## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

## BUDGET HEARING

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY

House Appropriations Committee

Main Capitol Building Majority Caucus Room 140 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Tuesday, February 18, 2014 - 4:04 p.m.

1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404 717.764.7801 877.747.2760

```
Page 2
1
     COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
     Honorable William Adolph, Jr., Majority Chairman
2
     Honorable Ryan Aument
     Honorable Karen Boback
3
     Honorable Jim Christiana
     Honorable Gary Day
 4
     Honorable Brian Ellis
     Honorable Glen Grell
5
     Honorable Seth Grove
     Honorable Adam Harris
6
     Honorable Tom Killion
     Honorable David Millard
7
     Honorable Mark Mustio
     Honorable Donna Oberlander
8
     Honorable Bernie O'Neill
     Honorable Scott Petri
9
     Honorable Jeffrey Pyle
     Honorable Curt Sonney
10
     Honorable Joseph Markosek, Minority Chairman
     Honorable Brendan Boyle
11
     Honorable Matthew Bradford
     Honorable Michelle Brownlee
12
     Honorable Mike Carroll
     Honorable Scott Conklin
13
     Honorable Madeleine Dean
     Honorable Deb Kula
14
     Honorable Michael O'Brien
     Honorable Cherelle Parker
15
     Honorable John Sabatina
     Honorable Steven Santarsiero
16
     Honorable Jake Wheatley
17
     REPUBLICAN NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
18
     Honorable Robert Godshall
     Honorable Darvl Metcalfe
19
     Honorable Matthew Gabler
     Honorable Rick Saccone
20
     Honorable Hal English
     Honorable Mike Tobash
21
     Honorable Paul Clymer
     Honorable Will Tallman
22
     Honorable Mario Scavello
     Honorable Steve Mentzer
23
     Honorable Marguerite Quinn
     Honorable Mark Gillen
24
25
```

	Page 3						
1	DEMOCRATIC NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:						
2	Honorable Pam DeLissio Honorable Dan Frankel Honorable William Keller						
4	STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:						
5	David Donley Majority Executive Director						
6 7	Ritchie LaFaver Majority Deputy Executive Director						
8	Daniel Clark, Esquire Majority Chief Counsel						
9 LO	Miriam Fox Minority Executive Director						
L1	Beryl Kuhr, Esquire Minority Chief Counsel						
L2							
L3							
L 4							
L5							
L6							
L7							
L8							
L9							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							

INDEX OF REQUESTED INFORMATION  Page Line Page Line Page Line 28 12-18 34 25 35 1-3 49 8-10 64 4-8 64 10-18 67 2-4 69 2-6 73 9-12							Page
PAGE  DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY Julia Hearthway, Secretary		IV	DEX TO	restifier	RS		
INDEX OF REQUESTED INFORMATION  Page Line Page Line Page Line 28 12-18 34 25 35 1-3 49 8-10 64 4-8 64 10-18		ERS					
INDEX OF REQUESTED INFORMATION  Page Line Page Line Page Line 28 12-18 34 25 35 1-3 49 8-10 64 4-8 64 10-18	DEPARTM	ENT OF LAR	OR & TNI	NISTRY			
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							6
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							
Page       Line       Page       Line         28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18							
28       12-18       34       25       35       1-3         49       8-10       64       4-8       64       10-18		INDEX OF	' REQUES'	TED INFOR	RMATION		
49 8-10 64 4-8 64 10-18	Page	Line	Page	Line	Page	Line	
	28	12-18	34	25	35	1-3	
67 2-4 69 2-6 73 9-12	49	8-10	64	4-8	64	10-18	
	67	2-4	69	2-6	73	9-12	

2.3

Page 5

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to reconvene the House Appropriations Committee budget hearings. It's certainly my pleasure to have before us here today the Secretary of the Department of Labor and Industry, Secretary Julia Hearthway.

Good afternoon, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Good afternoon.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: It's also a privilege to have here with us the Republican and Democratic chair of the House Labor Committee, both former members of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative Mario Scavello and Representative Bill Keller. Thank you, gentlemen, for being here.

Chairman Markosek, any brief comments for the Secretary before she makes her opening comments?

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you,
Chairman. Just to welcome Madam Secretary. Good
to see you again. It's probably one, two, three,
four, fourth time for you and I and some of the
rest of us here. So, welcome, and keep up your
good work. Thank you.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Thank you.

Page 6

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. Madam Secretary, the mike is yours.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I do have a few opening remarks that I think are topics that everyone are interested in and might save a little bit of time. First, thank you for having me here to speak about the budget and some of the issues with L&I.

I did want to say with respect to the UC

Trust Fund, as a result of Act 6 and Act 60, we

currently have paid into the fund more revenue now

than we pay out in benefits. It's been a long

time since that has occurred, but we now bring

more in revenue than we pay out in benefits.

Our current balance as of December 31st of 2013 was 263 million. We are still on track to be at almost a hundred percent solvency by 2019, and we will have the bonds fully serviced and paid for by 2019.

I did specifically want to touch on the service call centers and the lack of busy signals that are now being experienced. The problems that we had a year ago are fixed. They were largely due to a new phone system put in by Verizon. Our busy signals today are 95 percent less than they

Page 7

were this time a year ago. And each month I get a report -- Actually, each week I get a report. We increased the number of calls that we take as well. So, our busy signals have dramatically decreased, and our time in answering calls and answering questions and getting help to people are increasing on a weekly basis.

I interact with most of you, I think, on legislative matters, but we've had a number of significant legislative accomplishments, Act 6 and Act 60 that I just mentioned, the Child Labor Law, and recently the transportation bill.

We have a lot of other legislation in the works; physician dispensing being one of them.

But I wanted to take a moment to tell you about a few things happening internally that you may not be as aware of. And I will just mention a few of these.

The Governor has often said, you cannot run government like a private business. They are different. But you can apply private business principles to the way in which you run things. We have taken that to heart at Labor and Industry. We've done a great deal to improve the services being delivered to the citizens and to do it in an

Page 8

effective, efficient, and less costly manner. I wanted to point out just a few of those.

One of them is a prison cross match. We refer to it as Operation Close the Barn Door. We now for every UC claimant that applies for benefits, we cross-check it with the prison inmate population. That was not a particularly difficult thing to do. We use JNET and cross-match it with the computer system that keeps track of our inmates. In doing that, we have estimated--it's an estimate--that we've saved the UC Trust Fund a hundred million dollars a year by using this cross-match system.

Obviously, if you are in prison, you are not allowed to collect unemployment benefits.

Many prisoners were collecting unemployment benefits. We have shut that barn door. That is not occurring anymore, and it's a tremendous savings to the UC Trust Fund.

We have revamped our UC audit division, our Unemployment Compensation Tax Audit Division. Previously it was very decentralized, fragmented. It was not very modernized. We actually had tax agents picking up checks. We now have completely modernized the system. We have centralized it.

Page 9

Audits of businesses were done very randomly. We are now much more circumspect in how we do these audits, who's audited; what triggers or red flags go up to audit.

