# COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

# APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BUDGET HEARING

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

STATE CAPITOL
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
ROOM 140, MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2016 9:30 A.M.

#### **BEFORE:**

HONORABLE WILLIAM ADOLPH, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE JOSEPH MARKOSEK, MINORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE KAREN BOBACK

HONORABLE GARY DAY

HONORABLE GEORGE DUNBAR

HONORABLE GARTH EVERETT

HONORABLE KEITH GREINER

HONORABLE SETH GROVE

HONORABLE SUE HELM

HONORABLE WARREN KAMPF

HONORABLE FRED KELLER

HONORABLE TOM KILLION

HONORABLE JIM MARSHALL

HONORABLE KURT MASSER

HONORABLE DAVE MILLARD

HONORABLE DUANE MILNE

HONORABLE MARK MUSTIO

HONORABLE MIKE PEIFER

HONORABLE JEFFREY PYLE

HONORABLE MARGUERITE QUINN

HONORABLE CURT SONNEY

HONORABLE LESLIE ACOSTA

HONORABLE MATTHEW BRADFORD

HONORABLE TIM BRIGGS

HONORABLE DONNA BULLOCK

HONORABLE MARY JO DALEY

HONORABLE MADELEINE DEAN

HONORABLE MARIA DONATUCCI

HONORABLE STEPHEN KINSEY

HONORABLE MICHAEL O'BRIEN

## BEFORE (continued): HONORABLE KEVIN SCHREIBER HONORABLE PETER SCHWEYER NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS: HONORABLE MATTHEW BAKER HONORABLE JUDY WARD HONORABLE CRAIG STAATS HONORABLE TOM MURT

HONORABLE DAVE ZIMMERMAN HONORABLE KATHARINE WATSON

HONORABLE CRIS DUSH

HONORABLE SCOTT PETRI

HONORABLE MARK KELLER

HONORABLE MARCIA HAHN HONORABLE MINDY FEE

HONORABLE MARTY CAUSER

HONORABLE DAN MOUL

HONORABLE BRETT MILLER

HONORABLE KRISTIN PHILLIPS-HILL

HONORABLE DARYL METCALFE

HONORABLE MATT GABLER

HONORABLE RUSS DIAMOND

HONORABLE FLO FABRIZIO

HONORABLE SCOTT CONKLIN

HONORABLE MICHAEL DRISCOLL

HONORABLE LEANNE KRUEGER-BRANEKY

HONORABLE EDDIE PASHINSKI

HONORABLE JARET GIBBONS

HONORABLE MIKE CARROLL

HONORABLE VANESSA LOWERY-BROWN

HONORABLE PAM DeLISSIO

### COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:

DAVID DONLEY

MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RITCHIE LaFAVER

MAJORITY DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

CURT SCHRODER

MAJORITY CHIEF COUNSEL

MIRIAM FOX

DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

TARA TREES

DEMOCRATIC CHIEF COUNSEL

Tiffany L. Mast • Mast Reporting mastreporting @g mail.com (717)348-1275

### I N D E X

#### TESTIFIERS

\* \* \*

NAME TED DALLAS SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES10	
DAVE SPISHOCK BUDGET DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES16	
JENNIFER BURNETT  DEPUTY SECRETARY,  OFFICE OF LONG-TERM LIVING  DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES	
NANCY THALER  DEPUTY SECRETARY,  OFFICE OF DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS  DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES98	
SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY  * * *	
(See submitted written testimony and handouts online	∋.)

#### PROCEEDINGS

2.5

\* \* \*

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. Good morning, everyone.

I would like to reconvene the House

Appropriations Committee for budget hearings for the fiscal year '16-'17. Today's hearing is with the Department of Human Services.

I will just go over some quick housekeeping.

Okay. We have quite a crowd here today. I would ask everyone to take a couple seconds and turn off your iPhones, your iPads, all that type of electronic equipment that sometimes interferes with the telecast.

I will ask the testifiers to move the mikes as close as possible to you. They're not the most powerful mikes. And because of the crowd and because of the size of the room, sometimes the committee members cannot hear your answers. So thank you for that.

I want to take a couple minutes to go
through the introduction of the members on the committee
and some of our guest chairs of the House standing
committees. And I do that because I want the viewers to
understand, and of course the testifiers to understand,
how large the House Appropriations Committee is. And
also, it gives the viewers an idea of where the members

```
1
    of this committee are from. And I can assure you, they
2
    are from just about every section of the Commonwealth of
    Pennsylvania. So there's all different issues involving
3
    urban, suburban and rural areas.
 4
                So I will start off. My name is Bill
6
             I'm the House Republican Chair of the House
7
    Appropriations Committee. I reside in Springfield
8
    Township, Delaware County, the 165th Legislative
    District.
10
                MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK:
                                              Thank you,
11
    Chairman.
12
                Good morning, everybody. I'm State
13
    Representative Joe Markosek, 25th Legislative District.
14
                I'm the Democratic Chairman of the House
15
    Appropriations Committee. I reside in Monroeville,
16
    Pennsylvania, which is part of the eastern suburbs of
17
    Allegheny County.
18
                MS. FOX: Hi, I'm Miriam Fox.
                                                And I'm the
19
    executive director for the House Appropriations
20
    Committee, Democrats.
21
                CHAIRMAN FABRIZIO: Good morning.
22
                I'm Flo Fabrizio, Democratic Chairman of the
23
    Health Committee. I represent the 2d Legislative
24
    District, and that's Erie -- the city of Erie and parts
2.5
    of Erie County.
```

```
1
                REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Good morning, and
2
    welcome.
                I'm Madeleine Dean from Montgomery County,
3
    the 153d.
4
                REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Hi. I'm Matt
5
6
    Bradford from the 70th District in Central Montgomery
7
    County.
8
                REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Good morning.
9
                Mary Jo Daley, Montgomery County, the 148th
    District.
10
11
                REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: Good morning.
12
                Leslie Acosta, Representative of
13
    Philadelphia County.
14
                How are you, Secretary?
15
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Good to see you.
16
                REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: District 197.
                REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Good morning.
17
18
                Maria Donatucci, 185th District,
19
    Philadelphia and Delaware Counties.
2.0
                REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Good morning.
21
                Peter Schweyer, 22d Legislative District,
22
    Lehigh County and city of Allentown.
23
                REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Good morning.
24
                Stephen Kinsey, Philadelphia County, 21st
2.5
    Legislative District.
```

```
1
                REPRESENTATIVE SCHREIBER: Good morning.
2
                Kevin Schreiber, York County, 95th District.
                REPRESENTATIVE CONKLIN: Good morning.
3
                I'm Scott Conklin, the Democratic Chairman
 4
5
    of Children and Youth. I represent the 77th District,
6
    Centre County, which is the Penn State vicinity.
7
                REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Good morning.
8
                Karen Boback, House District 117, Luzerne,
    Lackawanna and Wyoming Counties.
9
10
                REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Good morning.
11
                Sue Helm, the 104th District of Dauphin and
    Lebanon Counties.
12
13
                MR. DONNELLY: Hi. Dave Donnelly,
    Republican staff executive director to the Committee.
14
15
                MR. SCHRODER: Good morning. Curt Schroder,
16
    chief counsel, Republican Appropriations Committee.
17
                CHAIRMAN BAKER: Good morning, gentlemen.
                Matt Baker, Chairman of the Health
18
19
    Committee, oversight chairman on Medicaid programs,
20
    representing the 68th District: Tioga, Bradford and
21
    Potter Counties.
22
                REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Good morning.
23
                Mark Mustio, 44th Legislative District,
24
    Allegheny County.
2.5
                REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Good morning.
```

```
1
                Joe Marshall, 14th District, parts of Beaver
2
    and parts of Butler Counties.
3
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Good morning.
 4
                Marguerite Quinn of the 143rd Legislative
    District, parts of central and Upper Bucks County.
5
 6
                REPRESENTATIVE MASSER: Good morning.
7
                Kurt Masser, 107th District:
8
    Northumberland, Columbia and Montour Counties.
9
                REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Good morning.
                David Millard, 109th District, Columbia
10
11
    County.
                REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Good morning.
12
1.3
                George Dunbar, Westmoreland County, 56th
14
    District.
15
                REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Good morning.
                Curt Sonney, 4th Legislative District, Erie
16
17
    County.
18
                REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Good morning, Mr.
19
    Secretary.
20
                Jeff Pyle, 60th Legislative: Armstrong,
    Indiana and Butler Counties.
21
22
                REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Good morning.
23
                Keith Greiner, 43rd District, Lancaster
24
    County.
2.5
                REPRESENTATIVE EVERETT: Good morning.
```

1 Garth Everett, 84th District, Lycoming and 2 Union Counties. Neighboring Chairman Baker here in what we fondly refer to as northern central nowhere, 3 4 Pennsylvania. REPRESENTATIVE MURT: Tom Murt, 152d 5 6 District, Philadelphia and Montgomery Counties. 7 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Thank you, 8 everyone. That gives you an idea of the number of 10 Representatives on the committee, 37 altogether. 11 a couple folks that are regular visitors to these 12 hearings. We do have a couple seats up front. I 13 quarantee we won't ask you any questions. Okay. 14 But I will announce some of our quests as 15 well, some of the members that are not on the committee that are here. 16 17 But just an opening statement, I want to 18 welcome the Secretary here today. And for your 19 information, you know, the Department of Human Services 20 represents about 38 percent of our State budget. 21 know, somewhere between \$11 billion and \$12 billion, 22 depending on what budget you're looking at. Okay. 23 And I'm looking forward to hearing the 24 Secretary's comments and introducing your staff. 2.5 Thank you.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Good morning, sir. Thank you.

2.5

First, let me introduce Dave Spishock. He's our budget director. I think he's a familiar face to many of you.

Chairman Adolph and Chairman Markosek, thank you very much for the opportunity to be here today.

We've made a lot of progress in the Department of Human Services in the last year. We have more folks covered who have health insurance than probably at any time in recent memory in Pennsylvania. That's largely due to the Medicaid expansion.

We have probably near an all-time low of the number of people receiving TANF in the State. The number is down about 10 percent since I got here, and I think it's well below what it was at the start of the great recession in 2008.

While we've also made a lot of strides in our customer service, we're answering phone calls faster, we're determining benefits more quickly, we've increased our program integrity by almost any measure, we're more accurate than we've ever been. And while we've done all that, there's still a lot of work to do.

For all of that, about 51 percent of our folks live in the community, who require long-term

supports and services. About 95 percent of them would want to be in the community. So we have some work there.

2.5

Pennsylvania is one of the few States that has seen an increase in the number of people who are homeless over the last few years. The numbers have been going down across the country.

And in addition, we have an increase in the number of kids who are in the foster care system. And ultimately over time, we want the foster care system to be smaller and smaller, and we want kids to be served in the home.

So while we've had some progress along the way, we have done some very good things in just the past year. We worked with the General Assembly to transfer CHIP over to DHS. So thank you for your help and cooperation on that.

While we've had a lot of good things going forward, there's still a lot of work to be done. I look forward to working with all of you in the upcoming legislative session, and I'm happy to try to answer any questions you may have.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

I would like to acknowledge the presence of

Representative Mike Driscoll, Representative
Leanne Krueger-Braneky, also Representatives Ward,
Staats, Murt and Zimmerman.

1.3

2.5

And because the Department of Human Services covers an awful lot of issues, we have with us today both Republican and Democratic chairs of the Children and Youth Committees. That's Kathy Watson as well as Scott Conklin.

Also with us today is the Republican Chair of the Health Committee, Matt Baker, as well as the Democratic Chair of the Health Committee, Flo Fabrizio.

Okay. Thank you so much.

Mr. Secretary, it is a budget hearing.

Okay. And I've been asking as an opening question to all of the secretaries that have been before us, trying to understand the Governor's blue-line. Okay. And every Department is a little different. Some

Departments, like the Corrections, 50 percent of their budget line got blue-lined. And everyone here knew that something had to give. Okay. And the Treasurer took action to make sure that the prisons stayed open.

Because of just the size of the number in looking at your line items, I noticed that MA capitation, \$3.8 billion, total spend number. In 1460, HB 1460, it increased to \$3.9. The Governor blue-lined

```
$1.9 billion.
1
2
                Now, I guess my first question is, did the
    Governor consult with you prior to the blue-lining of
3
    that line item?
 4
                SECRETARY DALLAS: I did have several
    conversations with some of his key staff.
 6
7
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Is that
    money going out?
8
                SECRETARY DALLAS: For Medicaid, yes, it is.
10
    The Medicaid capitation line item is one of our biggest
11
    line items. It's in Federal entitlement, which means if
    you qualify for it under the Federal rules, we have to
12
13
    pay it. The Federal government pays a share, about
14
    half. The State pays the rest of it, the other half.
    So that money continues to go out.
15
16
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. So is it
17
    just a blue-line on paper?
18
                SECRETARY DALLAS: No, I wouldn't say that.
19
    I think that if it's not restored, there will be
2.0
    dramatic and dire consequences for my budget.
21
                Since that is an entitlement I have to pay,
22
    there are other things that are considered
23
    discretionary. And when I say they're discretionary, I
24
    don't think by any means they're discretionary, I just
2.5
    mean they're not required under Federal law or State
```

```
1
    law, and they're things that we have discretion about
2
    how much we spend.
 3
                Those are things like pharmacy costs.
    are things like services for people with behavioral
4
5
    health issues. Those are all kinds of services that are
6
    discretionary in the sense they're not required or
7
    mandates, but there will be a huge impact on the rest of
8
    my budget if that money is not restored.
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                           Okay.
                                                   Are you
10
    talking within the capitation line item? Or are you
11
    talking about throughout your budget?
                SECRETARY DALLAS: No. I think what I meant
12
13
    was, since that is a requirement and that has to be
14
    paid, we will have to find State funds other places to
15
    cut to cover the matching portion of that line item.
16
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Throughout the
17
    other $11, $12 billion budget?
18
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Correct.
19
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Not that line
2.0
    item?
21
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Yes.
22
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Okay.
23
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    That's an entitlement,
24
    Federal entitlement.
2.5
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            So I'm glad to
```

```
1
    hear that. I'm glad to hear that we're paying what is
2
    mandated. Okay. I don't understand why that was
3
    blue-lined, since we have to pay it any way. All right.
                And it was also paid, I guess, during the
 4
    veto as well, during the first months; is that correct?
5
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Yes, I think the health
6
7
    insurance for folks, I think falls in the category of
8
    health and safety so there are certain things that pay
    even during a budget impasse.
10
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: For the general
11
    public's information, this is really the managed care?
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
12
                                  Yes.
1.3
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: A lot of that is
    the managed care?
14
15
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Yes.
16
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Question.
17
    And only because I was involved in trying to get the
18
    nurses, the pediatric nurses a raise within their
19
    contracts. They hadn't received raises in, you know,
20
    maybe a decade. Okay. And I think we had built into
21
    our budget, HB 1460, about a $5-an-hour raise for these
22
    pediatric nurses that serve these people in their homes,
23
    which is a cost savings. And I think you would agree
24
    with that.
2.5
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Yes.
```

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. competition of getting the pediatric nurses into Pennsylvania, because I think we have one of the lowest hourly rates, especially from my neck of the woods in southeast Pennsylvania, is that \$5-an-hour raise, do you know if that has been implemented? SECRETARY DALLAS: I'm going to defer to Dave -- Dave Spishock on that one. BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: It has not. There was money originally in the compromised bill for the \$5 increase. However, the budget that was enacted did not have any funding in there for any fee increase for pediatric shift nursing, so we have not implemented. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. Even though it was in that line, sir? BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: It was in that line. It was just in the compromised budget. However, it was not included as a part of the enacted budget, so we have not included it as part of the capitation rates. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Even though it was in HB 1460? BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: Yes. I don't think we had anything specifically, I think we were looking for some language on the fee increase, but it has -- I know it has not been included as yet into the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

1 capitation rates. 2 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: All right. Well, 3 it's something we have to work on. Okay. Obviously, it's important to get these folks 4 5 that would like to stay in their home and also make sure 6 that the proper services get to them. And the shortage 7 of nurses that are able to do that line of work is real. Chairman Markosek. 8 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: 9 Thank you, 10 Chairman Adolph. 11 Gentlemen, good morning. 12 SECRETARY DALLAS: Good morning. 1.3 BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: Good morning. MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Mr. Secretary, 14 15 Mr. Director. 16 And a special welcome to all the guests that 17 we have here. This is always one of the best attended 18 of our hearings. And I think it's because it is a very 19 big organization and it affects a lot of people. 2.0 would like to welcome everybody here this morning. have a brief statement, and I do have a question. 21 22 REPRESENTATIVE DALLAS: Sure. 23 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: About four 24 years ago in the 2012-13 budget -- that was before you

were there, Secretary -- county human service programs

2.5

were cut by about \$84 million. The Governor, Governor Wolf now, proposes to restore the cut over three years, beginning with the first down payment of about \$28 million in the 2015-2016 budget, which we are still working on; another \$28 million, he's proposed for the 2016-2017 budget, which is the next fiscal year, starting July 1st; with the final restoration payment the following year, 2017-2018. So a three-year restoration.

1.3

2.5

These county-run programs include programs such as: mental health, intellectual disabilities, drug and alcohol treatment, homeless assistance, and county and child welfare.

