COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE HEARING

STATE CAPITOL HARRISBURG, PA

MAIN CAPITOL BUILDING ROOM 140

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2014 10:01 A.M.

BUDGET HEARING INDEPENDENT FISCAL OFFICE

BEFORE:

HONORABLE WILLIAM ADOLPH, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE RYAN AUMENT

HONORABLE KAREN BOBACK

HONORABLE JIM CHRISTIANA

HONORABLE GARY DAY

HONORABLE BRIAN ELLIS

HONORABLE GARTH EVERETT

HONORABLE GLEN GRELL

HONORABLE SETH GROVE

HONORABLE ADAM HARRIS

HONORABLE TOM KILLION

HONORABLE DAVID MILLARD

HONORABLE MARK MUSTIO

HONORABLE DONNA OBERLANDER

HONORABLE BERNIE O'NEILL

HONORABLE MIKE PEIFER

HONORABLE SCOTT PETRI

HONORABLE JEFFREY PYLE

HONORABLE CURT SONNEY

HONORABLE JOSEPH MARKOSEK, DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE MATTHEW BRADFORD

HONORABLE MICHELLE BROWNLEE

HONORABLE MIKE CARROLL

HONORABLE SCOTT CONKLIN

BEFORE (cont'd):

HONORABLE MADELEINE DEAN

HONORABLE DEB KULA

HONORABLE TIM MAHONEY

HONORABLE MICHAEL O'BRIEN

HONORABLE CHERELLE PARKER

HONORABLE JOHN SABATINA

HONORABLE STEVEN SANTARSIERO

HONORABLE JAKE WHEATLEY

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

HONORABLE KERRY BENNINGHOFF

HONORABLE GEORGE DUNBAR

HONORABLE MARGUERITE QUINN

HONORABLE MAUREE GINGRICH

HONORABLE JOE HACKETT

HONORABLE STEVE MENTZER

HONORABLE MARK GILLEN

HONORABLE TIM HENNESSEY

HONORABLE VANESSA LOWERY BROWN

HONORABLE STEVE SAMUELSON

HONORABLE PAM DELISSIO

HONORABLE EDDIE PASHINSKI

HONORABLE PHYLLIS MUNDY

* * * * *

COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:

DAVID DONLEY

MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RITCHIE LAFAVER

MAJORITY DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DAN CLARK

MAJORITY CHIEF COUNSEL

MIRIAM FOX

DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

BERYL KUHR

DEMOCRATIC CHIEF COUNSEL

INDEX

TESTIFIERS	
* * *	
NAME	PAGE
MATTHEW KNITTEL DIRECTOR, INDEPENDENT FISCAL OFFICE	12
SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY	
* * *	
(See submitted written testimony and handouts	online.)

PROCEEDINGS

2 * * *

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Good morning,
everyone. I'd like to call to order House Appropriations
Budget Hearings for the fiscal year 2014/15. I want to
welcome everyone. Hard to believe that another year has
gone by. I'm looking forward to the testimony over the
next several weeks.

I just want to remind everyone, both the

Committee Members and testifiers and their staff and the

public that are present, if you could turn off your

iPhones, iPads, cell phones, whatever other electronic

devices that you may have. It would certainly help us go

on with the hearings.

We are going to just take a couple minutes right now to introduce ourselves, give the Members an opportunity for the viewers on PCN to know where the Members are from.

And my name is Bill Adolph. I'm the Republican Chair of the Appropriations Committee. My district is the 165th District in Delaware County.

Chairman Markosek.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Chairman.

And welcome, everybody. I am State Representative Joe

Markosek, 25th Legislative District. I live in Allegheny

County and represent parts of Allegheny County and

1 Westmoreland County. To my immediate right is our fine Democratic Executive Director of the House Appropriations 2 3 Committee, Miriam Fox. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. If we can 4 5 start with the Vice Chair of the Republican Committee. 6 REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Yes, thank you, 7 Mr. Chairman. Scott Petri from Bucks County, 178th District. 8 REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Good morning. Glen Grell, 9 10 a Representative from Cumberland County, 87th District. 11 REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Good morning. David 12 Millard, Columbia County. 13 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Seth Grove, York County, 14 196th District. 15 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Curt Sonney, 4th 16 District, Derry County. 17 REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Good morning. Jeff Pyle, 60th District, Armstrong, Indiana, and soon to be Butler 18 19 Counties. 20 REPRESENTATIVE KILLION: Tom Killion, 168th 21 District, parts of Delaware and Chester Counties. 22 REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS: Adam Harris, 82nd 23 District, Juniata, Mifflin, Snyder. 24 REPRESENTATIVE EVERETT: Garth Everett, 84th,

25

Lycoming County.

1	REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Good morning. Mark
2	Mustio, Allegheny County, communities surrounding the
3	airport, and Sewickley.
4	REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Brian Ellis, Butler
5	County, 11th District.
6	REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Good morning. Jim
7	Christiana of Beaver County.
8	REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: Representative Donna
9	Oberlander, Clarion and parts of Armstrong County.
10	REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Karen Boback, House
11	District 117, parts of Luzerne, Wyoming, and Columbia
12	Counties.
13	REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Good morning. Madeleine
14	Dean, the 153rd in Montgomery County, Abington and Upper
15	Dublin Townships.
16	REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Good morning. I'm
17	Steve Santarsiero. I represent the 31st District in Bucks
18	County.
19	REPRESENTATIVE BROWNLEE: Good morning. Michelle
20	Brownlee, Philadelphia County, 195th Legislative District.
21	REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Good morning. I'm Scott
22	Conklin, 77th District, Centre County.
23	REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: Good morning. I'm Tim
24	Mahoney of Fayette County 51st District.
25	REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Good morning.

Representative Deb Kula from Fayette and Westmoreland
Counties, 52nd District.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Good morning. Mike
Carroll, Luzerne and Monroe Counties.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Good morning. Mike O'Brien, 175th District, Philadelphia.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Good morning. Jake Wheatley, 19th Legislative District, Allegheny County, City of Pittsburgh.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Cherelle Parker, Philadelphia County, 200th Legislative District.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Thank you. As you all know, last week, the Governor presented his \$29.4 billion budget proposal. These hearings are the next stage of our State's budget process as we bring in each State Government agency to better understand the budget proposal and peel back the many layers of the overall spending plan.

These hearings serve two purposes. First, they will help the elected Members of the General Assembly better understand the Governor's proposal and allow us to appreciate how it will impact all of our districts and the individuals we represent. With that better understanding, we will then have a better idea if there are any changes we will need to make to better meet the needs of the constituents we represent.

The second purpose these hearings serve is that they will allow the residents of Pennsylvania to gain greater insight to the proposed State budget and appreciate all the details and the technical points behind the \$29.4 billion spending proposal. I appreciate the live coverage that we get from PCN.

I also wanted to let the viewers know that this year we've provided a new opportunity for you to participate in these hearings. This year, Pennsylvania residents were able to submit questions about the State budget to my office, to the House Republican Appropriations website. This tool will be available throughout the hearings, and I would encourage residents to visit the website to see the full schedule of hearings and submit questions. Today, we have about 100 questions and we will be asking those questions periodically during the hearings.

