue of the definition of small businesses. You all say that defining it is less than 5 million in net assets really isn't the best way to go to enable the small businesses like yours and others to fully utilize the set aside that we have.

If not defining it as assets, any other suggestions or any thoughts on a more appropriate definition for utilization of the tax credit?

MR. SEAN ROLLMAN: Speaking selfishly from a Plextronics perspective, I think revenues may potentially be a better measure of size than assets.

Assets, as I mentioned before, can somewhat be askewed because of the timing of an investment round. And the dollars, when we bring in investment dollars, they are

| 1 | already targeted for hiring and growth over the next |
|---|--|
| 2 | several years until we get to profitability. So the |
| 3 | fact that at a particular point in time that cash |
| 4 | is sitting there as an asset, and it hurts that |
| 5 | definition. |

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Revenues, I think, are a true reflection of a company's success and growth of their business. And it's certainly our goal to continue increasing revenues. We don't want to fit any kind of small business definition for too long, but at our stage today assets hurts a company like ours.

> REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: If we use revenue, any idea what level, roughly?

MR. SEAN ROLLMAN: Well, each industry I think would be different. We eclipsed \$2 million of revenues last year, but the vast majority of it is from government agency contracts funding our research, like I mentioned earlier.

I wouldn't even venture a guess. I'm sure there's some data out there that would pinpoint. If you looked at a population of all entities in Pennsylvania that have applied for R&D credits, there must be some data point that shows what our revenue number would be.

| 1 | MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: I'll just say, the federal |
|----|---|
| 2 | government actually defines small businesses by the |
| 3 | number of employees, and I think they also look at |
| 4 | gross revenue. It's kind of a hybrid approach. I |
| 5 | think the SBR program Carla, you're here to help me |
| 6 | out I think they say less than 500 employees and |
| 7 | less than a \$100 million in revenue. I'm not |
| 8 | positive. |
| 9 | MS. KARLA BECKNER WHITE: I'm not sure about |
| 10 | the revenue. It's definitely bigger than 500 |
| 11 | employees. |
| 12 | MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: But here's what we would |
| 13 | suggest, is to work with the Department of Revenue so |
| 14 | this is what we'd like to see happen. |
| 15 | First, we would like to see the \$8 |
| 16 | million that's set aside for small businesses be |
| 17 | fully utilized. |
| 18 | So, we would say, listen, let's work with |
| 19 | the Department of Revenue, the Department of |
| 20 | Community and Economic Development to run some |
| 21 | models to see what type of definition would allow |
| 22 | us to use that. |
| 23 | And if this legislation passes and we |
| 24 | increase it to 15 million, we would like to use |

that 15 million, too. And let's make sure that we

create a definition that allows us to use 100
percent of the 15 million.

I can assure you that any definition that you generate is not going to be one that was just made up so that you could use 15 million. They're going to be small businesses. You're going to be creating a definition of somebody that has fewer than a certain number of employees and a certain amount of revenue.

But right now we're not using the set aside program, and as a result you're not fueling growth in small businesses. And so that's really what our goal is is just to make sure we have a set aside provision, that we have a definition of small businesses that allows that set aside to be utilized and allows that money to be put on the street the way we intended it to be.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Okay. I can understand and will support in working together to make that happen, but I wanted to make it real, real clear, too, that we need to create that definition for the applicability of the research and development tax credit. And the reason for that is this:

Pennsylvania already has, if not the greatest, one of the greatest differentials between what are C

| 1 | corporations and what are subchapter S corporations |
|---|--|
| 2 | actually pay in terms of taxes. Subchapter S's pay a |
| 3 | personal income tax. Maybe not Kennametal. They |
| 4 | might be a C, but my guess is you are probably are all |
| 5 | S's. |

MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: We're all C's.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: You're all

C's, okay. S's pay the personal income tax rate at

3.07. C's pay, at least on paper, okay, you pay 9.9,
but we know that hardly anybody pays that anyhow,
okay, you know, because we have these different
mechanisms in place in law that you're allowed to
utilize, that enable you to pay a lot less, okay?

So, between 3.7 and 9.9, there's a huge, even though that's the nominal rate, the effective rate is something less than 9.9, but, nonetheless, even the differential between the effective rate of the CNI at less than 9.9 and the PIT. There's such a skewed differential, okay.