Unfortunately, the budget plan sent to the Governor in December, HB 1460 as we were talking about, did not include any additional funding for our county human service programs. I don't quite understand why that happened, but the funding was agreed to as part of the so-called bipartisan budget agreement, which actually did not get passed in late December and was replaced by 1460. I hope that that funding will be there in the final 2015-2016 budget because all of us, obviously, in the room have county human service folks back home and constituents that depend not only on the funding but the services that these organizations

provide.

2.0

2.5

My question though, just a slight change, is related to the effort to combat the heroin and opiate epidemic in Pennsylvania, which now your Department will have a part in.

Yesterday we heard from the Department of Health and Drug and Alcohol programs relative to this very, very serious and growing problem. There is, in the Governor's proposed 2016-2017 budget, \$34 million in additional funding that we would see if we would get that passed.

Can you explain, please, in more detail what that funding would be used for? And how you would drive that out; and the programs that would be involved.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure. So the \$34 million, also there's about a -- there's some Federal money that would be matched by that \$34 million. So altogether, it would be about a little over \$50 million that would be spent on trying to combat the opioid crisis that you mentioned.

As you know, heroin affects all walks of life now, whether urban, suburban, rural, rich, you know, low income. It doesn't matter. It's across the state. The money would be for something called the addition of health homes.

So it's something we've already started doing in the Department of Human Services. We have about 20 that we're rolling across the State for folks who have a substance-use disorder or SUD. They are for pregnant women who have a drug or alcohol problem.

There are about 20 across the State. They are in the population centers in areas that have been hit hardest by the opioid crises.

1.3

2.5

The money that you're referring to would add another 50. These would be for folks across the commonwealth, regardless, not just pregnant women. The idea would be that we'd have the first of them roll out -- the first 25 roll out on July 1st or whenever the '16-'17 budget is enacted.

And then the final 25 would occur January

1st of that year. So we'd do 25 in the first six

months, 25 in the second six months of the budget.

Prior to the budget, in anticipation of the funding being there, we are going to work with the Department of Drug and Alcohol program, Secretary Tennis, and other agencies such as the Secretary of Health to have a competitive process for these health homes. And we'll hopefully be in a position to have them awarded and ready to go as quickly as possible after the money is actually passed in the budget.

For us, a health home is -- sometimes it's a little confusing. Folks think of a health home as a physical location. It can be that. But what it really refers to is the home for the doctors and the folks that work on and try to help folks who have a substance-use disorder.

2.0

2.5

So when you think about a substance-use disorder, it's very easy to think about the drug problem they have, but I think where we have failed in the past is we haven't looked at the whole person as much as we should.

So folks who have a drug or alcohol problem also have a lot of times a behavioral health issue that's driving that drug or alcohol problem and they're often physical manifestations of those issues.

So when you look at that and you look at the services that we need to provide, whether it's methadone or buprenorphine or Suboxone, the drugs that are combined with therapy, that usually gives people the best chance to beat their addiction.

There's also the help they'll probably need in behavioral health issues or physical health issues.

So the idea is combining all that and looking at that person as a whole and not having one doctor here, one doctor there. But by combining that, we give people the

best chance they have to beat their addiction.

2.5

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: How are these health home -- health homes or sites, whatever they may be, how are they located? Determined?

Are there folks out there that have these operations that are coming to you and applying to become one or be part of your system? Or is this something that you have some sort of an internal mechanism for selecting areas and locations and personnel to be part of it?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So we will be initiating a competitive process. Folks will apply. We will be looking at a variety of factors, obviously, the quality of the proposal. And then I think also making sure that these health homes serve areas that are hit hardest by the opioid crisis.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: And just to conclude, the hearing that we had with the Drug and Alcohol Secretary a day or two ago, was really, in my experience here, after six years as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and probably 200 different hearings over that time, perhaps the most sobering hearing that I've experienced in my experience as Chairman and part of the Appropriations Committee.

One of the things that Secretary Tennis

mentioned was that we need to start doing more on treatment. Prevention is obviously something very important. And things like Narcan, that can save a life after somebody has become overdosed, is great. And it gives a person a second chance.

2.5

But it sounds like what you're trying to do is really put at lot of effort into the treatment end of the whole heroin drug epidemic problem. And I think it's something very necessary. And I think it's something that we will have to deal with and find the money to fund this in some fashion because this is just too big of a problem facing our society. It's not just here in Pennsylvania.

And I want to applaud you for your efforts there, and would urge you to continue those efforts.

And we will do whatever we can here to help you do that.

So thank you.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Thank you, sir.

When I've been out across the State holding events in support of the Governor's budget, there's always a question-and-answer period afterwards. And invariably, there is somebody who gets up and talks about a member of their family or a friend who is no longer there because of the heroin crisis.

And when you hear these stories, they break

your heart. And you hear them from all kinds of folks, folks you wouldn't necessarily expect. There are folks at DHS who have had this touch them personally. And it is something that we're going to need to come to grips with as a State and as a country, as the numbers continue to grow.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, Chairman.

It's been brought to my attention that

It's been brought to my attention that
Representative Ed Pashinski has joined us as well as
Representative Cris Dush. Thank you.

Chairman Baker.

2.5

CHAIRMAN BAKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning again. I've often said that your job is probably one of the toughest ones in the Commonwealth. You have, according to our expert Ann in the Appropriations Committee who has done an outstanding job, you folks have responsibility in a book of business of \$36.7 billion in combined Federal and State funding, which is well in excess of our State budget. So I know the magnitude of your programs and your responsibility is pretty significant.

With that said, I'd like to sort of hone in on an issue that's been very important to me. And

first, let me thank you and your staff because we have a lot of interaction with your Department, obviously, having oversight on Medicaid programs. You've got a great person with Abdul working with you. He used to be on the Health Committee. So we miss him, but I know he's a good asset to you folks.

1.3

2.5

I want to talk about critical access hospital funding. It's very, very important in Pennsylvania. And I know that the budget, the proposed budget, maintained the elimination of \$13 million in State funding for obstetrics, neonatal services, hospital-based burn centers. And I know other members are going to comment on those issues.

But also the MA critical access hospital line item is very important in the continuum of care for access to quality health. And the Governor's veto of Act 10A, HB 1416. I have some concerns about the State funds, along with \$6.2 million in hospital assessment revenues. That would have been matched with another \$21 million in Federal funds, to provide a total of \$40.3 million to qualifying hospitals. And the DHS materials only reflect about \$6.2 million in hospital assessment revenues with no matching funds.

So my question -- first question is, what impact is the Governor's veto of \$5.7 million in State

funds, which resulted in the loss of \$15.3 million, including matching Federal funds, having on small rural hospitals that received these funds?

2.5

I have almost weekly e-mails and contacts from these hospitals that are adversely impacted by the lack of funding. And it's getting -- not only are they critical access hospitals, but their margins of operation are very, very slim.

And, in fact, I believe one in Mike Hanna's district, the Bucktail Medical Center, has filed for chapter 11. And if they don't get this money pretty soon, they could be joining the ranks of 48 other small town hospitals in the last five, six years that have closed.

So this money is incredibly important, and we need help in getting that money released. And I hope -- I hope DHS understands the magnitude of this problem.

SECRETARY DALLAS: First, let me say thank you for your kind words at the beginning of your statement. And I agree, Ann does a wonderful job.

For us, these issues are some of the most critical that we face every day. Those hospitals receive payments through Medicaid. They receive other payments.

I'll turn it over to Dave in just a little

bit about some of the funding that we have been able to release. But we are aware of those issues, and we're talking to some of those hospitals. And it's largely the function of the work that's yet to be done here for a budget.

2.0

2.5

I know that the compromised budget that was almost enacted around Christmastime included restoration of those funds. I'm hopeful that we'll be able to work together to find a way to come to an agreement as we go through the '15-'16 and the '16-'17 budget. But particularly, the hospital you mentioned, Bucktail, I know that Dave spoke with the CFO there yesterday. And we are working to try to help stabilize their finances as well. But I'll let Dave go through some of the particular numbers there.

BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: The critical access and the OB/NICU separate appropriations, the State funds were vetoed, line-item vetoed as part of the budget. However, we still continue to have the hospital assessment money.

There is \$3.2 million in hospital assessment for critical access; another \$3 million for the OB/NICUs. We will federalize that -- those funds. They are shown in the model as a State-only payment, but we will federalize them.

1 We have a public notice that will be going 2 out, I think either this Saturday or next Saturday. We 3 will follow up with a State plan amendment to get the 4 Federal approval for that funding. We are working on releasing those funds as quickly as we can. 5 I think 6 once we get the public notice out, we'll be able to do 7 more with those funds. But we will anticipate releasing 8 the funding soon. We are working, still working on trying to get -- if there's additional State funds added 10 to that, we could always amend the State plan amendments 11 to add that funding back into the program before we make 12 the payments there. 13 As the Secretary has mentioned, we are working with Bucktail to see if we can get some 14 15 immediate relief to them as well. 16 CHAIRMAN BAKER: I appreciate that 17 commitment, and we'll look forward to seeing that money 18 released soon. BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: 19 2.0 CHAIRMAN BAKER: Thank you very much, Mr. 21 Chairman. 22 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 23 Chairman Flo Fabrizio. 24 CHAIRMAN FABRIZIO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2.5 And good morning again, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Good morning.

2.5

CHAIRMAN FABRIZIO: A couple of questions, and actually you've answered one of them regarding the 50, you know, the proposed 50 health homes. I think that this, as Chairman Markosek said, it's -- we're moving in the right direction there. Believe me.

We took a pretty positive step when we smoothed the cliff regarding child-care subsidies and we now allow working families who qualify for subsidized care to get that care, to continue getting that care as long as they're within 300 percent of the Federal poverty income guideline and 85 percent of the State median income.

But we still have a little bit of a problem with that waiting list. Is there anything that the Department is doing to try and alleviate that problem?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So I could say there are probably a couple of things. First, there's \$12 million proposed in our budget to address the waiting list that's at about 3100 folks right now for child-care subsidy.

The \$12 million that's proposed would probably take about 2600 folks off that waiting list. So that's a step in the right direction. Those dollars are going to be even more important as some changes at

the Federal level mean that there'll be changes in who is on that list and who is on and off that list.

2.5

The Federal government did, I think, a very good thing. They changed the redetermination period for child care from six to 12 months. And what that did was, for working families that someone might lose a job or their child might get ill and they might need to -- they might lose their job, while they're looking for a job, by having that redetermination period be longer, it will give them more time to continue to have child-care subsidy and hopefully get a new job.

So while that's a very good thing, what that means is the churn of folks who come on and off that waiting list will slow down. So as a result, the \$12 million that we're talking about will be even more -- it will be even more critical than it usually is to make sure that we can continue to make a -- reduce that waiting list.

CHAIRMAN FABRIZIO: Okay. I've got to understand that.

As Chairman Markosek and Chairman Adolph said, yesterday we met, the committee, met with the Health Department and drug and alcohol. And obviously drug addiction, whether it's opioid based or whether it's heroin based or whether it runs through every

fabric of our society in this commonwealth.

1.3

2.5

Couple of questions, and only one that I'm really kind of concerned with right now because it's, just in my own mind, I just want some clarification. A lot of the funding for opioid treatment and whatever is within the Department of Human Services, even though the programs are within the Department of Drug and Alcohol.

Just kind of give me an overview how the two Departments coordinate. I know, obviously, they must, you know, interrelate on a constant basis regarding that, but I would appreciate some kind of an overview on that.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure. So first and foremost, the Governor is very clear about we all work on this issue at the same time. I don't think that most Pennsylvanians, you know, care whether the Department of Drug and Alcohol Services is providing funding or Human Services is providing funding, provided the services are available when they need them and they're good, high-quality services.

So the Governor has brought together those agencies, and we meet on a regular basis. The Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs has been involved in the process we have for these health homes. They're going to be involved in the evaluation of these

health homes. They'll be involved in the licensing of these health homes.

2.5

But overall, we get to some of the bureaucratic part of it, which is where the money is put in the budget. Since this is -- these are Medicaid dollars that will be matched, the Department of Human Services is the single State agency or single State authority for Medicaid. That's why the money is in our budget; right.

So in order to draw down that money and make sure we do it in the right way, make sure we don't have any disallowances that we have to pay back later, the experts in our Department who know how to bill Medicaid, know how to make sure we get all the paperwork right, that's where the services are.

In addition, I had mentioned earlier when Chairman Markosek was talking about it, there's another aspect to this. It's not just drug and alcohol programs. There are also physical and behavioral health programs that these folks need at the same time. So by coordinating it there with the folks who are providing those services, we have the infrastructure and the ability to do it.

And since we are such a large department, we can keep the overhead and the administration costs down

```
1
    maybe a little better than a smaller department like the
2
    Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs. But overall,
    we're working together, and the services will be
3
    provided seamlessly.
 4
                But behind the scenes, we've done some
6
    things to make sure that we make sure the most money
7
    goes to services and not to overhead, and also make sure
8
    that when we bill the Federal government for the Federal
    dollars, that we do that in an efficient way and we
10
    don't get any disallowances.
11
                CHAIRMAN FABRIZIO: Okay. So the thrust is
    cost effectiveness then?
12
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Yes.
13
                CHAIRMAN FABRIZIO: Okay. You get a bang
14
15
    for the buck out there to the people that need it.
16
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Absolutely. And also
    just making sure we can coordinate those services across
17
    folk's health needs.
18
19
                CHAIRMAN FABRIZIO: I appreciate that.
20
    Thank you.
21
                One last question, Mr. Chairman, if I may.
22
    And this is another -- I've been told or we've read
23
    somewhere that 51 -- almost 52 percent of adults that
24
    leave TANF return within a year. I find that an
2.5
    extraordinary number. I don't know why. Is there
```

anything that we can do to make, you know, to develop some kind of self-sufficiency or move these people toward self-sufficiency once they leave the TANF program?

1.3

2.5

SECRETARY DALLAS: Well, it's a great question; right. I think folks sometimes have ideas in their head what the folds on TANF are like and what their backgrounds are. But that 51 percent you mentioned, that I think is -- while it's great that the number of folks who are relying on cash assistance is at a near all-time low if not an all-time low, it's lower than it was before the start of the recession.

The thing that I think we need to look at is, what are we doing long term to help folks move from poverty to self-sufficiency? Now, when you look at folks who are receiving TANF, what you see are folks who are, for lack of a better term, at the mercy of the economy; right. If they're lower-skill folks or entry-level jobs, they're the one's who are most susceptible to changes. When the economy is good, they get hired. When the economy is bad, they may be the first ones who will be laid off.

In addition, depending on their personal circumstances, they may not have some of the life skills or the job skills that other folks have in terms of

managing their life and keeping a job. So when we look at this, the key is saying, one size doesn't fit all; right.

1.3

2.5

So everyone who walks through our door who's part of the work programs we have, they're not the same person; right. We need to look at what their individual barriers are and also what their strengths are. And we need to find a way to make sure we better match up the skills they have and the strengths they have with employers that are out there.

And for those folks who need more help, making sure that we're providing them with the skills that they can get. Not just to get a job, not just to get them in the door and get them out the door to a job, but getting them to a job where they have a career path, getting them to a job where they can sustain -- that they can sustain, and one that will sustain their family over time and help them get from poverty to self-sufficiency.

So there are a lot of things that we need to do there. I think we're working with L&I, with Secretary Manderino on the WIOA Act, which is a change in the way we do job-training programs. We're moving to more performance-based contracts with our TANF providers.

```
1
                And with a mix of accountability and also an
2
    understanding that it may take some folks longer to get
    the skills they need so they don't come -- they're not
3
    part of that 51 percent, those are the things that over
 4
    time, I think, are going to move those numbers long term
5
    and help it so that when it's 51 percent, that 51
6
7
    percent becomes 60 percent who, you know, never come
8
    back; 70 percent and so on. But right now, we're not
    where we want to be. But I think those changes that
10
    we're doing right now will help move us closer every
11
    year.
12
                CHAIRMAN FABRIZIO:
                                     Thank you, Mr.
13
    Secretary. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Thank you, Mr.
15
    Chairman.
16
                Next question will be offered by
17
    Representative Keith Greiner.
18
                REPRESENTATIVE GREINER:
                                          Thanks, Mr.
19
    Chairman.
2.0
                Good morning, Mr. Secretary.
21
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Good morning, sir.
22
                REPRESENTATIVE GREINER:
                                          I believe I might
23
    have asked this question last year, being a former
24
    county controller. I wanted to speak a little bit about
2.5
    the Human Services Block Grant Program.
```

SECRETARY DALLAS: Certainly.

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: And the Block Grant was started in the 2012-2013 fiscal year with 20 counties. And I know that Lancaster County was very involved in that. And then that increased to 30 counties in the fiscal year 2013-'14.

The Human Services Block Grant has increased flexibility to those counties eligible to participate, helping them to coordinate services across systems and allowing them to move a portion of funds among those line items to best meet the needs of those that they serve. And me, having been in the county, I saw that firsthand. I thought it was a very positive thing.

The proposed budget this year maintains the block grant at 30 counties. I have several questions. First one, has the Human Services Block Grant changed the way services are allocated in participating counties?

SECRETARY DALLAS: Yes, it has. There are some counties, I'll mention Allegheny County in particular, who have taken advantage of the flexibility afforded to innovate and to make changes. There are other counties, I think, that have done well with it as well. So I think that flexibility has helped many counties.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: So then, kind of a follow-up question. Do those counties that have participated in this, you believe that the Block Grant has actually improved services for them. Maybe some counties -- I mean, maybe that's the other thing. Do you have an evaluation tool?

Maybe some counties are doing it more effectively than others, too.