As we dig into the details of this budget, we need to appreciate the context of the budget as it was constructed. This year's budget planning for the fiscal year '14/'15 will unfold with a unique set of challenges. Even before last week when the Governor presented his budget, we had a substantial list of problems we needed to consider. These problems included a significant increase in required payments to our two State pension systems, the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, and the \$220

million in additional mandates State spending obligations to comply with the Federal mandates. One that we're all familiar with is the \$325 million less in FMAP reimbursements.

These issues alone could nearly consume all the revenue growth and force more than \$1 billion increase in State spending if we continued the same level of services. That spending increase would not include the normal inflation and contractual required spending growth across the State Government. Needless to say, the challenges are significant.

I hope that the Members of this Committee will use these hearings for a genuine and sincere opportunity to better understand this budget so that we can create a solid roadmap. I hope that we can reserve judgment on the initial proposal until we get a complete understanding of this proposal. The strategies contained in this proposal are one approach to constituting a budget. Before anyone dismisses this budget, we should appreciate one important factor, that there are no tax increases on the residents of Pennsylvania, which is very important and something that I know many of my constituents appreciate. I think that we need to keep that in mind as we review this plan. We should be cautious and understand that if there is an outright dismissal of the strategies contained in this

budget, there are only a few other alternatives to think about.

With that, I look forward to working with the Members of this Committee to enact the fourth on-time budget with no tax increases and a responsible but also a very sustainable budget.

With that, I'm looking forward to my good friend Chairman Markosek's comments.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you very much, Chairman.

And I echo the Chairman's sentiments that this is of course the beginning of a three-week period where we I believe he used the term unpeel the budget and really get into the nitty-gritty.

And I want to just say that we do look forward to working with Chairman Adolf and his Committee and his Members, his staff as well, and I might just say something to the folks watching today, that we actually do respect each other and get along. People might not think that's true. We disagree on a lot of things and we quibble about a lot of things, but at the end of the day, we have a great respect for one another here, both Democrats and Republicans, and I'm sure most elected officials feel that way.

Since the Chairman mentioned the online

1 questioning, I would mention that the Democrats have a 2 website as well, HACD.net. That's House Appropriations 3 Committee Democrat.net, which folks can go online and more 4 than just ask questions, they can take a look at our 5 talking points and all of our various information that we 6 have on many, many different facets of the budget. So I 7 look forward to getting things started. And, Chairman, with your permission, I'll just 8 9 ask the first question to get things started. 10 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Yes, we will. 11 For the viewers' information, our first testifier today is 12 Matthew Knittel. Mr. Knittel is the Director of the 13 Independent Fiscal Office. And good morning and welcome. 14 Before the Chairman asks the first question, 15 would you like an opening statement? 16 MR. KNITTEL: Yes. If I could do so, that'd be 17 nice. 18 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. All right. 19 Thank you very much. 20 MR. KNITTEL: Well, good morning, and thank you, 21 Chairman Adolph, Chairman Markosek, and Members of the 2.2 Committee. I thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. 23 The Independent Fiscal Office or the IFO provided 24

some background materials to the Committee regarding the

25

office, the economy, and major General Fund revenue sources. I will not review that material in the limited time for opening remarks. Rather, I would like to summarize the IFO's economic and revenue outlook for the current and next fiscal year.

A core function of the IFO is the provision of revenue estimates for consideration by the General Assembly. Our next formal release will be on May 1st when our preliminary revenue estimate will be completed. By June 15th, the Office will release its official or final estimate for FY '14/'15. Although the Office will not provide a formal estimate until May 1st, I would like to take this opportunity to outline our current thinking about the revenue outlook and the state of the economy.

Turning to the revenue outlook for the current fiscal year, the IFO recently released a midyear update of its revenue estimate for the current fiscal year and concluded that a \$150 million reduction was warranted to the revenue estimate. For comparison, our revised estimate is roughly \$112 million below that certified by the Governor, and that figure did not change in the recent Executive Budget. The IFO's reduction was based on two factors. First, at the midpoint of the fiscal year, the growth rates for the General Fund and its major revenue sources were below our expectations. Second, for the

remainder of the fiscal year, it is unlikely that the growth will reach the levels necessary to meet the IFO's original estimate.

Although we have reduced our estimate, it still relies on stronger growth in the second half of the fiscal year. Factors that likely had a negative impact on economic growth in tax revenues in 2013 such as the expiration of the Federal payroll tax cut and the Federal budget sequester should largely be absorbed at this point. However, recent wage growth and consumer spending do not appear to be strong enough to meet our original estimate.

For the first half of the fiscal year, General Fund revenues only grew by 0.5 percent. The projected second-half growth rate necessary to meet our revised estimate is 1.8 percent for a total growth of the fiscal year of 1.2 percent. The projected January through June growth rates for major General Fund revenue sources are follows: For corporate net income, 1.7 percent versus 1.3 percent in the first half; for sales and use taxes, 3.9 percent versus 2.3 percent in the first half; and for personal income tax withholding, 3.6 percent versus 2.2 percent in the first half. So these differentials underscore the fact that our reduced revenue estimates still require a higher level of economic activity in the second half of the fiscal year compared to the first.

Unlike last year, we do not expect strong growth in the final payment for personal income taxes this April. April 2013 revenues were artificially inflated because taxpayers accelerated the receipt or recognition of certain income at the end of 2012 to avoid Federal tax increases that took effect in 2013. When we remove this behavioral effect, we expect annual personal income tax payments in the spring of 2014 to return to a more normal pattern or more normal level. Therefore, our estimate anticipates a three percent reduction in the April and annual payment.

Turning to the outlook for 2014, the economic outlook, the economic data released at the end of 2013 suggests that conditions are favorable to facilitate stronger growth in the U.S. economy in 2014. Businesses have cash balances available to spend for hiring.

Households are in better financial shape as they continue to pay down debt, especially credit card debt and mortgage debt. There have been gains in the stock market. There have been gains in the stock market that may bolster consumer confidence and give rise to a wealth effect that would facilitate more consumer spending. However, recent revenue data suggests that these conditions have not yet translated into higher spending levels.

We believe that the key to tax revenue growth in 2014 will be the labor market. Wages are highly correlated

with overall economic growth, personal income, and sales and use tax revenues. An increase in consumer spending is not sustainable without growth in wages. For 2013, wage growth was very modest due to low inflation and significant slack in the labor market, which reduces worker leverage. In order for workers to realize wage gains, the slack must be removed from the labor market. Hiring must increase for an extended period of time before that can occur.

For 2014, the IFO projects Pennsylvania wage growth of 3.6 percent compared to 2.6 percent for 2013.

That growth rate can be decomposed into two parts: One percent growth due to new jobs. We anticipate 57,000 new jobs for 2014; the second part, 2.6 percent for wage inflation or pay raises to current workers, for a sum of 3.6 percent. And improvement in the labor market would support stronger sales and use tax and employer withholding collections.