And we've already had a proliferation of S corporations in this state over the last decade. Ten years ago or so we had about 100,000, a little more than a 100,000 S corporations. Today we have over 400,000, okay.

Now, obviously, a lot of that's because

| L | of the start-up of a lot of new businesses, and |
|---|--|
| 2 | that's good, and we want to encourage that. But a |
| 3 | lot of it also happened because a lot of |
| 1 | corporations have become reclassified out of C and |
| 5 | into S. And there's that huge differential then |
| 5 | in terms of revenues that they pay to the |
| 7 | Commonwealth, okay. |

So I think to the extent we can work on a definition that is relevant and useful to you all, we need to make sure that it stays focused on the utilization of the R&D tax credit, okay.

One question that you all could answer however you want kind is kind of the question that Tim asked, I mean, what are you doing here in western Pennsylvania? I mean, come on, this is the worst state in the nation to do business.

We've got the highest CNI in the whole country. We're the only state, maybe outside of New Hampshire, that hasn't uncapped NOL's. You know, we're this smoggy, dirty place. Living in the past with more municipalities and like over-fragmented global governments and everything. I don't understand this, but we're attracting venture capital investment at record levels, and you all are here.

| 1 | Why are people doing business here and |
|----|---|
| 2 | investigating here? Why? |
| 3 | MR. LARRY SWEENEY: I'll take a shot. Founders |
| 4 | of our company are from Pittsburgh, not all borne and |
| 5 | raised, but from Pittsburgh. We decided that we |
| 6 | wanted to stay in this area. |
| 7 | Why? It has a lot to do with core |
| 8 | values. Our company is very strong when it comes |
| 9 | to core values based on pretty much the root of it |
| 10 | is integrity, and we find that in the Pittsburgh |
| 11 | community you have a lot of that in western |
| 12 | Pennsylvania. And it breeds a type of person that |
| 13 | has a certain level of loyalty, a certain level of |
| 14 | integrity and honestly and truthfulness. And we |
| 15 | value that very highly in our work force. |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Thank you. |
| 17 | Does anybody else want to take a stab at this? |
| 18 | DR. WILLIAM HSU: It's the same thing for |
| 19 | Kennametal. Kennametal, even though that name doesn't |
| 20 | reflect original family, it's the Kenna family. They |
| 21 | dropped the Mac and become Kenna. |
| 22 | It's McKenna family that started the |
| 23 | whole thing, and it was actually rooted back to |
| 24 | when this whole area was the center of steel |

manufacturing. That's how we started. That's how

| 1 | we come up with the hot metal to help process the |
|----|---|
| 2 | steel. |
| 3 | And we have been here for over 75 years. |
| 4 | This is the home. I mean, we are still based in |
| 5 | Latrobe. That's where the world headquarters is, |
| 6 | and that's where the global technology center is. |
| 7 | And we like the blue collar work ethic, |
| 8 | and we like what is described to be the |
| 9 | friendliness of the people. I'm not a native |
| 10 | Pennsylvanian. I actually spend a lot of my |
| 11 | career in Delaware, Wilmington, but when I move |
| 12 | here I really like the friendliness of the people. |
| 13 | So, this is an outstanding environment in |
| 14 | terms of raising a family and doing necessary |
| 15 | work, you know? But you are very well said that |
| 16 | the weather of these things could be distracting. |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE DARYL METCALFE: I agree. |
| 18 | DR. WILLIAM HSU: My wife didn't like it in the |
| 19 | wintertime. It got her depressed because she couldn't |
| 20 | see the sunlight. Whereas on the east coast you see |
| 21 | the blue skies all the time. |
| 22 | But it has its distractions, but overall, |
| 23 | Kennametal decided that this is our corporate |
| | |

That's why we insisted on being here. We

could at one time. In fact, the history suggested

24

25

home.

| 1 | that at one time we could have moved the whole |
|---|--|
| 2 | corporation down to Carolina, North Carolina, |
| 3 | because at one time, the whole engineering, design |
| 4 | center of our metal working part is actually based |
| 5 | in Raleigh. |
| 6 | And so there was whole discussion should |

And so there was whole discussion should the whole company be split in two? One part here and one part in North Carolina? Should we all move down to North Carolina? And then the answer, after a lengthy debate, they said, the family members said this is our home. We need to be here.

So we built the technology center. We moved everybody back from North Carolina. In doing so, we lost 70 percent of the work force.

