1			
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA		
3	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE		
4			
5	MAIN CAPITOL ROOM 140		
6		HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA	
7		BUDGET HEARING	
8		DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE	
9		WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2014	
10		1:07 P.M.	
11	BEFORE:		
12			
13	HONORABLE	WILLIAM F. ADOLPH, JR., Majority Chairman	
14		KAREN BOBACK JIM CHRISTIANA	
	HONORABLE	GARY DAY	
15		GORDON DENLINGER BRIAN ELLIS	
16		GARTH EVERETT GLEN GRELL	
17	HONORABLE	SETH GROVE	
18		ADAM HARRIS THOMAS KILLION	
19		DAVID MILLARD MARK MUSTIO	
20	HONORABLE	DONNA OBERLANDER	
	HONORABLE	BERNIE O'NEILL MICHAEL PEIFER	
21		SCOTT PETRI JEFF PYLE	
22		CURT SONNEY JOSEPH MARKOSEK, Minority Chairman	
23	HONORABLE	MATTHEW BRADFORD	
24	HONORABLE	MICHELLE BROWNLEE MIKE CARROLL	
25	HONORABLE	H. SCOTT CONKLIN	

```
1
     BEFORE: (cont'd)
2
     HONORABLE MADELEINE DEAN
3
     HONORABLE DEBERAH KULA
     HONORABLE TIM MAHONEY
4
     HONORABLE MICHAEL O'BRIEN
     HONORABLE CHERELLE PARKER
5
     HONORABLE JOHN SABATINA
     HONORABLE STEVEN SANTARSIERO
     HONORABLE JAKE WHEATLEY
6
7
     ALSO PRESENT:
8
     HONORABLE MATT BAKER
     HONORABLE PAUL CLYMER
9
     HONORABLE GENE DIGIROLAMO
     HONORABLE MATT GABLER
10
     HONORABLE MARK KELLER
     HONORABLE STEVE MENTZER
11
     HONORABLE DARYL METCALFE
     HONORABLE NICK MICOZZIE
12
     HONORABLE MARGUERITE QUINN
     HONORABLE MIKE REGAN
13
     HONORABLE DOM COSTA
     HONORABLE PAM DELISSIO
14
     HONORABLE WILLIAM KORTZ
     HONORABLE MARK LONGIETTE
15
     HONORABLE DAN MILLER
     HONORABLE MIKE SCHLOSSBERG
16
     HONORABLE KEVIN SCHREIBER
17
     DAVID DONLEY, MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
     DAN CLARK, MAJORITY CHIEF COUNSEL
18
     MIRIAM FOX, MINORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
19
20
21
22
23
                     BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR
                         P. O. BOX 278
24
                       MAYTOWN, PA 17550
                    717-426-1596 PHONE/FAX
25
```

1	IND	ΞX
2	NAME	PAGE
3	BEVERLY MACKERETH SECRETARY	5
4	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFAR	E
5	DAVID SPISHOCK DIRECTOR OF BUDGET	12
6	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFAR	E
7		
8		
9		
LO		
L1		
L2		
L3		
L4		
L5		
L6		
L7 L8		
L0 L9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## PROCEEDINGS

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to reconvene the House Appropriations Committee budget hearing.

This afternoon's hearing is on the Department of Public Welfare. With us today is the secretary of Welfare, Beverly Mackereth.

Good afternoon, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Good afternoon.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: And also with her is David Spishock, budget director,

Department of Public Welfare.

interest and concern.

Good afternoon.

MR. SPISHOCK: Afternoon, sir.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: We certainly have a crowd here. I certainly appreciate all the

This will be a very informative budget hearing. And in order for it to be productive and effective, I'm just going to go over a couple housekeeping rules. I'd like you to check your cell phones, your iPhones, your iPads, and all the other devices that you may have and turn them off, at least put them on vibrate. They do interfere with the testifiers and also the television

coverage.

I wish we had more chairs. I apologize. Maybe we can have someone try to accommodate everyone during the course of this. We have scheduled for a two-hour hearing; it may go a little longer. I try to allow all the members of the committee as well as some chairs of standing committees to ask questions. And I know we also have some folks here that have submitted some questions to be asked by members. And it should be a very interesting and informative hearing.

As is the custom of Chairman Markosek and I, we have also invited the Health Committee Chairman, Matt Baker; the Human Services Committee chair, Gene DiGirolamo; the Children and Youth Committee chair, Kathy Watson. Thank you for your attendance.

I'm going to ask Madam Secretary for some brief opening comments, and we'll get right into the questioning.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: That would be great.

First off, I just want to take this opportunity, as I look around the room, it is so nice to see so many people who care about this

issue, about the DPW budget. So, everybody, thank you so much for coming today. It's really our opportunity to be able to share information, not just with the general assembly but with everyone here as well as. So, thank you.

Good afternoon, Chairman Adolph,

Chairman Markosek, and members of the Appropriation

Committee. Thank you for providing me with the

opportunity to talk to you about the Department of

Public Welfare budget. I have submitted written

testimony to the committee for you to read at your

leisure.

You know, sitting here in the caucus room brings back a lot of old memories of my time in the general assembly. I actually think it would probably be easier today if I was sitting on that side than where I am. However, it is what it is, and so, again, I am very happy to share information about the Department of Public Welfare's budget.

As I'm sure all of you are aware, the Department of Public Welfare budget makes up 39 percent of the entire commonwealth's general fund budget. Medicaid, which I know that we will be discussing today, makes up 30 percent of the general fund budget and 77 percent of the entire

DPW budget.

As you know, I have been the secretary of the Department of Public Welfare for about a year now. Actually, I had been on the job as acting for two weeks prior to the last budget hearing. It has been a challenging, rewarding, and, at times, overwhelming and frustrating first year.

Today gives me the opportunity to publicly thank my staff. Believe me, they don't get to hear those words enough. But they are an amazing group of dedicated public servants, and they really do a truly amazing job.

Thank you to all of you.

DPW provides services to 2.7 million Pennsylvanians. These individuals reside in each and every one of your districts. They are your seniors, your individuals with intellectual and physical disabilities, individuals and families dealing with mental health and substance use, families who are struggling to get by. They are parents who need help parenting their children or their teenager, at-risk children, and those born with special needs.

We provide services birth through death

to our most vulnerable citizens, all the while ensuring that tax dollars are being spent in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

This budget makes strategic investments in the lives of these individuals, moving seniors and individuals with disabilities off of waiting lists to provide them with the services they need.

Many will come out of institutional settings and have the supports and services they need to live in their own home and in their own communities.

Children will come off the wait list for child care, so their parents can go to work without worrying if their child is being cared for properly.

I know as we walk through the questions and answers today, there are times that we will need to agree to disagree, and that's okay, because these issues affect real people's lives, and we need to get it right while continuing to balance the rights of taxpayers who ultimately pay for these services.

I welcome the chance to talk about the critical services we provide. And I look forward to providing the committee the answers that you need as you move forward to prepare the

Pennsylvania 2014-2015 budget.

that -- I said this last year, and I'm going to repeat it again this year. Any time that you would like to meet with me or sit down and talk, and those who have asked, we have been there immediately to meet with you. We are here to answer your questions. We are here to provide you with information. And if you don't ask, you're not going to have the answers. So, I'd like to, please, just throw that back on the table as something we see as our responsibility, I see as my responsibility, to each and every one of you.

With me today is David Spishock. He is the Department of Public Welfare's fiscal management director and knows more about the DPW budget than anyone.

Thank you all so much for the opportunity to testify today. And I am more than happy to take your questions.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I have a couple questions which I'm not going to go into an op-ed, I'm just going to get

right to the question. My first question is a result of receiving a letter today from you regarding cost savings that your department has implemented over the last several years. Okay. The total savings to the taxpayers, you know, 1.9 billion dollars.

Could you please explain to this committee what your department has done?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Absolutely. And I'm going to go ahead and start and talk a little bit about the policy part of this, and then I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Spishock to talk with you more about what each of the numbers represent.

So, to be begin with, part of our responsibility, as I mentioned in my opening, is to ensure the integrity of the tax dollar, to make sure we are spending every dollar as wisely as we can, as efficiently as we can, and providing the services that our most vulnerable people need.

So, through the last -- I think you -you know, we've been talking about waste, fraud,
and abuse for a long time, but I'd like to put it
in perspective for you, because there will always
be people who are out there trying to game the
system. But that is not the majority of people.

And so, what we find is that most people are doing the right thing. They are not trying to commit waste, fraud, and abuse. However, because those few take advantage of the system, we have to have some protections in place so that the truly vulnerable who are entitled to benefits get it, and those that aren't, don't get it. We call this our Program Integrity. And this has been there for a long time. I'm not going to sit here and say, oh, we -- you know, we're going to take credit for this. Program Integrity has been part of what we do; we're just doing it better.

And we're doing it better because we're operationalizing it into what we do every day. So, it's not like a new thing out there. It's something that every worker in every CAO office in every agency that we deal with, it's part of the responsibility, accountability, and to ensure that the dollars are going to the people it should and not the people that it shouldn't.

There's several ways we do this. And
I'm going to let Dave talk to you about the
different savings buckets that we have and how much
we've been able to save.

Thank you.

MR. SPISHOCK: Thank you.

Where we really take a look at fraud, abuse investigations. One of them is our continued interest and work with the office of inspector general, taking a look at field investigations and overpayments. And through the course of the administration, we've saved three hundred thirty-eight million dollars through an increased usage of the OIG inspectors. A lot of that is actual recoveries. A great deal of it is cost avoidance. We will try to save dollars up front, to save the money before it goes out the door, instead of going back and -- paying and chasing the money later on.

We saved money through savings and

We saved money through savings and recoveries. A lot of our savings are coming from TPL recoveries with health insurers. We save over seven hundred million dollars by looking at health insurance.

Cost avoidance, significant amount of money through our cost avoidance programs, whether we're looking at EBT, out-of-state reviews, compares federal matches. We do provider overpayments and audit recoveries. So, out of 1.997 billion during the course of the

administration, a good deal of that is actual recoveries, but the bulk of it is from cost avoidance dollars, making sure that we don't pay anything up front and chasing it later.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Which leads me to my second question. We're dealing in tough economic times. Okay. And we're presented here today, by this administration, a budget that increases by over four hundred million dollars. And could you please explain to this committee why such an increase and what has caused it?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to.

And I think as all of you know, the DPW is -- the total budget for DPW, I believe, this year is projected to be about 32 billion dollars. So -- and that is federal and state dollars, and that, I think maybe for the first time, bypasses the entire commonwealth of Pennsylvania general fund.

And as we looked at this budget, the first thing that I'd like to point out to you is we received a letter back in October from the federal government telling us that there is a reduction to our FMAP, and that's their federal match

participation. That amounts to three hundred twenty-two million dollars a year.

Now, so you know, we immediately picked up the phone, I did, and called CMS, Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and I said, What is this and what happened here? And it was a change to a national funding formula. And Mr. Spishock can share more about that, but we immediately took a look at it, contacted, you know, our partners at the Department of Revenue to look at it, because we are very concerned.

We have sent a letter back to the federal government, asking them for a review. We have talked to a congressional delegation, asking them to follow back.

It is the largest reduction in federal match in thirty years. It's, again, based on a change to a funding formula, and Pennsylvania seems to have lost the most dollars. So, that is a significant part of what you're seeing.

The other thing that we're going to talk much more about today is the issue of Medicaid. Medicaid costs continue to increase and always have. This is not a new phenomenon. They go up every year, somewhere between four hundred

and five hundred million dollars a year. And we are expected and must make up those funds.

There were also costs for the

Affordable Care Act, which I'm more than happy to
go into, but the bottom line is, when the

Affordable Care Act passed, there were seventy

mandatory provisions that DPW was required to do,
and, yes, the federal government did provide a

match to us, but to provide a match of 90 percent
on IT, I believe -- am I right, David? Two hundred
million dollars?

Total funds, two hundred million dollars. We had to pay a 10 percent match on that. Staffing was at 50 percent. So, we're already over that four hundred twenty-eight million, and we could go on and on. I'm going to let Dave fill in some of the blanks, but those are the key areas that have increased the costs for DPW.

MR. SPISHOCK: Normally, when we put the budget together, there's really three driving factors for the department. One is the FMAP. Two is any rate changes that occur throughout the year. In the past year, we have budgeted two hundred one million dollars in rate changes across the

department as well as eligibility changes. This
year, eligibility accounts for 199 million
dollars.

So just, from the start, the FMAP was, as the secretary said, three hundred twenty-two million dollars. We were about a seven hundred million dollars growth in the program with items that we didn't really have a lot of control over.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Little over five hundred fifty million dollars in what the state has to make up in state tax dollars because we lost some federal money; is that correct?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Yes.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Various mandates.

Thank you.

This is a little different from a lot of the budgets that have come before us before because there's a proposal out there that your department has sent to the federal government for approval of waivers or exemptions or however you want to call it. So, we have before us today a proposal that we need to get done by June 30th; however, the federal government has this.

And, Madam Secretary, you can be very

brief. When was this sent, Healthy Pennsylvania,
sent to Washington, D.C.? When do you expect to
hear back from them so we'll have a final
decision? And how much of this -- of these
waivers, in your opinion, will be accepted or
rejected by the federal government?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. And so I am sure there will be more

questions about this as we proceed, but I will

answer your question specifically.

Number one, the waiver was sent last
Wednesday. The federal government have a
fifteen-day initial period of review. They have a
thirty-day public comment period. And then there's
another fifteen-day period. We're thinking we'll
hear back from them approximately March 6.

And so everybody is aware, we have been -- Governor Corbett and I went down to meet with Secretary Sebelius and the group from CMS in April of this past year. And in talking with them then -- actually, it was interesting, because, at that point, their thinking was a little bit differently of what they would allow states to do and what they wouldn't allow states to do. And so, we began to push for some of the reforms that we

felt were absolutely necessary.

You know, when I was at that meeting,
Secretary Sebelius said, "I can't believe that
Medicaid makes up 30 percent of your entire general
fund budget. We have a problem here." And so,
they are working with us.

So, for the Healthy PA proposal, we have been in informal conversations, and they have been providing technical assistance since April. I talked to the executive director, I would bet you -- we've become friends. We talk weekly. We can't wait 'til this is done. Or we'll e-mail. My staff has ongoing conversations with staff.

The day we sent the proposal down, really, then, begins the negotiation period. We know there's things in there that they don't want, that they're not convinced are the right things. We know that. We sent down what we believe is the right approach for Pennsylvania. And that doesn't mean they're going to throw it out; they're not.

We are going to work through what are the pieces that they're comfortable with, what are the pieces that they're willing to negotiate on, and then we'll move forward from there.

I have to tell you that Governor

Corbett and I share a commitment to ensuring that five hundred thousand Pennsylvanians who are uninsured are covered. That's the bottom line.

The federal government, they share that same goal.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Thank you.

And my last question, which comes from Pennsylvania residents who -- family members are disabled. And I know we've talked about this briefly, Madam Secretary, in the past. Okay. But what I'm referring to is the Medical Assistance redetermination process. Okay.