Turning to the outlook for FY '14 for revenues, stable Federal tax policy and the resolution of Federal budget issues remove some of the sources of uncertainty that have affected the economic and revenue outlooks for recent years. The IFO's preliminary outlook for FY '14/'15 General Fund revenues indicates a growth rate of roughly 3.0 percent over the current year. That base growth rate does not include any additional revenues that might be

received due to the expansion of small games of chance to bars, restaurants, and taverns; proposed legislative changes to reduce the holding period for unclaimed property or to transfer monies from the Oil and Gas Lease Fund; and new revenues due to slots or table game fees from new casino openings. If we include small games of chance in our revenue estimate, then our projected growth rate would then increased to roughly 3.3 percent for next fiscal year.

Thank you very much and I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, Mr. Knittel.

Chairman Markosek.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Yes, thank you, Chairman.

Good morning. And just maybe reiterate because you covered some of this stuff that I had in mind to ask. The Governor's budget for next year, and let me just run down some of these things, assumes that we will end the current fiscal year on target as far as revenue growth. At the midway point you estimated that the State would end the fiscal year \$112 million below the estimate. Now, you had mentioned that obviously there are some things that may or may not happen as we move forward that we can't predict, and understanding that the two largest collection months

are coming up, March and April I believe---

MR. KNITTEL: Right.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: ---if I'm not mistaken, does your forecast indicate that we will end the year below the estimate?

MR. KNITTEL: We believe that it's more likely than not that we will end up below the official revenue estimate. However, as you noted, we still have a few large months ahead of us, March and April. Our take on the very important final payment in April is that it will be relatively weak due to that behavioral effect, the higher capital gains tax rates, things where individuals pulled monies forward. So I know that's a bit of a difference between us and the Administration regarding that April final payment.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. I think you had indicated roughly about a percentage difference. The budget for the next fiscal year is based on more than a four percent growth where you had predicted about three percent. And when we're talking about a \$29 billion General Fund budget, one percent can be a fairly big number and create a lot of problems for us, for the Commonwealth, relative to our putting a budget together. And I guess just really the bottom line is do your forecasts still indicate that the three percent is even realistic?

MR. KNITTEL: Currently, between us and the Administration, if you remove some of these items such as the proposals for unclaimed property, the transfer from the Oil and Gas Lease Fund, and the new slots and table games fees, the \$75 million, the growth rate in the Executive Budget is roughly 3.9 percent. That would compare to a growth rate for the IFO of roughly 3.3 percent, so about a 0.6 percent differential. That would translate into roughly \$375 million between the two fiscal years. And I would attribute that to a more optimistic economic outlook on the part of the Administration, that they think the labor market will improve a bit more and in particular withholding tax revenues will be stronger.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. But you also indicated there that they're using some one-time budget gap fillers, so to speak, to make up that difference, that one percent difference.

MR. KNITTEL: There are some items that would not be repeated in future years, yes.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KNITTEL: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you very much.

Mr. Knittel, on your projection that you do not

2.2

March or April of 2013, and you state that because the taxpayers paid a larger fourth-quarter estimate than they did the year before and you don't see that coming because there was fear of a capital gains tax at the Federal level. Now, the PIT in Pennsylvania, whether it's capital gains or wages, there has been no change in the rate of tax. And the stock market in 2013 did quite well, and if those folks that dabble in the stock market did well and they paid what is considered the safe harbor estimated tax payments, meaning that they paid what they owed the year before, isn't it possible that they still may owe some substantial tax with Pennsylvania in March or April?

MR. KNITTEL: That is possible. As you note, the S&P 500, I believe, was up 25 percent on the year-over-year basis, so very strong growth. One item that is of concern is that the quarterly payment in January was very weak, and that's usually a precursor to the final payment that we'll receive in April.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Right. Yes. I think it also has to do with the safe harbor payment more than anything else, and only time will tell. That's for sure. I'm optimistic that hopefully the Pennsylvania residents did very well in the stock market and we'll see the tax in March or April.

I was very interested in your November 2013

forecast regarding the demographics of Pennsylvania, and it really is pretty shocking if people take a look at that.

The under-19 population in Pennsylvania will decline by 1.8 percent. The working-age population, age 20 to 64, will see no growth. And the 65-and-older population in Pennsylvania will increase by 29.2 percent. That's pretty staggering. I guess my first question to you is that are people retiring at age 65 in 2013/14 like they did 10 years ago?

MR. KNITTEL: The data that we are seeing -- and I would defer to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. They publish labor force participation rate. It actually suggests that the older individuals, more of them are working and they may still be making up losses in the stock market or pension funds for prior years, but that participation rate is actually increasing.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. What we're seeing in an our budget and what we're seeing nationwide in many State budgets, and I can take a look at my own family, that the aging population you see about 90 percent of all your healthcare come in your last two years. And people are living longer now and obviously those folks that are retired do not pay taxes on their pensions or their Social Security in the State of Pennsylvania, but a lot of times

the health costs that we're experiencing and we're going to see it when the Department of Welfare Secretary appears to us. But it is staggering that the population of 65 and over is almost increasing at 30 percent and everything else is stagnant. So I think it does affect our revenues.

MR. KNITTEL: Oh, absolutely. It will restrain them moving forward.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Thank you very much.

The next question will be by Representative Parker.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and welcome, Director Knittel.

I guess I want to pick up where we left off last year during our hearings as it relates to the issue of student loan debt. Last year, I had asked about trends in student loan debt and sort of where Pennsylvania fell compared to the other States. You gave us a shocking answer. Well, at least it was shocking to me, and that was that Pennsylvania ranked second in the Nation in our Pennsylvania graduates having the highest average loan debt. And last year, the number you gave us was \$29,959. Now, some of our State-related institutions, Temple University, Lincoln University, personally familiar with those, they rolled out some incentives to encourage

graduation in four years to reduce student loan debt. Tell me, how are we faring now?

MR. KNITTEL: To my knowledge things haven't largely changed that much since last year. I would need to confirm that. Pennsylvania is still in the top of student loan debt whether you measure it in terms of per capita basis or in terms of income. We rank somewhere between second and seventh generally. There are a few surveys out there. So over the past year since we last talked, that largely has not changed. What we're finding in Pennsylvania and much like the rest of the U.S. is mortgage debt, credit card debt continues to decline. They're paying that up. The one type of debt that continues to increase is student loan debt.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Okay. Thank you. And,
Director Knittel, if in fact any new and/or current data is
found, can you please forward that to Chairmen Adolph and
Markosek?

My second question I want to go back to the demographic issue that Chairman Adolph mentioned earlier. In you're five-year economic outlook you note that we could see a slower growth in the PIT along with the sales and use taxes due to the demographic shifts, little or no growth in the working population and increase in the senior population. Well, given that the PIT and SUT are two of

our Commonwealth's three major revenue sources, would you be of the opinion that we should start exploring other sources of revenue not based on wages and/or consumer spending? And is that something that we've looked at comparing to what other States are doing in that area? I was looking at the data. I think about 41 percent of our revenue comes from the personal income tax and about 31 percent of revenue comes from the sales and use tax.