2.5

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think that's right. I think some counties have done better than others, but I think -- I think some counties have really taken advantage of the managerial flexibility. Some have done a little better, but not as well as some of the counties that have really been out in front.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Well, let me ask in regard to that, shouldn't it be offered to all 67 counties? I mean, what are your thoughts on that? Is that something that you would consider or something that, you know? With the success we had in Lancaster County, I was thinking, well, maybe that's something we should do throughout the Commonwealth.

SECRETARY DALLAS: So, yes, it's absolutely something we would consider. For us, I think the biggest concern that I've heard about the Block Grant is there are folks out there who are worried that the

flexibility will be used to rob Peter to pay Paul, that certain funds will be transferred from -- to programs that people like over other ones. So I received a similar question from Senator Vance on Monday when I testified in the Senate.

2.0

2.5

And my response to her was, I think there's an area, this is one of the areas that I think we'll be able to work together. For us, if we're able to find a way to make sure that there's a baseline level of service that a county needs to provide and that we can measure it, we can take that flexibility and match it with accountability. I think we can expand the Block Grant and give that flexibility to other counties.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: And I know that's been the argument in the past. I think we've been very good about how we did things in Lancaster County. And I would hope -- I appreciate your answer because I do think we can work on that. I think it was still advantageous. I think moving forward, the State needs to consider that. And I think it's a good way to save costs, which kind of goes back to -- let's kind of shift gears a little bit and talk about counties, not necessarily the Block Grant Program.

Do counties return moneys to you? Have they returned moneys to you during this past fiscal year?

SECRETARY DALLAS: They have. The Block

Grant, I think, allows for a 3-percent retained funds

for a county. So if they're innovative and they're able

to save money, they can take 3 percent of that Block

Grant if they don't spend the money and use it to invest

in further innovation. There is some money that's been

over and above that 3 percent.

2.0

2.5

On a case-by-case basis, I think about \$800,000 we've approved for other investments that those counties have made, but they have been a little bit over that 3 percent.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Now, before the Block Grant Program though, have counties returned funds to the State? Even prior to your time, I believe you might even, if I'm not mistaken, with Governor Rendell?

SECRETARY DALLAS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: So did the counties return moneys back over the last six years or so?

SECRETARY DALLAS: I'm sure they have, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Well, let me

just -- the only reason I'm asking you that, my concern

is, I know that we're looking for a lot of increased

spending. I know that people back in my district expect

us to contain costs and keep things in line. So if the

counties are returning money, then I don't know whether

there should be a lot of upward pressure to increasing taxes and increasing --

2.5

SECRETARY DALLAS: Well, I think that -- I think you need to put that -- those returns in perspective. I think with the Block Grant, it was probably just \$1 or \$2 million that was over that 3-percent retainage. And if you're looking at the budget and you're looking at the size of my budget, it's a strange thing to say out loud, but that million dollars is not near enough to cover some of the other increases we have there.

So are those overages things that can be part of the overall budget discussions? Sure. But I don't think anyone should mistake them for a real budget that has sustainable revenues and one that addresses the true cost of providing social services.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Well, let's talk about the overall budget. And Chairman Baker had mentioned that. You have a budget of \$37 billion, when you're looking at total dollars you have to work with, including the Federal and what have you.

As I said to one of my other colleagues who also had to pass a CPA exam, as I'm a CPA, we just said this is like spaghetti trying to track this budget. It is complex. For the people that are out there, I have a

lot of people at home that tell me they don't want their taxes increased. And they said the first area that they want me to look at is -- they still use the term "welfare" -- but the Department of Human Services.

2.5

And I think it's something that -- I think it's a concern overall. You'll often see news stories with fraud and abuse, and unfortunately, that gets the most press. But I do think -- I do think we need to be cognizant of that fact. And, quite frankly, when you do look at the numbers, accounting, many times, is black and white.

In this particular, you know, your particular Department is very complex. And I think the people out there need to know that. And I do think that we need to be careful and we need to make sure that we contain costs and work hard to do that.

But as I said, I understand the situation you're in. We're going to work hard. I know that Chairman Adolph had some questions. I don't know why it was blue-lined, but we're going to work through this. So I appreciate you being here. I appreciate you talking to me about the Block Grants.

And like I said, I appreciate the time, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,

1 Representative. 2 Chairman Scott Conklin. CHAIRMAN CONKLIN: I'd like to thank you, 3 Chairman Adolph, Chairman Markosek, for allowing me to 4 be part of today. 5 Secretary Dallas, as always, it's a please 6 7 to be with you. You've been very informative and 8 helpful to me over the years, and I do thank you for your input. 9 10 SECRETARY DALLAS: It's good to see you too, 11 sir. 12 CHAIRMAN CONKLIN: What I want to talk about 13 is the -- one of the things that's been implemented recently is the Child Hotline --14 15 SECRETARY DALLAS: Yes. CHAIRMAN CONKLIN: 16 That's -- or ChildLine as 17 they call it, the hotline. But what -- I've noticed that there was an article in The Tribune-Review that 18 19 talked about a 44-percent increase in southwestern 20 Pennsylvania in that -- in the usage of it. 21 My question is basically two parts. 22 have the counties been able to handle the volume of the 23 increase of calling, when you're looking at up to 44 24 percent? And two, when you're looking at this type of 2.5 increase, have you looked at ways that, perhaps, you can help the counties be more efficient? And is there anything that we can do to make that hotline even more effective than what it is now?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So ChildLine hotline has been in place for a long time as you know, sir.

CHAIRMAN CONKLIN: Yes.

2.5

ChildLine right now is an increase in the number of calls, and that's driven by a couple of things, but primarily, by some of the laws that were passed in the General Assembly. I think, in the wake of the Sandusky scandal, there were increases in background checks, and that has driven a lot more traffic through ChildLine. And there are a lot more child abuse clearances that need to be done and so on.

But for us, ultimately, what we've seen is it has, you know -- first, on the background checks, it has increased the number of background checks and the number of folks who have been flagged as having a history of abuse or neglect in applying for jobs. It went from about 1100 in the previous year to about 1600 folks who were flagged through that process of background checks.

Now, with regard to ChildLine, the calls have come in, and that's increased a lot of need for

investigation. But it hasn't necessarily increased as much the need for the number of kids who have to enter the foster care system.

2.5

So while the investigations have gone up, it hasn't increased the number -- it hasn't resulted in more kids coming through the front door. I mentioned earlier in my opening statement that the number of kids in the child welfare system has gone up in Pennsylvania, but that's largely because there are fewer children leaving the foster care system than there used to be. And there are a bunch of reasons for that.

But for us, I think when you look at ChildLine, the increase in the number of calls, particularly, around certain times of year, when folks come back to school and so on, and you have mandated reporters such as teachers, that has put stress on the system. We have increased staffing to deal with that level of those -- the increased level of calls.

This is one area where the budget impasse has had an impact. While we have been -- we have worked to try to increase staffing there, there are some cases where the budget impasse has made it harder for us to get the staffing we need. And that has resulted in making it harder to get through the ChildLine calls.

So it's just one of the many reasons that I

```
1
    think once a budget is resolved, many good things will
2
    flow to the State of Pennsylvania.
 3
                CHAIRMAN CONKLIN:
                                    Thank you, Secretary.
                And once this goes through, you know my door
 4
    is always open to you if you have any suggestions that
5
6
    we can help improve it.
                             Thank you.
7
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Thank you, sir.
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
8
                                            Thank you.
                Chairwoman Kathy Watson.
9
10
                CHAIRWOMAN WATSON:
                                    Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11
                Good morning, Mr. Secretary.
12
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Good morning to you.
1.3
                CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: Let me begin by saying,
    as Chairman of the House Children and Youth Committee,
14
    you've been before us, but we would invite you back any
15
16
    time. And hopefully by the time you come back, we will
17
    have a lot to talk about that you referred to.
18
                I recognize that --
19
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Any time, Representative,
2.0
    Watson.
21
                CHAIRWOMAN WATSON:
                                    Okay. And I recognize
22
    that, sadly, in a lot of ways, you're in the position,
23
    where I call it the "doctors without borders," in
24
    that -- in what has become almost, my words, but this
2.5
    war-type environment and things.
```

I'm not a believer in collateral damage.

And I look at some of the Department of Human Services

budget, blue-lined, and what I see before me is

collateral damage. I have communicated that and that

phrase directly to the administration. I recognize that

you don't have a lot to say about that. Sadly, neither

do I.

2.5

I think Chairman Adolph led off the right way in saying this is something that we have to stop, and we need to get back to the business of taking care of those who need our help, who absolutely need it.

In that vein, then, counties are really caught in the middle. I think of, perhaps,

Representative Greiner and I have a lot in common when we talk about counties. At one point, I was a part of county government, too. So I have a fondness there.

And I come from a county that has done very well in managing its affairs, but even that well-managed, good county is experiencing a lot of trouble. If they are with their larger tax base and all of that, I really worry about the rest of the counties throughout the State, many of which are small, some of which are rural, and how they can even begin to manage.

They have a fundamental responsibility under law, both State and Federal, to provide services for

what I would particularly care about, protecting abused, neglected, delinquent children, as you well know.

But efforts to enhance, and you referred to that in discussing your answer with Representative Conklin, enhance their staff recruitment and the retention, it's imperative if counties are to maintain this stable and well-prepared workforce. Which in today's times, I

think, is particularly needed.

1.3

2.5

Case workers are under extreme pressure for when they walk into a situation. What do they do? How do they help this child? What's the best way? What services are available? Does it depend on where you live, what services are available?

I believe in your budget, you are proposing an increase, as I looked at it, to the county child welfare needs-based budget for '16-'17. Would you please talk about that a little bit in specific detail? Why and how this request is made.

And I understand, I'm not a person who wants to pay a little more. I want to squeeze every penny out of that dollar, but I understand the value in what's been going on here, and in some ways what our committee and this legislature has done, that you need to have a little more money. I understand that because we've put more responsibility.

But could you explain it and draw the parallel between the dollars and the services?

Thank you.

2.5

SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure. So I think you're correct. It's a little under \$32 million that's being requested for the child needs-based budget.

As you're aware, the needs-based budget is a process where the counties go propose and tell us what their needs are for child welfare, staffing costs, all those things are allowable costs as part of the needs-based budget.

I agree with you, we need to make sure we have a stable, well-trained workforce. There's some of that there. A lot of what's driving the increase are -- is actually the opioid crisis. So if you look at the need and how governments, county governments across the Commonwealth are dealing with the opioid crisis, one of the -- there is actually an excellent article. I think it was the Wall Street Journal said that an echo of the opioid crisis that we have now is the children of family members who are addicted to opioids.

Now, it's not always the answer that you take those kids into care, but a lot -- sometimes it is.

And I think when you see some of the increases in the caseload, you see some of the changes that are hitting

the system, a lot of that is the reverberation of the opioid crisis.

2.5

So as we're, hopefully, making some progress there, we hope to make some progress on the children who are affected by that. But it's going to require a lot of work. It's going to require, at the county level, not the State level, folks who do behavioral health, folks who do drug and alcohol, folks who do child welfare, all of them to work at a level that they may not be used to.

This is a new challenge. And I think a lot of what you're seeing in there is the growth in the caseload, the impact of that drug and alcohol crisis, and the impact it's having on families across

Pennsylvania.

CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: Mr. Chairman Adolph, may I ask a follow-up question?

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Yes, you may.

CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: Thank you.

Mr. Secretary -- well, you try to be polite.

Mr. Secretary, you bring up the point in looking -- and

certainly this is not all the children who end up having

to be taken out of the home that they're used to, but

many of these children also, we have the advantage that

grandparents will step up --

SECRETARY DALLAS: Yes.

2.5

CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: -- or have other family members to take these children because they really can't live in the environment that a parent is providing.

What are we, we -- and I hope that we will work together -- but do you have thoughts on what we can do because it is my understanding and indeed we had a hearing on this, that grandparents really don't even end up in the same category as a foster parent in terms of any kind of subsidy or help?

And yet, grandparents are older when they admit their age. And even if they have been able to plan successfully for a retirement, a retirement income was never designed to raise a family. And I will always remember a very lovely 80-year-old woman I met, who had a 17-year-old granddaughter she'd been raising since the child was a little under two.

And she was talking to me about, you know, she couldn't get a job, but she needed extra money because it wasn't enough. And I believe the granddaughter wanted cheerleading, which would require extra money for uniforms, this and that. And the child couldn't participate because the grandmother couldn't afford it.

So what I know is, they do us a great

service, and yet we're not giving them help. How are we going to do something for those folks?

2.5

SECRETARY DALLAS: So, first, I think I would say that when you talk about kin placements or grandparents, those are things that are very important. As you know, when you're forced to take a child out of that home, there is all kinds of trauma you inflict on that child. You can have the trauma of the abuse or neglect that led them to be taken from their home, but also the trauma of being taken from the only parents they know.

In a lot of cases, kin placements, whether it's a cousin, whether it's a grandmother, helps ease that secondary trauma that can be so difficult to deal with. So it's an important part of our system. I think that it's an area where we can work together to try to increase that. It's going to take resources. It's going to take money.

In a lot of cases, if we're forward-thinking about it, placing a child with grandma will wind up costing less than putting them in a group home or in congregated care. And I think that there are opportunities there.

I think there's some rules along the way that prevent us from maybe going where you want to go,

```
1
    but I'm committed to working with you to try to find
2
    ways to encourage the use of kinship care.
3
                CHAIRWOMAN WATSON: Thank you, Mr.
4
    Secretary.
                Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Thank you.
 6
7
                Representative Kinsey.
8
                REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY:
                                        Thank you, Mr.
9
    Chairman.
10
                Welcome again, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Director.
11
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Good to see you.
12
                REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Thank you.
13
                Mr. Secretary, in reviewing the budget --
    well, first I want to applaud you and the department for
14
15
    the progress you've made over the past year providing
    services to vulnerable citizens.
16
                I want to focus on a sector of the
17
18
    Department that provides services specific to folks with
19
    intellectual disabilities. We've recognized that
    Pennsylvania is a State that continues to see its
20
21
    population continue to age. We're seeing a large number
22
    of parents, 60 and over, providing supports and services
23
    to their children as well as grandchildren with
24
    intellectual disabilities.
2.5
                I think in this current budget, there's $8.7
```

million set aside, and I'm not sure of the exact number, but that's just from State funding to provide waiver services for an additional 250 individuals on the waiting list, on the emergency waiting list.

2.5

I think we also saw a report that showed that there are over 4500 individuals that are actually on the waiting list. So we're looking at moneys being set aside to service 250 individuals, but yet the list in and of itself, exceeding 4500.

I guess my question is, what are the plans?

I mean, it's great to see that the State is chipping

down on the waiting list, but you know, when we look at

it from a percentage standpoint, it seems just to be a

very small percentage of folks that are being served

through those dollars.

So is there a plan, a 5-year plan? You know, what's the plan to really chip down at that number of folks that are on the waiting list?

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think this is -- the part of my budget you're referring to is easily the toughest part of my budget this year. It's an area that I wish we could have done better. While we have increased the funding for folks with intellectual disabilities, up about \$71 million, and that's across a variety of categories, we haven't done as much as I

would have liked to in terms of reducing that waiting list. It is something that we try to work on every day and something that I think we need to come to grips with.

2.5

Now, I will say that because of the unique situation that we're in right now with the '15-'16 budget and the '16-'17 budget, we do have about a thousand folks that we'll be able to take off the waiting list with '15-'16 dollars. And all in, including different categories, there are about 750 or so that we'll be able to do if the '16-'17 budget is enacted or maybe closer to 800.

So in all, you probably have about, over the next 18 months, you have the opportunity to move about 1800 people off the waiting list. Now, that's going to be a big task.

REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Right.

SECRETARY DALLAS: There's a lot of things you have to -- it's not simply just flipping a switch. There's a lot of service planning and things that go on. And it's going to take a lot of work over these next 18 months to move folks there, assuming the budget passes on time.

That being said, I wish I could do more.

And I know that there are folks out there that are very

vocal about that we haven't done enough. I think that if I didn't have the job I had right now, I'd say, you know -- and I will say it, even though I have the job, I agree with them. We should be doing more.

2.0

2.5

But there's a limit to what we can afford right now. And I think that when you look at the finances of the system and you look at the growth of the system, we put in the budget what we thought we could afford. That being said, if the General Assembly would like to put some more money in there for me to serve more folks, I'll certainly spend it.

REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Right.

SECRETARY DALLAS: But I think when you look at the long term, the dynamics of the system, we are under pressure from a variety of factors.

First, is the waiting list.

REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Sure.

SECRETARY DALLAS: One thing about the waiting list is its -- the categories are imprecise.

There are folks who are on that waiting list who are receiving some level of service. They're not receiving an adequate level of service, but they are getting some level of service.

And then there are categories that have been in place for a long period of time. Those can also make

it a little difficult to get your arms around what the true waiting list is.

2.5

That being said, I think the biggest issue we have, in addition to finding the right amount of funding to make sure we're serving folks, is getting the financing of the system done right.

So right now, it's a cost-based system.

It's a result of changes that the Federal government required us to make maybe about four years ago. And I don't know that the system has fully recovered from that yet.

We are working with stakeholders, whether they be providers, whether they be family members, on a finance workgroup to get the way we pay for services to align better with what the actual needs of folks are now.

Whether it's intentional or unintentional, there are ways that providers can get higher reimbursement rates than maybe the needs of the person they're serving, and we need to get that right. We need to get the services to be based on what the needs of the person are; and how much we're paying to be based on the folks who need the most help.

We are working through that now. We're making progress. It's going to take some time to do.

In the interim, it is one thing that every night when I go to sleep, I wish I could do more. And I understand why folks are upset. It is finding a way to serve these folks adequately. My hope is that as part of this budget discussion, all of us can find ways to add additional funding to this process within my budget and within the constraints that -- and the realities, the fiscal realities we face as a commonwealth.

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: I thank you for that.

And just to touch on something you just mentioned, find ways to service these folks adequately. On the other side, 30 years ago, I served as a direct support professional working with individuals with intellectual disabilities.

Today, a lot hasn't changed in regards to the type of services that's still needed, the commitment, the dedication by individuals who provide those supports and services. And even the rate of pay, unfortunately, I mean, I recall roughly what my salary was 30 years ago. And, unfortunately, when I look at inflation and what direct care service workers are making right now, it's -- in my opinion, it's well below what they truly deserve.

Just the other day, the Governor executed an

executive order to increase the minimum wage for State employees as well as State, I think, State-affiliated or State-associated workers. For direct social -- direct care workers, direct support professionals, will this increase impact their rate of pay?

2.5

I know that -- I think I sort of asked this question last year when we were trying to get additional dollars in there to provide services. So here it is, I'm back here a year later, still looking at the workers providing, you know, day-in and day-out services to the folks who are most vulnerable.

So I guess my question is, is there any plan or any funding in this proposed budget to provide any type of increase to those workers who are providing services to our most vulnerable folks?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So, unfortunately, no.

The executive order addresses some folks, and I think

it's a good start the Governor had, but the executive

order doesn't focus on all workers.

I think that if there isn't already, there will be legislation about the minimum wage. I think when you're talking about that minimum wage and raising it, you have to do it for everybody. I think the impact would be something that would be very beneficial.

I think when you look at our Department,

```
1
    there would be costs associated with doing that with
2
    workers, but there would also be a lot of savings
    associated with that. If you look at the folks that we
3
    serve now who, because they don't make a living wage,
4
    are receiving benefits from the Department, we stand to
5
6
    save hundreds of millions of dollars in benefits.
7
    taxpayers, you know, will save that literally by those
8
    folks' wages going up and them no longer requiring
    benefits or not as many benefits as they had in the
9
10
    past.
11
                But for us, I think that that is one area,
12
    as I mentioned before, I wish we had done more, and I
13
    wish we were able to pay more. But right now, it's not
14
    something we believe we can afford. But working with
15
    the General Assembly, we'd be happy to have that
    conversation.
16
                REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Mr. Secretary, I
17
18
    want to say thank you.
19
                And Mr. Chairman, if there is an opportunity
20
    for a second round, I'd like to be considered.
21
                Thank you.
22
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Okay. Thank you.
23
                Representative Tom Killion.
24
                REPRESENTATIVE KILLION: Thank you, Mr.
2.5
    Chairman.
```

Welcome. I really just, I'll be pretty brief; just two quick questions. I served on Delaware County Council for eight years, and we have a 911-bed nursing home. At least it was 911 beds when I was there. I don't know what it's at now.

1.3

2.0

2.5

But we would work with COSA, which is our County Office of Services for the Aging to provide services to keep folks out of the nursing home until it was absolutely necessary.

So I'm wondering, what's your opinion of the LIFE Program, which provides these types of services to keep nursing-home eligible people in community?

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think the LIFE Program is a great program. It's one that we're looking to expand. We've expanded into five counties to try to make sure that we have that as an option for folks as they're aging in place.

And it's a program that -- I've visited several LIFE Programs, and I think it's one of the best services that we have in the commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE KILLION: Now, you said it's in five counties. Is it -- I thought I heard they might be expanding to five other counties?

SECRETARY DALLAS: That's what I meant, I think they're expanding into five, yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE KILLION: Okay. Can you tell us who they are yet or?

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think there's Perry County, Montgomery County. And I can get you the list of all of them.

REPRESENTATIVE KILLION: Okay. Thank you.

And then a complete separate item. In our county, we have a very fine burn center. There are six burn centers in the Commonwealth. And as you know, the Governor zeroed out \$3.8 million for those hospitals, resulting in \$7.9 million when you include Federal funds.

I know what the impact is for the Crozer

Burn Center, it's about \$2 million, which is clearly not insignificant. I'm just wondering, what was the thought process, if you can answer that, or if you had a conservation with administration about that blue-line?

And what effect do you see it having on the other five burn centers?

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think that those -when looking at the options we had and the limited funds
we have, we looked at some of the other revenue streams
that are coming into those from Medicaid, that are
coming in there, and it was an area that we didn't think
we could afford to fund.

```
I would note that in the '15-'16 compromised
1
2
    budget that was almost passed, that money was restored
    by the General Assembly as part of the compromise.
3
    I suspect there will be a very active debate about
 4
    restoring those funds for '16-'17.
5
                REPRESENTATIVE KILLION: Yeah, the funding
 6
7
    is crucial, I'd like to see that happen. Thank you.
8
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Sure.
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
9
                                            Thank you.
10
    Representative Madeleine Dean.
11
                REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Thank you, Mr.
    Chairman.
12
13
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Good morning.
                REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Good morning
14
15
    Secretary. Good morning, Director. How are you?
16
    welcome. Thank you for being here.
                As everybody has noted, you have a massive
17
    budget, $33 billion. I guess about one-third of it, to
18
19
    be provided by the State, to be funded by the State.
20
    And you can tell by the crowd that we have here today,
21
    what you do is so important to so many very vulnerable
22
    Pennsylvanians.
23
                I wanted to ask you, since in effect, you
24
    are, like the Department of Education, part of the
2.5
    epicenter of those impacted by our budget impasse.
```

Could you tell us what impact the budget failure had on your Department?

I realize you have very huge Federal

2.5

services.

dollars, but what was the impact of the State failure?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So my Department, it's very big and it's also a little different. There are some funds that paid during the budget impasse as a matter of health and safety. There are some that were Federal passthroughs that paid, but there was no doubt that it had a huge impact on the ability to provide

It hit in multiple places in the Department, but I'll just focus on one, that's at the county level.

I think those were the places that the budget impasse had probably its most pronounced impact.

And I think that's, as I understand it, it's because the general -- you know, we weren't able to pay all of those funds, particularly things like child welfare and some other funds because, you know, the General Assembly appropriates money that we give to the counties that the counties then spend with providers there on those services. And without a budget, didn't have the authority to spend that money. So that's just one example.

I think Chairman Conklin was talking about

ChildLine, our inability to hire staff there, in some places. That had an impact. We did our best to manage through that, but that also had an impact on our ability to literally answer phone calls for folks who were calling about kids they thought were victims of abuse and neglect.

1.3

2.5

There are probably, you know, when you think about our ability to provide basic services to folks to determine eligibility for services they need for health care, to be able to feed their families. All of those things have impacts across the Department. I probably could go on for a couple hours about that, but it hit all parts of our Department.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: And many of us, all of us, heard from providers downstream from your Department through our counties of the hardship, whether it was borrowing money or laying off staff or reducing hours, reducing services, the number of things that were critically forced to be cut as a result of the unpredictability and the failure to get moneys and resources out to them.

SECRETARY DALLAS: And it was even -- in some cases, the effects are still being felt because if we don't get those services at the right time, if it's early childhood things, you wind up paying more later

on; right.

2.5

So if we don't get services at the right time for folks, it costs us more to treat them later on. So if folks don't have health insurance and they go to the emergency room, it costs much more to serve them in the emergency room than if they went to see their doctor. So there are all kinds of impacts downstream in addition to that.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Exactly right. I appreciate that point. I was impressed in December by the Greater Pittsburgh Nonprofit Partnership who put out a letter to the Governor and to the leadership in both the House and the Senate, talking about our budget impasse.

And as starved as they were and their association members were for funds and resources to do the critical services that they provide, they did not argue for a stopgap budget. They didn't argue for, oh, please, just piecemeal out any moneys you can, we're so starved and desperate.

And I was really proud of that and surprised by the wisdom of what they said. And what they said to me in person was that if we just take pieces, if we just take unpredictable, unreliable stopgap kinds of funding, what are we going to do in the future?

It's just not the way a government needs to do this critical set of services. We can't do it in an unpredictable piecemeal fashion. That was a December 18th letter.

2.0

2.5

And I just thought it was extremely wise, and I know an awful lot of non-profits who would really liked to have seen moneys coming to them, had to make that tough choice and say it's not -- in fact, in their letter they actually said it would be like giving a child a pacifier instead of nourishing that child. They didn't want a pacifier. And so I really appreciate the wisdom of their advice and counsel to us in the legislature.

And I know that some people here are puzzled by the Governor's blue-lining of parts of Human Services. And as puzzling as that may be, more puzzling to me is the 177 days that led up to Christmas Eve that we failed to pass a budget that would have funded Human Services. And now the 75 days since that time that we have failed to do the same thing.

I want to shift gears, and it's a little bit related to what you said about paying more later. We know that there are undocumented children who are uninsured in Pennsylvania. Do you have any sense of the numbers?

SECRETARY DALLAS: Of undocumented children?

No, I don't have a sense of the numbers.

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: I looked into it just a little, and I had some help doing that. And what's wonderful is we have the CHIP Program, and we have the Affordable Care Act, so we know thousands and thousands of families and children are getting critical medical coverage. But, unfortunately, about 24,000 undocumented, uninsured children in Pennsylvania.

And to your very point, what happens is they wind up approaching services when it's the most costly, when they go to ERs. They suffer through poor health for long periods of time. Their families suffer as a result of that. Then they go to ERs at very costly, uncompensated costs.

Is there anything your Department would like to see done in order to get all children within the CHIP Program, which, you know, Pennsylvania is very proud of because we were the first state to embrace the CHIP Program and start it. Is there anything your Department would like us to do regarding undocumented, uninsured children in Pennsylvania?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think that, you know, I'll start by saying I think all children should have access to health care. I think it's an important

thing. I think that to change where in Pennsylvania would require a conversation with the General Assembly.

And I think there are also Federal prohibitions to the kind of coverage that you're talking about there.

So if we were to do it here in Pennsylvania, it would require all State funds. It is currently one of the things that we don't have the resources to do, but I also acknowledge that it's a subject that would not be without controversy and without debate.

I think that if the General Assembly wants to have that conversation with the administration about the benefits of doing that, I think it's a good conversation to have.

Right now, I'm precluded from doing that under several rules and laws. But at the same time, we can have that conversation, but I think it will be one that I'm sure there will be a lot of folks on both sides of that discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: I'm sure. And in the middle will be the children. And I'm pretty sure that it might be the right economic thing to do and the right humanitarian thing to do. I agree with you, all children should have access to health care.

Thanks for the work you do.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.5

1 SECRETARY DALLAS: Thank you. 2 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: And thank you, 3 Representative. 4 Representative Sue Helm. 5 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Thank you, Mr. 6 Chairman. 7 And, welcome Secretary Dallas. 8 SECRETARY DALLAS: Good morning. REPRESENTATIVE HELM: You talked about 9 State-wide independent living, but I haven't heard the 10 11 answers to my questions. 12 Where is Pennsylvania in terms of 13 rebalancing our long-term care system for both individuals under age 60 with physical disabilities as 14 15 well as seniors? And what are our ratios in terms of both 16 17 individuals served in the community, compared to persons 18 being served in nursing homes for both populations? 19 And what are the spending ratios for each 20 group. 21 SECRETARY DALLAS: So as I mentioned -- I 22 think I mentioned earlier, when you poll the people of 23 Pennsylvania, 95 percent of them prefer to be in the 24 community. It is one of our big goals to serve as many 2.5 people as we can in the community. We have thousands of people in nursing homes who don't need to be. We have folks in State hospitals and State centers who probably don't need to be.

1.3

2.5

Right now, if you look at, with regard to nursing homes versus the community, we're able to serve about 51 percent of the folks that we serve for the long-term support system or the long-term care system, 51 percent of them are served in the community. That is better than it has been in previous years, but still nowhere near 95 percent.

We need to make some fundamental changes to our system to get people, be able to provide services for the way people want to receive them. That's what our Community Health Choices Program is about. We are moving to a managed-cared system for long-term care, and that will help us serve more people in the community.

Right now, it's very easy to get into a nursing home, but it is much too difficult to get home and community-based services. Sometimes all you need is a ramp or an accessible bathroom to get to move from a nursing home or never to have to go to a nursing home in the first place.

That is something that is the result of a system that I think is fractured now and one that needs to be fixed. I think the changes we're making will move

us in that direction.

1.3

2.0

2.5

Many other States who have gone to the system I'm talking about are able to have folks coming into the system who are, you know, maybe 60, 70 percent of the folks coming into the system are being able to be served in the community as opposed to the 50 percent that we have now.

Ultimately though, you've also hit on a very important part of this. When folks who run human services programs say we need to do the right thing, a lot of times that is code for, I need to spend more money; right.

But in this particular case, not only do people want to live in the community as opposed to a nursing home, it's actually a lot less expensive for us to do that. So that also adds to the frustration that everybody has about where the system is right now.

I think if you say we're about 50/50 in terms of who we're serving, the costs are closer to 60/40 in terms of -- even though it's 50/50, about 60 percent of our costs are related to nursing homes. And that's because nursing home care can, in many cases, be twice the cost of serving someone in the community.

So over the next few years, the changes that we're talking about will change the system so that we

get rid of that bias to the extent it exists to have people served in nursing homes. And we can serve people where they want to be.

2.5

And at the same time, if we're smart about it, it's going to bend that cost curve, and it's going to reduce the cost of serving individuals. And also, just put -- and like I said, put them where they want to be.

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: I have a question. You mentioned State hospitals, and since we did close a State hospital here in Harrisburg several years ago, the proposed budget includes \$4, about \$4 million to provide home and community-based services to 90 individuals currently residing in State hospitals. And there are seven State hospitals.

How many individuals are currently residing in the State hospitals.

SECRETARY DALLAS: I don't have that number off the top of my head, but we can certainly get it for you.

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: And do you think there are adequate services in capacity in the community for individuals that are being transitioned back to the community?

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think that's what some

```
of the money you mentioned is for, is to help build that
1
2
    capacity. I think there is capacity to serve more folks
3
    in the community, and I think wherever we can do that,
    that's always a good thing.
4
                REPRESENTATIVE HELM: And since we closed
5
6
    Harrisburg, are you considering closing any of the other
7
    State hospitals?
8
                SECRETARY DALLAS: We always are looking at
    our State hospital system as well as our State centers
9
    for folks with intellectual disabilities. We always
10
11
    want to move folks to the community. And to the extent
12
    we can reduce the population, we would certainly look at
13
    consolidation of either State hospitals or State centers
    as we move forward.
14
15
                But ultimately, the decision always starts
16
    with what's appropriate or most appropriate for the
    individual that we serve.
17
18
                REPRESENTATIVE HELM: All right. Thank you
19
    very much for your answers.
2.0
                Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Sure.
22
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Thank you,
23
    Representative.
24
                Representative Daley.
2.5
                REPRESENTATIVE DALEY:
                                        Thank you, Mr.
```

Chairman.

2.5

2 SECRETARY DALLAS: Hello.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Hi, Secretary.

It's good to have you here this morning.

And I just want to join the others in thanking you and all of your staff for the work that is done in your Department.

So as you know, Act 150 provides State funding for mentally alert, physically disabled adults, ages 18 to 60, who require assistance to complete functions of daily living, self-care and mobility.

Okay. Is that better?

These individuals have jobs and are able to stay out of the waiver program for attendant care in a nursing home because they're not financially eligible, even though they may be clinically eligible to be in the nursing home.

So the Attendant Care Program, Act 150, appears to anticipate zero growth in the number served. The program is 100-percent State funding. But it seems like a benefit of this Attendant Care Program, for the disabled person is that they can continue to work with all the benefits that that provides and to the State for the tax revenues and user fees.

So my question is, what can you do to ensure

that those who desperately need this attendant care but do not qualify for the waiver get the care they need?

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY DALLAS: So there used to be a waiting list for those services. We have worked hard to drive that waiting list down. I don't -- I'm not aware of, and I think Deputy Secretary Burnett, looking at her, she's agreeing with me that there is not a waiting list for services under Act 150.

If there are folks that you are aware of that need those services that aren't being served, perhaps we can catch up after the hearing and we can see if we can work something out for them. But over the last couple years, we've worked hard to eliminate that waiting list for services.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: So is that in any reason because people are -- weren't able to get funding and would end up then becoming eligible financially for the Waiver Program or is it just because you've been able to cut -- I'm looking, I guess, for reasons how you were able to cut the waiting list.