I wanted to also mention that we completed our state integrated workforce plan and submitted it to the U.S. Department of Labor. We're required to do this every five years. With this particular plan, we spent a great deal of time drawing on labor statistics and data, analyzing them. We were very careful to integrate both workforce development with education with DPW with economic development. We drafted a plan, and we were commended by the U.S. Department of Labor for the thoroughness and comprehensive manner in which we approach workforce development. They actually use Pennsylvania's plan as a model for other states to follow.

I think, as all of you know, federal funds have shrunk dramatically. In one area that we've tried to compensate for that is, we've been very aggressive in applying for national emergency grants. To date, this week Pennsylvania has received over \$19 million in national emergency grants that we applied for to help workers in

various situations.

Our Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has implemented a fiscal efficiency plan with 13 different points of finding efficient cross-check, double check matters so that we are effective and good stewards of taxpayer dollars.

I mention this because, internally, I wanted all of you and the citizens of Pennsylvania to know that we are doing what we can to modernize, update, be efficient in our operations so that services are delivered in a more effective manner. Are there still things that need to be changed? Absolutely. It's a big agency, a lot of different responsibility; but I wanted you to be aware of the work that is being done by the very good staff at Labor and Industry.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Thank you very much, Madam Secretary. I want to personally thank you for getting involved in the busy signals. It's certainly a problem for the Pennsylvania residents.

I also want to compliment you. I just was told by my district office manager that the follow-up, when the problem still does exist today, that we have been able to in my district

1 office bring the constituent into our office, fill 2 out a form, and then fax it to your department. 3 And sometimes to the disbelief of the constituent, within a half an hour sometimes that person, that 5 claimant, is being taken care of. So, that 6 follow-up really means an awful lot for these 7 people. Because I always say, you know, we are 8 going through a recession, but when you are laid 9 off, it's a depression. And we really need to 10 take care of these hardworking folks who,

Thank you very much. And I'm looking forward to working with you and the Labor Committee on a bill that we are going to be introducing real soon to help a ship builder in South Philadelphia involved in workers' compensation problems. So I am looking forward to working with you.

Chairman Scavello.

unfortunately, were laid off.

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. What a pleasure it is to be back

here at the Appropriations Committee.

Good afternoon, Madam Secretary. I had about eight questions, and you answered four of them in your comments.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

2.3

Page 12

One is, what effect does the workmen's comp cancer presumption for firefighters have on the solvency for SWIF?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: None as to date.

It's still relatively new. On the cancer presumption, there has been a little over a hundred claims submitted. Most of those claims predate the time in which the statute was passed. We have been insuring a number of places, a number of fire departments because they have been dropped mostly by mutual funds that have been supporting them.

I suspect that the market will work itself out. This is sort of a new arena. Insurance companies don't like unknowns. And so there is an immediate rush to drop some of these claims.

We've not seen decisions that are impacting significantly financially on this. And I suspect the private market will enter back into providing those policies at some date.

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: I hope that happens. I know you have been working on this for the last few years, the status of the establishment of a statewide definition for the term laborer under the Prevailing Wage Act.

Anything new there?

2.3

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: We have posted that definition.

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: It's posted?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: It is posted. It was posted a couple of weeks ago. It is a statewide single definition for laborer that everyone can look at. It's some 36, 37 points. It's very specific. Hopefully, it will take the guesswork for contractors out of the equation. They'll now understand what is in a definition of

a laborer. I have to commend the laborers' association, the unions. They've worked with us tirelessly to come up with this definition, and it has been posted.

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Great. What is the department doing to expand business participation and Keystone Works -- WC and Keystone Works Programs?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Keystone Works has been slow to get any kind of momentum. I have personally approached a number of companies and asked them to work with me to try and get people, currently on unemployment, on-the-job training and hired. We are working with half a dozen companies

2.3

Page 14

now to try to fill those positions. I will tell you the numbers are small. We do have more businesses interested right now than we do individuals, and I don't know why that's the case. We are looking at doing a survey both of claimant individuals, as well as businesses, to see what are the roadblocks in wanting to engage in this program. Is it too long? Do we have it only on high priority occupation?

It's a very noble way to get people off of unemployment. It's on-the-job training, a new skill while they are currently on unemployment. So it's been slow to get off the ground. We've been working -- I have been personally working with some companies to figure out what the roadblocks are.

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: Good. My last question, could you provide any update on the funding for the Centers of Independent Living and where we stand with them?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: There was some issue last year and the year before with respect to a level of funding for the Centers for Independent Living with a 4 percent administration fee.

It was the 4 percent administration fee that was

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

Page 15

the controversy. We needed to place an
administration fee on the centers or we would lose
the federal match without doing so.

However, our Office of Vocational
Rehabilitation has been so efficient in their
administering of these programs that we do not
need 4 percent to administer. We need 2.75. So,
in a sense, they get a little bit of an increase
because we're now only charging 2.75 percent for
the administration fee.

REPRESENTATIVE SCAVELLO: And thank you very much, and thank you for the good work you do down at Labor and Industry. It's a pleasure working with you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
Chairman Scavello. Madam Secretary, I've been
asked to ask you if you could pull your mike a
little closer to you. Thank you.

I would also like to announce the presence of Representative Quinn and Representative Mentzer have joined us. Thank you.

Chairman Keller.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.3

2.4

Page 16

Madam Secretary, always a pleasure to see you.

I'm glad you mentioned Act 60. I don't think people understand what a heavy lift that was, and it's an example of us all working together to get something accomplished. It was a 4-billion-dollar problem that the State had been trying to solve for ten years and they couldn't do it, and under your direction it was done, and I think we should do more of that. It was a great accomplishment that nobody -- You never know about anything if it goes right. You only know if it goes bad. It was a very good job of getting that done. It made a big difference in the State. We were really running out of unemployment without that fix, and it was a very good job.

Last year, again, we worked on a bill.

House Bill 26 became Act 34 of 2013. It provided
a funding stream to staff unemployment
compensation service centers. That was another
good fix. I was just wondering, can you give us
how the funding authorized in Act 34 has been used
so far?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: The funding that you have administered to us from the employee

Page 17

contribution of the UC tax has been used primarily to keep our staffing levels up. I would say 90 percent of it has been used for salaries; to keep staffing within our service centers, within our UC tax office and our Bureau of Appeals, UC appeals.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I think that's a great use for it, and that was part of the problem we had last year with not having enough people employed to take care of the problems. I think that's a great use of it.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: It was very much appreciated. When the federal government in a single year withdraws \$40 million, it's significant.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Well, that's sequestration. We're not for that, by the way. That brings us back to our main topic last year. I was very appreciative last year when the Chairman ended this hearing with saying you should sue somebody's pants off. I was very happy to hear that at that time.

And, you know, we know that the modernization of the computer system was a complete failure, and we're not the only state. I see where Florida is now penalizing their vendor

2.3

Page 18

of modernization of systems an enormous amount a day and Ohio had the same problem. So, it wasn't unique to us. And I think I know the answer to this, but just trying to make an attempt to see what the Commonwealth has recouped any of that money that was paid to the vendor, which did not deliver the services they were supposed to.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Not yet. The matter has been turned over to General Counsel's Office, and the attorneys are looking at it to see what the next steps are with respect to that. It is not a unique problem. Lots of states have encountered this.