MR. KNITTEL: Yes, that's correct. Going forward, the demographics do suggest that the revenue growth will be restrained. In particular, the lack of growth in the labor force, it will be stagnant over the next decade, so less job creation, lower wage growth. As well, elderly residents have different spending patterns. They tend to spend on nontaxable items such as healthcare and prescription drugs, less on taxable items, new cars, furniture, things of that nature. So we do expect restrained revenue growth from these broad demographic trends. They will place pressures on the budget. We have identified a structural deficit under current law going forward. Really the only way to relieve a structural deficit is either to raise more revenues or cut spending.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Director. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. I'd just

2.2

like to acknowledge the presence of Representative Peifer and also Representative George Dunbar.

The next question will be by Representative Scott Petri.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for being here again this year.

I have a two-part question. The first, you mentioned in your testimony uncertainties, and I've read and I'm sure many of the Members have read articles about how corporations have more cash than any point in time in recent history, that things are about to move and explode but yet we're lagging and lagging, both State and Federally. So I'm wondering have you seen any reliable information or surveys about this business uncertainty, and if so, is it Pennsylvania only? Is it something that we as a Legislature have done, aren't doing, or is it more national? And if so, can you tie it to any policies of the Federal Government or uncertainties in that -- so that's part one.

Part two is if you have any information on what you anticipate the PA TABOR rates to be for one-, two-, and three-year increases, understanding that our joint responsibility is to pass a budget that is not only on time and balanced, but reflects where we think we're going in one to two years? So your comments on that would be

helpful. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KNITTEL: Sure. Sure. I agree with your note on the business cash holdings liquid investments.

They do have a very large holding, more than at any other time previously, and the Federal Reserve tracks those amounts. So they do have a large amount of liquid holdings that are available to be spent for hiring for investment purposes.

What we think is happening, and as you had noted, the economy continues to underperform below expectations both for Pennsylvania and for the U.S. We keep expecting jobs growth and we don't get that. One of the reasons we think that's happening is we've talked about deleveraging or paying down debt. We thought that would reach a bottom and people would stop paying down the debt and therefore would have more money to spend. The most recent data don't support that. It shows that they continue to pay down their debt. They are continuing to pay down credit cards, mortgage debt. The only debt that is rising is student loan debt. So they're still in that leveraging process and that's restraining the spending, and businesses are seeing that, and they are not investing. So they're kind of in a holding pattern.

I would also agree that there is uncertainty at the Federal level. We always have the debate over debt

ceilings. Some of it has been removed from the tax policy, so it's always good to remove that uncertainty from a business perspective. We think that, going forward, things will improve, the consumer spending will pick up, the deleveraging will stop, some of the uncertainty will be They're working on the Federal budget sequester right now trying to come to a bipartisan agreement, so that's a good sign.

Regarding the TABOR rates, I'm not sure what average inflation rate one would use, what years that would be based on. The inflation rates that we're seeing recently are on the order of 1.5 percent. The demographic growth, you can see in our report, average demographic growth of about 0.4 percent, so depending on the average one uses, the years you use, that rate might range from 1.7 to 2.2, somewhere in that ballpark.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. I'd also like to acknowledge the presence of Representative Pam DeLissio.

The next question will be by Representative Santarsiero.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Knittel, welcome back.

MR. KNITTEL: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: I'd like to focus

this morning on job and economic growth in Pennsylvania. I noticed in your testimony you talked about in addition to 57,000 jobs in Pennsylvania in 2013, can you give us a sense of how that job growth broke out in terms of private versus public sector and then within the private sector, what sectors of the economy we saw those numbers being added?

MR. KNITTEL: Sure. Most of the great majority of it would be in the private sector, and two sectors stand out much like they've done over the past three or four years. That would be healthcare and professional business services. They're clearly the ones that are adding the jobs, the great majority of the jobs. The public sector jobs I believe are largely flat both at the Federal and State levels.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. And when you talk about professional business services, what is that?

Can you give us a little bit more specifics of what that means?

MR. KNITTEL: Sure, a catchall, engineering, architecture, accountants, lawyers.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. And healthcare, what is that range?

MR. KNITTEL: Any home care, hospitals, doctors, dentists.

1 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. Okay. Within that grouping, any greater emphasis, say, on home care 2 3 versus, say, doctors or do you have that breakdown? MR. KNITTEL: That I'd have to check on. I'm not 4 5 familiar with the granular detail. 6 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. If you could, 7 if you could get that back to us at some point, that would be helpful. 8 9 MR. KNITTEL: Sure. 10 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: The 57,000 number, 11 how does that compare -- well, let me ask on a percentage What is that? What kind of growth is that? 12 basis. 13 MR. KNITTEL: That's one percent growth---14 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: One percent. 15 MR. KNITTEL: ---in jobs. 16 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. And how does 17 that compare to the national growth rate in jobs? MR. KNITTEL: That would be somewhat lower than 18 19 the national growth rate. Relative to the prerecession 20 high, both the U.S. and Pennsylvania right now through the 21 fourth quarter of 2013, they have both shed about one 2.2 percent of their jobs. 23 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okav. 24 MR. KNITTEL: So Pennsylvania is still short about 50,000 jobs from the prerecession high. 25

1 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: MR. KNITTEL: The U.S. is short about 1.2 2 3 million. 4 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Right. 5 MR. KNITTEL: The recession in Pennsylvania was 6 not as severe and so we're not getting the uptick that the 7 U.S. is getting. REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Right. So I quess 8 9 that's why my next question is really comparing apples to 10 apples. Where are we in terms of that growth, just 11 focusing on the growth rate in 2013 versus nationwide? 12 MR. KNITTEL: The growth rate in Pennsylvania, it 13 was slightly under that in 2013 compared to the nationwide 14 growth rate. 15 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Where are we with 16 respect to our neighboring States, New Jersey, New York? 17 MR. KNITTEL: That I'd have to check on. I'm not 18 sure. 19 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: If you could, yes. 20 And just if you could include the Northeast as a snapshot 21 on that, that would be helpful as well. 22 Turning to economic growth, and I think the phrase we use at the State level is gross state product, 23 where are we with economic growth in 2013? 24 25 MR. KNITTEL: I believe we were at 1.2 or 1.3

percent. It's in the packet here. I'd have to check on that.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. And I just don't recall the number for gross domestic product in 2013. Do we know where that was? Do you know that offhand?

MR. KNITTEL: That was also in the low one or mid-one range. I'd have to check on that as well.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. And I guess
I'd have the same question, if you could follow up, in
terms of comparing gross state product between Pennsylvania
and the other States in the Northeast. That would be
helpful as well.

Last question I have has to do with the point that Chairman Adolph raised earlier about our senior population, and you talked about the increase in growth in the senior population. Certainly, one of the reasons for that would be the demographic trends in terms of birth rate over the last 60, 70 years and where we are today. Are there other factors that you're aware of that contribute to such a significant increase in the senior population in Pennsylvania?

MR. KNITTEL: No, not that I'm aware of, and we do have the Baby Boom generation that's a large population wave that's entering retirement, so that's really the driving factor.