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think it was through some -- you know what, before I get ahead of myself here, Deputy Secretary Jen Burnett, who handles the Office of Long-Term Living, which includes Act 150, let me have her come up here. She is the real expert. She

```
1
    can talk through some of that.
2
                REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Great.
                                                Thank you.
                DEPUTY SECRETARY BURNETT: I will just move
3
    my chair over.
4
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
5
                                    Okay.
                DEPUTY SECRETARY BURNETT: Thank you.
 6
7
                MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: I think the
8
    stenographer is going to need an ID here.
9
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure. Deputy Secretary
10
    Jen Burnett. And she is the Deputy Secretary for the
11
    Office of Long-Term Living.
                                  Sure.
                DEPUTY SECRETARY BURNETT:
12
                                            Thank you.
1.3
                My office operates the Act 150 Program.
                                                           And
    during, I'd say, the past five years, has worked very,
14
    very hard to establish efficiencies.
15
16
                We've slightly grown the program over the
17
    years. It is flat funded this year, but that's because
18
    of the trending -- trends that we have seen, and we've
19
    been able to manage it. So we do not have -- currently
2.0
    have a waiting list.
21
                Anecdotally, I'm hearing of people not
22
    getting into Act 150, and I want to know about that so
    we can work to resolve it.
23
24
                REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Okay. Great.
                                                       Thank
2.5
    you very much.
```

```
1
                And thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
3
    Representative.
                Representative Jim Marshall.
 4
                REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr.
5
6
    Chairman.
7
                Thanks for being here, Mr. Secretary.
8
                I had questions on the intellectual
    disability waiting list. I think they were already
9
10
    addressed with Chairman Fabrizio and Representative
11
    Kinsey.
12
                I do though have a question on the autism
    waiting list. It's a separate list than the
13
14
    intellectual disabilities? And how are we addressing
    it?
15
                Is there -- I believe that that list will
16
17
    continue to grow, and I question how do we even know who
    is on the list? Aren't there still individuals without
18
19
    a diagnosis or, you know, will that list grow when
20
    people see, you know, that they may be closer to funding
21
    and they're not on the list and then get on it?
22
                So any details you can give me on the autism
23
    waiting list.
24
                SECRETARY DALLAS: First, just one
2.5
    technical -- a technical issue. It's actually an
```

interest list. So the folks who are on the autism waiting list are folks who have expressed interest.

It's not, you know, per se a traditional waiting list.

2.5

There are some folks, for example, who live in other States who have needs for those services, who have inquired about services in the Department. So the number is not necessarily a traditional waiting list for us. And that is an area consistent with national trends that we expect to grow. That is something that we will be facing moving forward.

I think there are some dollars for folks to move off that interest list or provide services for those folks, but that is something that will grow and that will be something that will be -- a service that we're going to have to plan for in the future as well.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Was there a number of adults that are proposed to be taken off of that list?

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think -- what was the number for -- it was 100 for the autism interest list; is that correct? Yep.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: And if that number was continued to be used in the next budget, 100 each budget, will we end the list? Or what will end the list?

```
SECRETARY DALLAS: Well, I think that over
1
2
    time there need to be more resources appropriated by the
    General Assembly for those services.
3
                Unfortunately, you know, we're always trying
 4
5
    to find ways to serve folks more efficiently, but
6
    undeniably it's going to require some additional
7
    funding. And I think that's part of what the budget
    discussion is about.
8
                REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Okay.
                                                  Thank you,
10
    Mr. Secretary.
11
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Sure.
12
                REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr.
    Chair.
13
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
14
                                            Thank you,
15
    Representative.
16
                Representative Acosta.
17
                REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: Thank you. Thank
18
    you, Chairman.
19
                And welcome, Secretary.
20
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Oh, there you are.
21
                REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: I know you were
22
    looking for me.
23
                SECRETARY DALLAS: You moved on me there.
24
                REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: Good to see you, and
2.5
    welcome.
```

1 SECRETARY DALLAS: Good to see you, too. 2 REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: I have a question about the Demonstration Project and its purpose. 3 In 2012, Pennsylvania expressed interest in 4 applying for a Title V-E waiver and with the goal of 5 6 improving outcomes for children, youth and families 7 involved in the child welfare system. 8 Can you walk us through the process of how that waiver works and who was targeted specifically for 9 those waivers? 10 11 SECRETARY DALLAS: So if you're talking -- I 12 think you're talking about a Title IV-E waiver for --13 REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: A title -- I'm 14 sorry. Title IV-E waiver, yes. 15 SECRETARY DALLAS: IV-E; okay. 16 So IV-E is a program that was offered by the 17 Federal government. The way that it works is it 18 essentially takes the child welfare funding. One of the 19 larger pots of money we get from the Federal government 20 we get for child welfare is called IV-E money; Roman 21 numeral IV-E. That is money for out-of-home placements. 22 Now, the business of the child welfare 23 system, as it should be, is to serve kids in their home 24 wherever possible. And over the last 10 years, States across the country, including Pennsylvania, have had a 2.5

great deal of success serving children outside of group home placements in the foster care system.

1.3

2.5

Now, the interesting thing about that is the Federal government paid you for each time you took a child out of the home. So there was a weird incentive there, which was as States became more and more successful in serving kids and reunifying kids with their families, getting them adopted, getting them placed with grandma and grandpa, it actually had a negative impact from the Federal government because the Federal government was reimbursing folks for what we didn't want to have happen, which was taking kids out of their home.

So at the Federal level, the Administration for Children and Families said this is a perverse incentive in the system. And what they wanted to do instead was we wanted to essentially take the money that you got from IV-E and instead of penalizing you for doing good work, they would essentially block grant that money.

They would say, here's the amount of IV-E money that you get, and we're going to block grant that to a State and say you can now use that system -- you can now use those dollars for other services, things that we know will help kids, keep them out of the child

welfare system and serve them better.

1.3

2.0

2.5

Now, several States, I think there are probably 20 or 30 nationwide, have gone to these waivers.

REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: Right.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Pennsylvania had sort of a hybrid approach. There are several counties in Pennsylvania, I think there are maybe five or six of them -- five, you got. There we go.

REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: That's correct.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Five of them, including Philadelphia County, that have applied for that IV-E waiver. And they're working to hit certain benchmarks about care that they agreed to as part of getting that waiver from the Federal dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: Okay. So my question is in regards to the benchmarks and in regards to, specifically, Philadelphia and the Community Umbrella Agencies in Philadelphia that now, you know, there is a -- there's 10 contracts that went to the Community Umbrella Agencies in Philadelphia. DHS has 10 contracts out there with these Community Umbrella Agencies, which are community umbrellas.

In 2007, Philadelphia -- Department of Human Services from Philadelphia began to make significant

reforms to the child welfare system as a result of the Danieal Kelly's death. And it was a very well documented story of a child in foster care, lack of supervision, lack of oversight. She was -- as a result, she died.

1.3

2.5

And so Philadelphia then engaged and, obviously, is part of this Waiver Program under the Demonstration Project. But the issue here that I have, and I know that the model and the process in which Philadelphia wanted to engage the IOCs, which is incorporating a model to transfer the managed care or direct services to providers, to private providers, has not always been the best.

And I know that they were given a waiver, and that the waiver now, Philadelphia, I think, is probably ending -- I think they're -- in three years, I think, they're coming to their renewal of that waiver.

Where are we in terms of providing or renewing that waiver for Philadelphia? And do you have any data, any data, that shows that Philadelphia is really improving on these outcomes under this Demonstration Project, which is to improve parent behavioral health; increase parenting skills; improve child and youth function; reduction in the number of

1 children and youth entering care; reduce length of stays 2 in placement; increase youth being placed in most appropriate, least restrictive placement? 3 Do we see any movement, any improvement with 4 DHS locally under these areas? 5 So I guess, first I would SECRETARY DALLAS: 6 7 say that since the new administration has come in in 8 Philadelphia, I've had several meetings with the Mayor's staff there, the city managing director, some of his 9 10 deputies, the folks who work at DHS. I wish I could 11 tell you that the changes that have occurred in 12 Philadelphia have helped improve the system. 1.3 Right now, I think the approach that 14 Philadelphia took was one that had merit. I think the 15 issues they're facing right now are ones of 16 implementation. I think that the Kenney Administration 17 has inherited some issues that they're trying to work 18 through, and we're trying to support them. 19 But all the things that you mentioned there, 20 the number of kids in care, reducing the length of stay, 21 all of those things, or virtually all of those things, 22 are trending in the wrong direction. 23 I think that ultimately it's going to 24 require a lot of work, some system reform and some real

leadership at that level. And we'll be -- we're working

2.5

hand-in-hand with that administration to make some changes that will get the ship righted there.

2.0

2.5

There are -- when I talked about earlier in my opening statement about the increase in the number of care, kids in care in the State, the 800-pound gorilla, or the reason why the number of kids in care is going up is the city of Philadelphia. They have many more kids in care.

REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: That's right.

SECRETARY DALLAS: And that is largely the result of children not exiting the child welfare system at the rate they used to, and that is a function of the system not moving kids to permanency as fast as they should.

So whether they're reunified with their parents, whether they're being adopted or whether they're achieving another level of permanency, it's not happening as fast as it used to, and that is a cause for great concern.

REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: Right.

SECRETARY DALLAS: As the child welfare system grows, not many good things happen. There are a lot of -- there are a lot of, I think, implementation issues that still need to be worked out. We are committed to working with the Kenney Administration to

start moving in that direction. And they have been very open to taking a good, hard look and a frank look at that system and how it might move going forward.

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: Yes. Because part of the goal is to decrease congregate care.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: And Philadelphia is at 26 percent higher than the national rate, and that is a problem and an issue when we have 343,000 kids in our system in Philadelphia. And we have child abuse reports of 4,000. We have in-home services of 25 percent and we have children in foster care, 29,000 kids. So it's a major concern. And hopefully, we can resolve this issue.

I have one more question and this is real quick. I'm sorry, Chairman, but I have to get this one in there. This one came in from a constituent.

Secretary, in regards to the proposed managed long-term care system for adults with physical disability and seniors, but specifically for individuals with physical disabilities, ages 18 to 20, can you briefly explain what programs currently serve young adults, ages 18 and 20, with physical disability and what will change in the proposed Community Health Choices for this population?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So I'm going to turn it over to the expert on this. Deputy Secretary Burnett can fill you in a little better than I could on that.

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: Thank you.

DEPUTY SECRETARY BURNETT: Good morning.

We -- in our original proposal for managed care for long-term services and supports, we did include the population of 18 to 20-year-olds. And we did this because we have several home and community-based service waivers that serve that population.

However, that population is primarily served through EPSDT, which is part of the Health Choices

Program. All children are entitled to that through the Health Choices Program, which is the Early Periodic

Screening Diagnostic Testing Program. So they get the bulk of their services through EPSDT for that population.

not included in EPSDT, and we've continued to look at them very carefully to figure out how we would continue to serve that population with those services. Those include home modifications, a couple -- there's a few services. And I can get you the list of the services that are not covered through EPSDT.

So what we've decided to do is cover them

through the OBRA waiver, which is one of the waivers that we have that includes services not included in EPSDT. So they will continue to get those services. We have decided though not to include them in Community Health Choices. We're starting at age 21 6 because we felt it was -- for such a small population, it would be very difficult to require the managed-care organizations to have pediatric care networks. So we decided not to put them in Community Health Choices, but those children will continue to get 11 served through Health Choices and then also the OBRA waiver for that small group of services or people that 13 need those services, such as vehicle modifications, home modifications, and I believe respite care. REPRESENTATIVE ACOSTA: Okay. Thank you so much, Chairman. 16 Thank you, Secretary. SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. Representative Marguerite Quinn. REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. 22 And thank you very much for being here, all

1

2

3

5

7

8

10

12

14

15

17

18

19

2.0

21

23 I also would be remiss if I didn't thank you 24 for the wonderful work that you do, taking care of our 2.5 constituents, the people of Pennsylvania and their

families.

2.5

2 SECRETARY DALLAS: Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I believe you've already received a letter that I sent. It was directed towards some exploration that I'm doing regarding your GGO. I mean, we've just heard the need. And as you said, if we wanted to give you any more money, you'd certainly find a way to spend it. But wanted to just bring it up here in a public forum, that I look forward to receiving your response -- oh, it looks like you've got it here.

SECRETARY DALLAS: You caught that, yeah.

13 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay. "A" for

14 subtlety. Go ahead.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Yeah. I mean, we can certainly provide these to you in writing, but I think you were asking for the number of full and part-time employees in GGO. There are currently 979 full-time salaried employees.

The percentage of GGO that is attributed to salary increases, that's 17 percent. The percentage of GGO that's dollar amount of increase attributed to health benefits, there is no increase in the health benefit rate for '16-'17. And then the percentage of GGO increase that's attributed toward the pension costs,

that is 65 percent.

2.0

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Sixty-five percent. Wow. I'm surprised. The 65 percent, I'm surprised at for high, and I'm equally surprised for the flat line for the health-care increase. That's interesting.

I'm not challenging it. I look forward to getting the numbers. My point in bringing this up, as you might have heard, as I was speaking about this in other hearings. In looking at those numbers, trying to redirect GGO dollars into your programs, what we found in Bucks County, in Montgomery County, and in a number of States and even retirement systems, once they'd conducted a dependent eligibility audit, they found that typically there's 5 to 8 percent of just simple slippage with enormous cost savings going forward.

And that's what I was looking at this, and I'm asking all of the different agencies and departments and commissions to come back so we could see if maybe this is a way to recover some cost savings forward and put them right back into your programs that serve, you know, those who need it the most.

So thanks for that.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure.

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Again, I'm impressed} \\ \mbox{by the numbers.}$ 

SECRETARY DALLAS: I can read the numbers

Dave put together very well, I just -- we're certainly

happy to work with you in any place that we can get more

cost efficient or avoid unnecessary expense. So happy

to work with you on that.

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Could you explain, you just said 979 full-time. In one of the big, fat budget books, I thought I saw that you had about 17,000 State employees.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Well, for the General Government -- GGO, for that line item, it's 979. All in for the Department, there are about 17,000 employees.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: In that number is where I would think that, you know, if the 5 to 8 percent is across the board, as we've found in many public sector positions, that that's where the number of significant savings could be found.

So thanks for that.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I want to go back to an earlier question that the Chairman brought up when he first spoke.

My understanding, with regard to the \$5 pediatric nurse increase, is that those dollars were in what we passed -- or what was signed on December 29th,

became Act 10A. We called it 1416. 1 2 We understand that the dollars were in it and that the blue-line was not specific to those 3 dollars. The blue-line was an across-the-board 4 50-percent cut. So it seems to -- am I correct? 5 I'm seeing --6 7 SECRETARY DALLAS: You know, from our 8 perspective, I'm not sure that we thought about it that way. We can certainly take a look, another look at it, 10 after it was raised by the Chairman and yourself. 11 We can certainly double-check where we are 12 on that. But I think, Dave, you answered earlier that --13 BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: I believe there 14 15 may have been language in a Fiscal Code for the \$5 increase, but I don't think there was a Fiscal Code 16 17 associated with that budget bill so. REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: 18 True. I understand 19 the Fiscal Code is across the other side of the Rotunda 20 right now. 21 BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: Yes. 22 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: But the, you know, 23 the intent was certainly there. And what left this

chamber and what was signed by the Governor, had dollars

in it for that \$5 increase. Is that being spent

24

2.5

somewhere else right now? Or is that being held until the Fiscal Code makes its way over?

2.5

BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: No, that's currently -- the funding for the capitation program is spent within the capitation appropriation. So whatever we had in that allocation is allocated to the managed-care plan.

So, yes, it is being spent.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Bummer. Are you aware of any children right now that are being hospitalized right now because there aren't enough pediatric care nurses to serve them in their home?

I understand from one of the larger agencies in the State, that they've got about 3,000 openings at any given time just because they don't have the budget to hire nurses. They're able to go somewhere else.

And as a result, not only are families, you know, having to visit their children in the hospital, but there's additional costs incurred.

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think that specific numbers I'm not aware of, but having this issue be raised twice, we'll certainly take a look and see what flexibility we have and what the law provides to initiate that payment.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay. And one other

```
1
    thing. Back to your budget numbers. Thank you for
2
    sending the budget materials in advance.
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
 3
                                    Sure.
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Clearly, we've
 4
    received them prior to the Governor's executive order
5
6
    with the raise in minimum wage.
7
                How does that order affect your Department
8
    specifically? And was -- were your -- did your numbers
    that you presented to us reflect that rage -- rate, not
9
10
    rage. Did it already reflect it?
11
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Our budget does assume
12
    the impact of the executive order. It does not affect a
13
    great deal of our budget. The way it's constructed,
    it's fairly narrow in its focus, and I think that's a
14
15
    reflection of a need to address the minimum wage
    statewide.
16
17
                I think what the Governor did was a great
18
    start, but ultimately, the full impact is something that
19
    I think will require legislation. But overall, our
    budget does include the impact of that executive order.
2.0
21
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: So you were aware of
22
    it prior to when you gave us the --
23
                SECRETARY DALLAS: I was -- yes. I was
24
    aware of it.
2.5
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay. My concern,
```

```
1
    obviously -- well, among other things, it would be that
2
    you weren't aware it came out, and the dollars in your
    budget are going to be coming away from those that you
3
    serve, to the servers.
 4
                SECRETARY DALLAS: So the -- our budget
 5
6
    includes that cost. We were involved in discussions
7
    when the Governor and his office were drafting the
8
    executive order. So the impact of that order is assumed
    in our budget.
10
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you very much.
11
                Thanks, Mr. Chairman.
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure.
12
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
13
14
    Representative.
15
                Representative Maria Donatucci.
16
                REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Thank you, Mr.
    Chairman.
17
18
                And good morning, Secretary, and Director.
19
                I would like to discuss autism, starting
20
    with children or those under 21 years of age. There
21
    seem to be new cases every day. Parents always calling
22
    me looking for programs. They call me about the costs.
23
    They call me about insurance.
24
                I understand that prior to the Pennsylvania
2.5
    Autism Insurance Act, known as Act 62 of 2008, almost
```

all Pennsylvania children with autism received services through Pennsylvania's Medical Assistance Program.

1.3

2.0

2.5

My question is, what are you doing to make sure that Act 62, requiring insurers to cover services for children with autism, including diagnostic assessments, treatments, and how is it going to be properly implemented? And can you also tell us what other categories of service are covered?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So for Act 62, one of the things that I have had a particular level of focus since I've been here is making sure that that Act is fully implemented. As you noted, that Act provides for private insurance to cover, in certain cases, services for children with autism.

In many cases, insurance companies do cover the cost. In some cases, they do not. There are a variety of reasons that may happen. There is some concern, and the Department certainly has that concern, that some of the diagnosis and service codes that should have been included under the Act are not currently included under the Act.

We have worked with advocates and stakeholders and identified the codes that we believe not all providers are covering. We are shortly going to have some meetings with insurance companies and help

clarify the law and the scope of the law and which codes are included.

We will work with those insurance companies to make sure that those claims are paid. And we will initiate any process that we need to. We have, you know, we collect a lot of money every year for things that Medicaid should have paid for, but probably shouldn't have. That will be included in these expanded codes. And we hope to be able to move forward very soon on that.

REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Thank you.

And as a follow-up to Representative

Marshall's line of questioning for adults with autism.

There are approximately 17,000 adults with autism living in Pennsylvania. The number is going to continue to grow, especially over the next 15 years. And we have no choice but to figure out how to address their needs.

But my question is, are individuals on the autism waiting list informed of their right to an intermediate care facility? And how would the Department pay for that entitlement if placement is requested?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think, whether it's Nancy or Nina -- can you come up to the --

25 DEPUTY SECRETARY THALER: Hello.

```
1
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Ma'am -- ma'am,
2
    if you would, for the benefit of the hearing and for the
    stenographer and those viewers, if you could identify
3
    vourself.
 4
                DEPUTY SECRETARY THALER:
                                          My name is Nancy
6
    Thaler, and I'm the Deputy Secretary of the Office of
7
    Developmental Programs.
8
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.
                DEPUTY SECRETARY THALER: Currently, the
9
10
    practice in the Autism Program, which is fairly new, is
11
    to take the names of people who apply and keep a list of
12
    people who are interested.
13
                We are going to have to transition to a more
14
    formal approach. And that is, when people express
15
    interest, that we determine their eligibility. And if
16
    they are eligible for a Medicaid Waiver or ICF, that we
17
    give them that information, give them an opportunity to
18
    apply. And so that practice needs to be established and
19
    formalized consistently.
2.0
                REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Thank you.
                                                        Thank
    you for all the information.
21
22
                Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Thank you,
24
    Representative.
2.5
                And thank you, ma'am.
```

```
1
                Representative Karen Boback.
2
                REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you, Mr.
    Chairman.
3
 4
                Secretary Dallas, going back to the Aging
5
    Waiver, if you will, how much is in the Governor's
6
    proposed budget for fiscal year '16-'17 for the Aging
7
    Waiver, both in State and Federal? And this is the
8
    Aging Waiver.
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Dave, have you got a
    precise number there?
10
11
                REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Approximate.
12
                Sorry to put you on the spot, sir. And if
13
    you don't have it, you could submit it to our chairman.
14
                SECRETARY DALLAS: He's almost there?
15
                REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Okay.
16
                SECRETARY DALLAS: All right. We can get
17
    you that exact number.
18
                REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: I do appreciate
19
    that. You might have to get back to me on this one,
20
    too, then.
21
                How many folks are we serving now in the
22
    Aging Waiver Program? And if you do get the money, as
23
    per the appropriation, how many more will be eligible?
24
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Dave, are we going to get
2.5
    back to her on that one or do you have that one?
```

1 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: That's fine. 2 BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: Currently, we're 3 at 28,710. We propose an increase, as part of the budget, to grow. I mean, the Home and Community-based 4 Waiver Program is going to grow, regardless of the 5 6 Community Health Choices Waiver Program. 7 I mean, we grow that number to just a little 8 over 30,000 people in '16-'17. Can't tell you total funding. That's \$953 million; \$453 million in a 9 combination of State, Tobacco and Lottery Funds as well, 10 11 too. And then we have \$495,000 in Federal funding as well. 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Okay. Thank you. 14 And again, you might have to get back to us 15 on this one. But how much money does the program 16 actually save compared to someone going into a nursing 17 home per person? And this is always brought up in my 18 district. How much does it actually save? And I know it's a lot. 19 20 BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: It is. T think 21 that the nursing facility services are probably about 22 three times as much as somebody in the Waiver Program. 23 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: All right. And 24 you'll get me those numbers? 2.5 BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: I do appreciate 1 2 that. 3 My second question has to do with Medical 4 Assistance Transportation Program. SECRETARY DALLAS: Yes. 5 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: According to the 6 numbers I have, in fiscal years '16-'17, it looks as if 7 8 one trip, not a roundtrip, but one trip, is estimated to cost, I believe it was \$14, which is an increase of 7.7 10 percent over last year. 11 Why? When the price of gas has gone down 12 dramatically. 13 SECRETARY DALLAS: I can probably -- I can only speculate about that number increasing. I think 14 15 that there could be a variety of reasons. I think the mix of folks that we serve in areas that have longer 16 17 trips maybe, maybe more rural areas has gone up. I 18 think the areas where the cost per trip is lowest are 19 urban areas, where there's access to mass transit and 2.0 those kinds of things. 21 But probably the mix there, the mix there in 22 terms of the folks that we serve is probably driving 23 that increase, but I can get back to you on a more 24 detailed answer for that.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Is there an

2.5

```
1
    eligibility for the seniors to take this ride?
2
    shared ride, and I think it's supplemented by the
    Lottery also; isn't it?
3
 4
                SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think, the financing
5
    of it, I think Dave can talk about. But we try to work
6
    with PENNDOT and other folks to -- so we can make the
7
    rides as efficient as possible. I think a lot of the
8
    coordination is done now at the county level. We are
    taking a look at how we finance and how we manage that
9
10
    program and hopefully be able to bring those costs down.
11
                REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK:
                                         Thank you.
12
                I do appreciate that because if it's
13
    correct, it's $14 one way; $28 would be cost-prohibitive
    for many of my seniors to just go to the senior centers.
14
15
    So I'd like to talk with you further about this.
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
16
                                    Sure.
                REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you.
17
18
    thank you for your time.
19
                Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Thank you,
21
    Representative.
22
                Representative Schweyer.
23
                REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Thank you, Mr.
24
    Chairman.
2.5
                Mr. Secretary, up here. I tried to graduate
```

from the kids' table over there and come here and spread out a little bit.

2.5

SECRETARY DALLAS: Good to see you up at the adult table.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Thank you. I'm going to enjoy this perch for the three minutes that I, excuse me, five minutes. I'm going to take every second that I can, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, good afternoon, and thank you for being here.

Secretary, you had mentioned earlier that there are people in nursing homes who simply don't need to be. And you said -- and I'm going to try to get your words as close to being a hundred percent accurate as possible. You said, it's very easy to get into a nursing home but very difficult to get community-based services.

And as a statement of principle, I couldn't agree with you more. I think it's vital and important to -- not only is it a financially-prudent thing to do, but it's also -- beyond that, it's the humanitarian thing to do. Somebody wants to age in their home, live in their home as long as possible, whether it's just simply a matter of aging or if it's a matter of a physical disability of some sort or another.

It's absolutely a hundred percent right, and I'm thrilled about the Community Health Choices Program.

I know there are a lot of folks out there concerned about the implementation and the changes moving forward, but that's just simple concerns about changing how we've done things always.

2.0

2.5

But I do want to talk about a very small population of Pennsylvania residents, a very small subsection of Pennsylvania residents who aren't necessarily senior citizens, but they have complex, rare and extraordinary disabilities. I mean, these are folks who are, let's be perfectly honest, the belief that they will ever be able to live independently is probably not withstanding.

And we have, if I'm not mistaken, only four of the five-star special rehabilitation centers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, one of which happens to be in my district. And we're talking about hundreds of beds statewide, not thousands or tens of thousands of beds.

My special rehab facility is 100-percent full. It's always 100-percent full, and we have a waiting list of over 30 people. So -- and I know they're not unique. I know all three of them have that -- are looking at numbers. There's clearly a

demand and there's clearly a need for these facilities.

2.0

2.5

So how is DHS going to provide -- to partner with these facilities? Or more importantly, and less important than the facilities, how are you going to partner with these Pennsylvanians who need these sorts of services, sir?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think it's -- first, thank you for your thoughts on the Community Health Choices Program.

I think when you look at the services we're providing for folks, it always has to start with the individual person.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Always.

SECRETARY DALLAS: So while there are folks that should be in the community now; there are folks who occasionally need to stay in a nursing home; and there are folks who have very complex needs, who may never be served in the community. And I think that's the group that you're talking about now.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Yes.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Ultimately, Community

Health Choices, while our goal and the success will be

measured by the percentage of folks that we have in the

community, I think we also need to make sure that we're

providing for folks across the entire spectrum of needs

that they have.

2.0

2.5

The group of folks that you're talking about, I think we sometimes refer to them as Peer Group 13. They are very, very complex needs. There are very few providers. I know our budget director has been having conversations with folks about how we can make sure we get the funding for them right.

It is a very -- it's a tricky thing. I think we're making a little bit of progress along the way, but it's something I'm happy to work with you on to make sure that when we make that switch, we're providing for everybody, whether you need to be -- whether you can be served in the community or whether you need to be served in one of the facilities you mentioned, too.

So I think we're making some progress. I think there's a bunch of -- there are some Federal rules. There are some other things that we're working through to try to get that funding right. But Dave is pretty good with that stuff, so I'm hoping we'll be able to make some progress soon.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: I am as well. Not the least of which is -- again, because we have this, it's a very, very difficult -- from a provider standpoint -- population. And there's just really very few options for them, and they deserve the same level of

treatment and humanity and care that we would expect,

you know, our grandmothers, too, as they age. And I

know you share that.

2.5

And I'm thrilled to hear that you're talking about the funding for them because I am concerned. You know, in my previous life, I was an executive at a hospital. And so you can't be an executive at a hospital and not talk about reimbursement rates. And of the four five-star special rehabilitation centers, three of them exist in the third phase of the rollout of the Community Health Choices.

So we have a three or four-year gap before they're implemented before -- I'm frankly worried about the economic viability of these facilities. And so, you know, is -- can I, you know, I'm going to ask kind of a very simple question. Can I have your word that we'll at least have -- continue to have conversations about making sure that they're held harmless and made whole for their -- for those services?

SECRETARY DALLAS: You absolutely have my word on that.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: All right. Thank you. It is vital. We don't want to lose these facilities because, frankly, I don't know where else these Pennsylvanians would go.

```
1
                SECRETARY DALLAS: I agree with you, sir.
2
                REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Thank you, sir.
 3
                Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Thank you.
 4
5
                Representative Mark Mustio.
                REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Good morning, and
 6
7
    thank you for your informative testimony this morning.
8
                I'd like to have a conversation with you
    about the GO-TIME initiatives.
9
10
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Okay.
11
                REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Just one suggestion,
12
    in the future if they could print it in a larger font
13
    for those of us that are aging. That would be great,
    but I know it's efficient.
14
15
                SECRETARY DALLAS: I will put that
16
    suggestion into the GO-TIME Office.
17
                REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: But you know, it's
18
    being much more efficient because you're using less
19
    paper. So that's a good thing.
2.0
                SECRETARY DALLAS: I'm sure that was part of
    their calculation.
21
22
                REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO:
                                         Right.
23
                You, obviously, were here under Governor
24
    Rendell, and I'm just wondering how the GO-TIME
2.5
    initiatives have played into your experience in the
```

prior administration? And what has changed to -- I guess, some of the changes would be along the technology lines, from what I see. But I'd just like to get your feedback on your experience before, and then coming in now, and say, hey, if I ever get the opportunity to do it again, I'd do it this way.

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think that GO-TIME, there were similar initiatives under the Rendell administration. I think there's always opportunities to make better use of technology, to be a little more efficient in the way we do things. I think that having an office centered in the Governor's Office who focuses on that is probably a good idea.

I think working with departments and finding ways they can work together will help us deliver services in a more efficient manner. And I think that -- I think under Governor Rendell, it might have been called the Office of Management and Productivity, or something like that. So it's called GO-TIME now, but I think similar initiatives have proven that they can save the State millions of dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Yeah, I appreciate that. Every Governor who comes in is going to be efficient. And some day, Pennsylvania's motto will be, the most efficient State.

One of the areas, when we go out and visit providers in the community, is they deal with various departments in government. And a lot of times, they will be completing applications, and they provide the information to one department and they have to redo the same information on a different application to other departments. You'd indicated that the Governor has centralized technology in one spot. Am I correct in saying one department's overseeing that? Is there an initiative to --

2.5

SECRETARY DALLAS: I know that in the Governor's Office of Administration, GO-TIME is housed there. And there's also a CIO for the State that works there, but they coordinate with CIOs in each of the agencies.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Is there a drive to coordinate applications? I see in one instance, there's going to be a mobile app for iPhones.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: There's some, you know, applications or web-based initiatives. Will there be some coordination among departments to create efficiencies for providers so that they're not coming back asking for more money?

SECRETARY DALLAS: Absolutely. As a Samsung

Galaxy owner, I'll say the app will also work probably
-- hopefully on the Samsung Galaxy, not just an iPhone.

2.5

But things like that mobile app, I think there is a huge opportunity there. So if you think about -- I'll take a step back for a second. The CIO that we have that works for us is also the CIO for the Insurance Department and the Aging Department. And I think that part of the reason the CIOs have portfolios like that is folks realize that there are opportunities to do that; right.

So there is some of that, we'll able to do through technology, through mobile apps so folks don't have to come into a county assistance office. They can submit documentation through their phone, take a picture of it like you do when you deposit a check or things like that. That will also help us be more efficient, less -- you know, we won't need as many human resources to do those things. Those folks will be able to focus more on higher value-added things.

But I think when you look at the approach overall in the State, there is an opportunity to go across departments. Now, I know for example, PENNDOT is very good at building mobile apps. They do -- they have done a lot of electronic data capture. We're working with them, and they've offered services to us. And

we've seen areas where we might be able to use some of the expertise that they have there.

2.5

In addition, you mentioned, you know, having to fill out information over and over again. An area where that happens is licensing. So there are a lot of facilities that are licensed by multiple parts of my Department. And rightfully so, providers say I can't believe I have to fill this information out over and over again. We have a licensing workgroup that is going to come up with some recommendations this spring. Some of them will be finding ways to make it so that they only have to provide information once.

Overall, all those things will make us more efficient and also make it easier for our providers to do the job they're supposed to do, which is helping folks that need it as opposed to filling out paperwork for bureaucrats like me.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Thank you. That's refreshing to hear.

To follow up on Representative Marguerite

Quinn's question related to head count in the

Department. Not being familiar and not being on the

committees that really address the issues that you do on

a daily basis, one would think the more technology, the

more efficient. Sometimes that leads to a lower head

count.

1.3

2.0

2.5

But I suspect that there's probably a lot of other regulations from the Federal government that come into play that maybe increase your costs. So could you talk a little bit about what's being done on the Federal level to help and what's being done to really hinder what you're trying to get accomplished in Pennsylvania in three minutes?

SECRETARY DALLAS: Okay. Let me -- I will just say this. There are a lot of places where the Federal government helps us; and there are a lot of places where the Federal government could be a lot more flexible, make our life a little easier.

I think that they have -- the administration in Washington has embraced some of the things that are priorities here in Pennsylvania as well in terms of human services, whether they were some of the changes that were under the Affordable Care Act. There were some changes under the Affordable Care Act that didn't make things easier, too.

But there are also things like embracing community-based care. One example is they have a grant process out there now for community-based behavioral health clinics. We had a -- there's a grant process that we were awarded in the first round, a planning

```
1
    grant. But that is working to make our system more
2
    flexible and be able to provide behavioral health
    services in places where folks get other services,
3
4
    particularly folks who might not be comfortable reaching
    out directly for behavioral health services.
5
                So by finding ways to get flexibility and
6
7
    changing some of those funding streams and making them
8
    more flexible, I know Representative Acosta mentioned
    the IV-E waivers. That's another example, where we have
    that flexibility by doing those things. They allow us
10
11
    at the State level to be a little more innovative and to
12
    spend the money on the things that we think will help
13
    people the most.
                REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Well, I thank you.
14
15
    And I hope you're successful in saving the $19 million.
16
                Thank you.
17
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Thank you, sir.
18
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Thank you,
19
    Representative.
2.0
                Representative Schreiber.
21
                REPRESENTATIVE SCHREIBER:
                                            Thank you, Mr.
22
    Chairman.
23
                Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Over to your
24
    left.
2.5
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Oh, there we go.
                                                       Sorry,
```

sir.

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE SCHREIBER: Just as a brief follow-up to that line of questioning. On the second to last infograph that you provided in your testimony, some of the positives from the Department over this past year have been to reduce the days to process child abuse clearances from 26 days to the current average of four days. The average call wait time from 10 1/2 minutes to 51 seconds, just under a minute.

Just wondering if you could highlight, along those lines, how are you achieving some of those efficiencies? And what are you doing to implement them?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think some of them are issues of management and putting some new procedures

in place. One was, I think, the correct allocation of staffing. And then, I think also some of them are policy changes.

The numbers that you mentioned with regard to the call center, they were largely the result of some of the complexity that was associated with the first effort of a Medicaid expansion in Pennsylvania, which was called Healthy PA.

That proved to be a pretty complicated thing. There were a lot of folks who couldn't get the coverage they need so that drove a lot of call volume.

By simplifying the program under the Medicaid expansion, we've not only increased the number of folks who have health insurance, but our ability to manage that process and respond to people in a more reasonable timeframe has gone up. Some of that is through a really hard management, but some of that is also through making the program simple enough that folks don't have as many questions.

1.3

2.0

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE SCHREIBER: Gotcha. I really want to commend the Department and all of the team here today for the work that they do. Many of the Department are on the front lines of customer service and really doing noble work in our communities.

To couple with that last question, on the more local side at the county assistance offices, over the past decade, we've seen the complement from DHS staffing reduced significantly over time. Just wondering if you could speak to that a little bit. Is that a trend that you see will continue? And we know to your testimony the work has not ceased.

So are CIO staffers managing that casework well? And are we giving you the resources to continue the important work that they're doing?

SECRETARY DALLAS: Well, the county assistance offices, I think Chairman Baker said I have

one of the toughest jobs. The folks in the county assistance offices, they have a tough job.

1.3

2.5

That is one that is -- it's not for everybody. It probably takes you about two years before you really know what you're doing there. It's a lot of very complex benefit programs. Over time though, we have been able to ease the burden through increased technology. And that has helped us also reduce the complement of folks who are providing that benefit determination.

So over time, for us, it really is a question for me of what's the appropriate start -- things for technology to handle? And what are the things that human beings need to handle?

So you know, as we're trying to manage that caseload, there are things in eligibility determination, whether it's checking citizenship status, whatever it is, that can be done automatically. There are Federal databases that you can ping. We are making those changes. We have made a lot of those changes to do those things electronically. That, in turn, has made our folks more productive.

I think they had a -- some of the folks and the CIOs handle -- there used to be about 177 cases, or something like that, per employee. They're now up to

190 or so. Just as an example, if we hadn't gotten them to be more productive to go from 177 to 190 or so, we'd have to hire another 1000 employees. We've avoided having to do that by investing in that technology.

2.5

But one of the most exciting things about investing in that technology is that higher value-add work. The things that you need to do that a computer is never going to be able to do. That one-on-one work with people, I think, really is the thing that makes you go from poverty to self-sufficiency, that work.

We're freeing up more resources to do that. So over time, I think we look at that mix. I suspect that as technology gets better, we'll be able to use more of that on some of those functions. And hopefully we'll be able to free up folks to make some long-term changes in people's lives.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHREIBER: If this is too far in the weeds, by all means, we can follow up later. With respect to the next generation of case workers, students that are coming out of college now or have within the past couple of years, are you seeing attrition as a problem at all?

I know, you know, we hear conjecture and anecdote from a host of folks that say that a lot of our young people coming into the workforce now, we can't

hold onto them that long, that it is an intense amount of work. It's not the type of job that you leave at the office.

2.5

And, unfortunately, it costs the same to go to college to get that bachelors degree or masters of social work. And obviously, the debt load that they're coming out with is significant.

SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think that there are -- we have both -- we have issues on attracting qualified candidates sometimes. And we also have retention issues. Like any large business, we have 17,000 employees. There are always folks leaving and folks coming on board.

I think the issues on attracting candidates, there are obviously always pay issues, but I don't think folks in my Department get into the business necessarily to make a lot of money. I think other issues that we face are the antiquated civil service system and how hard it is, particularly in some parts of the State, for folks to even apply for a State job.

And when you think about young people who do everything on their phones, having to sit down for a test and travel from the northern tier to Pittsburgh to sit for a test, those are things that folks just aren't interested in.

On the other end, these jobs are not for everybody. When you're talking about ChildLine or you're talking about a county assistance office, there is a fair amount of turnover. And a perfect example is the Dauphin County CIO right here in the Harrisburg area. For a variety of reasons, including getting into the State system and then going on to other State jobs, our turnover in that county assistance office reached 90 percent.

2.5

So if you think about that, imagine trying to manage it when your human capital or your workers need to have about two years' worth of experience to be proficient at their job. In a year, 90 percent of them are gone; right.

So trying to manage through that, when you're dealing with all the caseloads. We've made changes where we've moved the back end of -- we're trying that right now. We're moving the back-end functions and the Dauphin County CIO to Cambria County, a place where a State job is a better job, a more stable job. And our bet is, we'll be able to reduce some of that turnover there.

But we are facing those issues. For us, the things that would really help is being able to recruit and attract employees like a modern employer as opposed

1 to the way the State does it. And then in addition to that is making sure that we find ways that we're 2 3 rewarding folks who are doing a good job so that they stick around a little longer. 4 REPRESENTATIVE SCHREIBER: 5 Thank you, Mr. 6 Secretary. 7 Final, quick question. We've heard 8 testimony from other departments, for instance, Department of Revenue and the Auditor General, that they 9 10 have diverted some resources to advanced collections 11 with respect to revenue. 12 The Auditor General is obviously rooting out 13 areas where there could be additional corporate tax 14 receipts or areas where there is better efficiency that 15 could be generated. 16 With respect to the CIOs and the complement 17 of staffing going down, has that impacted negatively the 18 overpayment audits? Are those positions that can 19 generally justify themselves? Or should there be 2.0 additional resources to that? 21 SECRETARY DALLAS: So with regard to the 22 monitoring of, sometimes folks call it program 23 integrity, we are actually -- that's one area where 24 technology and some good management practices have

2.5

helped.

In most ways, I think, almost every way I can think of, counting we're more accurate than we ever have been. I will give you just a few examples. The previous year we collected -- in overpayments and fraudulent payments, we collected about \$582 million in payments. Some of these were payments in error. Some of these were fraudulent payments. That number is projected to grow to about \$613 million this year, which is one of the highest in the last five or six years. If it isn't the highest, it will be very close.

2.5

We have driven down our Food Stamp error rate, which is the accuracy in which we determine Food Stamps. We have knocked that down by about 60 percent since January. That has translated to about \$35 million of avoided costs for invalid payments for Food Stamps.

In addition, we have something called the Recipient Restriction Program for Medicaid. So for folks who have suspicious patterns and look like they're doctor shopping, they might have a drug problem. We have restrictions on their ability to do -- to go to those doctors. That saves us about \$50 million each year. That's up \$10 million since January, and that's from better management of that program.

In addition though, long term, that's another area where technology can help us. Right now,

```
1
    when you look at those overpayments, the system in the
2
    past, the old way of doing things was everybody has to
    provide more documentation, everybody has to give you 14
3
    different types of ID and a retinal scan and whatever
4
    else we could come up with.
5
                For us now, it's really about moving into
 6
7
    data analytics and looking at data mining and finding
8
    patterns that are suspicious. And we can do that, we
    issued an RFP last -- a couple weeks ago to do that.
10
    Those are the kind of ways that we'll be able to
11
    efficiently look at it and even drive the numbers, as I
12
    mentioned, even higher.
1.3
                REPRESENTATIVE SCHREIBER:
                                            Great.
                                                     Thank you
14
    for your work. Thank you to your team.
15
                And thank you, Mr. Chairman.
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
16
17
    Representative.
18
                Representative Gary Day.
19
                REPRESENTATIVE DAY:
                                      Thank you, Mr.
2.0
    Chairman.
21
                Thank you for being here, Secretary.
22
                You know, I had sent a letter to your office
23
    back in February, late February, so it's okay we didn't
    get a response yet, but I was trying to get some
24
2.5
    information, some data, and maybe -- I notice that in
```

your opening comments, you did mention about out-of-State placements or placements of adjudicated youth in your statements.

2.0

2.5

But let me just ask for here, see if you have the information here. If not, just start a dialogue about it. Over the last 10 years, there's been a strong movement among States, probably for financial reasons, but mostly for treatment reasons and successful treatment, to greatly restrict and reduce out-of-State placements of adjudicated youth.

And, you know, these policymakers that have done this already recognize that children in crisis and dealing with mental health issues, you know, should receive treatment as close to home as possible.

So while some States have approved what's known as Billy's Law, I think, is what it's called or the nickname for it, which has a regulatory system in place. So anybody placed out has to go through a pretty strict regulatory process by legislation.

You know, and I think through the years

Pennsylvania has worked to reduce those numbers. And I

was just curious, I'm trying to get the data for not a

long time, but just to see what our trend is maybe the

last three years for what reductions have taken place

and what that data is. Were you able to get that

information together?

2.5

working on that. I'll be happy to provide it as soon as it's compiled. I don't know the exact status of it. I can tell you that I absolutely agree with you about serving kids out-of-State. I think I look at it in a slightly different way, which is -- and I think you mentioned it as well, is serving kids close to home. So there maybe some situations if you live in Philadelphia or Pittsburgh or Erie, that you might actually -- the closest option to your home might be across the State border, and I think you need to be a little flexible about that.

But, generally, you want to serve kids in the State. But I certainly wouldn't want to have a kid in Erie served by someone all the way in Philadelphia, if there was something right over the border there in New York that would serve them equally well.

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: And I would agree with you. Some type of radius around the child's -- you know, an ability to travel that distance so that the family can be close to that area. And I understand in the Allentown area, I'm western, northwestern.

So if you go over into New Jersey, where I'm from, and we have great treatment facilities in my

district as a matter of fact, which I'm sure you're aware of. But one of the things that I'm really looking for is a county-by-county, if you have it, to that level of those out-of-State placements. I think that was how we kept track of it.

2.5

I saw some numbers. And when I look at placements in general, I was thinking, when I sent the letter, I was thinking about out-of-State or let's call it -- you and I can coin a term, out-of-radius, out-of-home-radius placements.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: I want to see something like that, if you can collect that data, that out-of-radius placement, out-of-State placements, you know. I'd rather have, if we do go far, to remain in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We have a little bit more purview to have that great outcome.

But what I saw was with the out-of-home placements, out-of-radius, all the numbers that I got my hands on seem to be going down. And I, what I was looking for was out-of-State placements going down and maybe that would cause other ones to go up. So I was looking for a total number of placements, and then these out-of-State or out-of-radius, whatever you want to provide --

SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure.

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: -- what your target is.

And then of course the ones that we continue to see.

Because many times I don't know if we can totally, I guess the only place to go when you're out of home is in home, and I know you have mentioned that already that you're trying to move -- that's even closer to home by keeping them under the roof.

 $\label{eq:solution} \mbox{So I would appreciate if you could provide} \\ \mbox{that information.}$ 

SECRETARY DALLAS: I'll be happy to provide any data that I have in that regard.

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: Thank you.

One comment, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to make is, you know, we're all going through a brand-new, you know, budgeting time, budgeting strategy. And when I see things come before me, either on this Committee, the Appropriations Committee, or under the full House to fund things, I've said this before, and I just want to share it with you as well. Because I think things like long-term care, burn centers, critical access hospitals, things like that are vital, important and have broad support on both sides of the aisle in the State House.

And I often say in these hearings, and this might be the third time that I've said this, is that the

```
1
    place to go when you are at an impasse is to go through
2
    and say, what do we all agree on? And these are items
    that we all agree on. So I'm not going to ask you the
3
    question again. I'm not going to make you try to answer
 4
    that again, but I do want to just put my voice from
5
    western Lehigh County, northeast Berks, in questioning
6
7
    the strategy. And I'd like you to just take a look at,
8
    and however you can within the administration.
                I know negotiations are in the Governor's
10
    Office usually, but just however you can, carry my voice
11
    back to the administration that I think there is a way
12
    to proceed when you're at an impasse. I've done it many
13
    times in the private sector and the public sector.
                                                         They
    weren't pleasant meetings that we had, but they
14
15
    eventually got through to the end, where we all know we
16
    want to go, especially on critical line items like the
17
    ones in your Department.
18
                I'd like to thank you for being here.
19
                And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for letting me
20
    ask a question and making my comment at the end. Thank
21
    you.
22
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH:
                                            Thank you,
23
    Representative.
24
                Representative Tim Briggs.
```

REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Here, Secretary.

2.5

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.5

Thank you, Secretary. And thank you for all you do for Pennsylvania.

I wanted to circle back a little bit on

Deputy Secretary Nancy Thaler's comments regarding the

autism interest list. And real brief, I think it's

going to be a quick question.

How -- how is the citizen selected? Is it based on first-come, first-served? Is it assessment of need? Has that been formulated yet?

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think that if -- and I'm looking at Nancy to make sure I have this right.

Right now, I believe it is first-come, first-served.

And I think that as that list matures, we need to look at need as we're addressing that population.

REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: So as the list matures, part of it, has that conversation started happening yet?

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think so. And I think we need to -- Nancy had mentioned or Deputy Secretary

Thaler had mentioned, that we need to start doing assessments -- assessing these folks and finding out where the need is greatest if we're going to manage the list.

REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Okay. Sure. That's

the way I would hope it goes, so thank you for that. 1 2 Next is, and I know there's a lot of 3 questions, and I apologize. I was sitting next to Representative Bradford, and he keeps me entertained. 4 So sometimes I miss what people are asking. 5 But regarding -- it's been a long couple of 6 7 weeks, sir. 8 Adult protective services, Act 70 was passed in 2010. Could you tell me what the funding and what 9 10 kind of Federal funds are being drawn down? 11 SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think either if Dave 12 doesn't know the answer, we'll have to get back to you 13 on the funding for it. It is a program that we've 14 launched. It is up in all parts of the State. I think 15 the issue that we're looking at now is making sure that 16 folks are aware of the program and they know to report. 17 One area that is surprisingly low reporting, especially 18 for the number of people there, is the southeastern part of the State. 19 20 Out west, and maybe in some of the northern 21 parts of the State, there seems to be a higher rate of 22 reporting. But we're trying to get the word out there 23 and trying to make sure that folks know that service is 24 available.

BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK:

And I do not have

2.5

1 the funding broken up separately for adult protective 2 services, but we can get that for you. REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Okay. Terrific. 3 And regarding the Act and regulations, is 4 that an ongoing, trying to get the regulations complete 5 on that; do you know? 6 7 SECRETARY DALLAS: I don't think so. Ι 8 think we're implemented; right? Yes. REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Okay. And just 10 lastly, there's always a lot of talk about the 11 Affordable Care Act and Medicaid expansion and the cost 12 on citizens. I watch TV. A lot of it always comes up 13 about the concerns. Could you give us a little bit of the 14 savings that it's providing to Pennsylvania? I know 15 16 that's a pretty broad question, but some examples of 17 what -- since we've expanded Medicaid -- Pennsylvanians have saved. 18 SECRETARY DALLAS: I think there are 19 generally two categories of savings that folks expect or 20 21 project would accrue from the Affordable Care Act. 22 first one is savings at the State level. There are 23 folks that were funded with State-only funds, and that 24 Pennsylvanians were paying for with 100-percent State.

Those folks are now covered a good deal. There was

2.5

initially 100 percent, now down to 95 percent that are covered with Federal funds. So there's over half, I think it's about \$500 million -- it's probably a little more now as the program continues to grow -- in avoided State costs from that.

2.5

And I think over time, the design of the Affordable Care Act is designed to get people access to insurance. We have almost 560,000 people who have insurance who didn't have it before, that they'll be able to access services at primary care, and they won't wind up in the emergency room.

And then as folks have access to health care and they have access to doctors, they'll use them and that will make them healthier. And some of the larger costs that you see from delayed health care will start to go down. It's probably too soon to see that here in Pennsylvania. We've only really had the Medicaid expansion since January.

But over time, I think other States have seen slower rates of health-care costs grow when the Affordable Care Act has been implemented as opposed to States that haven't taken the Medicaid money.

REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Was there -- I mean,
I'm quickly looking at this. Was there savings from
drug rebates that we benefitted from?

```
BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: There was.
1
                                                        There
2
    was additional savings from drug rebates. We
    implemented that provision probably several years ago,
3
4
    when the ACA came in. We were able to claim drug
    rebates for drugs provided through managed care
5
6
    organizations as well, too. But those are continuing
7
    savings that occur each year in the program.
8
                REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: And ballpark, what
    amounts?
9
                BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: I'm not -- I will
10
11
    have to research that and get back to you.
12
                REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Okay. Thank you
13
    very much, Chairman.
14
                Thank you, Secretaries.
15
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.
16
                Representative Seth Grove.
17
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Thank you, Mr.
18
    Chairman.
19
                Mr. Secretary, good to see you.
20
                David, good to see you.
21
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Good to see you.
22
                DAVE:
                       Thank you.
                                   Nice seeing you.
23
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: First, let me start
24
    with, during the Governor's budget address, he said
2.5
    this, quote, no, this crisis is not about politics at
```

all, this is about math. Pennsylvania now faces a \$2 billion budget deficit, end quote.

2.5

What in your budget will actually reduce the structural deficit moving forward?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So there are several initiatives. It's a very good question. There are several initiatives that we have planned for this year that will help us contain the cost of growth.

So a lot of times when you're talking about health care. And what we do is largely health care for low-income folks, that is -- you're talking about the rate of growth, so bending the cost curve and also saving money. So there are several things that we're doing.

First one is Community Health Choices. That is about serving folks in the community where they can be. That costs anywhere from serving someone versus serving someone in a nursing home. That can be anywhere from two to three times the cost of serving someone in the community. It's also where they want to be.

We also have -- in an interesting way, the opioid initiative we're talking about also has potential to help us save money in the long run. I think maybe not so much in the Department, but if we don't provide services for folks and help them beat their addiction,

they cost us more when they show up in emergency rooms or the impact that they can have on family members and the family finances if they were to succumb to an overdose. But also folks that if we don't serve them in the community, they wind up being served in prison, and it costs a whole lot more for Secretary Wetzel to serve them in a prison than it does for me to serve them in the community.

2.5

In addition, we're making investments in early childhood education and home visiting. Every study has shown that for every dollar you invest in those programs, you see a return that's sometimes \$7 or above for each dollar that you spend. And I think for us that ultimately, over the life of a child, that could save you \$20,000 for each child that you're able to serve through those programs.

So those initiatives will help us contain costs. So when you're looking at our budget, it's important to understand that the folks that we serve are eligible for a whole bunch of programs. So take folks who are eligible for long-term supports and services.

As Pennsylvania gets older and the demographics of the State are that we're serving more people and more people are going to be required to have those services, the question for us is how are we going

```
1
    to serve them? Are we going to serve them in a system
2
    that's broken, one that costs twice as much, or are we
    going to make the investment we need to up front so that
3
    we can reduce those costs? And when we serve those
4
    folks, that we're serving them in the best way that we
5
6
    can and also in a way that's cost efficient.
7
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So all those programs
    annualized will not reduce the structural deficit?
8
    Annualized, what's that cost increase for next year
    carried forward?
10
11
                SECRETARY DALLAS: So when you say, reduce
    the structural deficit, I'm not sure that --
12
13
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Well, there's $2
    billion in between, revenues and expenditures; $2
14
15
    billion total, total.
                SECRETARY DALLAS: I'm sure you're not
16
    saying that the Department of Human Services will fix
17
    the entire structural deficit.
18
19
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Absolutely not.
2.0
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Okay.
21
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: But, you know, if his
22
    entire budget speech was about structural deficits, you
23
    know.
24
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Right.
2.5
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: There wasn't anything
```

```
1
    else in there. We read it three times. So if the
2
    Governor's main goal is to not have a structural
3
    deficit, I assume the direction of all the departments
    is, get me a budget, get me budget documents where we do
4
    not have a structural deficit anymore.
5
                So, you know, there should be a lot of
 6
7
    subtractions not additions to deal with that.
8
                SECRETARY DALLAS: I think, perhaps, it
    would be a good thing to look at our budget overall when
9
10
    you're asking that question. So if you look at our
    budget overall; right. There are several things that
11
12
    have driven costs in my budget.
13
                I can't speak as authoritatively on the
    entire budget.
14
15
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                        There's Federal
16
    mandates, believe me, I --
17
                SECRETARY DALLAS: So, I mean, but you asked
18
    the question so probably let me answer it; right.
19
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                        Yeah.
                SECRETARY DALLAS: At the end of the day
20
21
    there are one-time revenues that we have, and those are
22
    things that everybody here agreed to, General Assembly,
23
    the administration. There's probably about, in my
24
    budget, the increase when you're looking at my budget,
2.5
    is probably about $250 million in one-time revenues.
```

At the same time, right, there are initiatives. The initiatives I told you, I mentioned there. Those are investments we're going to have to make to not have the budget grow even faster than it's growing now. If you subtract all those things out, our budget grows by about 4.5 percent; right. And if you look at that, if you look at -- compare that to the cost of health-care growth in this country, the average growth for health care is about 6.6 percent.

1.3

2.5

So when you're looking at that growth over time, right, Pennsylvania has actually managed to control its costs far lower than what the average cost for health-care growth is across the country.

Now, what you're getting to is that structural deficit. Beyond all of that, how are we going to make our budget balance? And when the Governor says it's about math, he's right. Because even if you look at that -- if you look at the unprecedented savings we have from program integrity, the changes that we're making to reduce the growth of our health-care costs, all the GO-TIME initiatives, all those things, that doesn't resolve the structural imbalance.

And I think the Governor has been very honest about that. You're going to need to look at the revenue side. That's what having a structural

balance --

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Well, here's the problem with the GO-TIME initiatives. We've gotten all these documents of GO-TIME initiatives, and they're nowhere in the budget books.

Like, if we're saving money, shouldn't they be subtracted out of certain line items? Like, we don't need those funds in there anymore moving forward; correct?

SECRETARY DALLAS: I think -- I believe that, at least, there's a list of GO-TIME initiatives and what those savings are have been requested and provided.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Yeah. So there's savings. Is that matched in your budget documents anywhere? Believe me, I'm probably one of the only people here that actually reads the Governor's budget book line by line.

I did not see one single GO-TIME initiative subtraction and explanation of what it is in that entire book. There's an entire section in the front part that says GO-TIME initiatives, we're going to save money, yea, us. But within the budget documents itself, it's nonexistent.

I mean, we get spreadsheets here, but

1 where's it at within the line items of the budget? 2 SECRETARY DALLAS: I think when you look at 3 a budget -- again, I can't speak about other departments, but I know that for our budget, a lot of 4 the savings that we're talking about are included in the 5 general cost to carry our budget in the overall amount. 6 7 So, you know, you can get into certain line items and 8 some of them are very big. The savings that we've talked about and the things that were mentioned there, 10 they may not be called that on a specific line item, but 11 they're assumed in the growth -- or the lack of growth of some of those line items. 12 13 So we can certainly go through -- we can 14 provide you with the details of our GO-TIME initiatives, 15 some of our other savings initiatives and point to the 16 areas where it would save us money, but I don't know --17 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: And when I say that, 18 that's not only this administration. The Corbett 19 Administration, the Ridge Administration, the Rendell 2.0 Administration had those similar programs. You were 21 here. And those administrations also didn't highlight 22 those costs within their budget documents at all. 23 Hopefully that change is made moving forward. 24 And, again, I think that's a budget 2.5 secretary objective to do that.

SECRETARY DALLAS: I'm sure there are a lot of accountants who would be very happy to have that conversation with you.

2.0

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Yeah. So counties are handing back State dollars. They have seen savings through the Medicaid expansion, since people they have served are now obviously on Medicaid. So what's the reason for increasing their funding at this point, if in fact they're returning money? It seems like they're prudently spending money, and a lot of their costs have shifted to the Federal government, much like the State's costs have shifted for the Federal government.

I mean, that's the point Medicaid expansion for States was a good deal, because we could shift costs to the Federal government. So why are we giving them increases?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think that I almost agree with what you said there, but I think when folks looked at the Affordable Care Act and the ability --

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So close.

SECRETARY DALLAS: Very close, very close.

I think that when you look at the need that's out there, and I think there was some expectation, that as you move some of the costs to the Federal government, that you would see savings there.

But I think also when you -- the piece that was incomplete from what you said was the need that was out there, and I think the need has grown so much that a lot of the funds that have been covered by Federal Government, we've saved, you know, we've shifted over half a billion dollars in costs to the Federal government on that.

2.5

There is still a need out there. And that's when you say things like, you look at the Block Grant cut. I think if there are folks who represent counties here or folks who represent folks who are served by counties, I would be very surprised if any one of them tells you that there isn't a greater need than they can serve there.

So I think when you look at those savings, those savings have enabled us to provide a higher level of service for the need that's out there. But I don't think it's, you take that money and you don't spend it somewhere else. I think if you ask anybody in this room, any county administrator, they will tell you that the need is greater than it ever has been.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: But if the need is greater, then why are they handing back dollars to begin with? Especially within the Block Grant system? And they can keep 3 percent of unspent.

So if they can keep 3 percent of unspent dollars and they're handing money back, how does that drive that need? Wouldn't they expend those dollars if they have a need?

SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think that when you're -- again, I think you're probably getting to accounting issues. At any given moment, they're spending money on programs. And there are some programs that they might not spend it at exactly that moment when the fiscal year ends. There's money that carries over. There's money that they can use to invest to reduce their future costs.

But, ultimately, the amount of money that counties return as a part of the budget problem that the Governor is talking about, the budget problem that I face in my Department, that money is nowhere near what's needed to cover that.

Now, in certain --

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: I'm not talking about covering expenditures. I'm saying, they're not expending their dollars. So if they're not spending all their dollars and we want to give them more dollars -
SECRETARY DALLAS: I think what I'm saying is they are spending those dollars. I think in some

25 cases --

```
1
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Why are they handing
2
    it back?
                SECRETARY DALLAS: You know, I'm desperately
3
4
    trying to answer your question, Representative.
5
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                        I mean, it's --
 6
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    If you let me get more
7
    than one sentence out in a row, I might be able to do
8
    it.
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
10
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Right.
11
                At the end of the day is, you know as well
12
    as I do that there's -- the fiscal year can end at a
13
    certain point, and there are bills that are still due
    and those payments may not have been made. Some of that
14
15
    is simply the transition between one year to another.
16
                And what I'm saying to you is, that in any
17
    business, whether it's private sector, public sector,
18
    you're always going to have those issues. You know that
19
    and I know that; right. So that need is there.
2.0
    whether they spend it on June 30th or July 1st, that's
21
    there.
22
                At the same time, the Block Grant was
23
    designed to give counties the ability to innovate.
24
    when they innovate and they're able to save that money,
2.5
    I think part of the deal for the Block Grant was being
```

```
able to invest that money, that 3 percent, invest that
1
2
    money back in innovation.
3
                So I think when you're looking at those
    things, certainly as we're trying to come to a budget
4
5
    agreement, there is room to look at some of the overage.
6
    But, first, we should be absolutely clear. It's nowhere
7
    near the amount of money that we need to fund social
    services.
8
                And second, I would say that when you look
10
    at that, I think you also need to -- as we are proposing
11
    investments to help drive down those costs, you need to
12
    give the counties the opportunity to do that as well.
13
    Otherwise, we'll be having the same conversation year
14
    after year after year.
15
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                        What were the total
16
    savings for counties because of Medicaid expansion?
17
    Have you tracked that?
18
                I did ask Secretary Tennis because obviously
19
    -- I mean, he went into great detail about the Medicaid
20
    coverage for drug and alcohol. What are those savings
    for counties?
21
22
                SECRETARY DALLAS: I think we've talked
23
    about --
24
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: What's the shift?
2.5
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Overall for Pennsylvania,
```

```
we've saved over half a billion dollars. The number is
1
2
    probably higher for those folks. We can't get you the
    exact number now, but that number continues to grow for
3
    folks who would have been served under our current laws,
4
    our current programs, our current ineligibility, who are
5
6
    now being covered by the Affordable Care Act.
7
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Can you give me the
8
    specific programs, the savings, and the number of people
    who were shifted over?
10
                SECRETARY DALLAS: You will have any
11
    information that I have, sir.
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Appreciate it.
12
13
                Obviously with Medicaid expansion, we will
    see reduction in Federal funding. How is your
14
15
    administration planning on covering that hole moving
    forward?
16
17
                SECRETARY DALLAS: So that is something
    that's assumed in our budget this year. You're
18
19
    referring to the match rate that we have.
2.0
                So it started off at 100 percent.
21
    making its way down to 95 percent. That number is
22
    included in our cost-to-carry budget. And overall, when
23
    you look at the $500 million-plus we saved by making the
24
    switch, the additional costs we have, we are still way
    ahead of what it costs us without the Medicaid
2.5
```

expansion.

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So part of the Governor's tax increase is to pay for that cost shift?

SECRETARY DALLAS: No. I think that the amount of revenues we would need to run the government would be much higher if we didn't have the Medicaid expansion.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: The Commonwealth

Court in Knoll v. White held that State officials are

mandated by the Supremacy Clause of the U.S.

Constitution to continue paying States welfare payments
during a budget impasse who rely heavily on Federal

funds.

The Court determined that the following specific programs had to be paid even with no budget in place: aid to families with dependent children, refugee cash assistance, Food Stamps, Medical Assistance. The Courts also upheld that State-only funded assistance programs that are operationally integrated with Federal programs by means of intertwined computer programs in a single unified database must also continue to be paid if the State programs could not be separated out from the Federal programs.

Those programs specifically ordered by the Court to be paid under this category were General

```
1
    Assistance and State line pensions. Can you tell me
2
    which HHS programs continued to be paid during the
    budget impasse, due to the Federal funding component?
3
 4
                SECRETARY DALLAS: So I think there are
5
    components of the Medicaid program, SNAP Program and
6
    TANF; those are Federal dollars or Federal
7
    pass-throughs. A complete list, I don't have off the
8
    top of my head. But those are generally the --
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right. Could you
10
    get us a complete list?
11
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure. I can get a
12
    complete list.
13
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Are any State-only
    funded programs currently operationally integrated with
14
15
    Federal programs by intertwined computer programs and
    single-unified databases?
16
17
                SECRETARY DALLAS: I would suspect, yes,
18
    there are.
19
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right.
20
                If so, I assume by your question, you don't
21
    know specifically which ones. Could you provide us a
22
    list of which ones are intertwined?
23
                SECRETARY DALLAS: Sure. I could probably
24
    think of a couple of them, but I'll be happy to provide
2.5
    you a list.
```

```
1
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right.
2
    Department considered operating State-only funded
    programs from its operational systems and databases that
3
    include programs receiving Federal funds?
 4
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    No.
5
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Were there any
 6
7
    programs paid during the budget impasse that did not
8
    meet or comply with the standard set forth in Knoll v.
    White?
10
                SECRETARY DALLAS: I'm not an expert on
11
    Knoll v. White, but we can certainly look into that for
12
    you.
13
                BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: I am not sure at
14
    this point. We do have a number of payments that went
15
    out due to health and safety reasons. I'd have to take
    a -- I'm not familiar with the lawsuit.
16
17
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: It's a very big case,
18
    very big case.
19
                If -- were there any HH programs that were
20
    not paid during the budget impasse?
21
                BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK:
                                            There were
22
    several county-funded programs that were not paid during
23
    the impasse.
24
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: And would they meet
2.5
    the criteria of Knoll v. White?
```

1 BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: Again, I'm not 2 familiar with it. I would have to check with our legal counsel on that. 3 Okay. 4 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: The Governor repeatedly said, compromised 5 6 Is he referring to the framework budget or a 7 supplemental plan he pushed forward? 8 SECRETARY DALLAS: It's my understanding, when he refers to the compromised budget, that it's the 9 10 \$30.8 billion budget that was almost passed just around 11 Christmastime. 12 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right. So he 13 wants to go back to that, but his supplemental 14 appropriations do not meet that framework budget. 15 I'm very confused as to what he's exactly asking for. 16 Because the actual supplementals he is asking for, that 17 highlights in his budget request for supplementals, do 18 not match up with the framework budget. 19 So do you have any clarification on that? 20 SECRETARY DALLAS: I mean, if you have a 21 specific question about a line item, I think we can try 22 to help, but I'm not sure there was a question there. 23 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: The entire thing. 24 mean, he's literally asking for \$50 million more in his

supplementals than quote, unquote the framework budget,

2.5

1 so.

2.5

BUDGET DIRECTOR SPISHOCK: I would think for a lot of our appropriations as well, we continually update the model program, taking a look at the actual programs. So what we may have calculated for supplementals for '15-'16, as part of the budget request is a more up-to-date calculation.

So the supplementals that we include as part of our budget request are an updated supplemental compared to what the Governor may have had in the framework budget.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. And one last question. You mentioned that the minimum wage executive order was not expansive and will not cover you.

SECRETARY DALLAS: No. I said it wouldn't cover a great deal of my Department. I didn't say it wouldn't cover me.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right. So I would like you to take a look at, specifically, under coverage B, employees who directly perform services or construction. That is an "or" statement and literally covers -- the definition of employee in the Minimum Wage Act is any individual employed by an employer, as long as they're not exempted by the Minimum Wage Act. That line covers private sector, public sector, anyone who

directly performs services. 1 2 Under your specific Department, you have a lot of entities that directly perform services. 3 Non-profits, I'm not sure are covered under that 4 generally, but you do have some. So I would take a very, very strong look at that and maybe ask the 6 7 Governor to revise that language so it's not the 8 expansive nature the language says as to what he actually enacted. So thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 11 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, Mr. 12 Secretary, Mr. Director. 1.3 Nobody went into time-out today. That's a good thing, you know. 14 15 A lot of good questions; a lot of extensive 16 answers. Obviously, we all have opinions. You know, I, for one, apologize to any of those Pennsylvania 17 residents that have suffered as a result of the budget 18 19 impasse. 2.0 You know, we all have opinions whether some 21 of these line items that were vetoed early in the 22 process should have been sent out immediately and some, 23 you know, use a blue-line rather than an entire veto. 24 We talked a little bit about the blue-lining

in December. You know, we have difference of opinions

2.5

```
1
    on that.
2
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                    Sure.
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: But I tell you
3
    what, and I shared this with Chairman Markosek.
4
    impressed with the Secretary and his knowledge of the
5
 6
    issues. Obviously, the Director has been through many
7
    administrations. I'd like to know how he does that.
                                                           Не
8
    must be able to bob and weave pretty good.
                SECRETARY DALLAS:
                                   He has some very
10
    incriminating photographs.
11
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: But he also is
12
    very good at what he does, and I think that is obvious.
13
                You know, I'm happy that the Feds didn't cut
    us as much with the FMAP as they did a couple years ago.
14
15
    Whether you guys had something to do with that, I'm not
16
    sure. We could never figure out why we got cut so much
17
    a couple years ago. But I'm glad, even though we went
18
    down about $22 million, but as compared to $300 million
19
    from several years ago.
2.0
                But let's work together. And let's close
21
    this gap. Appreciate your testimony.
22
                For the members' information, we will
23
    reconvene at 1:30 with the Department of Agriculture.
24
                Thank you very much.
2.5
        (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 12:18 p.m.)
```

## I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same. Tiffany L. Mast, Reporter Notary Public Tiffany L. Mast • Mast Reporting mastreporting@gmail.com (717)348-1275