I think where Pennsylvania was different is that we didn't roll the system out in an ineffective manner. We stopped the process of -- not before a great deal of money was spent, but we stopped the process before benefits checks stopped. There are other states that could not make their UC payments based on their computer system not working. Pennsylvania did not encounter that.

CHAIRMAN KELLER: Again, I would like to thank you. I know you terminated the contract. It would have just languished on if you didn't do

Page 19

that. I think that was a bold step, and it doesn't seem like many states have done that. I want to compliment you on taking that step also.

The Legacy system, the old Legacy system that we were trying to replace, how is that holding up under the current demand?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Relatively well.

One of the biggest difficulties is, it's an old program, and we're losing those individuals that can understand and write for that program. With the federal government changing things, each time there's a change, we have to rewrite the program, so that is a bit challenging for us. And there are incidences where it doesn't run as smoothly, but it is chugging along, and we have done things to shore it up. We have also worked at retraining individuals so that they are better equipped for that.

And I will tell you, because you've mentioned the other states, my Deputy Secretary of Unemployment Compensation, Gregg Shore, is meeting with states. A number of states have gathered together because they've had the same type of modernization computer problems. So we're pulling together our resources. We're looking to see what

2.4

Page 20

has similar systems in each of the state, and if we can have a universal computer system where we share the cost of the development and see how far along they are. So those discussions are taking place. I am very hopeful that we will find a system that's further along that we can more or less buy into, along with other states to work with to make sure it's the most effective system.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Just it's bewildering that in this day and age we're having problems getting a computer system to work. It's just amazing to me.

On that note, the funding that was provided by House Bill 26, like I said, keeping workers funded I think is the right thing. If we get to a point, will you be able where you need to fix the Legacy system or to modernize, or to find out how to modernize the computer, do you have any designs on using some of that money for that?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Not at the current time, but it's always in the back of my mind that that is a source of funding we could utilize now to have a new computer system.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Because that's eventually where we got to be.

Page 21

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: We eventually have to get there. I just want to do it very deliberately, carefully. I'm not going to repeat the problems of the past.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you. I'm not done yet, Mr. Chairman.

Maybe this is a question for Chairman Scavello. In Act 60, we had some unintended consequences where people who worked overtime were making too much money. We had a 49 and a half percent outside your highest quarter. That's been a problem especially in the construction industry.

I know we worked real hard in getting a fix into House Bill 403 over in the Senate -- that was amended in the Senate with a fix. Now we're having problems in the House. We're trying to work with Chairman Scavello and Senator Gordner and everybody involved. Have you heard anything about the problems we're having in the House with that fix?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I know that not everyone is comfortable with the suggested fix that Labor and Industry had come up with. We are meeting with various individuals. There is

Page 22

legislators to try and come up with a very targeted solution that everybody would be comfortable with.

CHAIRMAN KELLER: And my point is, we have the fix that will help 4,000 people, and we have delayed it longer than we should have already. I just know I'll be pushing, and I think we should all push together. If we have a fix for 4,000 people, we shouldn't delay it. If we need a fix for additional people, we should do that also.

As the Chairman started out saying, when people are on unemployment, they need these checks. It's their whole way of surviving, and we should be able to -- We know we made a mistake, but we should be able to fix that and fix it quickly.

My last question, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, we met with Director Suroviec about the Business Enterprise Program under the OVR.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: It was a bad audit that came back. We all understand that, and he agrees with that. I was just wondering if -- And that's not state money, so everybody, it's not

2.3

Page 23

state money, and we are working on it and people are going to get fixed. But, are there other programs that should have this oversight? I know you have a ton of programs, but this one kind of got out of hand.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: This is the blind and visual services?

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Yes.

knew this was a problem. We requested this audit. We asked for them to come on board and audit this division so we could see where the problems were and how to correct them. We worked with the auditors through the entire process.

Most of their suggestions had already been implemented because this was a joint process.

This was not a situation where they came in, audited us, we didn't speak, and then they slammed us with a bad report. It was something we requested.

We knew it wasn't going to be pretty. We knew that there weren't the checks and balances that should be in place, but we wanted a very methodical road map to correct that. So we worked together. This is one of the things that we have

Page 24

been doing internally to make sure that the money is spent wisely, it's accounted for, and that everything is transparent.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: But my question was, do you think there's other programs that need this kind of oversight also? And I know it's not your fault. I mean, it was done way before you got there.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I will tell you that there are programs that have been running without a lot of oversight for a long, long time, and we are taking a very close and careful look at all of them. I do believe we've hit the major ones that have not had the checks and balances that they should. Have we caught everything yet? Probably not.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: My final question. I know you have to support the Governor's budget as proposed. I get that. But I'm going to sit with the Chairman after this meeting. There's a couple line items, especially including the blind vendors, which is a great program. I don't think people understand how good that program is that help the visually impaired people. It's a great program. But I believe

1 there is some money being left on the table, 2 because there's a 4-to-1 match on most of that 3 money. So, if I can just get the Chairman to bump up a line item or two, we will be able to increase 5 that by four. I know you have to stay with the 6 proposed budget. 7 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: If I can interject 8 for a second. It is prudent to have a buffer on 9 those federal 4-to-1 and sometimes 9-to-1 matches, 10 because the federal government often rips that 11 money back and does so fairly quickly. So if we 12 go right up to the match on everything, we lose 13 all flexibility when they do that. 14 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I'm very targeted 15 at what I'm trying to get done,. You know it. 16 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank vou. 18 I'm looking forward to be working with you between 19 now and June 30th as well. 20 Representative Mark Mustio. 21 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: You know I'm 22 always available, Mr. Chairman. 2.3 REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: I did want to 24 agree with Chairman Keller on his comments

25

regarding the unemployment fix for the seasonal

2.4

Page 26

construction workers. I wanted to make that comment before I got specific on a budget line item, the strategic early warning network.

I did attend a Senate Joint Caucus meeting between their economy business and jobs caucus, their community college caucus, and their manufacturing caucus that your Deputy Secretary Staten attended and spoke, and she did introduce Tom Kroft from SEWN at that meeting, and they had two businesses speak that were beneficiaries of the work that SEWN does as far as keeping jobs in Pennsylvania.

So my specific question to you is, do you agree that layoff aversion services are essential and will continue to be essential in this budget and will that line item continue to be funded?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Yes. And I believe the request is a level funding now, and I think that's appropriate.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Thank you very much, and that's my last question.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you very much, Representative.

Representative Sabatina.

REPRESENTATIVE SABATINA: Thank you,

Page 27

Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Secretary. Just to
follow up on Representative Mustio's question
about SEWN. I was also visited by a member of
that organization, and I was informed on what a
great program it is saving jobs and unemployment
and things like that.

I heard you say about a level funding. Is there any cost benefit to increasing that funding at this time?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I would not recommend that, no. I think the program is working well, but I think it is appropriately funded now.