1 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. Do you have, in comparing the other States, would you be able to provide 2 3 us with the demographic breakdown of the projected growth rates of those other States as well? 5 MR. KNITTEL: Sure. I can say based on the 6 latest data, Pennsylvania is the fourth-oldest State in the 7 Nation following Florida, Maine, and West Virginia. REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Yes, and I think 8 9 most of us are probably aware of that distinction and it's 10 trying to get our arms around why that is that I ask those 11 questions. 12 MR. KNITTEL: Sure. REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. Thank you 13 14 very much. 15 MR. KNITTEL: Absolutely. 16 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 17 Representative Donna Oberlander. 18 REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: Thank you, Chairman. 19 Thank you, Director, for being here. 20 You stated in your testimony that stable Federal 21 tax policy and resolution of Federal budget issues will 2.2 make this less uncertain, but I want to bring it back to 23 last year when the Federal Government removed the payroll

tax cut and immediately in January there was a two percent

increase to everyone's taxes. Do you see anything like

24

25

that on the horizon, and if so, can you talk about what might happen in terms of impact on revenue collections for the Commonwealth?

MR. KNITTEL: Sure. As you noted, in January 1st of last year, the two percent payroll tax cut expired and raised the Social Security tax for wage earners. Going forward, I'm not aware of any similar type of scheduled tax increase, but of course that would be dependent on what Congress will do.

REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: Thank you. It certainly did have a big impact on our 2013 sales tax for the first quarter, and hopefully, we won't see anything like that again.

Thank you.

2.2

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Jake Wheatley.

17 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Good morning again, Director.

I want to follow up on the line of questioning that my colleague before me kind of started. And today there was a report that came out that talks about the recovery after six years of this economic recession that we had, and they talk about the fact that -- and actually to get it right I want to read the line and then I want to get your feedback on it as it relates to Pennsylvania. It

says, "this fragile recovery after six years of severe economic shock results from policies that choose fiscal austerity over job creation and investment and growth, a choice made again" -- it goes on to talk about the choices of Federal Government.

But I want to talk about it as it relates to us because one of the things that stuck out to me in your presentation you talked about in order for us to really start to maximize and grow our economy, we have to invest in the wages, a sustained, continual investment and growth of wages that will impact our economy the best. So one, respond to that statement around the choices of austerity and its implications to our economy from policy positions, because we're policymakers so these choices have real ramifications. So I would like to get your feedback on that first.

MR. KNITTEL: It is, as you noted, a policy choice, so I cannot comment on whether it's appropriate or inappropriate to have fiscal austerity, to restrain spending growth. I can say that generally more spending would generally increase economic output. I would also note that, as I noted in my testimony, the wage growth is really the underpinning of the Pennsylvania economy. In order to get the revenues to come in, we do need additional wage growth to drive the personal income tax collections

and to drive the sales and use tax collections. And that currently has not picked up as we had hoped.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: So, again, I'm a policymaker so I understand what you're saying and I don't want to put you in the cross arrows of anyone. You're independent. You're supposed to be very balanced. Do you have suggestions for us looking around at other States? Again, I read some things that talked about other States having surpluses and having the choice now of if they're going to give their citizens some tax return break or they're going to invest more in their economics. We on the other hand have a deficit. So can you suggest to us how, from a policy perspective, we might have gotten here and what we can learn from getting here, going forward doing something differently?

MR. KNITTEL: I cannot make policy recommendations or suggestions. I can say in order to enhance economic growth, there are several important factors. Certainly the tax structure is an important factor. Educated workforce is an important factor for businesses, where they choose to locate; infrastructure, another important factor. So these are things that businesses are looking towards and they consider in their location decisions. And again we need the additional hiring growth in Pennsylvania, much like any other State,

to get the economy growing.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to end with this. I want to make sure I have it right, what you said, the investment in educated workforce, the investment in infrastructure, and the tax structure makes a difference in how business in our economy can respond positively and grow?

MR. KNITTEL: I think those three items are all important in the business decision on where they locate and what they choose to do going forward regarding hiring.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Grell.

REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Director Knittel, and thanks for your excellent testimony and the work of yourself and your office. I think your work is very, very helpful to us throughout this process.

I just wanted to ask to what extent your office analyzes or follows the Commonwealth's bond ratings, and if so, can you give us any thoughts on the direction of those bond ratings or the risk factors associated with those bond ratings and whether we're seeing positive or negative movement in the factors that were included in some of the

1 | bond reports from last summer?

MR. KNITTEL: We do not track them closely and haven't been asked to do any analysis on them. I know recently in the fall there was a minor downgrade, I believe. I forget which rating agency, but we have not followed that issue closely.

REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Dean.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Director Knittel. Nice to see you again.

MR. KNITTEL: Thank you.

about appropriations, I want to say to you also thank you for your work and the work of your office. And I noted I think that the Governor is suggesting an appropriation for your office that continues what it was last year, \$1.675 million I believe. Is that sufficient? What are your needs? How are things going?

MR. KNITTEL: Yes, I would characterize it as sufficient for our needs. We currently have nine staff. We hope to hire one or two more staff going forward and that \$1.675 million should be sufficient once we get fully staffed.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Terrific. And now to your

testimony, you said that the revenues, your projection is

\$112 million less for this fiscal year than what was

projected before. What drives that number? What informs

that number?

MR. KNITTEL: Well, there are two items that mainly inform it. One is the revenues we've seen through January. They clearly have fallen below our expectations. I know they're running roughly \$40 million below the Administration's expectations. So there's that element. The second element is economic growth has just been revised down for the second half of the fiscal year. So those two items combined led us to reduce our estimate by \$150 million.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: And if you break it into the revenue portion of that, the reduction, what are some of the shortfalls, in what areas?

MR. KNITTEL: There are two items that clearly stand out, sales and use tax very much weaker than we had expected, also personal income tax withholding, much weaker, not as weak but weaker than we had expected.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Okay. And on the jobs issue, you projected a 57,000 job gain this year. What did we gain last year?

MR. KNITTEL: The current number, and I stress that it's still preliminary at this point, is 25,000.

1 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Okay. And that's for '13? MR. KNITTEL: That's for '13. 2 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: And for '12? 3 MR. KNITTEL: That number I'd have to check. 4 Ι do not recall what the gain was in '12. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Okay. And in any of them, 7 maybe we'll just choose the 57,000, what percentage of that is public and what is private? 8 9 MR. KNITTEL: Nearly all of it is private. 10 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: All private. 11 MR. KNITTEL: I'd have to check on the exact 12 percentage. 13 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: So no gains, in fact, 14 probably we're shedding jobs still in the public sector? 15 MR. KNITTEL: I think in the overall it's roughly 16 flat but I'd have to confirm that. 17 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Okay. And a final 18 question, in a response to one of the questions you spoke 19 of a structural deficit number. Can you explain what that 20 means and do you have such a number projected? 21 MR. KNITTEL: Yes. So a structural deficit is 22 the deficit that remains after the economy returns to a 23 normal level of output, normal growth rate. So the deficit is not due to economic conditions; it's really due to 24 25 policy choices. In our five-year outlook report that we

put out in November, we did identify a structural deficit.

It was \$840 million for next fiscal year and then it grew

If you look at the underlying detail that's driving that, what you find is that revenues only grow by 2.8 percent but spending grows by 3.9 percent, and nearly all of the additional spending growth is driven by pensions. We found that they were growing by 19 percent on average over the next five years.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Do you mind backing up and doing those numbers again? I'm sorry I missed them.