We had already built the entire engineering competency. So, we are here to stay. So you don't have to worry us fleeing, in spite of all the negatives you mentioned.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Anybody else have a comment?

MR. SEAN ROLLMAN: The younger, early stage companies that reflect a lot of the members of the Technology Council, borne out of the seeds that are planted out of the universities.

| 1 | My former employer was also founded out |
|---|--|
| 2 | of some brains that came out of the local |
| 3 | universities. They did a search and they chose |
| 4 | Pittsburgh because of the cost of living. So, the |
| 5 | evaluation that I know we did at that last company |
| 6 | was not as much from a business perspective, as |
| 7 | from a personal perspective in the eves of our |
| 8 | employee base. |

The fact is our wages here in Pittsburgh are about 60 percent less than they are on the west coast. So, if you can convince those skills, those technological skills to come into

Pittsburgh, which we were successful at doing at our last company and today's, there's a benefit to it.

You're right. There's going to be folks that have that stereotyped image that it's hard for them to get over. I think two of our biggest goals is to get national sports television to not show the blast furnaces every time they show Pittsburgh Steelers or the Penguins. That was driving me crazy.

My ten-year old son was watching the Penguins last week, and they come from a commercial break, and there's this big blast

| l furnace. | And | my | son | says, | what | was | that? |
|------------|-----|----|-----|-------|------|-----|-------|
|------------|-----|----|-----|-------|------|-----|-------|

That's exactly the point. Unfortunately,

the world is thinking that we still have black

5 the steel industry is certainly critical to our

6 economy, but the fact is it's not the case.

But a lot of it comes from the universities. We have great universities. I think way disproportionately more strength here than in a lot of cities, and companies like ours take advantage of that. We were borne out of that.

smoke and steel mills downtown, and by no means

MR. JOSEPH JACOBSON: And I would echo all of that what you heard. I would also add from in terms of the venture capital, that is, it's backing our company, they are from the Pittsburgh area. And given that as opposed to someone coming out of Silicon Valley, I mean, there's a totally different approach on how they manage a company, all right.

I've been with companies before that were under venture capitalists that were much more aggressive, much more concerned about their bottom line in terms of how quickly they could turn and spin the company. But with our partners at this point, they're much more patient, not involved in

| 1 | the day-to-day activities, and are more concerned |
|---|---|
| 2 | about developing industries within the Pittsburgh |
| 3 | area. So, it's a win/win for all of us. |

REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Brian, do you want to take a stab?

MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: Well, I would just say that you've seen some of the great companies that are here. But I would say that we believe that some of the uncompetitive facts of our business climate are impacting our growth, right? So, we are growing, our economy, and every states' growing their economy. We're just not growing as quickly as other regions.

And we do think that we could accelerate that growth by knocking off some of these uncompetitive pieces of our tax climate, and by putting in some of the things like single sales factor, which everybody is going to do single sales factor. The last one to do it is going to be the one that doesn't have any benefit out of it, of any single sales.

So, now, we just think we could accelerate our growth, and we could have more companies like the ones before you. We could do things like increase and expand the R&D tax within Pennsylvania, and to send advice to manufacturers

| 1 | tο | make | investments. |
|---|----|--------|----------------|
| L | LO | lllake | THVESCILLENCS. |

Like our good friends at U.S. Steel this

year announced -- I think the governor

characterized it as one of the largest corporate

sector capital investments in the state's history.

And there are some tax ramifications for those

investments that really don't make sense in terms

of public policy.

So great things going on in Pennsylvania. The venture capital growth, you guys are doing a lot in the General Assembly to fuel some of that growth by supporting early stage things through groups like Innovation Works and the Ben Franklin Program, the Life Sciences Greenhouse.

It's really a partnership. It really does involve investing and creating a business, a competitive business by even having a balanced approach. And you've done a very good job at balancing it. You've made some progress I think in the capital stock and franchise tax. You made progress on the NOL. You made progress on the single sales factor. We're just here today to say keep moving forward and let's make some more progress here in 2008.

| 1 | with | а | summary | of | what | Ι | heard, | and | then | just | put | this |
|---|-------|----|----------|----|--------|-----|---------|------|--------|------|-----|------|
| 2 | all i | ln | context. | - | I appı | rec | ciate v | rour | respor | nse. | | |

I mean, what it tells me is for some reason those of us from western Pennsylvania like to beat ourselves up a lot. We always seem to talk about what's bad, what doesn't work. We're our own worst enemies sometimes, to be honest with you, okay.