REPRESENTATIVE SABATINA: Okay. Has anyone done any research or technical studies? There's always a law of diminishing returns where you increase it and you only get so much in return. I'm wondering what the proper level of funding -- You're saying the proper level of funding is what is currently? It wouldn't be better if it were increased?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I think those reaching out to be serviced by it are being well served, and no one is being turned away. So, the basis of saying that it's, I think, appropriately

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 28

funded at this time. 2

REPRESENTATIVE SABATINA: Okay. Thank you very much.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Curt Sonney.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, nice to see you.

I don't want to belabor the point, but I want to go back to the 49-and-a-half-percent rule. I represent eastern Erie County, and I've met with a number of constituents that have been affected by that change. And I would ask that if you could supply the Chairman with the numbers of the people that have been affected throughout the state, and what I would really be interested in is if you could break it down by county, if that's possible, and also the savings that has been derived specifically from that change.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I can tell you we estimated that it would be an average of 49,000 individuals affected by the 49 and a half percent. That was averaged out over a five-year period. This past year, it's been 41,000 individuals affected by the 49 and a half percent.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 29

I will also tell you with every single individual who feels that they have been impacted by it, I've asked them to contact our office, and we've looked at those individual cases. I would encourage you to have your constituents or through you to contact us of the specific constituents that are having problems. Because, invariably, we have of this group--and I've looked at them personally myself a number of them--we have a third that would not have qualified under the old law or the new law. They've simply now misunderstood and think it's the new law causing them not to get benefits. We have about a third that do qualify and didn't realize it; that they do have sufficient hours, weeks, wages to qualify for.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: In that particular group, they did not even apply are you saying, or they were denied?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Yes. There is a group that because they hear that they're not going to get it, make that assumption instead of applying. And there is about a third of the cases I've looked at -- I've gotten lists from unions from different contractors of some working in

2.3

Page 30

transportation where they say, we don't qualify.

We look at their circumstances and about a third

do qualify.

So I would encourage them to apply; not simply assume they don't qualify at this point. And then there are about a third that we look at that don't qualify. Those that don't qualify generally need two, no more than four weeks of work outside their high quarter to now qualify. And knowing that is very helpful to those constituents. Knowing that it's that piece that is missing is very helpful.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Well, that's helpful knowing in the next year, but it doesn't help them out in the situation they are in.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: But every quarter you have a new base year that you calculate for your unemployment benefits. So it may not be a year that they have to wait in order to qualify.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: So they can readjust their existing claim by simply -- SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: No.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: -- going to work and saying, hey, I've worked a little bit. You know, once you establish that claim, that claim is

open for one year, correct?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Yes, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: So, how do you change the calculations within that year?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: A lot of people go in and out of employment through that year, and some of those in and outs will now requalify you for that unemployment. It depends on each individual circumstances.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Okay. I will definitely look into that one. And I would just like to bring you another circumstance that is not big by any means, but I think that it might be an easy fix for you to do. General Electric is right next to my district, the General Electric plant in Erie, and they do what they call rolling layoffs. And the situation that I've run into is where I have an individual that hasn't been laid off for 25 years, so they know nothing about the process, and they go online and they open their claim. And when they open that claim, you know, one of the questions is, do you have a return-to-work date. And these are the people that have a return-towork date in either one week or two weeks, you know, sometimes three weeks. But it's usually a

Page 32

very short time span. And, of course, the reason for asking that question is it keeps them from having to do the work search obligation.

But these individuals, since they haven't been in the system for years and years and years, they think that they're done; that they don't have to do anything else. In other words, they don't have to go back in and actually submit for those checks.

You know, opening the claim is one process, right? And then going back again after the time period, I guess, I'm not fully certain on how it works, but you have to go back in and actually apply for the money then, correct?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Yes. There's a week waiting period.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: That's the part that they're missing, because they think once they check the box, they are returning to work in two weeks that you know they are going back to work. They don't have to do anything else. Now, the ones that I've met with, and it's been quite a few actually, again, because it's all new to them, and they are led to believe simply by checking that they are going back to work in two weeks that,

Page 33

knowing they have a waiting week, that they just expect that one week's pay to come because they've notified you.

And I've, you know, informed them that you have to go back, and then after the time period inform them that you actually did not work that two weeks. But that's just a little glitch like, that maybe if we can add something around where they are checking that box, that it's not the end of the process.

You know, you contact the unemployment and we know that a packet is sent out. Well, again, this group they are already back to work probably before the packet even comes anyway, and they just — they don't read it. They think it's a done deal. I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Thank you. And it's a point well taken. We've worked very hard at making the booklet, the computer screens readable, understandable, simplified. We meet actually frequently with Legal Services, and they tell us this is how this is being misinterpreted; this is how that's being misinterpreted.

I'll take your statements. My deputy

1 secretary that runs that department is in the 2 audience, and we'll take a look at that 3 situation. I had not specifically considered that individual off for just a two-week period, and I 5 can see where that might be confusing. It may be 6 something that we can change with the language 7 that clarifies it. 8 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Thank you. 9 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Sure. 10 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, 11 Representative. Representative Dean. 12 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Thank you, 13 Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Madam Secretary. I 14 wanted to just get a couple quick updates from 15 last year. Under the new work search regulations 16 last year, claimants had to go into the Job 17 Gateway system and show their search for work 18 habit.

At this point, we have community advocates who have told us as many as 79,000 folks have been denied unemployment compensation based on the fact that they are not within that system or not meeting the requirements. And despite the fact many of these people think that they did go in and register or they are meeting the requirements, can

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2.4

Page 35

you give us an update on how that system is working and who's backlogged, who's on appeal, that kind of thing.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Your number of 79,000 is correct over a four-month period. We spent a little over a year educating, informing, trying to make the system as easy as possible to register. We constantly make changes to that. Most recent changes were in December to make it even easier, and there is a printout that tells you whether you've successfully registered or not.

There are three notifications that go out to encourage you to register; that you haven't registered; a 21 days has past you have not registered. So there is a minimum of three notifications that go directly to a claimant. We did this for, it's either just under or just over a year. We had about in the range of 70, 75 percent complying, the remainder not. We started enforcing in the sense that if they were not now registered with Job Gateway, they would not get their unemployment benefits.

We are now currently at an 87 percent registration rate. So, 87 percent of the

Page 36

individuals are registering without problems and in the system.

I think the education time period, perhaps, was lengthy and had significant effect. But this last group, it's actually working through knowing that the benefits will stop if they don't register and now the registrations are coming in.

We'll continue to update the system. If there is something that is unclear, that is confusing, we will gladly change it. We want this as simple and easy as possible. Job Gateway is a wonderful tool. We have over 200,000 job postings a day on that tool. We have 350,000 people, talent, labor talent registered in Job Gateway. So it's a very valuable system for them to get into, but there were 79,000 that had not in the four-month period.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: And have many of those 79,000 now come into compliance?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Absolutely. They come into compliance the week the benefits stop.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Okay. And then, conversely, last year I know there was an amnesty program for those who received overpayments.

Could you give us an update on that? We had

Page 37

hundreds of millions of dollars in overpayments.

million owed to the state both from businesses not paying taxes and for individuals having collected benefits they weren't entitled to, either through no fault, a mistake or by fault. That's over a 40-year period. Amnesty had not been done in this state ever. We collected, I think it's 15 and a half or 16 and a half million of either overpayments or taxes on that amnesty program. I know when you look at 600 million, you may think that's not significant. That is significant for an amnesty program. That is a success story to have collected that amount. We have now stepped up our enforcement effort.