MR. KNITTEL: Sure.

to about \$2 billion five years after.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: What drives that?

MR. KNITTEL: We have the revenue growth growing by I believe 2.9 percent per annum and the spending growth was at 3.8 percent per annum and the pensions, a little more than 19 percent. If pensions had grown the same as the rest of the budget, the spending, there would be no structural deficit.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: And I think also wouldn't it be true that if revenues had grown, if we didn't have this economic sort of anemia, we also would be overcoming this structural deficit?

MR. KNITTEL: In theory, but in theory that projection is returning the revenue growth to a normal

historical average, so again, it's when the economy is operating at full capacity, at full employment.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Yes, but I think as policymakers up here we also see just the significant tax cuts that have been put in place in the last three or four years, and that to me seems to be driving down revenues, which is making our spending harder and making our growth more anemic, all of these things contributing.

So again, I thank you very much for your fine work and the work of your department.

MR. KNITTEL: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Boback.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Director Knittel.

MR. KNITTEL: Good morning.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Essentially, all of the gross receipts tax collections are received in March, correct?

MR. KNITTEL: That's correct, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: The deregulation of the electric industry has significantly impacted the way this tax is paid and the cash flow of the revenue is received by our Commonwealth. My question to you is are you anticipating any major shortfall or surplus in the tax

collections for the gross receipts tax?

2.2

MR. KNITTEL: Yes. As you noted, due to the deregulation and consumers switching their providers, we did have some unusual patterns in gross receipts tax over the last few years. For this spring we think there'll be less of that and we have relatively flat growth. We think a lot of that has largely played out having to deal with the safe harbor payments and giving these odd patterns to gross receipts, surpluses or shortfalls. So we don't anticipate a major surplus or shortfall.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Carroll.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Director Knittel, thank you so much for being here today.

I'm going to change gears a little bit to a subject that I haven't heard discussed this morning, and that is revenue projections related to gambling, whether it's small games of chance, the lottery, tables and slots. Can you characterize for me what the outlook is going forward for our tax revenues related to gambling in those various categories?

MR. KNITTEL: Sure. Let me start with the lottery. The Office had recently issued a lottery report about two weeks ago where we looked at historical trends

and we looked at challenges going forward. And very recently, the lottery has done quite well. The sales have been very strong I think over the last three years, about 6.5 percent. For the first half of this fiscal year I believe sales are up 5.1 percent year-over-year. Instant ticket sales in particular have been a real standout, very strong growth, more than 9 percent over the last few years.

We talked about in the report that there are some concerns because the demands for the services provided by the lottery funds we think will grow very quickly because they go to elderly residents. We do think there's movement for the lottery to further expand. We refer to that as the penetration rate, so there could be some additional growth there.

However, that will be increasingly harder to attain. The market is getting increasingly saturated with alternatives for gaming. Now, we have small games of chance that will be expanded and Keno as well. So we do anticipate it will get increasingly difficult to generate growth rates both for lottery, Keno, and small games of chance going forward as the market becomes more saturated.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Can I assume table games fall into that same category with respect to growth rates?

MR. KNITTEL: And slots, yes, so that would be

all.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: And you reference the potential expansion to Keno. Does the Keno expansion in any way negatively affect the growth rates for these other categories?

2.2

MR. KNITTEL: I would think there would be some shifting of sales from lottery products or small games of chance over to Keno if it were enacted. How much is unclear but they are clearly substitutes for one another, so I would expect some sales shift.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: It just seems to me that we would be unrealistic if we just assume a level of growth in all of these various categories related to gambling without some expectation that there's going to have to be some limit relative to the amount of money that's available with respect to all of these various programs. Do any of your revenue estimates going forward show any kind of a decline in growth or even a reduction in growth, a decline in revenue, I should say, relative to this universe of gambling options that exist?

MR. KNITTEL: In the short-term, no. And we haven't done long-term projections. We haven't tried to estimate the impact of Keno or even small games of chance at this point, so we have not done so. In the short-term, we do think the lottery sales will continue to be robust.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: And then, finally, the

effect of the expansion of table games and slot machines in neighboring States and their effect on Pennsylvania casinos and therefore our tax revenues that are generated by slots and table games, going forward, do your revenue projections contemplate the effect of other States' expansion of gambling in the world of casinos and their impact on our revenues?

2.2

MR. KNITTEL: We have not built that in, but your point is well taken. Recent casino openings in Ohio and Maryland are competition for the Pennsylvania casinos and would restrain growth.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Not to mention New Jersey's online gaming activity as well?

MR. KNITTEL: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: All right. I'd be interested to know. I'm not sure, I'll have to take a closer look at what the expectation of the Independent Fiscal Office is with respect to these sorts of projections because it seems to me that folks in this building are increasingly relying on revenues from these sorts of programs. And if we are going to use all of these programs as a substitute for tax revenues, we better get a pretty good handle on what the expectations really are because the default position that a lot of folks have around here is let's just do another game and the revenue that'll be

generated, it will solve our problem instead of the usual traditional sources of revenue for programs that are worthy. So, going forward, I think it's important for the Independent Fiscal Office and for all of us to have a keen understanding of what the expected revenues are from these various types of gaming.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Grove.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Thank you, Director Knittel, appreciate it.

In your kind of slideshow handout you have, sales and use tax collections, you did a projection year-to-year growth between New Jersey, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. Out of that list, we're third from the bottom. We're in the positives, has Maryland at -.1 percent, Virginia -2.9 percent. The rest of the States we've seen a major growth ranging from 3.3 percent to 8.6 percent. PA is at 2.3 percent. Have you analyzed why we've seen those States have a huge jump surrounding us comparably to Pennsylvania?

MR. KNITTEL: We have not but I would agree with you. We found it odd that we would be quite different than the surrounding States. Again, we were anticipating some gains here. We have the stock market is up, the housing market, and it does not appear to have translated in

Pennsylvania.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: In one of your notes later you mentioned the fear of that is because, what, 30 to 40 percent of sales tax collections are derived from businesses, from corporations. Are we seeing corporations and businesses spending more money in those States where in Pennsylvania it's holding onto it?

MR. KNITTEL: That's possible, but unfortunately, there are no data that we can point to to confirm that.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. Maybe another aspect is expanded sales tax base. I know Maryland, while its -.1 percent, does have sales tax on clothing versus Pennsylvania. Could that play a role in that as well?

MR. KNITTEL: That could be a likely candidate, the broader sales tax base picking up some additional growth.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right. Have you looked at this in relation to the personal income tax? I know that's a little more difficult as we have a flat rate versus other States who have more progressive rate. Have we seen that in income tax also or is it just unique to sales tax?

MR. KNITTEL: We did not make the comparison for personal income tax. We just did it for sales.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. And one other

1 question, obviously, we are continuing the capital stock 2 franchise tax elimination through this budget. Part of 3 your testimony brought in that. At least within here I saw a line item that it'll be easier to calculate moving 5 forward as it's a shrinking amount. Have we looked at 6 alternative taxes like other States? I know some States 7 employ an alternative minimum tax plus a CNI. Have you done a comparison with other States if that's completely 8 9 phased out, where we are comparable to other States? 10 MR. KNITTEL: In terms of tax burden or tax 11 structure? 12 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Yes. 13 MR. KNITTEL: We have not. We do put out a so-14 called tax burden report every year where we do rank the 15 States by various personal income, corporate income. 16 ranking has been falling slowly but we haven't examined it 17 in a prospective basis going forward. 18 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. Thank you. 19 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 20 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 21 Representative Christiana. 22 REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Thank you, 23 Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Director. 24 I just want to shift gears to a different topic.

Just last week I think the Congressional Budget Office

released a pretty extensive report about the economy, and a significant section of that was dealing with the Affordable Care Act and the impact on the economy and the labor force. I hate to put you on the spot because you may not have read the document or have been aware of it, but can you talk about the impacts of the labor force as it relates to the Affordable Care Act? And what they were talking about as to a reduction of work hours to employees.

MR. KNITTEL: I'm familiar with it, and as you noted, they did increase their estimate of the reduction in the labor force due to the Affordable Care Act, much of that due to working fewer hours to make sure the healthcare coverage, they maintained the subsidization. So much of it was due to that, but it was characterized as a reduction in the labor force.

question specific to Pennsylvania, can you talk about, you mentioned some of the opportunities in the economy as it relates to the stock market growth, housing growth, but my concern is that's also offset by the rising cost of healthcare and the fact that more and more companies see the percentage of their budgets being taken up by healthcare costs. Can you talk about looking to the future with the uncertainty of the Affordable Care Act?

Will health care costs, and since it is such a

1 significant part of our economy, I mean, nearing 17, 18 percent of GDP, can you talk about the uncertainty as it 2 relates to healthcare and whether or not you believe that 3 will offset some of the opportunities in the economy? 4 5 MR. KNITTEL: I would agree it is a major concern 6 for a business, the healthcare cost, since they comprise 7 such a large component of the labor costs for them. I would also say that uncertainty, regardless of its origin, 8 9 whether it's healthcare or tax law, is generally a bad 10 thing. It generally restrains economic growth, and anytime 11 we can clear up the uncertainty, it's to the benefit. 12 REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Well, I appreciate 13 the insight and you being here today. 14 And thank you, Mr. Chairman. 15 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 16 Representative Mahoney. 17 REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for being here today. 18 Throughout the State, there are people hurting 19 20 for property taxes, and I see you did some reports on 21 elimination of property taxes and studies on House Bill 76 22 and Senate Bill 76. Can you relate to if any of these things that you've done would fit in for us as a 23 24 legislature to pursue?

MR. KNITTEL: Well, the analysis we undertook was

1 a specific proposal to eliminate the school operating taxes 2 and replace them with sales and use and personal income, so it was a very targeted, specific analysis, but we haven't 3 done anything more broadly to make suggestions regarding 4 options for property tax relief. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: The report you did with 7 Michigan, what was that report about? MR. KNITTEL: So that request was an analysis for 8 9 Michigan. In 1994 Michigan instituted what was known as 10 Proposal A where they eliminated all local school operating 11 taxes and replaced it with a higher sales and use tax, 12 higher tobacco taxes, and a statewide levy property tax. 13 REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: So that's like House 14 Bill 76, Senate Bill 76? 15 MR. KNITTEL: It was similar. 16 REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: And how did that work in 17 Michigan? Do you know? MR. KNITTEL: I would say it depends on who you 18 19 talk to. 20 REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: Well, I'm telling you if you talk to somebody that owns property and that they're 65 21 2.2 or older, it's important. MR. KNITTEL: I would say it's still in effect 23 24 today. It likely has restrained the growth of the property

taxes, not completely. They have begun to creep up again.

It has restrained growth in spending on education. I think if you talk to individuals there, they would largely characterize it as having been successful in its original goals.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE MAHONEY: All right. Thank you very much.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

We'll now start our second round of the questioning with Representative Santarsiero.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: I know you're probably excited to be part of the bonus round here. I just have a couple of follow-up questions, first, to the ones that my colleague, Representative Dean, was asking before. When you talked about that structural deficit and you identified the pension, let me ask about the tax cuts, the corporate tax cuts that this Administration has enacted in the last three years which, through this fiscal year, total \$1.2 billion. If they go through as proposed for the next fiscal year, I think the total by the end of these four years would be \$2.1 billion. How has that impacted the structural deficit going forward? Have you done that analysis?

MR. KNITTEL: We have not broken that out separately, but I mean it's all built into our estimates.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: If you could provide

that information to us to see how that has impacted the structural deficit going forward for the State, I think that would be very helpful.

2.2

Second question is following up on Representative Christiana, who was talking about healthcare costs, and it reminded me of a discussion we had at some length last year with a number of the witnesses who came in front of us, and that is have you done an analysis on what job growth would be in Pennsylvania had the Governor expanded Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act and had we gotten that \$39 billion or so in Federal aid over the next eight years, as some of the other States near us have done?

MR. KNITTEL: We did not do an analysis of the impact on jobs growth. Last spring, my office did put out a report on the budget impact from Medicaid expansion but in that report we did not touch on the impact on the labor market.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. Can you get that information or is that an analysis you'd have to undertake?

MR. KNITTEL: We could not do that. We don't have the models to make that estimate.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay. Thank you very much.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Boback.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you.

And this is more or less a follow-up to the last question. Do you have any studies on job growth in other States that are near us or where was, I guess, the big switch to more jobs in neighboring States? And we talk about the gas companies and the gas industries hiring in Pennsylvania, but there's got to be more than that in other States. You mentioned the private sector. Who is hiring? When I talk to manufacturers, because we had been the prime manufacturing State way back when, but many of them have told me that technology now is taking over. For 10 employees, they might have a machine that's run by one. So have you done any studies? Where can we go with this to create more jobs in the private sector?

MR. KNITTEL: Yes, we have not undertaken any studies to that effect about what could be done to encourage more job creation. As you note, both for Pennsylvania and the U.S., 1/3 of the job losses since the prerecession peak have been in manufacturing so Pennsylvania as much like the U.S. in that regard. And much like the U.S., nearly half the job gains are in the healthcare sector. So the healthcare sectors, the professional business sectors, leisure and hospitality are the ones that are growing most quickly.

1	REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: So healthcare sectors,
2	are you talking about professionals, doctors, nurses,
3	dentists, and dental assistants, et cetera?
4	MR. KNITTEL: Yes.
5	REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: And then with tourism and
6	housing or
7	MR. KNITTEL: Tourism I can't comment on. For
8	construction
9	REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Construction?
10	MR. KNITTEL:Pennsylvania is a little
11	different than the U.S. Thirteen percent of the job losses
12	were due to construction in Pennsylvania. For the U.S. it
13	was 1/3 of the job losses, so that reflects the more severe
14	housing bust for the U.S. than for Pennsylvania.
15	REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Okay. So we're saying
16	healthcare and construction, they would be key in the
17	private industry to create more jobs?
18	MR. KNITTEL: Yes. Going forward, we would
19	expect job gains in both of those sectors.
20	REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you very much.
21	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.
22	Representative Dean.
23	REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Thank you.
24	Just sort of a global understanding, as I was
25	looking over the Governor's budget proposal, there's an

awful lot of the upcoming budget that will be based on nonrepeating funds, unsustained funds, somewhere in the area of about \$1.2 million. To give you some examples of what I'm thinking about, the escheat time frame, shortening the time frame for escheats, that's going to get us something right away but it will not be sustained; the onemonth payment delay to the managed care organizations; the leasing of forest lands for additional drilling.

I would add to that I know that lottery and gambling and those kinds of games will continue, but the dependence upon these kinds -- if they're not one time, they are either in the area of gambling/lottery. I worry about that as a source of our spending, as a source of our collection of revenues and then a source of our spending. Can you say anything about the health of an economy that does rely upon such things, you know, \$1.2 billion worth of unsustained stuff and then add on that gambling, lottery, et cetera?

MR. KNITTEL: Well, to your point, as you note, some of the revenues in the current budget are one time, much like the escheat proposal, the transfer from the Oil and Gas Lease Fund. If one looks at the underlying detail, the spend number is up about \$1 billion in the budget year. If you look at the underlying detail, the General Fund, the normal recurring General Fund revenues are also up by

roughly \$1 billion. They have 3.9 percent growth. If you took out the small games of chance, it would be again roughly \$1 billion, 3.5 percent growth.

So if one ignores all of the interactions with the beginning balances and the lapse funds, if one believes that the revenues will grow by 3.9 percent, it would be enough to support the \$1 billion in spending. But we have a difference with that. We do not think it will be 3.9 percent.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: For me to be a little clearer on that, I'm talking about this one-time spending. And so when we come about next year and the year after, how do we sustain a budget of this size when we continue to do tax cuts? I can't see this as a healthy path toward collection of revenues and spending.

MR. KNITTEL: And I would refer to again our five-year outlook report where it is true that there is a structural deficit going forward. So it can't continue on that path. A policy choice must be made to raise revenues or cut spending.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Yes. And that's my concern that maybe this is the year that we face these questions. Thanks very much for your information.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Grove.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.2

You stated earlier, one of the comments you made was if we didn't have the, basically, increases in our pension system, we wouldn't have a structural deficit in our budget, correct?

MR. KNITTEL: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So that is the driving factor. So if we take care of that issue, we take care of our structural deficit leading to why we should be doing pension reform.

I also want to hit on the capital stock and franchise tax a little bit. 2003 we had a 7.24 millage rate. We're down to .89. Over that time frame we've seen a decrease in revenue of the capital stock and franchise tax of \$594 million. At that same time we've seen growth in the corporate net income tax of \$894 million and personal income tax increases of over \$3.9 billion. Would it follow to reason that we're changing the business climate and that reduction in the capital stock and franchise tax has led to an increase of corporate net income tax as well as personal income tax through businesses hiring more people and wanting to come to Pennsylvania and stay and create jobs here in Pennsylvania?

MR. KNITTEL: In theory I say, yes, it can only make the business climate more attractive by reducing the

1 tax burden. To prove that statistically would be very 2 difficult, though. 3 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Chairman Markosek. 5 6 Thank you. Just one MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: 7 thought relative to the last speaker's question, what we 8 have is a debt problem. This is really relative to the 9 pension. It's not a pension problem. It's a debt problem. 10 And some of the solutions that we've seen out there just 11 increase that debt and increase that structural debt. 12 that correct? 13 MR. KNITTEL: In the near term some of the 14 proposals would do so. In fact, they would increase in the 15 near term the unfunded liability. 16 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Right. So I just 17 want folks to just keep that in mind when we look at that issue and that's coming. We have those folks scheduled I 18 19 believe next week. So our issues with that are a debt 20 problem, not necessarily a pension problem. 21 Thank you, Chairman. 2.2 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 23 Mr. Knittel, on the online sales tax, the remote

sales tax, could you discuss with the Committee a little

bit about whether you think we are collecting our fair

24

share of sales tax on these internet sales? Do you have a figure in mind that is probably escaping us as a result of this? And do you have any suggestions how we could improve our collections on these remote sales?

MR. KNITTEL: Yes. I believe the latest annual number is roughly \$42 million in remote seller collections through the sales and use tax. Is that a little higher?

Maybe closer to \$45 million perhaps.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Is that a year?

MR. KNITTEL: That's an annual number, yes. We do think the sales tax collections maybe were not where they could have been this last holiday season, and there's no doubt there's some leakage there that even though we have the remote seller collections, that some still escapes. We have not tried to put a number on that. There would really have to be a Federal legislation in order to address that issue.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: I understand that. And that doesn't seem to be forthcoming.

MR. KNITTEL: Not in the near term.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Yes. Yes. There's been an awful lot of discussion today regarding reducing business taxes and how that improves the job creation. I think there are an awful lot of things that go into job creation other than just reducing business taxes, and that

is obviously an educated job force, number one.

And I think we've been very fortunate here in Pennsylvania with the new natural gas industry. And you mentioned that we here in Pennsylvania, even though we went through the recession, we were not hit as deeply as some other States as a result of having the natural gas industry coming to Pennsylvania almost at the same time as people were suffering with the recession. Is there any truth to that statement that I just mentioned?

MR. KNITTEL: Yes. Clearly, at the start of the recession, roughly about 2007 or 2008, is when we started to see large job gains in the natural resources and mining sector. So without those, the recession clearly would have been worse.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: And one thing that we always debate here in the General Assembly is tax credits as far as job creation is concerned. Any thoughts regarding tax credits for any particular industry? Do they create jobs, giving an industry a tax credit?

MR. KNITTEL: I would have to defer on that. We haven't studied that issue on whether it's an effective way to encourage job creation.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Well, I would appreciate anything that your office could do with that because that always seems to be an issue that we in the

General Assembly face. Obviously, the film tax industry comes into mind and there's some legislation that's been introduced that they would like to uncap it and there's an awful lot of us that feel that this would be a great opportunity for jobs here in Pennsylvania and increase revenues. But there are some other thoughts to that, that they don't bring back the tax revenue that is lost as a result of the tax credits, so anything that your office could help us with that because I'm sure that's going to be part of the debate as well.

Just for the Members' information, we're going to delay the afternoon session hearings for about a half an hour. We didn't realize when we scheduled the one o'clock hearing this afternoon that at the same time we were going to have a new Member of the General Assembly sworn in, and I've been asked by a few of the Members of the Committee that they would like to be present for that swearing in. We're going to start the afternoon session at 1:30. You can adjust your schedules and your phone calls and that type of stuff that you need to do. We'll come back here at 1:30.

Mr. Knittel, I want to thank you for testifying before us today and also for the outstanding job that you and your staff have been doing for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania over the last couple years.

MR. KNITTEL: Thank you. It's our pleasure. 1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Thank you very 2 3 much. We'll come back at 1:30. Thank you. 4 5 6 (The hearing concluded at 11:19 a.m.)

1	I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings
2	are a true and accurate transcription produced from audio
3	on the said proceedings and that this is a correct
4	transcript of the same.
5	
6	
7	Christy Snyder
8	Transcriptionist
9	Diaz Data Services, LLC