There are a lot of good things that you obviously pointed out. You know, we've got access to capital. We are competitive in labor cost and labor markets. We certainly have some of the best medical and education research facilities in the world, if not the country. We do have a strong work ethic, friendly people.

And for those of us that like four seasons, we got that, too, okay. And not everybody's a sunbird, okay. But there's a lot of assets that we have here in Pennsylvania and particularly in our region. And I think sometimes that all gets drowned out by the self-inflicted negative perception that we have.

And, Sean, just one thing. I think we ought to take, for our region, we ought to have two images. It ought to be all this investments.

| 1 | This old steel mill. Joe, you have no idea what |
|----|---|
| 2 | this facility along here was 20 years ago. |
| 3 | MR. JOSEPH JACOBSON: Right. |
| 4 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Okay? It was |
| 5 | old the J&L Works. We've taken an old industrial, |
| 6 | contaminated you know, it had a lot of really good |
| 7 | jobs here. I mean, you can't believe back in the |
| 8 | 1970's in our region. I mean, from 1979 to 1984, this |
| 9 | region lost 150,000 manufacturing jobs. You have no |
| 10 | idea the enormity of these steel complexes, okay. |
| 11 | And, you know, that is our past, but it's |
| 12 | also part of our present, too, because that |
| 13 | \$1 billion that U.S. Steel's investing in coke |
| 14 | making technology, that's in my district, okay. |
| 15 | So, I think there's two images here. One |
| 16 | is what we've done with the old brown fields and |
| 17 | how we've renovated them and made significant |
| 18 | public investment to put an environment together |
| 19 | where some of our most innovative companies can be |
| 20 | nurtured and grow, right along here. |
| 21 | But it's also down in Bill Kortz's area |
| 22 | and my area of the Mon Valley, too, where our |
| 23 | manufacturers, thanks to companies like |
| 24 | Kennametals, are helping to develop the new |

technologies, the manufacturing processes to keep

| 1 | our existing manufacturing competitiveness as |
|---|---|
| • | |
| 2 | well. |

So while I really will continue to do
everything I can to try to help grow our new
economy, manufacturing does matter, too. And that
ought to be made sure that we keep that in mind
and integrate that in our efforts as well. Brian?

MR. BRIAN KENNEDY: Can I just follow up on that point because it's really relevant to today's discussion. I mentioned in my testimony the Deloitte study and that it was conducted by the state's Industrial Resource Centers.

What I didn't mention was the response of Industrial Resource Centers. Catalyst Connection, which is co-located with us and has been partner of ours, they have been working to help -- historically have been working with companies to help make them more efficient and to manufacture and increase their productivity.

As a result of this study, they are now working with manufacturers in probably each of your districts to help them not only become state-of-the-art in their manufacturing process, but also to help them understand product development processes and how to transition away

| 1 | from some of these historically commoditized |
|---|---|
| 2 | industries into these value-added sectors where |
| 3 | they can grow their topline revenue. |

And as a result you're seeing some tremendous impact at the firms that work with the Industrial Resource Center. So, that's just another example of how the General Assembly has been supportive.

I know that after that study you guys actually increased their funding by 50 percent. So that's just another example of how you've been working together to support innovation and manufacturing in Pennsylvania, and as an example of that balanced approach that I was talking about.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: And now just my final observations, to put this all in context. I mean you obviously know how I feel about R&D, want to make it happen. And I recognize there are these other business tax issues that are important in various degrees for different companies, depending on where you are, what kind of business you're in, and whether you're a start-up or a mid range or a mature industry and company.

The uncapping the NOL's, doing the full

| 1 | sales factor on apportioning, the CNI, lowering |
|----|---|
| 2 | the CNI, all of those, I understand, are things |
| 3 | that the business community wants. I'm an |
| 4 | economist by training, so I understand that we |
| 5 | have these wants and you've got to match that |
| 6 | against the ability to pay. And as Representative |
| 7 | Frankel spoke a little bit earlier, given what's |
| 8 | going on nationally with the economy and with |
| 9 | states surrounding Pennsylvania, we're looking |
| 10 | at a pretty tight fiscal situation. We got to be |
| 11 | really careful what we do in terms of tax code |
| 12 | changes. |

I think even within that bleak picture, that bleak economic picture that we're looking at, I still think we can make an argument that investment and research and development is really important, okay. I think it's the most important thing.