And I'm sure there's some folks in the room here that are familiar with that process as well. Okay. And it just seems to me, in reviewing these forms, most of the questions, okay, seem unnecessary. There's always a problem in deadlines being met. They seem to get the paperwork to -- they get about twenty-four, forty-eight hours to fill it out. There always seems to be a time delay.

Some of the questions on the form are: When do you expect to get better? Now, I don't know who's coming up with that question, but it, certainly, at times, to a relative, a care taker,

it could be demeaning, you know. Some of these folks with severe disabilities are not going to get better. They're just going to accept their disabilities and live with it. Okay.

First of all, is it the state that's sending this out? Or is the state being mandated by the federal government to do this?

Some of these folks have been forty, fifty years with these disabilities, and every year, the same time, they get sent these forms.

What can we do about it to help these folks?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Mr. Chairman, I have heard that also. And I agree wholeheartedly that if I'm an individual who has a disability and I'm asked year and after year do I still have the same disability, I think I know how I would feel as well. This is a federal requirement that we have this form completed.

Another thing that I think is important is, we have millions of people, of individuals, who are served by our CAO offices, our ninety-three CAO offices, every day. And they have a very difficult job. And we need to make sure they have the tools that they need to be able to work smarter, and we are working on upgrading our IT systems, doing more

automation, which hopefully will help with some of
the other issues that you talked about. But,
unfortunately, to have to fill out a
redetermination form every year is a process of the
federal government.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. I have a list of individual cases that I'm going to ask you to see if we can help, because these poor folks are getting all types of answers, and sometimes, being -- after forty years being denied, you know, and then the next day getting a letter saying that they've been accepted. So, it's very complicated. There's a lot of pressure involved, obviously. And I won't take any more of your time.

Extremely helpful, but they are understaffed.

Bonnie Gallagher does an absolute fabulous job, but there's not enough Bonnie Gallaghers out there.

Okay. And our offices are being overwhelmed with questions from frustrated individuals regarding this. So, whatever you can help us --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Absolutely. And I would like to just say to all the members, please, get me -- if you have situations like this

as we're working through the changes to our 1 2 automation -- I mean, that's part of it. We're upgrading our system. It's going to have more real 3 time data; we'll be able to do a better job, more 4 efficient job. But if there's anybody -- we don't 5 want anybody to go without the service or the 6 benefit they need. Please get it to us, and we'll 7 check it out immediately. 8 9 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. Chairman Markosek. 10 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: 11 Thank you, 12 Chairman Adolph. Just a sidebar, for the information of 13 14 the members, Representative Kevin Schreiber, from 15 York County, is here with us today, a guest. 16 And a former member, Madam Secretary, 17 one your former colleagues, former representative Kathy Mandarino is here with us today as well. 18 19 Welcome, Secretary, Mr. Spishock. 20 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you. MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: 21 I have 22 just a couple of comments, and partly, really, just 23 to kind of organize my own mind here for a second, so, if you'll bear with me, but I do have a 24 25 question at the end of that.

This year, the governor's budget, overall budget, resorts to several one-time, and we think, unsustainable funding sources, totaling about 1.2 billion dollars to balance the overall general fund budget. However, several of those, which we again feel is unsustainable funding sources, are in your area of the budget.

We've counted at least four of them here. One is delaying the payment to managed care organizations; two, shifting expenditures for homeand community-based services from the general fund to the lottery fund; three, redirecting tobacco settlement funds to help fund nursing homes; and, four, banking on the questionable savings from the governor's alternative to Medicaid expansion, which he's called Healthy Pennsylvania. And we've determined that those four come to over seven hundred million in what, again, we feel are unsustainable, one-time funding sources for your department.

I'd like to focus a little bit on

Healthy PA, the number four there on my list.

They're banking on, the administration is banking on a hundred twenty-five million dollars savings from the Healthy PA, which was just recently

submitted, as you mentioned, to the federal government, and we think it is unlikely to be approved.

Twenty-six other states, I might add, including all of our surrounding states, have opted into Medicaid expansion. Here in Pennsylvania, and we've said this publicly before, the governor is dragging his feet, and about a half a million, as you mentioned those half a million -- of our residents are left out in the cold.

We are missing out on federal dollars, more than about seven million dollars per day since January 1st, when this would have gone into effect, had the governor chosen to go that way. We're missing out on real and immediate budget savings from expanding Medicaid, as intended under the federal law. We're missing out on creating about forty thousand family-sustaining jobs in the health care sector alone. And we're also missing out on the economic activity from the infusion of those federal dollars into our economy.

And I think it would be in everyone's best interest if Pennsylvania were to opt in to Medicaid expansion now, while the governor pursues his alternative plan, which we think would not even

be effective until next year anyway, even if some of it were approved, and we're very skeptical that any of it will be.

My question then is, assuming the governor's alternative proposal is not approved, what will happen to your budget?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Okay. Chairman,
I think you asked me, like, ten questions in there,
so I am really going to try to get through that, if
that's okay. If I miss something, please come back
around; I would be more than happy to answer it.

So, why don't we start -- we'll go ahead and start with the one-time funding. And with the one-time funding -- and I'm going to let the budget director, Dave Spishock, answer some of that -- but what I'd like to tell you, what I'd like to say to you is that we do have some one-time revenue enhancements in there. Okay. But we also have money to make sure that it's paid the following year, and I think that's the important piece.

With our Healthy PA initiative, the one twenty-five million is six-months' worth. Next year it's six hundred and sixteen million that will plug those gaps. And so we can -- I'm going to let

Dave talk more about that, then I'd like to talk to you more about Healthy PA.

MR. SPISHOCK: Yeah. The managed cycle rolls is -- previously we had moved -- we were paying managed care plans on a retrospective basis; we'll pay the June payment in July. A number of years ago, we put a proposal in to then add another month's roll to that where we would pay the May payment in July as well, too.

This year, the proposal is -- when we took a look at the increases we had, like I said, we were looking at probably a seven-hundred-million-dollar increase just with the FMAP change in eligibility and rates alone. The thought was, where can we go -- instead of making any type of Draconian cuts to the program, where can we go to generate additional savings. We relied on going back, taking a look at the managed care cycle rolls, to take the April payment that we make, make that payment in July.

It's a one-time savings in the current fiscal year. It creates an increase in state funds in the following fiscal year, in '15-'16.

However, in looking at the calculations, our calculations, for Healthy PA, we

```
do believe we would be able to save a hundred
1
2
     twenty-five million dollars this year, which will
     grow to six hundred sixteen million dollars next
 3
     year, which offsets, then, the increase and
 4
     expenditures that we would see for the managed care
5
     roll.
6
7
                  MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK:
                                                That's
     assuming it gets approved.
8
9
                  MR. SPISHOCK:
                                 Yes.
                  MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Which is a
10
11
     big assumption.
12
                  Go ahead.
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
13
                                        And,
14
     Mr. Chairman, I would not say it's a big
15
     assumption. I recognize what you're concerned
16
     about, and your concerns are very legitimate.
                                                     Wе
     know that the federal government is more than
17
     willing to work with us. I mean, I know that.
18
                                                      Ι
     would not be here telling you that if it wasn't
19
20
     true.
            They want the same thing that we want.
     need to have those individuals insured. So, they
21
     will work with us.
22
23
                  The parts of the plan that they don't
24
     like, they will negotiate; and we will negotiate.
25
                  So, do I believe they're going to turn
```

around tomorrow and throw the whole thing out? I know that is not the case.

So, we will be moving forward under the assumption we're not going to get everything; we know that. But do we want to do the right thing?

Absolutely. And so do they. Common goal.

The other thing you asked,

Mr. Chairman, is about lottery. And I need you to

know that the lottery funds -- and I remember when

I was in the general assembly, and we were very,

very careful that the lottery funds -- that we knew

that lottery funds were going to older

Pennsylvanians. That remains the case. These

funds will go to older Pennsylvanians. And we have

to certify that these funds go to older

Pennsylvanians.

So, it does provide a service to older Pennsylvanians. It does meet what the general assembly intended when they opted to do that. So, I just wanted to tell you that.

Now, Healthy PA, okay. Let's -- I'll try to talk with you about this. And I think the most important thing -- and you all, except for, I think, there's one in the room who was able to attend any of the hearings. We had seven public

hearings, and we had two webinars to talk about
Healthy Pennsylvania. It was all around the
commonwealth. And, by law, we were mandated to
have two, but we felt that this was such an
important issue, and we wanted to hear from
everyone, that we were out there. And we received
over a thousand comments back, and each of those
comments have been answered. And many of the
things that we heard were incorporated into changes
that we made in Healthy Pennsylvania.

And so, I've just got to start by telling you, when the Affordable Care Act was passed -- because there's people on both sides of the issue in this room today, and so, I want to address both as we move forward. When the Affordable Care Act was passed, it doesn't matter if you like it or you don't like it; it's law. And because it's law, there is a portion of it -- again, I mentioned the seventy mandatory provisions we had to meet. We've done that. And Pennsylvania did an excellent job to get up to speed with the Affordable Care Act.

There was also a part of the law that the higher court reviewed, and the court came back and said, States, we're going to leave this piece

to you, and you decide if you want to expand, up to 133 percent of the federal poverty, your Medicaid.

So, we went to the governor, and we talked to the governor about this. And I think, not in this budget, but in the last budget, you heard what the governor said. And what he said was that Medicaid was not financially sustainable. And I want you to think about why he said that. 2.2 million Pennsylvanians are on Medicaid. That is one in six individuals.

This year, Medicaid, the cost of

Medicaid, will be twenty-three -- it's projected to

be twenty-three billion dollars. Think about that

in relation to your entire general fund budget,

which is, what, twenty-eight -- projected to be, I

think, 29.1 billion. One program in

Pennsylvania -- and that's federal and state

dollars -- is projected to cost almost the same as

the entire general fund.

Last year, Medicaid was 27 percent of your budget. This year, it is 30 percent of your budget. Our budget, it's 77 percent. So, when people come to us and say, you know, we need this done, and we need that done, and how about this, this is the most significant portion of the DPW

budget.

Every year, Medicaid increases by about 2 percent. This year, with the woodwork -- and the woodwork, I don't like that term, but it's the term that's used -- and those are people who today are eligible for Medical Assistance but, for whatever reason, have chosen not to come into the program. With those individuals, it's going to be at 3.3 percent. And that is an increase in your budget every year of four hundred to six hundred million dollars. Medicaid is not financially sustainable.

When we took that back to the governor, he said, What are we going to do? What can we do? Because the goal is that there are five hundred thousand people out there, or more, that do not have access to health insurance.

And there is one other tweak I've got to tell you about, one other issue that helped -- or two other, really. So, when the Affordable Care Act passed, it also said, by 2016, we're not going to give this extra money to hospitals for their uncompensated care. So, for people in this room who say we should have done nothing, the uncompensated care after 2016 begins to decline dramatically to hospitals.

Number two, I think, was an unintended consequence of the court decision, but individuals between zero and a hundred percent of poverty, even though they can go onto the federal exchange, they cannot get tax credits. So, the reality are that anybody between zero and a 100 percent of poverty, who are our poorest, get nothing. They can't qualify. They can't afford anything. Zero to 133, they could go onto the exchange, and they can get tax credits.

We had to address this, Mr. Chairman.

And the way to do it, we felt, was through a private coverage option. It makes sense. It makes sense not to grow the entitlement of Medicaid to the point where we can't -- we can't handle it today financially.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Madam Secretary, if I may just get --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Got a lot more to say if you'd like, but go ahead.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Just a couple things. First of all, relative to the lottery, I mean the money that you're talking about, yeah, it's senior citizens, but it takes money away from other programs, and there is a

limit to what's in that fund.

The other thing is, we could have -the governor could have selected Medicaid
expansion, even though he had another plan, he
could have -- we could already be in the Medicaid
expansion and talking about doing some other
Healthy PA type plans as well.

And then the other thing that I'll just ask, I know you're negotiating with the federal government the governor's Healthy PA idea of a work search that has to go on. Is that something you're negotiating? And the monthly premiums that would be part of healthy PA, is that something that you're negotiating now?

When you say you're negotiating, are those things that, you know -- we don't, again, think that much of that's going to get approved, but I'm not the last arbiter on that, and I know you're negotiating, but are those some of things that you're negotiating as well?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Sure. First, I'd like to say, I know and I can tell you, you know, I've met with the governor many times regarding Healthy Pennsylvania, around Medicaid, what it looks like, and we have talked through all possible

options.

We could not have expanded Medicaid. We could not have done it. We don't have the staff. You heard about just Delaware County and the concerns there. You heard about other forms that may not be as, you know, we might not be processing as quickly as we need to.

Nobody took into account when they talk about -- and, Mr. Chairman, you mentioned it. The money that we could have been bringing in to PA, that money is to pay for services. They're not going to write us a check for six hundred million dollars and send it to us. That's not what happens. We pay for the service, and then they reimburse us for that individual who gets health care.

And so, they will do that, the same thing, under Healthy PA. We will assume the same savings. We will assume the same economic development. But the realities were -- and believe me, we have -- my staff here are tremendous, and we have looked at is there any way, because we don't want people to go without insurance. It costs more if that happens. It's not about flicking a switch. I wish it was.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: 1 Yeah. Let 2 me just end --Can I answer the SECRETARY MACKERETH: 3 work search and premium, or would you rather me 4 wait and somebody else --5 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Go ahead, 6 7 please. SECRETARY MACKERETH: I could do this 8 for days, if you want. 9 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: You're not 10 alone there. 11 12 SECRETARY MACKERETH: My representative 13 is shaking his head at me, saying "No." 14 Okay. So, what we're doing is we're 15 encouraging people to get employment. And where we are with the federal government, we are saying, why 16 Why not see and provide tools for 17 individuals, so that if they choose -- remember who 18 19 this population is, too. Healthy, able-bodied 20 individuals who, most likely, are working one job. 21 So, our encouraging employment really is about 22 people who are working twenty hours or less. 23 doesn't have to do it? Seniors, individuals with disabilities, children. It leaves a very, very 24 25 small margin of people who could be working who

should. 1 2 And if you go on to the CMS website, you're going to see in every area there where they 3 talk about how work is a -- such an important part 4 of healthy behavior and how work leads to better 5 health outcomes, physical health, emotional 6 7 health. You've got to remember that, as your --8 when you're a kid growing up, as you're a child 9 growing up, you're expected to go to school. 10 11 you're an adult, you're expected to work when you 12 can. 13 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Madam 14 Secretary --15 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Our plan gives 16 plenty of room there for changes. 17 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: I'll just 18 sum up my time here because --19 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Sure. 20 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: And I 21 appreciate your answers. We respectfully disagree 22 about Medicaid expansion, and we'll continue to. 23 SECRETARY MACKERETH: That's okay.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK:

there's plenty of other members here that have a

24

25

```
lot of other questions. I'm sure that we'll talk
1
2
     about it.
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
 3
                                        Thank you,
     Mr. Chairman.
 4
                  MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK:
                                               Thank you,
 5
                    I know I took a little extra time.
     Mr. Chairman.
6
7
                 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.
                  There's some seats up front here, if
8
     those that are standing want to sit down. And I've
9
     requested some more chairs to come into the room.
10
11
                  The next question will be by the
12
     Republican chair of the Health Committee,
13
     Representative Matt Baker.
14
                 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER:
                                         Thank you very
15
     much, Mr. Chairman. I really appreciate your
16
     inviting me to participate. Our committee has
17
     oversight over the Medicaid program, so this is of
     great concern and import to our committee.
18
19
                  Good to see you, Madam Secretary.
20
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Good to see you,
21
     too.
22
                 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: You by far, not
23
     to diminish any other secretary's positions, but,
24
     in my opinion, you have a toughest job --
25
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Thank you.
                                                     Ι
```

do.

REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: -- here in the state government. And you're --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: I do. Trust me.

REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Your budget

proves it. I mean, you prefaced your remarks by

saying, twenty-eight and a half billion dollars, fiscal year '13-'14. Next year, it could go over thirty billion. And that's when you combine the federal, state, and augmentation funds. Pretty significant.

With respect to the budget -- and I didn't see anything in the materials -- there could be a potential funding gap, I think, created. It's still an ongoing problem, as I understand it, by the federal government, in a letter I remember reading some time ago concerning the gross receipts tax.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Has that -could be a couple hundred million dollars or more
of great import in terms of a funding gap. Has
that been resolved? Is it getting closer to being
resolved? Or is that still an ongoing concern and
problem?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Chairman Baker, 1 2 what you reference is the gross receipts tax where we received a letter from the federal AG's office. 3 It was a draft report that was sent to us for comment. We have made a very strong case where we 5 believe that our GRT should be acceptable, but it 6 still remains out there, and we wanted to make sure 7 that the general assembly was alert to that. 8 that would be in state funds, what, about four 9 hundred million dollars loss. 10 11 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: And do you 12 anticipate any timing as to the resolution of 13 that? Or is this going to be an ongoing concern? 14 SECRETARY MACKERETH: It may be 15 ongoing, Mr. Chairman. We just don't know. 16 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Okay. Regarding 17 the -- some of the costs, as I understand it, the -- and a lot of people are under the 18 19 misunderstanding as to what the costs are regarding 20 MA, and the majority of it is elderly, the 21 disabled, nursing home care, hospital funding. 22 It's about 41 percent of total MA population, but 23 they account for about 78 percent of the MA cost. 24 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Correct. 25 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: And if your

proposal before the federal government and CMS is awarded and approved, another, conservatively, half a million people, many of whom will be able-bodied, healthy individuals, will now be eligible. And instead of one in six, we could be looking at one in four people in Pennsylvania.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Well, first off, Mr. Chairman, you're absolutely correct that most of the Medicaid dollars go to seniors and individuals with disabilities. And it is a very significant portion. That is why, in the coming year, our focus will be on long-term care, supports and services, and how do we account for our growing population of seniors.

I believe the latest I saw is by, like by -- what is it -- 2020, one in four Pennsylvanians will be seniors. It's huge. So, we've got some significant challenges ahead of us, and we have to address them.

As you're talking about the five hundred thousand newly eligible people, they will not come into our traditional Medicaid. In fact, we will take populations out of Medicaid, our all state-funded GA population and our MA population, who will go into the private coverage option. The

insurance in the private coverage option is just -it's commercial insurance.

Right now, the Affordable Care Act gave us a national standard for insurance benefits.

It's called the Essential Health Benefit package.

And so, it has to meet certain criteria to even be used. That's why I think all of you have seen that there were people whose insurance was stopped, that was because the insurance they had did not meet that essential benefit package.

So, the insurance that the newly eligible individuals will get will be private insurance. They will be in a different -- a whole different bucket. And if the federal dollars, which a hundred percent, then it slowly, gradually goes down in 2020 to 90 percent, and supposed to stay at 90 percent forever -- and yes, we do have concerns whether or not the federal government will be able or will meet that obligation. So, if the dollars are not there, that is a unique program that will not be there.

REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Thank you for that clarification. So, the half a million or more will be --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Private coverage

only. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Private coverage only. Paid with federal dollars? 3 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Correct. Paid 4 with federal dollars. And the changes to the 5 program that -- the changes to our traditional 6 7 Medicaid, traditional Medicaid will remain for your most vulnerable people, which I believe it was 8 intended to do, and the dollars from the changes we 9 make go to make up our 10 percent, moving forward 10 11 with the newly eligible. 12 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Terrific. 13 Okay. 14 And I do support the expansion of the 15 human services block grant to all counties. As you 16 know, we fought that battle. We're up to thirty 17 counties now and running. We hope to expand that. And I do support your proposal to do that. 18 19 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you. 20 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: The last issue, as I understand it -- and I've had several 21 conversations about this, since the ACA has passed, 22 23 the federal Affordable Care Act, it's my understanding that two hundred fifty thousand 24

people in Pennsylvania have lost their insurance.

25

And of that, about eighty thousand have gone online to apply, under ACA, to recover and try to be eligible for insurance.

And of that eighty thousand, many of whom have not paid their premium yet, this is an ongoing concern and problem, that people in my offices are coming to me, very, very concerned and upset. The ACA is not doing the job that it was intended to do, and we've got a continual problem in people losing their insurance. And I'm concerned that that is going to lead to additional cost to the commonwealth to pick up. Are you concerned about that?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: I'm not concerned that there would be additional costs because I don't -- I can't see -- that's not the population that we deal with. What I would tell you is, yes, the Affordable Care Act and the exchange, the federal exchange, has been fraught with problems. And Pennsylvania, we got -- our piece of the exchange, we were ready to go before the first of the year to accept some of those transfers.

And, again, we're talking about a different population here, because the population you're talking about are people that lost their

```
insurance because it didn't meet Essential Health
1
2
     Benefit package.
                  So, there are significant problems.
 3
     And as we walked down the path, looking at our
 4
     private coverage option, we're keeping all options
5
     open to us, because if this exchange does not work,
6
7
     we may have to look at how else do we get private
     commercial insurance. That's how we're moving
8
     forward.
9
10
                  REPRESENTATIVE BAKER:
                                          Thank you very
11
     much. You're doing a terrific job.
12
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Thank you.
13
                  REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Keep up the good
14
     fight.
15
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                         Thank you.
16
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                              Thank you,
17
     Chairman.
18
                  I'd like to announce the presence of
19
     representatives Regan, Mentzer, and Clymer, who
20
    have joined us.
21
                  And the next question will be asked by
22
     Representative Jake Wheatley.
23
                  REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY:
                                             Thank you,
     Mr. Chairman.
24
25
                  And good afternoon, Madam Secretary.
```

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Hi. How are 1 2 you? 3 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: I'm doing well. 4 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Good. 5 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: I want to try 6 7 to get as many questions I can asked to you. 8 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Oh, boy. REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And I would 9 hope that you would, as best you can, be as direct 10 but as concise as you can because I want don't want 11 12 the chairman to cut me off. 13 SECRETARY MACKERETH: But if you ask a 14 bunch of them, that's going to be hard. 15 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: I'm going to do them as best I can, and try to get it. 16 17 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Go for it. REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: I wanted to 18 19 go back for a minute. My original intention wasn't 20 to go this way, but since we're having this conversation, back in 2010, when the Affordable 21 22 Care Act was implemented, there have been some 23 savings that the state has been receiving from 24 that; correct? I mean, we've gotten some moneys 25 and benefits from that --

MR. SPISHOCK: Pharmacy rebates that we 1 2 were getting as part of the managed care plan. REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: 3 So, since 2010 to today, can you give me the number what 4 5 we've gotten back from the passage of that, even though we are still going back and forth with the 6 federal government? 7 MR. SPISHOCK: We do not have that 8 readily available. We can get a chart to you. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: I have, looking here -- and maybe your number's different 11 12 than mine -- but we receive three hundred thirtynine million in the -- estimated for 2014-2015 DPW 13 14 budget, three hundred twenty-six million estimated 15 for the current year, and four hundred thirteen 16 million that we have already saved from April 2010 17 to June 2013. So, that --18 MR. SPISHOCK: Seems kind of high, but 19 I don't think our managed care rebates are that 20 high, but we can take a look at that. REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Yeah. 21 Ι 22 would like to know if that is the case, because, 23 you know, we're benefiting at some point, we're 24 getting something back from the federal government;

25

right?

1 MR. SPISHOCK: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: From the ACA.

MR. SPISHOCK: ADA, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: So, it's not all bad; right? It's not a cloudy day all around; there are some benefits from it.

MR. SPISHOCK: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Now, going back to choices people make. I'm looking at a map of all of our surrounding neighbors who have expanded Medicaid, and their citizens are benefiting from that expansion in some form or fashion. We're the only state to our abutting states -- I know there are two in our region that maybe haven't -- but we are the only one abutting our neighbors that haven't expanded.

So, tell me, from January of 2014, this year, how much could we have saved if we had expanded? Like right now, how much could we have gotten back from those populations of people I heard the secretary talk about that was MA-eligible that we'll now be consuming? It is my understanding that had we expanded Medicaid 2014 like everyone else and still went through our process of negotiating, that we could have had a

hundred percent reimbursement for them right now.

MR. SPISHOCK: Just a couple of points. When the secretary had mentioned before that we currently have -- we currently have over seventy thousand people in Pennsylvania who are eligible for our current medical systems coverage at the income levels where we're at who are not in the system. They choose not to come into the system.

We also -- we just recently received sixty-eight thousand people who went through the federal marketplace, thinking they were buying private coverage who are being transferred to us because they were deemed eligible for Medical Assistance by the federal government.

The other piece, when we take a look at it, we have -- I think there's two bills out there to change the name of the Department of Public Welfare because of the stigma of welfare. We can't address the people. We can't get the people into the system now who are eligible for services right now. We want to do everything we can to get people in who are eligible for services.

So, when we talk about doing Medicaid expansion and saying that when we flip a switch on

on January 2014, we're going to get five hundred thousand people into the system, I just don't see that happening.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: I don't want to cut you off, but I want to get to the heart of this, because it does say something about

Pennsylvania versus New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and West Virginia, that our -- that we -- they can flip a switch and somehow, from 2010 to 2014, be prepared to receive and work with their expansion and we can't. That says something about us.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Well, and it does. And I think you're right about that.

Well, first off, I just would like to say, and this is one of the things that I've learned over the last year, is that if you've seen one Medicaid, one state Medicaid system, you've seen just that, one Medicaid state system, because we all look different. When we were down talking to the secretary, she was shocked that our system was 30 percent of the entire general fund budget. So, we have a system that, through the years, grew and grew and grew.

You heard about robust benefits. We

had fourteen or more benefit packages. We didn't look like them. Some of them were more prepared than we were. And it's been years and years -- and I'm not going to put the blame on any one administration; it's been for a long time. So, our Medicaid structure just continued to grow.

We can't continue to spend between four and six hundred million dollars a year more on our existing Medicaid. That may not have been the case. Some of them don't even have near the people we have.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Let me just say this, and I'm going to finish my line -- because I know there's plenty of other conversation we're going to have on this -- but it is critical that I understand this. I mean, I grant you what you just said.

What I don't understand is a decision that is made from our governor and that you are carrying out that while hundreds and thousands of Pennsylvanians are going without health coverage, we are going to continue to procrastinate and negotiate while other states are benefiting from the federal taxes that we pay and send to the federal government. And so, all of the

conversation we've had -- and, by the way, some of 1 2 these things that I've mentioned around the savings, you plugged into your budget projecting 3 So, it's not like you don't recognize the benefits that are happening because of this law, 5 but, you are unwilling -- when I say "you," I'm not 6 meaning you -- the administration is unwilling to 7 immediately allow for some relief to Pennsylvanians 8 who need coverage. 9 10 Now, we can negotiate. So, any time --11 my understanding of this law, any time we could

my understanding of this law, any time we could change our plan and move from the expanded one that we have to a more suitable one like Healthy PA, we could have done that, you know, at any time. Why are we procrastinating that we wait a whole year, maybe more, and not have people covered? That's -- my only point that I'm making is I think that's a choice that the administration has made, a political choice, that has endangered Pennsylvanians.

So, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Chairman DiGirolamo.

REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Madam Secretary, welcome. 1 2 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: We might at 3 times disagree on issues. 4 SECRETARY MACKERETH: 5 That's okay. REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: My favorite 6 saying is, Democracy at Work, but I will never, 7 ever doubt your sincerity, your honesty, your 8 9 openness --10 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you. 11 REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: -- to work 12 with us and your dedication and hard work, not only 13 for you but the rest of your staff. 14 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you. 15 REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: And I very much enjoyed working with them. Because we're 16 17 going to disagree on a couple of things. SECRETARY MACKERETH: 18 Great way to 19 preface it. 20 REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: I was not 21 going to talk about Medicaid or Medicaid expansion, 22 but I can't help myself. On the present Medicaid 23 program, and, you know, a lot of the discussion is 24 about the cost of what Medicaid is, but when you look at the population of the present Medicaid 25

program, almost a million are children, five hundred fifty thousand or so are disabled, two hundred twenty thousand are people who are aged in long-term care, and has been mentioned, there's where the savings, I think, potentially is for a lot of the savings. Almost a hundred thousand are chronically ill adults, and I think the rest of the population I would call moms trying to take care of their babies. And, you know, I know we need to focus

And, you know, I know we need to focus on the cost, but I think it's important for all of us to remember that Medicaid is absolutely life saving and critically important for all that population, and we have to remember that, and -- I didn't want to get into that, but I just thought it important to bring that up.

And what I'd like to focus on is the human service block grant.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: And I have a copy of the report that you put out recently --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Um-hum.

REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: -- on Act 80 of the human service block grants? I don't know if you have a copy.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: I don't have it with me.

REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: And it's a very nice report. And as I look through the pages, the one question that I have is, you have all the statistics and how it's doing, and my one question is, compared to what? We have nothing to compare what you have in this report to from the prior year.

And as we have the discussion about maybe some of the providers are coming around and starting to change their mind on the block grant, I'm going to refer to a letter just a couple weeks ago that was sent to Chairman Adolph, and I believe all the other members, Democrat and Republican, got it. And the letter's from the Behavioral Health, Intellectual Disability, and Autism Coalition of Pennsylvania.

And letter, the first paragraph says:
We are contacting you because we have serious
concerns about the implementation and evaluation of
the pilot block grant program.

And that's mental health, that's intellectual disabilities, and as I talk to the people who provide drug and alcohol services around

the state of Pennsylvania, they have similar and identical concerns.

I would love to get you a copy of this letter -- I'm going to get you a copy -- because they ask, I believe, nine questions that I -- the questions and concerns that I have. And just a couple of them, when you look at this report, the annual report should include data on services delivered prior to the implementation of the block grant. I mean, how do we evaluate how this block grant is working when we don't have any information on the prior year?

DPW's annual report should include data on specific services delivered. The impact on the services and people in the program giving up funds should be reported by DPW. I mean, this report is glowing. And, you know, you've got stuff in here and they added and they did this and they did that, but if you add onto a program, and you expand a program, you've got to use additional dollars from somewhere. Where are those additional dollars coming this from? I mean, you cannot tell with that report.

Number of individuals served, and we talked about that a little bit. I mean, you've got

a really nice chart of all the twenty initial counties that were in the block grant program, number of members served. I mean, where's the prior data? Is that more or less that were served prior to the block grant?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I mean, I come from a business background, and, you know, you start a new program, if you do something different, you've got to be able to evaluate what was before and if it's working or if it's not working.

I mean, the administration money, I mean, I've got a really serious concern, and that was one of the questions, how much additional money is going into administration? And if I go -- and I'll just take one county in particular, I'll just go to Allegheny County -- and the chart that you have for the county, and it says, the administrative costs are included in each of the categorical allocations, however, are reported in the human service development fund category. I mean, we can't break out the administrative money and see how it's being used. I mean, are counties, I don't know, hiring more people? Are they taking money away from critical services to hire people? I mean, is that part? We can't tell.

I mean, there are a lot of questions that I -- and been no secret, I don't like block granting of human services. I just don't think you should be forced to pit these people to fight amongst each other for these critical services. And might I remind everybody that the money was cut 10 percent three years ago, so they're doing this block grant with 10 percent less money, which was about eighty-seven or eighty-eight million dollars. That -- I want to give you a copy of the letter. I'm going to give you an opportunity to respond, but --SECRETARY MACKERETH: Good. REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: This letter is really good. I mean, it really asks the eight

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: This letter is really good. I mean, it really asks the eight or nine questions that I think we need answered.

We have to evaluate how this is working.

Let me ask the first question, is it -the administration, are you going to expand the
block grant in this year's budget? I mean, I think
you have thirty counties in it now. Do you
anticipate language in one of the bills to expand
the block grant further than the thirty counties?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Representative,

25 | first, you're right. We -- we've got to keep

working on this one, as you know, because my perspective on it is really from the perspective of having been back in the county for three years when I left the general assembly, and then, as the deputy secretary for the Office of Children, Youth, and Families, I got to travel all over the commonwealth and meet with various counties. I saw a lot of the same issues and concerns I had when I was back in York in these counties -- I hate to call out York, but I saw the same thing.

Let me first say that the block grant is not a program, and maybe that's the first area that might be helpful if it's understood. It's a funding mechanism. And a funding mechanism means that this is just a way to get the dollars to the county without them having to put it in different silos. And there are -- I agree with you. There are some counties that are going to do a really good job, Mr. Chairman, and there are other counties that may not.

When I was a human services director in York, I called Estelle Richman, who was one of my predecessors, and said, Could you please allow me to use the funds I'm not using here, here?

And just to give you an example, let's

talk about child welfare case, something I know very well. In a child welfare case, most of our children in Pennsylvania are being placed because of parents' drug and alcohol. The second highest reason why children end up in placement is because of mental health. Why wouldn't we address that from a wholistic perspective?

Why -- you know, I remember a day in York County where our mental health filed -- no children and youth sued mental health -- talk about costs -- sued mental health to pay for a child who was neglected and had mental health issues. It doesn't make sense.

If I have extra money in one category and it can meet the needs, my issue was, really, why not? So, I know; we have to talk more about this.

As far as administratively, every county has a cost allocation report. Every county should have that pulled out. And we really need to look at county allocation for human services, because, to be honest with you, we send a tremendous amount of money to counties for human services, and not all of it is spent as efficiently as it needs to. And we do pay for things all the

way from human services all the way up to county commissioners' offices. So, there's a lot more to this issue that I think is something that the general assembly and our office can address.

You asked about why we don't have data. We don't have all the data we need because nobody really took into account -- and it's not about people served; it's about quality, it's about what did we do, outcomes. If we're just counting people, that's not going to get us to anything that is meaningful.

And as far as the 10 percent, I'll tell you what, Representative, if there are concerns out there, I haven't heard them. When I've traveled to counties, I've said, Has this been a problem for you? I'm not hearing it has.

REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: As far as expanding, the question about do you --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: We would love to open it up to any county who is willing to get in, who is able to come in, and who is prepared to do so. Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: Do you anticipate doing that in some language in one of the budget bills to open it up?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: I figure your best friends could do that, so --

REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: The one point that you just made to me is a reasonable point about lapse money going over and counties being forced, but that, to me, is a simple change, administratively, and allowing the counties to use the money in the following fiscal year. I actually have a house bill, House Bill 806, and we moved it out of committee, and, you know, it's been sitting for a while, that would actually allow the counties to do that.

And I'm going to close with this, Madam Secretary. I'm going to get you a copy of the letter. Have you seen this letter?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: I have not. And, you know, that would be very helpful, if, when things come in that you think we would benefit from seeing, if you send it over to us, or if the providers that have concerns contact us, we can talk with them. We can intervene -- we won't intervene, but we would sit down with counties and help negotiate, work with them. That's part of our responsibility.

REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: We need to

```
have a comparison on how this is working. I don't
1
2
     know how you can evaluate something unless you can
     compare to the prior year. I mean, I just don't
 3
     know how you can just say it's working if there's
 4
5
     no information to compare it to to how it was
     working before.
6
7
                  There's nine questions here. I mean,
     I'd --
8
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
9
    Mr. Chairman, we are not going to get into those
10
11
     nine questions right now.
12
                  REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO: Oh, no, not
13
     right now. But I'm going -- I'd ask the secretary
     to give us answers if I give you the letter --
14
15
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Absolutely.
16
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                             That
     would --
17
18
                  REPRESENTATIVE DIGIROLAMO:
                                              Thank you,
     Mr. Chairman.
19
20
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                             Thank you,
21
     very much.
                  For the information of the members and
22
23
     for the folks here, we have about fifteen members
     now that have some questions. I know this is an
24
25
     important topic. I am going to try to ask you,
```

please, keep your questions short and your answers 1 2 as short as possible. SECRETARY MACKERETH: 3 You got it. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: And I'm 4 going to ask the members, if your question has 5 already been asked, don't rephrase it. Thank you. 6 7 Representative Kula. REPRESENTATIVE KULA: 8 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 9 10 Good afternoon. 11 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Good afternoon. 12 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: And I can tell 13 you, I will win Chairman Adolph's roadie award 14 today. So, I know everyone is going to be on the 15 subject that we've been on thus far, but there is one little question I want to sneak in before it 16 17 gets any further along. 18 I saw in the budget that there is 19 dedicated funding to remove two thousand eight 20 hundred ninety-five children from the child care subsidy waiting list. And my question is, does --21 22 I mean, the way that stands, will it eliminate the 23 waiting list, or are you foreseeing there is still 24 going to be an enormous number on that waiting

25

list?

```
SECRETARY MACKERETH: Representative,
1
2
     first, thank you for the question. And, actually,
     the way the waiting list works is there will always
3
     be people coming on to the waiting list, however,
 4
     that should eliminate the existing list, but people
5
     will continue -- children will continue to come
6
7
          But we're in very good shape with our child
     care waiting list.
8
                 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: That's good to
9
    hear. This allows people -- you know, parents to
10
     work and --
11
12
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        It does.
                 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: -- be assured
13
     that their children are cared for.
14
15
                 Thank you very much.
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
16
                                        Thank you.
17
                 REPRESENTATIVE KULA:
                                        Thank you,
18
     Mr. Chairman. I told you.
                 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank both
19
20
     of you.
21
                 Representative Scott Petri.
22
                 REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Well, thank you,
23
     Mr. Chairman. I probably won't win an award, but I
24
     won't go over the time limit. I promise.
25
                 I want to hit three brief areas, but
```

before I do so, I would really be remiss if I did 1 2 not thank you and Representative Watson for the significant work that was done on child abuse. 3 There are many, many others to thank, but -- and we can't name them all, one sitting next to you, Cathy 5 Absolutely. But it's probably, quite 6 frankly, the most important work we've done --7 SECRETARY MACKERETH: 8 I agree. 9 REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: -- in quite a long time, and I know you share that thought. 10 11 First area, on Representative Kula's 12 question, I'd like you to think about whether it's 13 time to eliminate the third-party providers and put 14 the function back where it was before, processing 15 these forms and the like through CCIS, put it into 16 the county, particularly if we're going to fund the counties with more workers, this is something I 17 believe -- and I might be naive -- that they would 18 be able to handle. It would be much more 19 20 seamless. It would eliminate some duplication. And I don't know if you want to respond 21 22 to that, but it's something we ought to look at. 23 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Sure. 24 Representative, thank you so much. 25 You know, we already have begun that

1 process of condensing the number that we have.

We've gone from fifty-nine to forty-one and reinvested the dollars back into the system. And I think we're always open to continue to look.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Thank you.

Second area I wanted to cover was on the ACCESS program. And I know you're highly aware and everybody's aware of what's going on, but I want to encourage all the three departments -- Insurance, DPW, and Department of Education -- this ACCESS funding for our schools is really becoming a problem in a cash-flow sense.

And there are two areas that I think really need to be addressed. One is, the provider reports. I'm being told by school districts they cannot match the student, the claim, with the check, still. And so, I think the provider reports have to get better so that they can understand what has been paid, what hasn't been paid. These are federal dollars. I know we all want to draw them down.

And then we're going to have to deal at some point in time with this insurance denial. I can envision a circumstance where there's going to be some insurance company that won't write a letter

that says we don't provide coverage for these in-school programs, and the question's going to be, What do we do? Do we leave the claim open and we don't compensate?

It's my understanding that there is no insurance company in Pennsylvania, or probably in the country, that pays for services for special-needs students in the classroom. Now, I might be wrong about that, but that's my understanding. So, this whole idea that the federal government is requiring you to jump all these hoops, in my opinion, is government at its most nonsensical, but --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Can I, just very quickly --

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Sure.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: We are processing the payments right now, so all should be aware of that. We will check on the provider reports. I was not -- I had not heard that, so I appreciate that.

There are nine of the ten largest insurance companies who have already agreed and signed off, so we are moving forward. We just have one more to get. And then they have to sign off

that's saying that they're not going to be able to pay that claim, and then we're able to move forward. And you need to let your school districts know that they must request the money from the Department of Ed. So, it's not going to just come to the districts without them requesting.

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

REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Thank you for that tip. I'll make sure that the school districts know, and I'm sure they're listening anyway.

Last issue is the outlier policy. Last year, through your good offices, we were able to resolve something for shared living. Shared living is a program where parents have children, mostly adult children, living in three-person group homes. It saves the department about twenty-five thousand dollars per person. It's wonderful because the parents get to see their child living independently, knowing that someday they're going to close their eyes, but because of the way the program is structured, it falls into that outlier policy. And we resolved the life sharing services last year.

But the question is, is there another way to deal with this, or do they have to go through this process where they're denied full

```
coverage and then they have to fight to get it back
1
2
     because the department looks at it and says, oh,
     this is a cost saver for us, let's do this?
3
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: I'm not aware of
 4
     that issue either. I -- see, I have great staff.
5
     They don't have to come tell me everything.
6
7
     goodness. But we will take a look at that for
8
     you.
                  Also, shared living is going to be part
9
     of the discussions as we move forward with the
10
11
     long-term care commission.
12
                  REPRESENTATIVE PETRI: Fantastic.
13
                  And I thank the secretary for all your
14
     time.
            Thank you.
15
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                         Thank you.
16
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                              Thank you,
     Representative.
17
18
                  Representative Brownlee.
19
                  REPRESENTATIVE BROWNLEE:
                                             Thank you,
20
     Mr. Chairman.
21
                  Good afternoon, Madam Secretary.
22
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Good afternoon.
23
                  REPRESENTATIVE BROWNLEE:
                                             T think T
     want to focus on the AAAs and the Centers for
24
25
     Independent Living and other community-based
```

providers. As you know and most people know, they do a great work in keeping people at home and giving supports to people with intellectual disabilities, physical disabilities, and seniors to be able to stay in a comfortable setting at home.

So, I have a question regarding the cost-of-living adjustments for these community-based providers. Can you tell us, does this budget -- where in this budget is the terms for providing a cost-of-living adjustment to these providers, number one? And if so, does it compare to nursing homes and other providers that give institutional care?

Next question, when was the last time any of the community service providers received a cost-of-living adjustment or increase?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Okay. Thank you, Representative. I'll try to answer as much of the question as I can, see if Mr. Spishock can add in then. If there's something we missed, we'll definitely get back to you.

I first want to tell you that we -- the providers are our partners, and we cannot do the work that we have to do, we can't keep people safe in the community, we can't improve quality of life

for anybody unless we value our providers, so we understand that.

In my opening, I mentioned that in this budget, we have made strategic investments in individuals. And that was done on purpose. We decided that we had to get people off of the wait list. People that were getting -- most of the people on the waiting list get some service, but they're not getting the service they need or the quality or the amount of service they need. So, our strategic investment was in that person, getting them off of the wait list and getting them the service in the home and community that they need. So, that's what we chose this year to do.

And so, it's my understanding that

And so, it's my understanding that there's --

MR. SPISHOCK: A lot of the rates that we pay the providers are really based on the fee schedule. We will take a look at the fee schedule over the course of the year, just to make sure that we are paying actually sound rates to providers. For a number of providers this year, there was nothing specific in the budget for an adjustment to the rates; however, we do look at this on an ongoing basis, just to make sure that the cost to

providers are within that rate range.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWNLEE: Okay. Are you developing a process to create a fair rate for the service providers?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: And that's what Mr. Spishock was saying. We do have that now. For every provider, it has to be an actuarially sound rate. And there's a range. And we try to keep it as close to, you know, the middle as we can do, but it must be within that range. And that is our commitment.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWNLEE: Okay.

Next question. I'm part of the -- I'm a member of the Children and Youth Committee here in the House, and with the leadership of our chairman, Watson, who is here, and Chairman Bishop Williams, who is not here, we did a series package of bills regarding child protection, and that was a direct result of the PA task force that issued its report in November of 2013.

So, I know the governor signed a package of bills. One had to do with expanding mandated reporters and such, trying to get rid of the backlogs that have traditionally plagued the system.

In your budget, does your ask reflect the need for this additional legislation, these additional acts?

SECRETARY MACKERETH:

Representative, I'd like to thank you for bringing that up. I was fortunate enough to have been part of the task force, so I sat with them, listening to testimony and as part of every meeting. It was a tremendous, tremendous experience.

And,

assembly. I would say this is probably the fastest I've seen a group of bills that were so important be worked on. Cathy Utz, from my office, was at the table with staff from the House and Senate. Everybody did a tremendous job. And having the governor sign this into law was just amazing, and the changes that were made to the child protective services were long overdue.

What you're talking about is our IT system. Those dollars are in the budget. Again, long overdue. We have an extremely antiquated child welfare IT system.

The other piece you're talking about is whether or not counties will be able to meet the needs of the new legislation. And I appreciate

```
that the general assembly saw that it would not
1
2
     work to put everything in there to be done
     immediately, so it's -- you know, some things are
 3
     due six months out; it's phased in.
 4
                  Deputy Secretary Utz has been meeting
 5
     with counties. She has a stakeholder group of
6
7
     eighty-three people who are meeting to talk about
    how to go about this. We have put in twenty-eight
8
     million dollars additional for counties that we
9
10
    believe will meet the need. And, again, we
11
     appreciate all the work everyone did on that
12
     package of bills.
13
                  REPRESENTATIVE BROWNLEE:
                                            Thank you.
14
     Thank you, Madam.
                  Thank you, Chairman.
15
16
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.
17
     Thank you.
18
                  Representative Gary Day.
19
                  REPRESENTATIVE DAY: Thank you,
20
     Mr. Chairman.
                  Thank you for being here. You do a
21
22
     great job with a tough service to the commonwealth.
23
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Thank you.
                  REPRESENTATIVE DAY: First, I'd like to
24
```

thank you and the administration as a whole for

25

realizing that federal money is not free money, and I appreciate that thought process, taking the time to analyze, negotiate, and plan ahead is kind of a -- instead of going after that political carrot of dangling money, it's a breath of fresh air.

It's what we do in the private sector. We analyze, plan ahead, and bringing that to this process, I think, is a very prudent way to manage and plan for the future and future budgets as we sit here every year, struggling with the budgets of decisions past in many cases.

Several years ago, the commonwealth invested significantly in a county-by-county system to assist Pennsylvanians' Network of Care, it's called, and to assist people with behavioral health issues. This Network of Care is administered by your department, provides quick, easy, useful information for agencies and providers really for the people who need these services. And, you know, many times these services, I believe, are a small price to pay to aid Pennsylvanians to avoid future costs. Another smart, efficient way to spend money in the commonwealth to avoid future costs.

So, my question is, you know, are you committed to stay with that? Are you committed to

use that in the 2014-'15 budget, promote it with county agencies, support its access? I have one quick follow-up question after that answer.

SECRETARY MACKERETH:

Representative, thank you. And thank you for your nice comments, because I don't think you're going to like my answer.

And,

I need to say that Network of Care is an excellent service. However -- and we have been funding it. However, we did meet with the counties this past year, and, again, you will hear me say over and over again, we're reviewing things. We review this. Because one of our strategic focus areas at DPW -- we have three -- one is back to basics, relooking at every program and everything we do to see if we're doing it the right way, if it's cost effective, if it's efficient; number two, communication, talking with everybody, sharing information; number three, accountability. That's what our focus is.

As we began down the back-to-basics path and really looked at it, we brought all the counties together. The counties, many of them have done their own systems, and so they have not been utilizing this.

Now, it's my understanding that probation and parole do use the system, and I would suggest that they take a look at it, because if they're -- if that community would like to, but, to be honest, we can't continue to fund something that's not being utilized anymore, even though it is a great service. So, I hope that, you know, one of our sister agencies will pick up on it.

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: I'll probably have some follow-up questions, maybe take you up on that offer to meet with you to talk about that issue some more --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: I would be happy to.

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: -- to learn more about that issue.

My follow-up question was exactly that.

I was going to ask you if you would support and facilitate parole and probation for using the system.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: We absolutely can do that. We have stuff that's worked with Network of Care for quite some time. And, again, it's nothing against Network of Care; it's just the counties opted to do some of their own stuff.

```
REPRESENTATIVE DAY:
                                       Okay.
                                               Just wanted
1
2
     to ask you a question that was away from all the
     heavy swinging --
3
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: Appreciate it.
 4
     Thank you.
5
                  REPRESENTATIVE DAY: -- on the big
6
7
     issues and everything, but it's something that's
     important to me and I thought was valuable to
8
     Pennsylvania. Thank you.
9
10
                  Thank you for your answer.
11
                  And thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                              Thank you,
13
     Representative.
14
                  Representative Cherelle Parker.
15
                  REPRESENTATIVE PARKER:
                                           Thank you,
     Mr. Chair.
16
17
                  And hello, Madam Secretary.
18
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Good afternoon, I
19
     guess.
20
                  REPRESENTATIVE PARKER:
                                           Madam
     Secretary, I want to go back to an issue that
21
22
     Chairman Adolph referenced earlier today, and it
23
     was regarding the potential understaffing of some
     of our County Assistance Offices. We have tens of
24
25
     thousands of Pennsylvanians who are relying on
```

home- and community-based services, and you referenced that constituency earlier, and they're trying to stay home versus going into nursing homes.

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

But, apparently, and I know we've been experiencing this quite frequently in the city of Philadelphia, and at first I thought it was just sort of my region. I'm in the northwest section of Philadelphia, so our office is off of Chelten and Wayne Avenue. But in talking with colleagues across the city, apparently they've been getting the same kind of complaints, and that is recipients have been seeing their benefits terminated improperly as a result of County Assistance Offices losing or not processing renewal or appeal paperwork correctly. And when folks have responded, none of them have said that any of this has been done maliciously, as was referenced earlier by Chairman Adolph, but many are speculating that it's the possible understaffing. And in some cases, they have noted that it's led to a decline in health for some vulnerable Pennsylvanians, and in Philadelphians in particular, in this case.

Tell me, was this the first time that

you're hearing this? I mean, particularly in the southeastern region. Is this a new issue that's being brought to your attention?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Representative, thank you so much for the question. And, no, it is not the first time I've heard it, but I think it's important to keep it in perspective, because I said it once and I'm going to repeat this, millions of Pennsylvanians access our CAO offices and send in applications every day. So, with millions going into our ninety-three offices, I can tell you, there will -- you know, it's humans. There will also be human error, and we know that.

In Philadelphia, we have worked very, very closely with our CAO offices. We have worked very closely with our advocacy groups. And whenever we hear of a problem, we immediately jump on it, get involved, figure it out. And that's not the way to do it.

Now, we are, again, as I mentioned, working on efficiencies that will help our staff to be able to do a more efficient job. And that's really when we get our IT system up to where it needs to be.

So, we have plans in place.

We're looking at what every other state does, what models could we steal that make sense for Pennsylvania, that would work in Pennsylvania. And so, we're going to continue to get better and better, but it is a struggle.

But I do want to keep perspective, because with millions coming through, we will always have some that there's a problem. And that's not acceptable. It's just reality. And we will stay on top of that to make sure nobody's harmed.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: And, Madam
Secretary, I want you to know I agree with you
wholeheartedly, and you're right, with millions,
and humor error is natural. But it's like when I
hear you talk about how much sort of -- how much
the Medicaid patients are costing from sort of all
of the constituency groups that you mentioned, the
impact that it's having on the budget, and I think
about, when you mentioned three hundred million
dollars and preventing welfare fraud, and it
wouldn't matter if it was one dollar in taxpayer
money, you know, that we were able to ward out
waste, fraud, and abuse, we should save it and stop
it wherever we find it. But what I'm actually sort

of advocating for is that the department work as passionately and be as committed and dedicated to warding out any types of unintended sort of accidents as it relates to enrolling people in these much needed programs and that you use that same fervor and trying to be accurate in the city of Philadelphia.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: And I do want to assure you that we are, and we work at that every single day.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you.

The next question -- and I wanted to go back to this for the record because it's something I ask every year. You mentioned that the renaming bill is over in the Senate, and Lord knows, I hope the big chamber moves the bill soon. You know, we've spoken, and we'll see that -- we'll see that soon.

But with that in mind, I need for you to tell me the impact that cash grants have on -that is the TANF recipient -- cash grants
specifically, the impact it has on DPW's budget.
And I just want to make sure I have this correct for the record. Medicaid comprises 30 percent of the general fund budget, and Medicaid comprises 77

percent of DPW's budget.

Why is it always important for me to get this issue on a record, every year, particularly during the election year is because, you know, we know that the term "welfare," it becomes a very polarizing platform for many people who are seeking a public office, and although we don't say it, when we say "welfare," the fictitious character comes in our minds, and we know what she looks like, and where she lives, and how many children, and that she's just lazy, and she's home, and she's collecting cash, and, you know, she just doesn't want to work.

Tell me, if you will, the number in terms of the dollar amount of cash assistance

Pennsylvanians receive.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Well, I can tell you in terms of how many individuals, and then perhaps Dave Spishock can tell you in terms of dollars.

So -- and I want you to know that, you know, we've looked at this, too. And out of 2.7 million Pennsylvanians whose lives we touch at DPW, a hundred and sixty-eight thousand receive cash assistance. And that's why -- you know, we do talk

about the Department of Welfare and welfare, and 1 2 all we see is those -- is the minority, the few that take advantage or the few that are on cash 3 assistance. And that's always been -- that's what 4 you hear. And what we need to begin talking about 5 is our growing population of seniors, our 6 individuals on disabilities, the people that are 7 our most vulnerable that we serve every single 8 day. We support that. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: And, Madam Secretary, I just want to interrupt quickly, 11 12 because I know the chairman, you know, the 13 stopwatch is going. You just gave me a 2.7 14 million, you noted, and a hundred sixty-eight 15 thousand, but I'll tell you what I was looking for, do you have a percentage? Because I made my notes, 16 17 Medicaid comprises 77 percent of DPW's budget. 18 What percentage does cash grants comprise of DPW's 19 budget? 20 Now, I have a figure here, but I'm not sure if it's accurate, so I'd rather hear it 21 22 directly from you. 23 MR. SPISHOCK: Don't have that. I know

that cash grants in state dollars, about sixty
million out of our total budget request. I'm not

sure on a percentage basis, what that would equate to on a percentage basis.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Okay. Well,
Madam Secretary, if you can just forward to
Chairman Adolph and Chairman Markosek that actual
number.

Now, what I'm looking at here tells me that cash grants account for only one-half of 1 percent, and when I saw one-half of 1 percent, I thought, wow, you know, hear so much about this program and that it's such an overwhelming burden on DPW's budget, I was just surprised, and I thought that was incorrect. So if you could forward that information to the chair --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: -- I'd greatly appreciate it.

In addition to that, if you could forward to the chairmen a map of what the Medicaid recipient looks like in the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, based on all of the sixty-seven counties. And why do I ask for this every year, Madam Secretary? It is because I think it is very important, whether it be the senior constituency and/or children or people overall with

```
disabilities, that we see where they live, who's
1
2
     receiving the Medical Assistance, who's receiving
     the cash grants, and also break it down by
3
     demographics, so that we know ethnically sort of
 4
     where we are, along with regionally. And it helps
5
     us when we're working on shaping public policy in
6
7
     this body.
                  Thank you. Absolutely. Thank you.
8
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
9
                                              Thank you.
10
     I can assure the representative that she is in the
11
    big chamber.
12
                  REPRESENTATIVE PARKER:
                                          Thank you,
13
     Mr. Chair.
                 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
14
15
     Representative Glen Grell.
16
                  REPRESENTATIVE GRELL:
                                         Thank you,
17
     Mr. Chairman.
                  Madam Secretary, thank you. Thank you
18
19
     for being here. Thank you for your hard work and
20
     all that of all of your staff. I'd be much more
     glowing in my praise, but it would eat into my
21
22
     time.
23
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Oh, go ahead.
24
     I'm sorry.
```

REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Last week, I

25

participated with the Pennsylvania Health Care
Association in an event releasing two reports
dealing with the financial situation facing our
long-term nursing facilities. One of them dealt
with the profit margins, the very small profit
margins that these facilities have, especially
those that deal with large volumes of Medicaid
patients. The second one deals with reimbursement
rates for these facilities, and actually concluded
that, for Medicaid resident's, nursing facilities,
on average, lose twenty-six dollars per day for
those residents. And I would ask you to look
carefully at those reports in the coming months as
we work on this budget.

But the specific question, last year, I recall, I believe, that there was an additional ten million dollars put into the long-term care line item to provide a little bit of extra reimbursement to nursing facilities that have a population of over 75 percent Medicaid. And my question is, is that -- I was unable to discern from the budget proposal whether that is in this year or not. If it's not in, I would ask that you work with us to revisit that, because I don't think the problem has gone away, but I wasn't able to figure out whether

the number is there or not.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Representative, first, I'd like to tell you that, you know, we recognize that nursing facilities are part of the continuum of care for many of our older Pennsylvanians, and, again, I gave you the statistics earlier about where we will be as the years go. And as part of our long-term care commission, they are part of that group. And we will be listening to all the different aspects of supports and services that are necessary for our growing population.

This year, we did make strategic investments, as I said to one of the representatives, in our individuals. So, the dollars are going for seniors to get out of nursing facilities and institutions into home- and community-based services. However, we have put twenty-five million dollars in the budget for nursing facilities. And this will be for all, so it's not just the ten million for a set group. It will be for all. So, that is in there.

REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: That's an

SECRETARY MACKERETH: The ten million

additional twenty-five million or that's --

```
is not -- the ten million is no longer in there,
1
2
     but twenty-five million is in our budget for them.
                  REPRESENTATIVE GRELL:
                                          So is that --
 3
                  MR. SPISHOCK: For all providers.
 4
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: All providers.
5
                  REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Is that a
6
7
     fifteen-million-dollar increase or --
                  MR. SPISHOCK: The line item for the
8
     ten million dollars was really a supplemental
9
     payment to a certain group of providers.
10
                                                The
11
     twenty-five million dollars represents the state
12
     funds, which will be a rate increase mainly for
     nursing facilities, to all nursing facility
13
14
     providers.
15
                  REPRESENTATIVE GRELL:
                                          Okay.
                                                 I may
     seek some additional clarification on that.
16
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: Absolutely.
17
                  REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: But I appreciate
18
19
     the answer and appreciate the fine work you're
20
     doing.
21
                  Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                         Thank you.
23
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                              Thank you,
24
     Representative.
25
                  Representative Dean.
```

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Thank you, 1 2 Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, Secretary. 3 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Hi. 4 Good afternoon. 5 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Good afternoon, 6 7 Director. Good to be with you. And while there's so much we could be 8 talking about because there's so much good work 9 your department does, I will focus on the historic 10 11 opportunity that is in front of us that many of us 12 have been talking about, and that is the opportunity for Medicaid expansion. 13 14 So, what I want to try to clear the fog 15 on is what many people are asking me. In light of 16 the new law and in light of the opportunity that it 17 is in Pennsylvania, as even identified by the governor -- the governor says, his own Healthy PA 18 19 plan is to -- one of its goals, main goals, is to 20 create access to health care for a half a million 21 uninsured Pennsylvanians. Within that population 22 are forty-seven thousand uninsured veterans, maybe

Part of his goals is to match benefits

half of whom could get insurance through the

expanded Medicaid coverage.

23

24

25

to health care needs. And we know that the needs are great. If you meet people who are sitting in Pennsylvania, uninsured, they're very often working people who just simply can't afford insurance. They don't qualify under the current Medicaid. They aren't eligible for the subsidy. They fall within that gap.

And so, I guess my fundamental question is when you take the positives, which would be the accessing to health care coverage for a half a million Pennsylvanians, so it's that human cost, and you add to it the state savings we would realize in the budget we're talking about and going to be voting on this very June, state budget savings would be three hundred million dollars or more for the folks that we are covering that would be eligible then in the expanded coverage if we would go that route.

The economic benefits, the estimate of forty thousand jobs. The dollars benefits, the estimate of federal dollars, our federal tax dollars, that are going to other states to insure folks that are not flowing here because we are, as some have called us, the island of the uninsured, seven million dollars a day. We're fifty-seven

days into this year. I have a ticker running in my office. That's four hundred and fifteen million dollars that we forfeited.

Now, not every dollar of that would be captured, to your earlier points. It would be when the services are actually accrued and we become responsible for reimbursement of those. But it is real money, 100 percent federal dollars.

If you weigh all that out, how is it that the governor -- I'm pleased he's put in his Healthy PA program. I'm very glad he's applied for his waiver, two hundred nineteen pages worth of application finally submitted to the government, and I know we have some time before we'll hear back on your negotiations.

How can we justify what the governor has said to those five hundred thousand folks, which is wait?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Representative, thank you very much. And I'm going to try not repeat answers I've already said because the chairman's looking at me.

So, again, I've got to first say that

Governor Corbett and I share your commitment to

ensuring that five hundred thousand-plus -- because

we know it's more than that -- individuals have access to quality, affordable health care. So, that, I've got to put on the table first.

Again, you can't ignore the facts. I don't know -- there's a couple things. One, no where in any study that we saw that would take into account costs, and there are costs associated with doing this: staffing costs, more IT costs.

Number two, as we said earlier, we can't flick a switch. We can't do something before we're able to do it, or it will be a disaster. And that's definitely been a concern of ours.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: But under Healthy
PA, it will be, if the government says --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Under MA -- we can't do -- we could not do MA expansion. We could not bring -- you heard -- it's interesting, because I wonder sometimes if we're disconnecting. The way that Medicaid expansion would work is the same way as Medicaid works today; therefore, what we're talking about is the potential for -- which we don't believe it will happen because, as my budget director said, we have seventy thousand now who could come into the program and aren't because of welfare as a stigma. But we have five hundred

```
thousand individuals, applications, that would come
1
2
     through our ninety-three CAOs. You heard the
     chairman, you heard other members say, you're
 3
     losing papers, there's problems, things aren't
 4
5
     getting processed. So, again --
                                        To be fair,
                 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN:
 6
7
     they're all not going to arrive day one.
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        They will not.
8
                 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN:
                                        And it is 100
9
     percent for the first three years, 100 percent
10
     federal dollars.
11
12
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Absolutely.
13
                 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN:
                                        Regardless of the
14
     processing of the paperwork. And we also know that
15
     in Pennsylvania, we operate -- Medicaid operates
16
     through private managed care organizations, so it's
17
     not this "other." It is private managed care.
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Okay. And we'll
18
19
     be able to debate this, and I would be happy to sit
20
     down with you and go through it.
21
                 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN:
                                        I'm going to take
22
     you up on that opportunity.
23
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Right, because we
24
     could be here forever. But there's a couple other
25
     things. One of the things that we talked about and
```

that we're looking at is sustainability for this program, financial sustainability. We can't come back to the table two years, five years. I don't think that, as an Appropriations Committee, you can withstand anywhere between four- and six-hundred-million-dollars increases in this program every year.

We also -- you mentioned about the ACCESS. We are also concerned that just giving somebody a card, an insurance card, is not going to get them the care that they need. And I want you to think about this for a minute. We've heard, and it was also brought up in the Senate hearing, about the doctors who will not accept MA. And there are doctors that will not. So, it is -- it was not as easy as flick a switch and we've got this huge system that will be able to handle the demands of population that will go in.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: I just have to respectfully say, I don't think it's satisfactory to say we're not going to flip that switch because we're afraid too many people will be eligible and will seek care.

Let me --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: No, what I'm

```
saying is, financially, it won't be sustainable.
1
2
                  REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: One other thing I
     wanted to mention --
3
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: All right.
 4
     Let's move on.
5
                  REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: One quick
6
7
     question, please, may I ask one quick question?
                 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Let me
8
     finish. Let me finish.
9
10
                  I allowed you to ask the question
     that's been asked three times before.
11
12
                  REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: I asked it
13
     differently.
                 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Please let
14
15
     me finish. Okay?
16
                  The secretary has answered the question
17
     three times on Medicaid expansion, why this
     administration chose to go with Healthy PA. We may
18
     disagree with that decision, but you have to accept
19
20
    her answers; you may disagree, but please don't
     talk over her.
21
22
                  Lastly, ask one question and then we'll
23
    proceed.
24
                 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: My apologies for
25
     speaking over you. I sincerely apologize.
```

My other question is simply, while we seek the waiver application, why did the governor -- or did the governor, did you and he consider filing the one-page opt-in that would have gotten us within expanded Medicaid coverage as of January the 1st? Was that a discussion?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SECRETARY MACKERETH: I think, if you recall, not this past budget but the budget address of the governor's over a year ago, the governor talked about that before he could do anything, that we needed to have reforms and flexibility. can't forget that reforms are critical. If we don't reform our current Medicaid system, again, it remains financially unsustainable for Pennsylvania. So, the reforms we -- you know, I guess we could have just said, Okay, we'll just do it and what the heck. We weren't willing to do that because, for us, we have to look at Pennsylvania ten years down the road, twenty years down the road, and we have to make sure that we're meeting the needs of all Pennsylvanians, and that's what we were trying to do.

We did our homework. We looked at what Medicaid looks like today, and we were not in a position to move forward without reform. And

that's what we had to do first. So, our 1115 waiver, it talks about reform.

It also talks about something else. It talks about personal responsibility. It talks about health outcomes. We don't talk about that today in Medicaid. We have to, because without good health outcomes, what are we doing with the dollars? So, it talks about good health outcomes, individual responsibility. People have to care about their health care; they have to go to the doctor. Today, we pay for a lot of things people don't use because they don't go.

So, we took everything into account.

We went back. We did our homework. And I believe we did a really good job figuring out how do we sustain Medicaid and health insurance for our most vulnerable in Pennsylvania today and twenty years from now. So, whether we agree or disagree -- and that's okay to do, because this is so important that a debate is critical, but we've had this debate for over a year. And we went down a path we thought would get us where we needed to be. It's a Pennsylvania solution. It's something that we believe the federal government will accept. And we believe it's the right thing for the future of

Pennsylvania. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: I appreciate all your sincerity on that. I urge the governor to opt 3 in today. 4 SECRETARY MACKERETH: 5 Thank you. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: 6 Thank you, 7 Representative. Representative Oberlander. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: Thank you, Chairman. 10 Good afternoon, Secretary. It's always 11 12 a pleasure to see you. 13 SECRETARY MACKERETH: You, too. REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: I'm going 14 15 to change the direction a bit. I want to commend 16 you on your hard work in identifying waste, fraud, 17 and abuse. You've done a great job, and specifically in the area of Medical Assistance, 18 19 transportation, the methadone changes have really 20 saved a lot, as you're well aware. My concern is that Medical Assistance 21 22 transportation program continues to grow, and the 23 estimations are that there will be an additional five hundred sixty thousand trips for this fiscal 24

year, an additional six hundred ten thousand trips

25

for 2014 fiscal year, which comes up with almost ten million one-way trips.

We continue to hear from counties that their ability to provide this public transportation is declining as a result of their fiscal strains.

And I'm wondering, as utilization continues to grow, what steps is the department taking to create efficiencies? And how is this -- the change in the private-vehicle allowance, has that had any impact on this?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Couple questions in there. First off, you know, when I was back in York County as the executive director of Human Services, this was my biggest headache, so I do understand. And you know, the federal rules, many of them, require us to provide transportation. So, as part of that, we are trying to work through how to create a system that meets the needs of the federal government and also the people of Pennsylvania.

And the change in methadone, we're still looking at it. We're still doing reviews. And we will continue to see. And I'll tell you what, honestly, that's come off -- that had come off my priority list with healthy PA and the

Affordable Care Act, and I think we can bump that back up and take a look at that this coming year.

So, we will look at that.

I think what you're talking about as far as the private, is it the med-evac issue? Is that what you're talking about?

REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: No, it was, if I choose to use my private vehicle, I used to be provided a subsidy of twenty-five cents per mile, and I believe it was reduced to twelve cents. My concern is that that would then push people into the more expensive transportation options, where if we were to pay that bigger amount per mile, maybe we wouldn't have so many using the other systems.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Let us take a look at this and get back to you.

Do you have anything to add?

MR. SPISHOCK: I was just going to say, we did make the change to reduce the reimbursement rate, but we really haven't looked at the -- we can go back. We may have looked at the utilization between them to see is it more cost effective to do that or not. But we can go back and take a look and provide you some information on that.

REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: I certainly

appreciate that. 1 2 And, again, thank you for your good work. 3 SECRETARY MACKERETH: 4 Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE OBERLANDER: 5 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 7 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, Representative. 8 Representative Matt Bradford. 9 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: 10 Thank you, 11 Chairman. 12 Secretary, if I could, I wanted to 13 follow up with you briefly on Representative Dean's 14 point about kind of the choreography of going into 15 Medicaid expansion on a parallel track. If the 16 governor believes long-term Medicaid is not 17 sustainable, why can't we expand Medicaid yesterday and continue to negotiate on a parallel track? 18 19 Sustainability is not affected one bit by a program 20 that's a hundred percent refundable. Everyone gets 21 covered immediately. The costs are absorbed by the 22 feds immediately. We stop subsidizing our neighbor 23 states. And, meanwhile, the governor can get 24 involved in the engineering of his plan. 25 MR. SPISHOCK: Could I just make one

I just want to say, the first couple years, point? 1 2 we do --it's 100 percent federal funds. The FMAP starts to drop, and it drops slightly. It will 3 drop to 95 percent in four years. In four years, 4 when it drops down to 95 percent, that's --5 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Healthy PA 6 will be approved or not by then. And I don't mean 7 to talk over you, but I know time's short. 8 Why can't we go into Medicaid 9 yesterday, through expansion, and negotiate Healthy 10 PA on a going-forward basis or at the end of the 11 12 three-year window? There's nothing preventing 13 that. MR. SPISHOCK: And our waiver was a 14 15 total package. To take a look at -- we wanted to 16 do everything in one package: the expansion for 17 healthy PA, the reforms to the program, the premium payments, the work incentives. We wanted to do 18 19 that as one package, not to take bits and pieces of

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Respectfully, though, the answer was sustainability. Sustainability, 100 percent paid for yesterday, half a million Pennsylvanians are insured. Instead, we're playing politics going forward on a

it, to implement one piece here, one piece there.

20

21

22

23

24

25

program. Sustainability is divorced from 100
percent federally funded yesterday.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SECRETARY MACKERETH: And, Representative, I would respectfully disagree; there is nothing political about this. This is an issue regarding ensuring access to more Pennsylvanians to health care in a way that's sustainable for the taxpayers. Without the reform, I don't see how we could have done that. Plus, we don't have -- we don't have the staff. It takes six months. They're in the budget for this year, and I hope all will approve it, but we're talking about significant staffing of over -- I think the number's around seven hundred individuals, to get up and running to be able to handle any of this. We were not prepared nor set up to handle the influx in volume of Medicaid. We just weren't.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Respectfully, Secretary -- and I'm going to move on because I don't want to ask the same question twice -- it strains credulity to honestly believe that a bill that was passed in 2010 that the current governor litigated for years at the cost of thousands, ten of thousands, hundred of thousands of dollars, taxpayers' dollars, to now say, four years later,

that we didn't know. It is laughable. It doesn't
pass any test.

The fact that we could expand yesterday, a half a million Pennsylvanians are being denied health coverage to play a political game, to say we didn't take part in Medicaid expansion. The people deserve it, want it, and it was the right thing to do.

## MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:

Representative, let's move on. Your op-ed has been noted.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Understood.

13 I appreciate your op-ed.

All right. On the issue of waste, fraud, and abuse --

16 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: -- I think you deserve a lot of credit for saying that the department needs to be renamed, because, obviously, there's a lot more that your department does than welfare. And welfare is a coded term. And we all know people use it for political purposes and divisive purposes and nasty reasons. And it serves a certain purpose.

So, let's talk about waste, fraud, and

abuse. You provided a letter, correspondence to Chairman Markosek, and I know you provided it to Chairman Adolph as well. And there's these numbers that serve certain purposes, and I notice that the term "cost avoidance" is used interchangeably from "waste, fraud, and abuse." And we had this discussion with your predecessor, who had a lot of ideas about waste, fraud, and abuse, and it played out in a lot of strange and crazy ways in this commonwealth.

So, tell me, what part of that saving was waste? What part was fraud? What part was abuse?

MR. SPISHOCK: We don't break it out by waste, fraud, and abuse. We do break it out by regular cost avoidance, recoveries, and projected savings. I mean, a lot of our dollars are cost avoidance. When we implement several provisions -- we talk about the drug testing in the counties, we may have had four recipients that were denied because of the drug test; however, we've seen some pretty significant reductions going forward.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: How much have we saved by drug testing?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: For the four

recipients, or for the projections of how many people may not have come into the system because they didn't want to take the drug test? And we can --

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: How do you quantify that?

these are formulas that the federal government allows us to use in order to determine cost avoidance. When we're catching things on the front end, we have to have some way to be able to share that information. And we're building things so that we can catch it on the front end. Because the one thing we don't want, it costs us more if people come in, then we find it later on, then we go out and do our investigation. So, we're trying to catch it as people come in.

And, again, that's why we think that we're doing a very good job in keeping some of the fraud -- and I think a lot of that probably is fraud -- out of our system. Now, not completely. We have case after case that's being investigated, but we still think we're doing a very good job with that.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Do you have

```
any breakdown in terms of criminal or civil?
1
2
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: We have, what,
     the three hundred and twenty-eight million that was
 3
     reported to the OIG that they're reporting.
 4
                  REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: And how many
 5
     of those were resulted in prosecutions?
6
7
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Excuse me?
                                                    What?
                  REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: How many
8
     prosecutions?
9
10
                  MR. SPISHOCK: I think from the
     OIG recoveries, we had actual recoveries of ninety-
11
12
     seven and a half million dollars. We had avoidance
     of 233.7 million dollars. And then program
13
     disqualifications of 6.7 million --
14
15
                  REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD:
                                            I'm sorry.
     My question was prosecutions.
16
17
                  MR. SPISHOCK: We'd have to
     double-check with the OIG on that.
18
                  REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: And I would
19
20
     also wonder what convictions are. Could you also
     get me that number?
21
22
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Um-hum.
23
                  REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Okay.
                                                    I will
24
     say, one of the concerns I have, cost avoidance
25
     could mean everything from -- cost avoidance is
```

costs the state didn't incur. 1 2 Secretary Alexander received quite a bit of hard criticism in August of 2012 when he 3 dropped eighty-eight thousand children from Medical 4 Assistance, largely over paperwork errors. 5 there were savings at this point that resulted and 6 7 viewed as great for the commonwealth, and we dropped children with cancer off and all kinds of 8 9 things. It was a mess. 10 Are those savings being counted towards 11 the number that you're today trumpeting? 12 MR. SPISHOCK: 13 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: They're not. 14 SECRETARY MACKERETH: No. 15 MR. SPISHOCK: No. 16 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Is that Act 22 savings being counted? 17 18 MR. SPISHOCK: Not in -- no. 19 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: No savings 20 from the costs. MR. SPISHOCK: No. 21 22 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Huh-uh. 23 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: I would like 24 to see your breakdown at 1.9 billion. If you could 25 provide that to the committee, that would be great.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Absolutely, we 1 2 have that. REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: 3 In the interest on moving on, because I know you've got 4 limited time, my third and final point is the issue 5 of payments to our managed care providers. 6 almost four hundred million, almost half a billion 7 dollars, is a tremendous amount of money that we're 8 going to be saving. It sounds fabulous if we save 9 that kind of money. 10 11 If we're on an accrual system, as 12 opposed to a cash system, could we actually, 13 honestly say that we're not incurring those 14 liabilities? I mean, aren't all we're doing is 15 we're going to make eleven payments instead of 16 twelve payments this year to our managed care 17 providers? 18 MR. SPISHOCK: Yes. 19 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: So, the 20 following year, we either make thirteen payments? 21 MR. SPISHOCK: We make twelve payment 22 the next year. 23 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: And then some 24 day, at the end of the universe, we make the 25 thirteenth payment that's been --

```
MR. SPISHOCK:
                                 Thirteenth payment.
1
2
                  REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: I mean, is
     that really how we're getting a half billion
3
     dollars? That's fiscally conservative budgeting?
 4
                  MR. SPISHOCK: That's the third time
5
     we've probably done that in the past eight years.
6
7
                  REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: I don't think
     it was a good idea any of those times.
8
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: But we will have
9
     the dollars, with Healthy PA, with our savings for
10
11
     Healthy PA, to make up those dollars. So, it's not
12
     like --
                  REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: We could have
13
     them with Medicaid expansion yesterday. And I will
14
     conclude with that.
15
16
                  Thank you, Secretary.
17
                  Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Thank you.
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
19
20
     representative.
21
                  Representative Brian Ellis.
22
                  REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS:
                                         Thank you,
23
     Mr. Chairman.
24
                  Madam Secretary, you started off --
25
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Good to see you.
```

REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Good to see you 1 2 as well. You started off saying that you thought 3 it might be easier over here. And I'm sure, now 4 two hours plus later, you're definitely nodding 5 your head that it would be easier over here. 6 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Absolutely. 7 I'11 go sit over there for a while. 8 Well, I'll say 9 REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: that for any of us that worked with you, we are 10 very happy to have you over there. 11 12 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you. 13 REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: And what you've 14 done with the department, it is a difficult task 15 for every secretary that ever sits at that table, 16 Republican or Democrat. And so we're glad to have 17 you. 18 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you. 19 REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Now, one of the 20 areas I want to go into real quick, obviously important across the commonwealth, is child care. 21 22 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Um-hum. 23 REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: And, you know, 24 whether, you know, you're from the upper end of the economic spectrum or if you're, you know, on the 25

lower end, child care is something that is needed.

My wife and I could not have gotten to this point without child care. We had, at times, subsidized and, some times, private, but what this administration did last year was acknowledged that one of the most important things we can do is to make sure that the quality of the education providers that are in the child care field are growing.

And we put in money in the budget last year to make sure that there was tuition assistance for -- because moving from step two to step three is really based on who's providing the child care.

Can you talk a little bit about what we're doing in this budget to continue to move child care forward in Pennsylvania?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Yes.

Representative, first off, thank you for the nice comments. I appreciate it.

But, yes, we do continue to fund tuition assistance at the same level that we did last year. And what you're talking about as far as quality is our Rising Stars, which is part of our Keystone Stars initiative. And we believe that government funds need to go to quality. So, we

```
continue to make -- so, same funding as last year
1
2
     for that.
                  REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: So, you will
 3
     continue to invest in that?
4
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: Right.
5
                                                Again,
     this year, just so you're aware, again, strategic
6
7
     investment in individuals, and so, our investment
     this year is to get our children off the waiting
8
     list and get them that into care.
9
10
                 REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Get them into
     care, but, at the same time, increasing --
11
12
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Increase quality.
13
                 REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Increasing from
14
     star two to star three as many facilities as
15
     possible.
16
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: Absolutely.
17
                  REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS: Okay. Thank you
     very much for your time. And thank you for all you
18
     do.
19
20
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Thank you.
21
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.
22
                  Representative Santarsiero.
23
                  REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Thank you,
     Mr. Chairman.
24
25
                 Over here, Madam Secretary.
```

```
SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                         Sorry.
1
2
                  REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO:
                                                That's
3
     okay.
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: It's getting
 4
     late.
5
                  REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Yeah, I
6
7
                I'll try to be as quick as possible.
     hear you.
                  Welcome back.
8
                  And Mr. Spishock, welcome back.
9
10
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                         Thank you.
11
                  REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO:
                                                I just
12
     want to start, very briefly, with a request to
13
     follow up on what Representative DiGirolamo was
14
     asking earlier, and it should be a pretty easy
15
     one.
16
                  This report that he was referencing
17
     has -- the tables he was referring to, just so you
18
     can see, because I know you can't see from there,
19
     but just so I can make it a little more clear, the
20
     first one is just a table of folks who were served
21
     under the block grant program, so it should be
22
     pretty easy to get the data about past years to
23
     compared to that. So, if you could do that for us,
24
     that would be great.
25
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                         Sure.
```

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: And the 1 2 second piece is an analysis of the participating counties with respect to allocations and 3 expenditures. And, again, you should be able to get previous data in terms of money that went under 5 the old silo approach to those different counties, 6 so we can compare those as well. That would be a 7 help. Okay. So, if you could follow up with that, 8 we'd be grateful. 9 10 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Um-hum. 11 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Thank 12 you. 13 You talked before about the process 14 with the federal government with the Healthy PA 15 plan, the waiver you've put in. And you mentioned 16 the fact that it's going to take a while and 17 there's going to be a negotiation and you're 18 probably not going to get everything you want. Do you have a sense of, based on your 19 20 discussions with the federal government and Secretary Sebelius, how long that process is going 21 to take? 22 23 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Yes, Representative. So, first, we don't have a 24 25 specific time frame. What we do know is that they

```
have fifteen days to review and they've assigned it
1
2
     or are assigning it to a project manager.
     have a thirty-day public comment period. So, if
 3
     anybody would like to give public comment, you
 4
     should feel free to do so. They have another
 5
     fifteen days after that to do their final review.
6
7
                  Once they've heard the public comment,
     during that time, we continue -- so we don't start,
8
     we continue to have conversations with the federal
9
     government around the proposal and what -- what
10
11
     they like, what they think won't work, and
12
     negotiate.
13
                  REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Okay.
                                                       And
14
     any sense of how long that negotiations going to
15
     take?
16
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        No, but I love to
17
     have letters of support from the general assembly.
     I bet that would speed it up.
18
19
                  REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Well, I'm
20
     asking because, obviously, that's going to have an
21
     impact on our budgeting, right?
22
                  Now, you said that right now the
23
     governor's budgeting, I think, a hundred twenty-
     four million dollars.
24
```

SECRETARY MACKERETH:

Twenty-five.

25

REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: 1 2 Don't want to forget that extra million. SECRETARY MACKERETH: 3 Huh-uh. REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: In savings 4 as the consequence of Healthy PA. If you don't get 5 everything you want, and I think, you know, again, 6 you've acknowledged that you probably won't get 7 everything you want and what he's proposing, how is 8 that going to impact that hundred and twenty-five 9 million dollars? 10 SECRETARY MACKERETH: 11 It should not 12 impact that a hundred and twenty-five million at 13 all, because the portions in which we see savings 14 are things that we have talked to the federal 15 government about. There may be some tweaks, but, 16 basically, we think that that's a very good number. 17 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: So, you 18 think you're going to get that whole hundred and 19 twenty-five million dollars. 20 MR. SPISHOCK: Yes. SECRETARY MACKERETH: 21 Yes. 22 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: All right. 23 You've been talking about the fourhundred to six-hundred-million-dollar cost 24 25 increase. Is that the additional cost in

Medicare, Medicaid --1 2 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Every year. REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: -- caused 3 by woodwork effect? Is that what that is? 4 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Well, for this 5 year, it's going to be -- it may be higher if the 6 7 people that are considered woodwork come in. is historic. 8 MR. SPISHOCK: And that's the 9 department number. That's our total department 10 11 budget increase, about four hundred to six hundred 12 million, not --13 REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: Yeah. And 14 I'm just trying to get an understanding. I mean, 15 what part of that is the woodwork? Because I had 16 taken your previous testimony earlier today to say 17 that was largely attributable to more people now 18 coming into the system. MR. SPISHOCK: Our woodwork number is 19 20 about a hundred thirty-one million dollars. REPRESENTATIVE SANTARSIERO: A hundred 21 22 thirty-one million. Okay. 23 You know, it strikes me as a bit 24 strange. You know, the last year we were here we 25 talked about the cost of Medicaid expansion, and

the administration was putting that cost at around four billion dollars, and I think we agreed, when we had this discussion back and forth, that about 1.6 billion of that is attributable to increased eligibility under the Affordable Care Act and, therefore, that's not really a cost that would have anything to do with expansion because that was going to be borne anyway by virtue of increased eligibility.

We're now talking about another a hundred thirty, a hundred forty million or so of woodwork effect costs. And I think we probably will differ on that in terms of what the total nut is on that. We think the number is closer to something like the four to six hundred million dollars a year. And, again, those are costs associated with people who are eligible under the Affordable Care Act now, regardless of Medicaid expansion.

But it was those costs which were the reason a year ago why the administration was not inclined, at that point, to do Medicaid expansion. Now, it's a year later, and we have this waiver proposal, and we're hearing that, you know, one of the problems in response to Representative

Bradford's questioning of why you can't simultaneously go forward with Medicaid expansion is because you're not prepared to do so.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, to Representative Bradford's point, it's four years now. The costs are largely going to be there anyway. And, in the meantime, we've got these five hundred thousand Pennsylvanians who are going without health benefit.

Now, I take you at your word that, you know, you're interested in getting those folks insured in some manner, but, candidly, there is no reason why we can't go forward with that now. You, to your own admission, state that you don't know how long it's going to take to negotiate this deal with the federal government, and at the end of the day, frankly, I don't think any of us in this room can say with any certainty whether you will be able to reach a deal with the federal government. could well be back here a year from now or two years from now without that having been consummated, and having lost two more years of moving forward with something that's out there right now that can insure those five hundred thousand Pennsylvanians who have gone without

health care now for years, a hundred thousand of
whom were thrown out of the adultBasic program when
that was ended.

Madam Secretary, I implore you to talk

to the governor, to review this and move forward on the expansion now. There is nothing that prohibits you from having those discussions with the federal government and negotiating your plan. But in the event that that doesn't happen -- and you've admitted and we've all seen there's no way anyone can assure us that that can happen -- those five hundred thousand Pennsylvanians need to be covered, and the sooner we step forward and pursue that path, the sooner they will be covered. And I think it's incumbent upon all of us to make sure that happens.

Thank you.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:

Representative Dave Millard.

21 REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, Secretary.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Good afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Always nice to

1 | see you.

2 SECRETARY MACKERETH: You, too. Thank 3 you.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Before I ask some questions here, I just want to commend you and your department for the great job that you do.

Back in my district, a lot of the clientele that come into my office, some of the concerns deal with your office. We have your office on speed dial.

They always answer. They're always helpful. And at the end of the day, I always like to think that we gave somebody a good night's rest. So, thank you.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: The questions that I'm going to ask you, Madam Secretary, are concerning the balancing incentive program, and these questions are from the Independent Living Council here in the commonwealth. It says that the proposed budget includes 75.3 million in savings from a 2 percent increase in federal Medical Assistance funds for increasing community-based service and supports.

The first question is, where's

Pennsylvania at in comparison to other states in

```
the proportion of home- and community-based care
1
2
     compared to institutional care?
 3
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Representative, I
     can tell you we're not where I'd like to see us.
 4
     The balancing incentive grant, I believe, is for
5
     states that are below the 50 percent. And so,
6
     that's why we are applying for it. We have to do
7
    better. And we hope to do better. And that will
8
     move us along.
9
10
                  There's three different issues that we
                 There's no wrong door with that.
11
     have to do.
12
     There's single assessment, which we'll need, and
13
     conflict-free case management. Those are the three
14
             And our hope is to create the system that
     areas.
15
     can get us moving in the right direction.
16
                  REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD:
                                           Okay.
17
     Secondly, where is DPW at in terms of applying
18
     federal rebalancing incentives offered under the
     Affordable Care Act?
19
20
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        That is it.
                  REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD:
21
                                           That is it.
22
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Yes,
23
     Representative. And that is -- and that's the
24
     seventy-five million that we're requesting.
25
                 REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD:
                                           Okay.
```

SECRETARY MACKERETH: And that is under
the Affordable Care Act.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: And then the

final is where is Pennsylvania at in terms of applying for these funds compared to other states?

And how long are these increased funds available?

MR. SPISHOCK: We should have our -- we have the application complete. It's in the final review. We should be submitting our application to the federal government within the next couple of weeks.

The funds will be available in '14-'15, and for one quarter. They will end September 2015.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Okay. And I guess my last comment is, we've heard a lot of comments today about, you know, the state accepting the federal dollars to join in the Affordable Care Act and everything else, and you've explained early on that it comes at a cost. So, to encapsulate this, would you indicate to me whether my comment is correct or incorrect: There are no free dollars.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Secretary. 1 2 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you. 3 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: 4 Thank you, 5 Representative. Representative Mike Carroll. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 Madam Secretary, I do not envy you in 9 your position, in your role today. 10 11 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Some days I don't 12 envy me either, but that's okay. 13 REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: It is quite 14 the challenge. I don't envy you in your role. 15 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: 16 I have 17 listened intently over the course of the last two and a half hours or so to the conversation, and, I 18 19 guess, just from a ten-thousand-foot perspective, 20 I'm having trouble reconciling the comments that 21 I've heard with respect to the governor and the 22 administration and the department's desire to 23 ensure the five hundred thousand folks and then to 24 do everything in a single package. I think it 25 might have been the budget director who used that

phrase "a single package."

And I just can't -- I'd like to know if you could explain to me what the rationale is for that "single package" decision. Why not take advantage of the program that's offered as a result of the Affordable Care Act with respect to the 100 percent reimbursement and move forward with a Healthy PA program and make adjustments midstream as has been done in this building time after time after time?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: First off, I
don't know if it keeps getting lost, but we do -from a practical perspective, it's not about
flipping a switch. We need to have -- we've put in
the budget for seven hundred positions to be able
to handle the workload in our ninety-three CAO
offices. We are working on our IT system. We're
not where we need to be.

Again, when I said, if you see one

Medicare -- Medicaid system, you've seen one state

Medicaid system. They all look different. Our

system, we had some things that we needed to fix.

We've had a lot of things that we needed to fix.

And believe me, we're not the only state, because

most states have some very similar problems that we

have had. They have less people. They have less seniors. Many have less individuals with disabilities. So, again, we look very different.

Our benefit package was robust. There was -- we were spending a lot of dollars. Thirty percent of the general fund budget goes to MA. We have to reform. The governor said two years ago, we need to reform, and we need flexibility to do some things.

If we continue to do what we've always done, with no good health outcomes, with no personal responsibility, we're going to get the same results, which is we just continue to spend money. I don't think that's acceptable to the people of Pennsylvania. I think they want to see better health outcomes. We want people to go to the doctor.

In our benefit package, we have said that individuals can go to the doctor, their primary care physician, as many times as they need to, because we want to push people to the doctor. We want them to have relationships with their doctor.

Again, in Medicaid, our provider base is much more refined than it will be under a

private coverage option where we're going to have much more access to docs for individuals. We're talking about a different population of people there.

Again, you know, I feel like I am a broken record. I mean, we can go through this -- and I would be happy to sit down with you. I'd be happy to come to your caucus and sit down and talk with you all about why we're doing what we're doing and how it makes sense. So, I'm just going to throw that out there to you.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: All right. In addition to changing the name of the department, I think we ought to think about changing the name of the Medicaid assistance we provide to seniors, because this conversation related to Medicaid includes that universe of folks and that financial obligation that is tremendously significant in terms of the global discussion of Medical Assistance.

And then, just one other observation.

You know, it seems to me that some of the folks
that you are concerned about coming into the County
Assistance Offices, it seems to me some of those
folks would end up in the Medical Assistance

program by virtue of a computer transaction relative to the exchanges. And so, I'm not certain that every single one of those folks would show up at the County Assistance Office. Some of those folks might actually get enrolled by virtue of a transaction in the community.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: And they may very well. And so, we have concerns about that as well, because we have -- I don't know. I think the last figure I heard -- which probably is inaccurate, guys -- but about sixty-eight thousand applications which the federal government is not able to send to us because it's not working.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: And I'll end with just a -- if we could have a short discussion about the FMAP and the three hundred twenty-two million dollars that the commonwealth will receive in terms of reduction this coming fiscal year.

As I understand it, the commonwealth was made aware of that last fall, sometime around September or October.

MR. SPISHOCK: Well, not the current FMAP. We received a preliminary FMAP back last fall, which had us at 53 percent federal, which is what we based our initial budget request on.

This October, we revised the current projections, which shows us at the 51.82.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: But the reality is that we knew last fall that there was going to be a reduction in terms of the --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Not the size we did. Our preliminary number was 53 percent.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: And as I understand it, the FMAP number changes year over year. And some years we do a little bit better, and some years we do a little bit less.

MR. SPISHOCK: We've been dropping pretty consistently. It's usually based on your per capita income tax. And the feds for this year rebased how they calculate per capita. It's a significant -- as we said, it's a significant drop for us. Percentage-wise, we're probably -- Delaware probably had the biggest decrease; dollar-wise, Pennsylvania had the biggest decrease in dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Yeah. I did look at the states, and there were a handful of states that were in the category with us in terms of having a large percentage drop, and then a few states that did well comparatively speaking.

But, I guess, you know, when I think about the hit that we were expecting to take with respect to the FMAP numbers that we had a sense of beginning last fall, and then you fold on top of that decision relative to the expansion of the Medical Assistance, it makes me wonder, again, if it wouldn't have been a wise move to recalibrate the decision, especially in light of the information relative to the FMAP percentages.

And I guess I don't expect you to answer that, but it seems to me that, given the decision that was made with respect to not, you know, expanding Medicaid, that the FMAP component probably should have brought us to a point where we recalibrated.

I don't know if you care to offer an opinion on that, Madam.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Representative, I would just say that the FMAP recalculation and knowing that is the funding formula change moving forward creates more pause than ever in a system that is already -- we're overspending, and now with a reduction in three hundred twenty-two million from this year forward, that makes us even more nervous about expanding a system that today can't

be financially sustained.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: But that formula that -- that data that's used in that formula will change every four, five years, as I understand it, and that percentage is a new percentage. Each fall we get that percentage.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: According to CMS's formula wasn't changed for many, many years.

MR. SPISHOCK: Yes, the per capita does not change. It probably hasn't changed in twenty years.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Yep. They've been waiting twenty years to be able to change this. And Pennsylvania fared worse, again, dollar wise, than any other state in the nation.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: This time.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: This time. But, for us, three hundred twenty-two million out of our budget, when our budget continues to grow because of Medicaid and the current population, is scary.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Fair enough.

And that brings me back to the decision relative to the 100 percent reimbursement. And I understand at FMAP contribution percentages are different from the Affordable Care Act, but the

```
reality is, is that we're living in a universe with
1
2
     both of those variables in play, and it seems to me
     that probably we should have recalibrated as a
3
     result of the knowledge related to FMAP.
 4
                  And I'll stop there.
 5
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
6
                                         Thank you,
7
     Representative.
8
                  REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL:
                                            Thank you.
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
9
                                              Thank you,
     Representative.
10
11
                  Representative Curt Sonney.
12
                  REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY:
                                           Thank you,
     Mr. Chairman.
13
14
                  Madam Secretary, good to see you.
15
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Good to see you,
16
     too.
17
                  REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: And I'm going
18
     to be brief.
19
                  I just want to touch base real quick,
20
     when you talked a little bit about long-term living
     and nursing homes, especially.
21
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
22
23
                  REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: And the need to
24
    basically keep as many individuals out of those
25
    nursing homes as we can. Of course, we know that
```

we have existing programs in place that can help 1 2 these elder citizens to be able to remain at home longer, and, of course, these are individuals that 3 do qualify, as far as their condition, to be placed in a nursing home, but yet, with the proper support 5 and services, they can remain in their homes much 6 longer, which obviously saves us all money. 7 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Not always, but 8 go ahead. 9 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: 10 But you had mentioned that the department is looking at 11 12 expanding those types of services. SECRETARY MACKERETH: Yes. 13 Over the 14 next year, with our long-term care commission, we 15 will be looking at the entire continuum of services to meet the needs of our growing senior 16 population. So, we're going to be looking at 17 everything, all home-, community-based, and 18 19 certainly nursing facility -- and nurse facility --20 if you're eligible for that, there's other 21 opportunities like LIFE programs, things like that, 22 shared living, all those kinds of things. 23 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: 24 SECRETARY MACKERETH: 25 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: And,

specifically, on the LIFE programs --

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Do you believe that -- and not just the LIFE programs, but in similar programs, do you believe that we have the infrastructure in place throughout the state to be able to provide services, you know, to a wide area of the commonwealth, for those individuals that would like to receive those services?

 $\label{eq:secretary mackereth: well, we are} % \begin{center} \begin{center} \textbf{SECRETARY MACKERETH: Well, we are} \\ \textbf{relooking at that.} \end{center}$ 

MR. SPISHOCK: We're looking at a distribution of slots as part of the program. In the current budget, we have eight hundred slots, which actually is an increase of two hundred over what's projected growth for the fiscal year, but we want to look at redistributing those slots where they are in the -- there's some areas of the commonwealth that do not have LIFE providers that may be looking to implement a LIFE provider, we'd look to redistribute those slots, where appropriate.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: And I do have some specific concerns about that that I've been hearing from local providers.

```
SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Okay.
                                                And we
1
2
     would love to hear them.
 3
                  REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: And I would
     love to meet with you. I wrote you a letter about
 4
     a month ago, and, quite frankly, I realize that you
5
     couldn't find a busier time of the year to get in
6
7
     touch with you.
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: I'll make sure
8
     you get your response back.
9
10
                  REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: But I wanted to
11
     get on the record and get in line for a personal
12
     meeting with you so that we could discuss some of
     those issues.
13
14
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH:
                                        Okay.
                                                Thank
15
     you.
16
                  REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY:
                                          Thank you.
17
                  Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                              Thank you,
19
     Representative.
20
                  Representative Seth Grove.
21
                  REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                         Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
22
23
                  Secretary, always good to see you.
24
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: Always good to
25
     see you.
```

1 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: You're looking 2 lovely today.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: David, you also.

MR. SPISHOCK: Thank you.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: I love you, Seth.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Definitely in a

manly way.

about the argument of entering into Medicaid expansion and then negotiate. To me, it makes absolutely no sense to completely give away all your negotiating position, and, obviously, it's so critical to get our budget under control. You've discussed the numbers. It's not looking good to just continue to do the things we've been doing in welfare.

Can you comment on why the federal government, if we expand it -- obviously they want us to expand -- why they would ever try to negotiate with us.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: I think that's certainly part of what went into the decision to move down the path that we have. We need to make sure we get reform to our current system. Without

reform, there is no way to move forward. You can't throw five hundred thousand people in a system that needs to be reformed and that is not financially sustainable.

So, do I believe that the federal government would just -- I mean, I think they would have been very happy for us to just expand. I'm not sure we have gotten the reform that we need.

 $\label{eq:representative grove: I absolutely} $$ agree with you.$ 

And looking at those reforms, one of my colleagues that's not on Appropriations brought up that the Office of Inspector General was looking at a 4 percent decrease, and his worry is we'll lose nineteen welfare fraud investigators, who -- each one of them brings in about 1.1 million dollars of reduction, between overpayments and trying to find that fraud. The worry is, without those investigators, we won't continue to ensure that those taxpayer dollars will be used for what they're supposed to be used for.

Can we get a commitment maybe to try to find a way to maintain their line item to make sure we don't use those welfare fraud investigators?

25 SECRETARY MACKERETH: I need to check

into that, Representative Grove, because I'm not
sure that -- I didn't realize that we were -- it's
not our line item; it's theirs.

But I can tell you that the partnership that we have with the inspector general's office has been tremendous, and we have sat down, we've worked with them. We've talked through how, when they're in any home or doing any kind of investigation, they can take that opportunity and look for, you know, if children are in the home, what's going on. So, we have a tremendous respect for the work they do on our behalf. In fact, many of the inspector generals sit in our CAO offices so they're there for us to talk with all the time.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Great.

Couple of lightning round questions. I'll ask short, you answer short, and we'll get through this.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: It's my understanding that child care providers contracted with the state since 1990 have had their rates frozen. New providers coming into the system have gotten a new rate.

Is the department looking at trying to

correct that inequity?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Actually, as one of the other reps brought up, we are paying for quality now. So, the dollars will go and the dollars continue to go for providers to move up and, for higher quality, from level two to level three or level four in our Rising Stars program.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Great.

Office of Long-Term Living waiver reimbursement has separate rates for RNs and LPNs. Basically, there's increasing reliance on LPN service. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the number of LPNs working in PA has decreased over 5 percent since 2009, and the number of LPNs in PA are much more limited than RNs.

Has there been efforts to assist providers in attracting and retaining LPNs?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Representative, I would tell you that it's really up to the providers to get out there and attract the level of employees that they need to have. They have not brought that at least to my attention, and even though I'm sure -- you know, they may have talked to one of my staff members, but it really is up to them to recruit for providers.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay.

Structured family care giving supports qualified family care givers in a twenty-four/seven commitment to caring for an elder or a person with disabilities. This model has been adopted, as I understand, by Medicaid programs ranging from Massachusetts to Texas, including our neighbors Indiana and Ohio.

What's your view on the model?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: I don't -- there
are so many models out there and through the last
year, Representative, it's like a revolving door of
groups coming in and sharing. There's amazing
stuff going on, I've got to tell you, in other
states as well as in PA.

This next year will give us that opportunity to look at all the different models and determine what meets the needs of Pennsylvanians.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. Final question. Is there anything we can do to assist you in helping you manage your budget better, even at a 3.9 percent with some of the good reforms you're trying to get in to your Healthy PA waiver? Is there things we can do to help assist you?

SECRETARY MACKERETH: Well, I mentioned

before, if we had a letter of support, I bet it 1 2 would speed up the process of getting Healthy PA through the federal government. 3 But, I also would say, you know, call 4 If people come in to meet with you about 5 us. issues, we hear from people every day about we need 6 this, we need rate increases, we need this, this, 7 this, all the time. Call us. Let's sit down and 8 talk it through. Let's figure out what's really 9 going on. I think that's important. If we're all 10 11 on the same page, it's going to help. 12 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Appreciate that. 13 SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you. Thank you. 14 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: 15 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 16 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: I got good 17 news for you, that was the last member with 18 questions. 19 SECRETARY MACKERETH: And my rep did 20 great. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: 21 We had 22 originally scheduled the Department of General 23 Services to be in here at 3:30. We're going to try

to keep him somewhat on time, probably be about

fifteen, twenty minutes late for them.

24

25

Madam Secretary, Mr. Spishock, thank
you so much for being here. I knew going into this
hearing, because of the amount of both federal and
state tax dollars that are spent on this budget,
but also because of the population that we're
talking about, because of those that are the most
needy citizens, we have to get it right.

And I'm happy to hear that the department has made an effort, based upon previous auditor general findings, to make sure that, you know, there is no waste or abuse or fraud. Not everybody goes to jail that wastes money, but we have to correct it, to make sure those that are most needy get the most money that they can.

Also, you know, even those that voted for the Affordable Care Act and that administration has made the decision to delay some of their provisions of the Affordable Care Act, whether it was for small businesses or whether it was for large businesses, whether it was reporting health care costs on W-2s. There's always delays in implementing legislation.

I don't know if Healthy PA is the answer. I'm not an expert. I'm hoping that the federal government does respond. I certainly would

have wished that we could have gotten it down there faster, obviously. I don't think you disagree.

SECRETARY MACKERETH: No.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: But it was a big change put upon us. But it's a little over, I guess, eleven billion dollars in state tax dollars that we have to make a decision how we spend it and make sure that it's sustainable for those that need it the most over the next several years.

We do have some problems out there, you know, and you have a big challenge. And there's some people here from the Arc of Pennsylvania that have some problems that they shared with us today, and, you know, these care givers that have sacrificed their entire lives to take care of those loved ones, and if they did not do it, they would have been a big financial burden on the commonwealth. So, we need to help those families out.

Thank you so much. I hope we hear from the federal government as soon as possible. You know, I have a feeling there's going to be some tweaks. We're going to have to get back to work, because we need to get this budget done, and, hopefully, we can get Healthy PA or some version of

```
it going so we can take care of these folks.
1
 2
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: Absolutely.
 3
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you
 4
     very much.
 5
                  SECRETARY MACKERETH: Thank you so
 6
     much, Mr. Chairman.
7
                  MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: The next
     hearing will reconvene at 3:50.
8
9
                  Thank you.
10
                  (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
11
     3:43 p.m.)
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. BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR Court Reporter Notary Public