We were also able to get, I think, the word out to an awful lot of individuals that a common mistake for a claimant is that they think the unemployment continues until they get that first paycheck. Well, you may get a new job and not be paid for two or four weeks. Your unemployment benefits stop the day you go to work; not when you get paid from the day you go to work. Many people misunderstood that, so we're unnecessarily being charged overpayments just by

2.3

Page 38

not understanding. We think a lot of the word in amnesty helped in that regard. People now know when they have to stop their benefits.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Are you considering renewing an amnesty program since it was so successful?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Not for the immediate future. I mean, part of their success is that you don't do them constantly. We now want to step up our efforts in enforcing those that did not take advantage of the amnesty program.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: A final follow-up on the Keystone Works. That was a million dollar line item last year. It renews this year at a million dollars. Number 1, I know very few people took advantage of it. I think only about \$21,000 was actually used of that million dollars. So, are we talking about a second million, or would we use the original funding?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: We would use the original funding. And I would ask that you keep it there. This is a valuable program, and the reason it hasn't taken off is important to know and to try and correct. This is an opportunity to truly retrain people on the job and get them

1 quickly back to work. I'm really asking for a 2 little bit more time to try and make that work. 3 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: What are we doing, or what are some of the thoughts to educate 5 employers about it? 6 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: We are going to 7 serve both claimants and employers. We do have 8 more employers than claimants interested. We do 9 have all of our CareerLinks, all of our workforce 10 investment boards and all of our workforce 11 partners know about it. I've worked with the 12 Chamber to get that information out. 13 We are considering an ad campaign. 14 would be a very targeted ad campaign, probably 15 through the Internet largely, to try and directly 16 reach these individuals and let them know of this 17 opportunity. 18 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Great. Thank you 19 very much? 20 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Sure. 21

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Jeff Pyle.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Thank you very much, Chairman. And, Chairman, if I may preface, I bring news for the good of the committee. I'd

22

2.3

24

25

1 like to commend Secretary Hearthway and the guys 2 over at L&I. We actually had a very down-home 3 experience where one of my constituents was having problems receiving his unemployment because he 5 worked half the year out of state. We were having 6 problems getting compensation from that state 7 He called me in a panic. Mr. Chairman, no 8 kidding, 10 a.m. last Friday, I called over to 9 I told them the whole story, and by 2 L&I. 10 o'clock the guy had money debited into his 11 account, did not get evicted. Way to go, 12 Secretary. Thank you. 13 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 14 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 15 Representative Matt Bradford. 16 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Thank you, 17 Secretary, I wanted to follow up. 18 year I had asked about the current debate about 19 increasing the minimum wage to 10.10 an hour, 20 which is being discussed a lot at the national 21 level and, obviously, there's a lot of push to get 22 states to start taking the lead in this regard. 23 At that time, with unemployment considerably 24 higher than it is now, you said it wasn't the 25 right time. Would this be the right time, and

Page 41

when does the administration think the right time is?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I do not think this is the right time. I think we are still pulling out of a recession, although Pennsylvania is 99 percent recovered from the jobs that it lost pre-recession. So we are 99 percent on the way back from where we were pre-recession job level.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Ninety-nine percent on the way to raising the minimum wage?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: No, no. I know there are arguments pro and con for minimum wage. Let me tell you one area that I don't hear talked about a lot that I think is important to at least consider as a factor in minimum wage. I did bring some statistics here.

Eighty-one percent of those people earning minimum wage in Pennsylvania are single with no children. They are largely between the ages of 16 and 24, and they largely work part time. Now, what I hear time and time again from businessmen and women in the state is that, we have an awful lot of our youth that aren't work ready; that don't have the soft skills to become fully employed.

Page 42

This is where they learn those skills.

This is where they learn how to handle a boss and a co-worker. This is where they learn to get up every day, go to the job on time, stay until the job is completed. These jobs for our 16 to 24 year olds are critical, and I -- They were hit significantly by the recession. I would not want to see those opportunities lost because the minimum wage was increased.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: I understand, and I would just respond, in realizing there is some truth to some of these jobs are done by the youth. But some of these jobs are also jobs by single moms and a lot of folks who've struggled with income and equality where, frankly, you can work 40 hours. You could work 80 hours at the minimum wage and be far below the poverty line in Pennsylvania for a family of four. The unwillingness to do anything when we're creating such an underclass of people who work hard every day, and they are not even able to glimpse the middle class with the minimum wage set where it is, is really disconcerting. We are years away from the last increase in minimum wage.

If we believe there should be a minimum

Page 43

wage, let alone a living wage, it would seem that we need to get on with increasing the minimum wage. There's not really a question there. I understand where your position is. I think there is another side to that story, which is a lot of people who are working very hard and not even coming close to a living wage.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: And I understand and respect that point of view. I would like to see that group of individuals rise in the ranks of their employment level whether it's through additional training. Pennsylvania's average hourly wage is \$21.40. We need to take those who are currently needing a family-sustaining wage at minimum wage and move them, either through training, additional education, more opportunities into those higher paying jobs.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Right.

Understood, Secretary. I think everyone supports job training, but I think as we have a larger and larger service economy, the reality is that the ability for folks to move forward in some of these jobs is dependent upon a minimum wage that will start driving wages; not just for those at the minimum wage level, but will drive those people as

Page 44

well. If there is no driver to move wages up -And we've seen stagnant wages for decades now. If
we don't do that, we are losing our middle class.
Frankly, we are losing the ability to say to
folks, if you work hard, you can start moving up
that ladder through one of those non-skilled
jobs.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I've looked at the argument as to whether raising the minimum wage will raise all other wages along with it, I've not seen compelling evidence that it does that. In fact, Pennsylvania has one of the higher average wages, and obviously there are states that have a minimum wage above Pennsylvania, and yet, their hourly wage is not at Pennsylvania's level. So it's a large debate, and I'd welcome continued conversation with you on it.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: And we can go back and forth. And I know there's a CBO article out just today about what going to 10.10 would mean, and obviously, it speaks conclusively, I think, in favor of the idea that the idea of job loss would be almost nonexistent, but that it would truly build a middle class. But again, I don't want to be argumentative.

1 And to move on to a couple other quick 2 points. Last year, I mentioned right to work and 3 was wondering what the Administration's position What is it at this time? SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: It's again what the 6 Governor has very consistently said, that if the 7 legislature in representing your constituents has 8 a majority vote and gets it to his desk, he would 9 sign it. If it doesn't get to his desk, obviously 10 he would not sign it. 11 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Paycheck 12 protection? 13 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: It's the same. Same 14 situation. 15 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: He would sign 16 paycheck protection? 17 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: If the majority of 18 representing this state agrees with that and it 19 gets to his desk, he would sign it. 20 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: If the majority 21 agreed with increasing minimum wage, would he sign 22 it? 2.3 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I have not discussed 24 that with him.

25

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: At the federal

Page 46

level as well, right now there is talk about extending unemployment benefits. What is your position on the need to do that?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I haven't,
obviously, as a state Labor and Industry
individual weighed in on that. I realize there
are a lot of people out there that rely on
extended benefits. But again, I think there are
arguments that may not be the best way to continue
to help in that regard.

I will tell you, just operationally, it wreaks havoc on all the states to have this indecision whether we're doing it, not doing it; having a break, then reinstating it, is very difficult for all states to then do it. I will let the federal government decide what the federal government is going to do, and I will stick to what I have control over.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Right. And I guess I'll conclude by saying this: It's hard to reconcile while the economy is not strong enough to give minimum wage workers a raise, but it's strong enough that the long-term unemployed shouldn't get extended benefits at the federal level at least. I'll leave it with that.

Page 47

Thank you, Secretary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Seth Grove.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Good to see you again, Madam
Secretary.

About a year ago the Department of L&I announced a potential solution to prevent UC payments from going to inmates in county prisons. Can you give us an update of how much money was saved doing that; and also, if you have a list of county prisons that have not updated or improved their reporting system, so we can start talking to them to help reduce waste. I don't know if you have that now or if you can provide it at a later date would still be fine.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: On the last part, I would have to provide at a later date. It is the vast majority of them that are now on board and that are part of the cross-match system.

We've estimated the savings in a single year to be about a hundred million dollars. Let me explain how we've estimated that. This is a preventive measure. We stop the payments before

Page 48

they happen, so we can't go back and calculate.

We've actually looked internally at how to do that and didn't want to expend the money to be down to the penny. So our Center for Workforce Information Analysis calculated the average length of a UC claim along with the average payment, and then the number of stops or hits that we had with our cross-match to come up with an annual savings of a hundred million dollars, a little bit more.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Wow, that's terrific.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: It's terrific. It is something that eventually or spread the word through the prison system that this is no longer a racket that once incarcerated you can enjoy. And it's, again, as we called it, closing the barn door. We're stopping that wasted use of funds.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Obviously, there's certain loop holes that we hear about now and then and unfortunately do happen. I appreciate your continued work, working with other agencies; making sure all our computer systems link so you can cross-check, whether it's Department of Revenue, DPW, and so on to continue weeding out waste and fraud where we can find it.

Page 49

Obviously, the Chairman brought up House
Bill 403. Obviously, my bill, passed bipartisan
out of the House, went over to the Senate. It was
recently amended. It had a negative impact, a -or actually I would say a positive impact on our
UC solvency. It reduced solvency through fighting
waste and fraud and abuse within the UC system.

As it's drafted today, do you know the fiscal impact on the UC Fund with the amended version?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I do not, but I can get that for you.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right. Is it now a cost increase to the UC Fund?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I have to look.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right. I would appreciate that. We herald Act 60. It's working very well. We're driving down our costs. We're not hemorrhaging money out of the system. It's becoming in balance. I worry long term about making policy decisions that will take us back to insolvency. We've worked too hard, and you've done a great job with the UC system as a whole, and I would just use some caution moving forward to make sure we don't go back to where we were at,

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 50

because we spent a lot of time and a lot of work to get there.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I'm sorry. 403 is the UC fix.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Yes.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I apologize. I do know those numbers. It's \$26 million to the fund annually. In terms of its long-term solvency, it is a minimal impact; minuscule impact the long-term solvency.

Not to correct you, Representative Keller, but it's 2,600 -- or 2,900 individuals that it would impact; not 4,000.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: We're talking construction; road construction field or --

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: The fix, as drafted, was for anyone once they reached that maximum benefit level. The fix was not to penalize someone for working more when they weren't going to get additional benefits.

It hits all areas. It actually hits professional businesses of industry, larger than construction -- No, I'm sorry. Construction is the largest. Professional business is the second. But it runs across all the industries.

1 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Would it be fair to 2 categorize it as benefiting higher paid workers 3 versus lower paid workers? SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: No. I think we 5 calculated the average wage of someone benefiting 6 from it was 25,000 a year. Maybe a little bit 7 more than 25,000 a year. 8 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Moving forward, is 9 there a way to offset that 26-million-dollar cost 10 with additional savings so we can at least get it 11 to a revenue neutral to take care of --12 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I'm looking to try 13 and find that. I'm also looking to try and find 14 an avenue that would be more acceptable and garner 15 a majority of votes. 16 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: T know 17 Representative Ron Miller has a draft 18 legislation. I don't know if you took a look at 19 that and could provide feedback on that. 20 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I seen a couple 21 drafts with respect to it, and we are in 22 discussions with respect to that. 2.3 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Appreciate it. 2.4 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:

Thank you.

2.3

Page 52

Representative Wheatley.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, Madam Secretary.
Let me ask you a question.

Do you think the fact that we have large unemployment and under-employment in certain segments of the Commonwealth is a threat to our economy?

economy? I think any time you have large groups of unemployed it can threaten the economy. It certainly threatens the local economy, so that you would want -- having a large labor pool and having as many people employed as possible is a robust economic circumstance. So any time you have large unemployed groups, there's a host of problems that are associated with that.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: I appreciate that response. Recently I was exposed to some numbers in the Pittsburgh market. I'm not sure if this is reflective across the Commonwealth. But for African-Americans, especially African-Americans between the age of 18 and I believe 45, there are over 20 percent in some areas and as high as 43 percent in other areas. Do you find

2.3

Page 53

across the Commonwealth community of colors that have high unemployment or triple the unemployment number of our state average?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Certainly different demographics hit different groups at different rates. Our African-American youth have a higher unemployment rate. Our largest group of unemployed are individuals with disabilities. Those are areas that we are trying to target. In fact, there is a line item in the budget. We are asking for a million dollars to help that particular group because they have their own challenges to employment.

What we are trying to do is look at the different segments and what are the barriers to employment and how we can lift those barriers, and they change from regions. Sometimes it's education. Sometimes it's, you know, needing to have more high school graduates for education. Sometimes it's relocating. There are more job opportunities for certain areas for those with a high school education. Certain people may not want to move. When they say there's a mismatch, it's not just a mismatch in training, but it's also a mismatch in location.

2.3

Page 54

In that regard, I work closely with the Governor and Secretary Walker as to what industries can we bring in because we have a labor pool here that has this set of talent or this issue. What industry can we bring in to raise that level of unemployment -- raise the level to employment.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Cool. So, just going back for clarity purposes, has the Department did any survey or studies to see if communities of color across the Commonwealth what their employment levels are as it relates to either under-employment, unemployment? And again, I'm going to use this caveat.

I understand how we normally classify employment for those who are actively seeking employment. The numbers that I'm talking about, though, is also inclusive of those who dropped out of that classification because they just can't find employment.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: That latter is a harder number for us to ascertain. We are very data driven. We are currently doing an unemployment study that's drilling down for I think the depths that you are looking for as to

Page 55

the areas, who's impacted, what age group is impacted, for how long; how has the long-term unemployed and which age bracket has that hit.

We're still in the middle of that study, but this is another area where other states are starting to look at Pennsylvania because we are drilling very far down to see what the barriers to that employment are so we can have the very targeted programs to help that.

We are not finished with that study. I can give you some of those numbers. I can't rattle them off the top my head. I can give you some of those. I will tell you those that have dropped out discouraged, they are harder to track. They are harder to calculate in terms of the numbers, and the under-employed are also a little harder.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: When do you anticipate having the results of your survey?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Later this year.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Okay. And the reason I'm asking that is because, what I saw missing in what you all are doing and what I hope is going to be a part of whatever the survey tells you is a targeted strategy to try to resolve that,

Page 56

because one of the statements you made earlier is to focus on helping those employees move to higher positions through training or education or whatever skills development they might need. I think in order for you to do that, you have to have a clear understanding of where they are, and what's happening to them. I've never seen anything that suggests that we, as a Commonwealth, were doing any type of thing to really identify those individuals.

been a little surprised at the number of training programs years past that haven't had the data attached to it that you would want in order to be very specific and, quite frankly, haven't had the follow-up measurements to see if they ended in the right result or not. This is part of the reason for that unemployment report.

We've been internally saying we want to understand the unemployed like never before. We want to know what the barriers are. We want to know what barriers we have the ability to lift and remove; what other barriers may be from global, national, economic barriers that we may not have control on. So this is a very in-depth study.

Page 57

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Finally, I just wanted to know what role or what activities you have in relation to working with the Department of Education and their career and technical training programs or partnerships that they create. And then second, if you have any programs that specifically target ex-offenders in their reentry into productive society via the job market.

with the Department of Education as well as prisons, corrections. Secretary Wetzel and I have spoken about a number of programs. Both he and my Deputy Secretary Staton went down to the laborer's training facilities with that thought in mind; what can we develop for the transition to inmates. There's been communications with a number of businesses that if we can help pay for the training, they will bring in inmates as a transition.

I've moved into certain areas. There are certain careers known as Gateway careers that will help you into other careers; not typically generally considered high-priority occupations.

We've moved those with the right data, supporting them into high priority so they can qualify for

2.3

2.4

Page 58

some training dollars. We have been working very closely to hit those groups that have been hit rather hard by the recession, but actually make a difference and not just a program that sounds good.

We work closely with a number of schools that we are trying to couple, partner; businesses with the school for technical training right in the high schools; working very closely with community colleges that offer very flexible programs for individuals working and then needing to garner additional training.

There is a lot of very high paying jobs that require nine months or less of training. We just need to get the right individuals into those programs and the right jobs afterwards. So, I appreciate those comments. We are working toward them. We've been talking about just lifting one barrier at a time.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: I appreciate that. Thank you, Madam Secretary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Jim Christiana.

REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Thank you,

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 59

Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, Madam Secretary.

I think it's important that we look at the name of your department, Labor and Industry, because so often about this topic there is a divide and conquer mentality that you have to be either for labor or you have to be for industry. And I think the one thing under your leadership has been your ability to rid that department of that mindset; whether it was the Petrachemical plant in Beaver County or the transportation bill. Whether you voted for one or either or both of those bills, I think your department, being able to bring labor and industry to the table, and I think it is a testament to the Chairman and the leadership in the House as well has been a huge success and not an easy thing to do, because a lot of interest groups benefit from that divide and conquer mentality, but it's not what you have It's not what our constituents expect. expected. And I think you deserve a lot of credit for making it labor and industry.

I just would like to have a little conversation about the energy sector in Pennsylvania. I think it's a unique sector, not only because of the direct jobs associated with

Page 60

energy development, but also the benefits to every other industry when we have a robust energy sector with an abundance of low-cost energy options, what it means for other Pennsylvania businesses. And if you could comment on the jobs that's gotten us through the recession, and also, what do you see as far as new industry and going forward with the opportunities for Pennsylvania.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Pennsylvania's energy sector is very diverse, and that's extremely important. We have coal, we have gas, we have nuclear, we have wind. It is a diverse area which we can rely on one or the other at any given time.

When I went around to sell the UC bonds, one of the biggest drawing points of getting a good price for those bonds, and really my job was to sell the solvency of Pennsylvania, was that we have this very diverse economy.

Our largest industry is healthcare, and it's at employment 14, 15 percent, and it's a kaleidoscope when you look at a pie chart of the industries that we have in Pennsylvania. That bodes very well for us. Unlike Ohio, which is largely the auto industry, we don't have that.

Page 61

With energy sector, we have the same thing. We have a vast variety of energy that we can draw upon. Now, I know gas is getting a lot of play because of Marcellus Shale. It is a tremendous driving economic force, as is all of energy.

But we really have the ability not just to be energy independent, but for this nation to be energy independent, and with it, all the jobs that come with that low-cost energy, energy development. If we get, God willing, that cracker plant and the ethylene that is derived from it, the string of manufacturing that can happen all the way from Beaver right down to Philadelphia County would be a tremendous boom for this state, and we are just ideally located for that to happen.

So we need to do everything possible to have that kind of robust involvement. It will mean our economic prosperity as well as very good paying jobs for everyone in Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: I couldn't agree more. And, once again, thank you more making this truly labor and industry. The Department of Labor and Industry, it's truly

refreshing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Carroll.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary. Two things before

I get to an actual question. First, I would like

to thank you, the administration, Representative

Keller for your leadership with respect to the UC

fix of the seasonal workers. Hopefully, we can

get it to the finish line with that despite some

of the concerns that have been outlined relative

to what I'm happy to hear you categorize as a

minuscule cost. I think that minuscule cost is a

wise investment in an effort to try and protect

those workers who were harmed. I think one of

those unforeseen consequences of Act 60, so I

thank you for that.

Secondly, I would echo the comments of some of my fellow members with respect to SEWN and the wonderful work that they do in my corner of the state in northeastern Pennsylvania. We have had instances where folks have been adversely affected as a result of a relocation, and the efforts of SEWN in northeastern Pennsylvania have

Page 63

been noteworthy, and I appreciate their work.

To get to a question, Madam Secretary, and I'm not sure you can answer this while you sit here today, so if you gather the information and report back to the Chairs of the committee and Chair that would be fine.

There has been a running dispute in Wilkes-Barre relative to the Wilkes-Barre General Hospital and the staff nurses with respect to the Act 102, and whether or not there have been any violations of Act 102, and the reporting of the dispute between the nurses and the hospital and, of course, the department is trying to figure out whether or not there were any violations. I cannot determine if there is a current investigation under way.

And so, my question for you is, is there an investigation that is currently pending relative to any violations with respect to Act 102 and what the status of that investigation might be? The hospital spokesman in a recent article outlined a -- it was a quote paraphrasing that any prior investigations have been dismissed for lack of evidence of a violation. But I can't determine if that's just referencing prior submissions or if

Page 64

it speaks to the most recent submission.

As I understand it, there was a meeting that was held that someone from your department attended in December of 2013. And I would like to know, and I think the nurses as well, whether or not there is a pending investigation with respect to the submissions made by the staff at Wilkes-Barre General?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I don't know that answer offhand, but we can certainly find out and get back to you.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Secondly, in the same vein, if you could share with me a global picture relative to Act 102 violations throughout the state over the course of the last three or four years with respect to what has been the experience that the Department has had with hospitals and staffing issues, and if you could share with me what sort of outcomes have occurred as a result of other investigations besides just the one at Wilkes-Barre General?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I know there have been some where there has been an award for overpayment, but I don't think the numbers are large. I can get you all that information and

Page 65 1 provide it to your office, let you know everything 2 that has occurred over the past year. 3 REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Well, if you could, perhaps, provide it to the Chairs, I think 5 that's the right protocol. 6 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Of course. 7 REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you. 8 you, Mr. Chairman. 9 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 1.0 Representative Donna Oberlander. 11 REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: Thank you, 12 Chairman. Good afternoon, Secretary. I heard you 13 mention your efforts to regulate the practice of 14 physician dispensing within our workers' 15 compensation industry. Have you been able to 16 estimate cost savings which will result if you are 17 successful in these efforts? 18 SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Yes. It's somewhere 19 in the vicinity of 18 to \$26 million that it would 20 save a year if we enacted physician dispensing 21 restrictions. 22 REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: Eighteen to 23 \$26 million worth of savings. That's

24

25

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

substantial. Thank you very much, Secretary.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Santarsiero.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, over here.

Welcome.

Last week when the Secretary of Revenue was in front of us, we had some discussion about the impact of the recent transportation funding bill on Pennsylvania's economy. And I believe one of the other secretaries told us that the department had concluded that it would have in this calendar year likely about a 40-million-dollar impact on Pennsylvania's revenue to the positive.

I was wondering whether your department has done any analysis of how many additional jobs would likely be created.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I worked with
Secretary Schoch on the Department of
Transportation funding bill. Their department
took the lead in determining what it would mean in
terms of the economics for Pennsylvania as well as
jobs. The estimate was 50,000 new jobs created by
that additional funding and approximately 12,000
jobs retained that would not be lost because of

the additional funding.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: And over what period of time were those 50,000 new jobs likely to be created?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I believe it's five years, but let me double check that for you to be accurate.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: I'd appreciate that. If you can get back to me on that, that would be great.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: On a related note, we had a discussion with the Secretary of Education right before you arrived this afternoon. One of the issues that was raised by both Representative Grove and me had to deal with the PlanCon program, which is the program by which school districts get reimbursed for certain eligible construction costs when they go out and they do school construction.

Right now and for the last few years, that program is being flat funded at \$300 million a year. I was wondering whether your department had any analysis of how many jobs are created in the school construction sector?

2.3

Page 68

We have an amazing department that pours over these labor statistics that might be able -- That might be something we could do. Sometimes when you drill down into the very local areas, it gets a little bit more difficult because there's not enough of a sampling to give you a good indication. We can look to see if we have information in that regard. If not, we can look and see what it would take to try and obtain that information.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: I would be grateful if you could do that because, as has been discussed previously, through the current program, at least, there's about a 1.2-billion-dollar reimbursement need that's been identified for -- which essentially accounts for every project that is somewhere in the PlanCon pipeline, which is a several step process which school districts must go through before they get reimbursed. So it would be helpful to have some sense of what the economic impact that that construction work is.

The department is working on an analysis of what the state of Pennsylvania's education infrastructure is, for lack of a better term, and

it's not clear when that analysis is going to come out. But in the meantime, if your department could provide us with a bit more information of what the impact is in terms of jobs on the current construction and at least maybe in the last few years as a snapshot, that would be helpful.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: We'll certainly try.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Thank you. I

appreciate that.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

Last question, I know Representative

Bradford brought up before the bill that is
euphemistically called paycheck protection, and I
think you indicated that, were that bill to pass
the legislature and get to the Governor's desk he
would sign it. Am I correct with that?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: What would the impact if that happened and that became law, what impact would that have on organized labor and the membership of organized labor in the state?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I don't know if I'm equipped to give you the full impact of that.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Do you have a sense of generally what the impact would be?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I know they

certainly feel it will impact their membership, their level of pay; that it will reduce the number of people that are in unions, but it's not an issue I've looked at on the impact of it.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: So, it would reduce the number of people in unions, and you said something about the level of pay. What would the impact on the level of pay be?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I think when you have fewer members, and the argument would be -- and I'm not making this as my argument; just factors that I've heard discussed. The larger and stronger a union is, the larger and stronger the bargaining position is for pay. The smaller and weaker the union is, the smaller and weaker the bargaining position is. That would be the crux of union membership or not; union growth or not.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: So, following that line of logic to the inevitable conclusion that would suggest that the pay would, in fact, be lower if the bargaining unit would be smaller?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I don't know that I agree with that, but that would be a factor that that would be argued by the unions.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Well, it's

2.4

Page 71

based on the analysis, which I think is a very reasonable one you just put forth. It seems like an unavoidable conclusion, I should say.

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: It's one among many factors. Again, I'm not speculating on something I haven't studied or looked at. I would like to gather all the facts as to where I think the pros and cons of certain things are, and that's not an issue I've looked at in depth.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Let me ask you this: In a consumer-based economy which we have, when wages go down, generally speaking, consumer spending tends to go down, and that ultimately has an impact on production. It has an impact on the economy generally, the economy appears to constrict.

So, it seems to me that any legislation that could have the impact -- and I understand you are not taking that position right now, but hypothetically could have an impact of lowering wages would ultimately, potentially, have the impact of also shrinking the economy. Would you agree with that?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Well, again, there's more factors at play here. It's how much it

Page 72

would; what part of the economy would that shrink; how many and what percentage of the economy would that lower wages for. I don't have those figures, so I can't give you a definitive answer. I think those things can be looked at and weighed and factored. I just haven't done that.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Is that something that the administration plans to do before signing such a bill?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I have not discussed this with the Governor, and it has not reached the level where we have done that kind of research.

My department has not done that kind of research.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Do you think that that's probably something that should be done, though, before the Governor would sign such a bill?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: I think it would be looked at in-depth. But, again, the bill would have to get to his desk.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Madam Secretary, could you give this committee an idea, and if you don't have the information today, you can get back to us with the information. You

2.4

Page 73

mentioned in your opening comments that the
Unemployment Trust Fund took in more money than
paid out last year and it's in pretty good
financial shape.

I was told that if those refineries in the southeast would have closed, we would have lost about anywhere between two to 2,500 jobs; about 15,000 indirect jobs.

Could you put together for this committee how much unemployment benefits that those refineries, by staying open, would have saved the Commonwealth in that unemployment trust?

SECRETARY HEARTHWAY: Yeah, we can try to calculate.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: I would really appreciate that.

I want to thank the members and Chairman Keller and Chairman Scavello for their input today. It's certainly appreciative. And as always, Madam Secretary, thank you for your input. I'm looking forward to working with you and your department as we put together this budget by June 30th. Thank you.

For the members' information, this committee will reconvene tomorrow at 9:30. We

```
Page 74
1
     have the PUC coming in at that time. Thank you.
2
              (The hearing concluded at 5:26 p.m.)
3
 4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I was present upon the hearing of the above-entitled matter and there reported stenographically the proceedings had and the testimony produced; and I further certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my said stenographic notes.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my hand this 27th day of February 2014.

Court Reporter

14 Amy J. Spangler

Key Reporters 717.764.7801

keyreporters@comcast.net