I hear about work force development, too, but I think this is really key to our competitiveness, which is really in the long-run is what we need to stay focused on. But we have all these wants, but the realty is in this fiscal year we're not going to be able to do everything. So, it boils down to making choices.

| L | And | that's | what | we | elect | public | officials | to | do | is |
|---|------|---------|-------|------|-------|--------|-----------|----|----|----|
| 2 | to i | make th | ose o | choi | ces. | | | | | |

I'd like to see some movement on these other business tax issues as well, but I just can't pass the opportunity when I have four important business people in front of me to talk about two ways that we could do that. Notwithstanding, we don't have a whole lot of budget surplus to be able to fund tax cuts. There's still two other ways to do it.

One of them is called adopting a way of making all corporations pay their fair share.

It's called unitary combined reporting. A couple dozen, almost a couple dozen other states have done this. This requires companies and all the subsidiaries to report all their revenue on a unitary basis and then apportion that fairly and accurately, okay, amongst all the different divisions and subsidiaries.

If we -- and the Governor had a tax reform commission about four or five years ago that looked at our business tax structure and said we want to do all these things. We want to uncap NOL's, we want to do single sales factor, we want to drive CNI down to 7.5, taken us from the

| 1 | highest or second highest to the mid range. And |
|---|---|
| 2 | we want to aggressively ramp up R&D investment. |
| 3 | We could do all that, okay, if we adopted unitary |
| 4 | combined reporting. |

It would generate -- the state would collect about 483 million more revenue from the business community, but we would use all that money to lower all these taxes, okay. And different companies feel different ways about it because some companies who aren't paying 9.9, okay, would say I'm not paying it anyhow, so don't give me combined reporting.

But I think for a lot of small, medium sized businesses, okay, who can't employ a whole battery of tax accountants and tax lawyers or pay a bunch of outside legal and accounting expertise to help you take advantage of creating a pick in Delaware and transferring your intangible assets, you can't play that whole game. Chances are you're probably paying more than your fair share of business taxes, so we could make that change. That's one way, and that involves some tough choices for us and the business community.

There's another way to do it. You want to uncap the NOL's this year? It's \$180 million,

| 1 | roughly. Can I cut \$180 million out of work force |
|----|--|
| 2 | development and work force training? We can cut |
| 3 | taxes and we can cut spending to match, too. |
| 4 | REPRESENTATIVE DARYL METCALFE: Hear, hear. |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: Okay. That's |
| 6 | another choice. But those are tough choices. And |
| 7 | from what I'm hearing yesterday, today and a couple of |
| 8 | weeks ago in Philadelphia and the suburbs, work force |
| 9 | development is really crucial to our competitiveness |
| 10 | as well. R&D is, okay, but our investment in our work |
| 11 | force development program is really crucial as well. |
| 12 | But that's another tough choice. |
| 13 | So that's the context in which those of |
| 14 | us that are elected have got to make these tough |
| 15 | choices. We want to do everything, but the |
| 16 | economic reality is we live in a fiscal world of |
| 17 | finite limits. |
| 18 | So that's where this discussion on R&D is |
| 19 | going to take place in that larger context of |
| 20 | everything else that we have to try to do in |
| 21 | Harrisburg, okay. |
| 22 | Anyhow, Brian, thank you, again, for not |

really good diversified panel of business people to tell us about how this works. And

23

only hosting this, but putting together, Brian, a

| 1 | let's continue to work together with the business |
|----|---|
| 2 | community, Democrats and Republicans to try to |
| 3 | make this happen this year. |
| 4 | REPRESENTATIVE DARYL METCALFE: Republican. |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: I said |
| 6 | Democrats and Republican. |
| 7 | REPRESENTATIVE DARYL METCALFE: You said |
| 8 | Republicans. I'm just one today. |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE DAVID KEVDANSKY: You and your |
| 10 | colleagues, Daryl, okay? Thank you much. |
| 11 | (THEREUPON, proceedings concluded at 11:54 |
| 12 | a.m.) |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

| 1 | COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | I hereby certify that I, Donna M. |
| 4 | McMullen, RMR, Notary Public, reported in |
| 5 | stenotype the record of proceedings in the |
| 6 | above-entitled matter, and that this copy is a |
| 7 | full, true, and accurate transcript of my said |
| 8 | stenotype notes. |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | · |
| 14 | Court Reporter, RMR |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |