COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARING

STATE CAPITOL
MAIN BUILDING
ROOM 140
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2016

PRESENTATION BY OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR EXECUTIVE OFFICES

BEFORE:

HONORABLE WILLIAM F. ADOLPH, JR., MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE JOSEPH MARKOSEK, MINORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE KAREN BOBACK

HONORABLE GARY DAY

HONORABLE GEORGE DUNBAR

HONORABLE KEITH GREINER

HONORABLE SETH GROVE

HONORABLE SUE HELM

HONORABLE WARREN KAMPF

HONORABLE FRED KELLER

HONORABLE JIM MARSHALL

HONORABLE DAVID R. MILLARD

HONORABLE DUANE MILNE

HONORABLE MARK T. MUSTIO

HONORABLE MICHAEL PEIFER

HONORABLE JEFFREY P. PYLE

HONORABLE MARGUERITE QUINN

HONORABLE CURTIS G. SONNEY

JEAN DAVIS REPORTING
285 EAST MANSION ROAD • HERSHEY, PA 17033
Phone (717)503-6568

1	BEFORE (cont.'d):
2	HONORABLE MATTHEW D. BRADFORD HONORABLE TIM BRIGGS
3	HONORABLE DONNA BULLOCK
4	HONORABLE MARY JO DALEY HONORABLE MADELEINE DEAN
_	HONORABLE MARIA DONATUCCI
5	HONORABLE STEPHEN KINSEY HONORABLE MICHAEL H. O'BRIEN
6	HONORABLE MARK ROZZI HONORABLE KEVIN SCHREIBER
7	HONORABLE PETER SCHWEYER
8	
9	ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
10	DAVID DONLEY, REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RITCHIE LaFAVER, REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
11	CURT SCHRODER, REPUBLICAN CHIEF COUNSEL MIRIAM FOX, DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
12	TARA TREES, DEMOCRATIC CHIEF COUNSEL HONORABLE VANESSA LOWERY BROWN
13	HONORABLE BRYAN CUTLER HONORABLE PAM DeLISSIO
	HONORABLE CRIS DUSH
14	HONORABLE THOMAS P. MURT HONORABLE DAVID PARKER
15	HONORABLE SCOTT PETRI
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER
22	NOTARY PUBLIC
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX	
2	TESTIFIER	
3	NAME.	D. C.
4	NAME	PAGE
5	RANDY ALBRIGHT, BUDGET SECRETARY, OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR/EXECUTIVE OFFICES	9
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	* * *
3	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Good morning,
4	everyone.
5	I'd like to reconvene the House Appropriations
6	Committee for the Budget Hearings for Fiscal Year
7	2016-'17.
8	I know this is the hearing everybody has been
9	waiting for. An awful lot of questions have been asked
10	over the last three weeks.
11	With us today is the Budget Secretary, which an
12	awful lot of the testifiers came out and said, I believe
13	the Budget Secretary will be able to answer that
14	question for you.
15	I think I ran out of fingers, you know, the
16	number of testifiers that mentioned this gentleman's
17	name during the questioning.
18	So today we are very happy to have with us the
19	Budget Secretary to answer all those questions that went
20	unanswered during the last three weeks.
21	Even though the room is not as crowded as it has
22	been, this is the gentleman who can answer those
23	technical questions that we've been asking for the last
24	three weeks.

But for those that are here, I would appreciate

25

1 you turning off your iPhones and your iPads and all that 2 stuff, you know, electronic equipment. This hearing is 3 being televised by PCN. I'm sure it's live right now 4 and will be replayed several times in the next 24 hours. 5 It's the custom in the morning for the members 6 of the Appropriations Committee to introduce themselves, 7 tell the folks in the viewing audience where they live and what area they represent. 8 9 So without further ado, my name is Bill Adolph. I'm the Republican Chair of the House Appropriations 10 11 Committee. I live in Springfield, Delaware County, 12 165th Legislative District. 13 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Chairman. 14 15 Good morning, everybody. I'm State Representative Joe Markosek, 25th Legislative District. 16 17 I represent a District that includes the eastern suburbs 18 of Allegheny County. 19 MS. FOX: I'm Miriam Fox, Executive Director for 20 the House Committee on Appropriations, Democrats. 21 REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Good morning and welcome. 22 I'm Madeleine Dean from Montgomery County. I represent 23 the 153rd, Abington and Upper Dublin. REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Good morning. 24 Matt

Bradford from Central Montgomery County.

25

1	REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Good morning. Mary Jo
2	Daley, Montgomery County, the 148th District.
3	REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Good morning. Maria
4	Donatucci, 185th District, Philadelphia and Delaware
5	Counties.
6	REPRESENTATIVE ROZZI: Good morning. Mark
7	Rozzi, 126th District, Berks County.
8	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Good morning. Peter
9	Schweyer, 22nd Legislative District, Lehigh County, city
10	of Allentown.
11	REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Good morning. Mike
12	O'Brien, 175th District, Philadelphia.
13	REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Good morning. Stephen
14	Kinsey, Philadelphia County, 201st Legislative District.
15	REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Good morning. Tim
16	Briggs, Montgomery County, 149 District. And I'm going
17	to take the Chairman's lead. I live in King of Prussia.
18	REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Good morning.
19	Representative Donna Bullock. I'm up top. How are you
20	doing today? I represent the 195th District in
21	Philadelphia County.
22	REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Good morning.
23	Representative Karen Boback, House District 117,
24	Luzerne, Lackawanna, and Wyoming Counties.
25	REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Good morning. Sue Helm,

-6

1	the 104th District of Dauphin and Lebanon Counties.
2	MR. DONLEY: Dave Donley, Republican Staff
3	Executive Director to the Committee.
4	MR. SCHRODER: Good morning. Curt Schroder,
5	Republican Chief Counsel, Appropriations Committee.
6	REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Good morning, Secretary.
7	Mark Mustio, Allegheny County, 44th District.
8	REPRESENTATIVE DAY: Good morning.
9	Representative Gary Day from parts of Lehigh and Berks
10	Counties.
11	REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Good morning, Mr.
12	Secretary. Curt Sonney. I represent the 4th
13	Legislative District in Erie County.
14	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Good morning. George
15	Dunbar, Westmoreland County, 56th District.
16	REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Good morning. David
17	Millard, 109th District, Columbia County.
18	REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Good morning. Dwayne
19	Milne from Chester County.
20	REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Good morning. Mike
21	Peifer, 139 District, which includes Pike and Wayne
22	Counties.
23	REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Good morning. Jim
24	Marshall, 14th District, parts of Beaver and parts of
25	Butler Counties.

-7

1 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Good morning. Thanks for 2 coming. Marguerite Quinn, 143rd District, which is 3 parts of Central and Upper Bucks County. 4 REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Good morning, Mr. 5 Secretary. State Representative Jeff Pyle, Armstrong, 6 Butler, and Indiana Counties. That's the 60th 7 Legislative District. REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Good morning, Secretary. 8 9 Fred Keller, 85th District, Union and Snyder Counties. REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Warren Kampf, the 157th 10 11 District, Montgomery and Chester Counties. 12 REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Keith Greiner, 43rd District, Lancaster County. 13 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 14 15 As you can tell, Mr. Secretary, we have many members on the Appropriations Committee, 37 to be exact. 16 17 They come from Southeast Pennsylvania to Northwest 18 Pennsylvania, from Northeast to Southwest and everything in between. It's representative of the entire General 19 20 Assembly. I'm looking forward to, first, your opening 21 22 I'd appreciate it if you would introduce to 23 the viewers the folks that are with you at the table as 24 well. They are certainly able to answer questions as

well. Just pull your mike up as close as you can

25

because they're not real strong and the room is big.

Everybody needs to hear your voice.

Before we get started, I'd just like to say a few things real short. I'm going to ask the members to be as brief as they can with their questions. I'm going to ask the testifiers to be as brief and to the point with their answers and both testifiers and the questioners be as respectful as possible to each other.

Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, the mike is yours.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity.

Certainly, given the weather outside, I was hopeful maybe we could find an outside venue for this hearing but I understand the technical difficulties and why that's not possible.

First of all, to my left, this is Brenda
Warburton. She's my Executive Deputy Secretary. To my
right is Steve Heuer. Steve handles all of our capital
budget responsibilities. And if we get any particular
questions that they might be the more appropriate
responder, I'll defer to them.

I'll dispense with any opening statement in deference to the number of members on the Committee so we can devote as much time as possible to their

questions and dialogue.

I will simply say thank you for this opportunity. I've appreciated the opportunity to work with many of you already over the first year or more of the Governor's term. And I certainly look forward to working with all of you in the future.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Chairman Markosek.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Chairman.

Good morning, Mr. Secretary, lady, and gentleman.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: A couple of things before we start. One is, you know, you can't be on the Appropriations Committee or be Chairman of the Appropriations Committee without having the Budget Hearings be sort of your defining moment as part of that experience.

And it dawned on me last night that this is
Chairman Adolph's last Budget Hearing. I just want to
say that this is the sixth time around that I got a
chance to sit next to him. It's been a wonderful

relationship. I think I only drank out of his coffee mug once or twice in that whole time, accidentally, of course.

But I would be remiss without saying, partner, it's been a great experience. I've really enjoyed working with you. You've been a real gentleman. You've been very fair, very cordial to all of us.

You know, after you're here in the Legislature for a long, long time, there's certain people that eventually when you're gone, you'll look back and say, you know, they were special to me or a little closer to me than others. Bill Adolph will be one of those people on my list.

I just wanted to publicly say that here today.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

(Standing ovation and applause)

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: All those mean things I was going to say, now I'll have a hard time saying them.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: I had to figure out a way to temper that.

But anyway, on a little more somber note, I got up this morning and saw the news of a shooting in Wilkinsburg, Pennsylvania, which is about three miles from my own District. And it happen s to be represented

by one of the members of this Committee, Representative
Ed Gainey. I think there were five people shot and
killed, about 20 shots fired, several others wounded.

I wanted to mention that because, of course,
Representative Gainey about a month ago had his own
sister shot and killed in his neighborhood. It wasn't
in Wilkinsburg. It was in Homewood, which is right next
door. So he's not with us here today. But I did want
to mention that. It's just a somber note.

And it's a problem, of course, that's way beyond anything we're going to perhaps solve here today. But hopefully in the future, we can get our arms around that very serious problem.

Mr. Secretary, you know, the last couple of days here we've had the Secretary of Health, Secretary of Human Services come before us. And I have to tell you — and I said this the other night — I don't think I was ever more somewhat flabbergasted, if you will, or maybe that's the wrong word, but there was such a somber thing talking about the drug addiction here that we have in the Commonwealth.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: And all of the efforts with the heroin epidemic that we have and how serious, really serious, that is. And I'm very happy to

see that Governor Wolf has put additional money into the budget to deal with that in the Human Services area. I believe it's about 34 million.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: I think the Health Department is a little less. But the Drug and Alcohol Secretary mentioned starting these homes for people with addictions to go to to get treatment, because, you know, we can try to prevent all this and try to handle folks after they've been afflicted with a drug addiction. But we need to start rehabilitating people after we save them, if we can save them, and try to obviously put an end to this.

It's a generational issue. We can't solve it here. But I am happy to see that the Governor has put additional money in for that. My guess is if we meet in future years there may have to be even more funding driven into those kinds of services with this really difficult epidemic that we have here in the Commonwealth and throughout the nation.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Just very briefly.

And I really don't have a question. I'll just throw a couple of things out here.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay.

2.4

2
 3

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: The Governor came out with a proposal last year of \$31.6 billion was his budget proposal. The Republicans' proposal that was sent to him, House Bill 1192, was 30.2, which was about 1.4 billion less.

And then as we worked our way through 2015 and got into December, there was a bipartisan budget agreement for 30.8, which was in the middle. The Governor was up here; the Republican budget was here.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: And we met in the middle with that proposed agreement, which, of course, didn't get passed. And I'm not going to get into all the whys and wheres. I mean, I think we need to get way beyond that right now.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: But that was somewhat of a compromise, in my mind anyway. The Governor was higher. Republicans were lower. We kind of found the middle ground there, but, obviously, it didn't pass. So now we have to move forward.

We can talk about a lot of the stuff that went on here in our hearings the last couple of weeks was about blue lines. You know, even some of the Democrats have questions about some of the things that were

blue-lined, why they were blue-lined, Why wasn't just the overall budget vetoed, those kinds of questions.

In my opinion, we're beyond that now. You know, to really be talking about why this or that happened at this point in time as we're eight, nine months late on the current budget and we have hearings for the future budget, which we don't even have the past one passed yet, it just really doesn't make a lot of sense.

I just hope that today we can hear from you.

And again, I don't have a specific question. But today that we can hear from you and the members here of steps that we can take to reach that somewhat middle ground, the sweet spot, if you will, and how do we get there and what can we do to help you? What can we do together, Democrats and Republicans? What can we do with the Governor to reach that middle ground? The Senate, obviously, has to be a part of it.

I think at this point in time we all need to look forward. If I can find one word just to describe the way I feel about this whole thing -- and I'm sure a lot of people share this -- it's frustrated. It's just frustrated.

And, you know, I'm not one of these people that gets mad very easily. But I do get frustrated. It's almost like it's hard to see our way out of this. But I

think we have to strive for that because that's our job.

And I'll just pretty much leave it at that.

I would hope all the members here today in this hearing would offer ways that they think that we could

I know Chairman Adolph has said there's a third way. It's not necessarily the Republican way or the Democrat way. There's a third way.

And traditionally -- and this is my 34th budget, probably more than anybody in the room here. And I know that in every one of them, the whole idea of getting to the budget was starting out apart and trying to find the middle ground. And that's what we have not been able to do at this point.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: But we need to move forward and do that.

So, again, I want to welcome you and, again, say I'm going to miss my colleague here as we move forward.

But I'll be very anxious to hear the questioning and some of your answers to all of that.

Thank you.

meet that middle ground.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: All right.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me simply echo your remarks and say that, you know, what we're interested in

more than anything else is compromise.

As you alluded to already, you know, we were very disappointed, you know, right before the holiday recess. You know, many of you here, you know, all of you here to some extent had worked very hard, long hours, long days, long weeks, long months, to get to the compromise agreement that we got to.

Unfortunately, we weren't able to get that final compromised budget agreement across the line. We weren't able to enact that as a final budget agreement for the '15-'16 Fiscal Year.

We want to, you know, do everything we can to continue to pursue that compromise and find that final resolution and move ahead and look at how we can find common ground to get our '16-'17 budget done.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Excuse me, Mr.

Secretary. I was just informed that they're having a hard time hearing you in all four corners of the room.

Thank you.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay. Is that better?

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Oh, that's so much better, yes. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

And, Mr. Chairman, thank you for your remarks.

I do appreciate it. It's been a real pleasure and an honor to serve as Chairman of this Committee for seven years and to serve the people of Pennsylvania for 14 terms. It's been a true honor and pleasure.

But just because it's my last budget hearing, my last day, I have to ask some questions that have been on my mind and a lot of people's mind, a lot of members' minds. I don't have written remarks.

But, No. 1 -- and I've known you, Mr. Secretary, in various capacities throughout your career. I certainly respect your opinion. But, you know, in order to solve this problem, you know, I think you have to review and get some answers, okay, so we understand what the Administration has been thinking about. Okay.

And, you know, from the start, the veto back in June, the House and the Senate passed a \$30.2 billion budget. No revenue necessary for that one, okay, the way the budget was put together. Now we may disagree on one-time shifts and so forth and so on. Some are good. Some are bad.

But I was very surprised with the Governor's veto. I think we have to go all the way back into the 1950s to see the last time that a Governor vetoed an entire budget. You know, schools, hospitals, okay,

non-profits, you know, various county government agencies were in jeopardy and suffered as a result of that veto.

What was the thinking of the full veto? We've never received an answer. This is the first time publicly that I've had an opportunity to ask the Budget Secretary that question.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I think we were certainly both publicly and privately clear about the reason we vetoed that initial budget that reached the Governor's desk in July.

There have been — to your point in setting up the question, there were many things or are many things unprecedented about the circumstances that we now face. A budget we believe to have a structural deficit that exceeds \$2 billion as we look ahead to the '16-'17 Fiscal Year, that particular budget itself would have been out of balance by more than a billion and a half dollars. It would have continued a series of budgets since the Great Recession in 2008 that used either one-time gimmicks of revenue assumptions or expenditure avoidance that simply would have made our budget situation in the State worse.

Over the course of the last five years, five downgrades from the bond rating agencies, all three of

which downgraded our bond rating in 2014, should have been, I think, the clear indication that we can't continue to budget business as usual as we have been over the last several years.

And most recently, to sort of add to that or underscore the gravity of the budget decisions that are now before us, S&P has put us on a 90-day notice. And what they've simply said is, you either have to change the way you're enacting State budgets or we're going to downgrade your bond rating again.

And the Governor has talked many times about the fiscal consequence of that. Another downgrade will mean that on any debt that we borrow, we're paying a premium of sorts of more than 100 basis points. That means for every billion dollars that we borrow, we pay an extra \$10 million annually.

Those are costs that we simply can't continue to incur. We have to find the means to balance our budget, to eliminate that structural budget deficit.

And as the Governor clearly said in his budget speech, at this point we face two very critical but divergent paths. We can either find recurring revenue to pay for the necessary expenditures, the obligations of the State Government or we can make even further deep cuts that double-down to some extent on deep cuts that

were made over the past several years that put added fiscal pressures on counties, school districts, local governments or, again, we can find the political courage to put together, in a compromised way, in a way that finds revenue answers and sources that all parties can bring to the table, as we did with the compromised budget agreement that did elude us just before the holidays, but to work together in a bipartisan compromised way to find better answers to how we fully fund the State's obligations.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. And then this is hindsight. This is hindsight. About two-thirds of the line items in, you know, our tracking runs, about two-thirds -- and some of them are not the largest line items in the budget. But two-thirds of those line items, that budget was either -- that line item was either greater than or equal to, okay. And this is just my opinion. Okay.

You blue line what you don't like in June and you get the money out to those that need it, that we agreed to. Just an opinion. Okay. And this, in my opinion, is the way you work to a compromise.

And when all these other issues fell apart -- and they did fall apart. And it's a shame that they fell apart because they were reforms that were well

needed and a long time coming for Pennsylvania. Okay.

And they fell apart.

So, in my opinion, if these three other major issues fell apart, that, as you call a compromise spend number, that also -- and how to pay for it -- was never agreed upon. Okay. In order to keep Pennsylvania moving, the House and the Senate passed another budget increasing spending by another 100 million, increasing education funding by another \$50 million, and put it on the Governor's budget.

At that time, the Governor -- and we were only four hundred to five hundred million dollars apart between what the Governor wanted at that time and what this budget that got to his desk did, anywhere between four to five hundred million. The Governor chose to blue line \$6 billion. I don't understand that.

And I think we found out since December that some of those blue lines really can't happen anyway. We saw that with the Department of Corrections. The State Treasurer continues to pay. There is a middle road between what the Governor would like to do and the fiscal crisis that you spelled out. There is a middle road.

But by vetoing the first budget, by blue-lining \$6 billion and preventing this tax money to go out to

the agencies that deserve it, it's just my opinion that that's not trying to work towards a compromise. That's creating a crisis for the people of Pennsylvania, for the schools of Pennsylvania, for the non-profits of Pennsylvania that really is not necessary.

That's just an opinion. That's just an opinion.

And that's, you know, 28 years' worth of experience.

You don't create crisis and let the residents of

Pennsylvania and those agencies suffer as a result of

that. Okay. You can't get us together going that way.

We need to finish '15-'16. And I think we're going to have an opportunity in the next hopefully 30 days to do that. We all know it's necessary. But we could have balanced '15-'16 with little revenue and then really look into '16-'17, but not at the rate of spending that the Governor is proposing.

The people of Pennsylvania cannot afford those types of tax increases to try to solve the structural deficit and at the same time increase spending. And that's what we're looking for. And that's the only thing that's going to be able to get passed. And until we all accept that, we're going to be at this impasse.

Do you want to explain what your thinking was -the previous Secretaries, some said they talked to you;
some said they did not talk to you -- regarding the \$6

billion worth of blue lines? What was the thinking there? What was the strategy there?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The thinking again, as the Governor enunciated when he signed what he referred to and what we view as an emergency spending plan, was that we were putting together — or signing a stopgap budget bill. In other words, we were putting something in place to relieve some of the pressures that had built over the previous six months of the budget impasse with an expectation that when the General Assembly returned to session after the holiday recess, in a matter of weeks, we would finish the unfinished business.

We understand that compromise is hard. And I've already talked about the many months of long hours that it took to come to the compromise agreement that we came to, compromises from all parties involved in those negotiations.

There were many things that we had to accept in that compromised budget plan. There were delayed payments to counties for their obligations for child welfare. There were delayed payments to school districts to make their Social Security payments. There were many, many compromises that we had agreed to make to come to a compromised budget agreement.

Yes, an actual appropriation bill did land on the Governor's desk. But what didn't land on the Governor's desk with it was any recurring revenue package to pay for even that bill that was inadequate in many aspects. Many State agencies did not have their General Fund obligations fully paid for, even the Department of Corrections, I might add, that's gotten so much attention about the blue line that followed.

What the Governor was thinking was that he was simply allowing an emergency spending plan to be put in place for a few weeks so that the General Assembly could come back and finish its business, take the compromised budget agreement, work through whatever the unresolved details were, put together a recurring revenue package that not only — and maybe it was less important that that revenue package pay for '15-'16, but that revenue package provided much more substantial recurring revenues to meet the obligations in the '16-'17 Fiscal Year.

A more than \$2 billion structural budget deficit is what looms in front of us. And we have to be responsible. We have to decide and agree upon recurring revenues that are going to pay for those obligations or, again, be willing to talk about deep and really, in our view, unthinkable cuts that would have to be made. But

if that's the path that we have to take, then that's what the honest conversation is going to have to focus on and what the implication of those cuts would really mean for outside State universities, for local school districts, for counties, and human service providers.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Well, Mr. Secretary, I respectfully disagree with you. Okay. That was a 12-month budget. I do agree with you, the IFO agrees with me regarding the amount of revenue that was necessary. If the Governor would have signed that budget, we would have been working on a revenue package almost immediately.

As a result of his blue line -- and even if we would have sent the \$30.8 billion budget, there was revenue still necessary. So no matter what budget we put on the desk in December -- I think it was December 23rd -- revenue was necessary.

But my point to all this was the excessive blue-lining of \$6 billion, okay, not getting out from December to now with schools taking out loans, with the Treasurer making tough constitutional questions, the Department of Agriculture lines, the health line items, trying to get this '15-'16 budget done, okay, trying to get that done and then let's work on this '16-'17 budget. But to try to say that we have to come to some

1 type of revenue decisions for '16-'17 and not getting \$6 2 billion out is a problem that I don't agree with. Okay. 3 I'm looking for discussions. I'm looking for meetings. I have not received those types of 4 5 conversations from the Administration. Okay. And it's 6 now March 10th. So I hope the meetings start 7 immediately. Okay. But it should have started almost a week after the blue line and they did not come. At 8 9 least I did not receive invitations. So thank you for your answer. I'd like to 10 11 acknowledge the presence of some members here that are 12 not members of the Appropriations Committee but are here to hear your testimony: Representative Pam DeLissio, 13 Representative Chris Dush, and Representative Scott 14 15 Petri. The next question will be offered by 16 17 Representative Mark Mustio. 18 REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 19 Mr. Secretary. 20 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning, 21 Representative. 22 REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Good morning. 23 24

My goal is to try and fill that gap, the structural deficit, with my questions. We've had several agencies come in front of us -- and your office

25

was kind enough to provide to our Committee some of the answers -- complaining about their increased allocation for their workers' compensation charges.

And I'm taken back to the October 28th, 2015, press release from the LCB where they say, additionally, the Commonwealth's new insurance examiner determined the Commonwealth as a whole had been insufficiently contributing to its self-funded workers' compensation liability and increased the total liability for the fund from \$160 million to \$860 million, roughly, rounding numbers. That's a \$700 million increase.

My first question is, of the structural deficit that you're citing, how much of that 700 million are attributed to that?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: All right. I don't think those -- I don't think those numbers are quite accurate. We did in a more recent actuarial analysis make a determination that our outstanding workers' comp, long-term workers' comp, liability was much more substantial than had been previously anticipated.

The downside for the LCB, if you will, is that two changes were made, one of which you've already alluded to. But even more significantly for the LCB, in the prior Administration, they had made a decision near the end of the Administration to change the way we

apportion workers' compensation costs or liabilities across State agencies.

We're continuing to take a look at whether that was the right decision to make. But that is currently what is in place. And what I mean by that is that the experience rating of each agency is now an individual determination. Previously whatever that workers' comp liability had been determined to be on an annual basis, all agencies essentially paid the same rate.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Right.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Now we look individually at the experience rating of an individual agency.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: And I'm not challenging that. My question was, first of all, you sort of implied to me that that 700 million increase was accurate.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: It was about 200 million, as I remember, off the top of my head. We'll get the details for what the previous estimate had been and then what the revised estimate was.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: And when was the revised estimate made? Do you know the date?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, this was done
-- you alluded to an October letter. That estimate had

been made earlier in the calendar year. We had several meetings sitting down with the LCB to work through with them a number of different accounting changes, if you will, that did affect essentially their bottom line. It was just not the workers' comp issue.

There were also some Federal accounting changes for how we report and how they have to assign liabilities that also affected their balance sheet.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Right. And I'm not specifically addressing their balance sheet. I was specifically addressing the comment, which many of the agencies came into, specifically alluding to the workers' compensation charge.

And the reason I bring that up -- and the allocation model is interesting, but really it doesn't tell you anything unless you're comparing the actual losses to the allocation. So some of the responses that were made to our staff where, you know, agencies are taking steps to improve workplace safety and reduce claims, which will impact future rates.

Well, it's my understanding that the

Commonwealth has had the same safety and loss prevention

vendor, you know, in place for at least the last five

years. For years their total employment has been coming

down.

So I guess my concern is that we have these numbers that are able to fluctuate by hundreds of millions of dollars. We had the same situation several years ago with the Pennsylvania School Board Association playing games with reserves, which ends up establishing a cash fund here. Then we maybe possibly could come in years later with another actuarial study and reduce the reserves but we have all this cash.

So that's what I'm trying to prevent from happening. And I'm not accusing your Budget Department of doing it. But you're relying on numbers that within the last six months have gone from a \$700 million increase down a \$200 million increase.

And that raises a lot of questions, a lot of questions. And I'm glad you asked them to get the reduction.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Again, I want to emphasize that the delta is clearly not the magnitude that you're citing. But we'll provide you with those precise estimates, both what the prior actuarial estimate had been and what the revised actuarial estimate now is.

And again, these are estimate s of future liability. You know, we have to take a hard look at what the underlying assumptions are and make our best

estimate about whether those underlying assumptions are accurate or not.

You know, the conservative nature that I would bring to the office wants to make sure that we have appropriately and fully accounted for what our future workers' compensation liabilities are.

I mean, we all know the sad tale of woe in our pension system and what happens when we don't make the best actuarial estimates or don't fully fund future obligations and let those obligations simply grow or that debt loom larger in future years.

But to your point, there is no intention, I assure you, to creating any unwarranted fund balance. We want to make sure that we provide adequate funds to meet these liabilities and nothing more.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: And I want to be clear that I wasn't making the assertion that you and your Department were doing that.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Sure

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: But sometimes when you rely on outside vendors without knowing how they're compensated or what their ultimate goals and mission is, particularly when some of them have been in place for years, establishing the support that created an unfunded liability at a certain level now all of a sudden it

significantly increases, that raises a lot of red flags to me.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: I mean, I spend a lot of my evenings reading reserving ratios and claim reports and things like that. I have a boring life. Okay. So when I saw those numbers, that was an immediate red flag. It was the same red flag that came to me with the School Boards Association when they were overcharging our school districts by millions of dollars.

So I appreciate the dialogue. We can get -- if you would be so kind to have a dialogue with the Committee to get us the specifics so that we could review those.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: We could work together to maybe fill some of these holes.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We certainly appreciate that. We welcome that input. And we'll be happy to do that. It was a new actuary. And that's what often happens when you bring fresh eyes to provide that perspective.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSTIO: Let's go to the old actuary and save a couple hundred million.

Thank you.

1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. At this time I'd like to acknowledge the 2 3 presence of the Speaker of the House, Representative Mike Turzai. Welcome. 5 The next question will be offered by 6 Representative Mike O'Brien. 7 REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 9 And good morning, Mr. Secretary. BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning. 10 11 REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Good to see you. 12 When I was in the private sector, I was in the 13 meat industry. And I spent a lot of time negotiating. I spent a lot of time haggling over pennies on a pound. 14 Three cents on a pound could have made the 15 difference between making pay that week and not making 16 17 pay that week. Thankfully we always made pay. 18 So being in a position here when we talk about tens of millions of dollars being a rounding error when 19 20 I'm sitting here -- I don't have enough money in my pocket to buy a hot dog -- it kind of gets confusing and 21 muddled. 22 23 So help me go through the process here, if you 24 would. So we start off with a proposal from the

25

Governor of \$31.6 billion. And we get to an agreed

amount of money in the framework of \$30.8 billion. So during this negotiation process, the Administration gave up \$800 million.

What did we give up? What did the

Administration say? All right. We'll take this off the
table. We disagree with you. We think it's a bad move.

But we'll take this off the table. Give us a sense of
what was given up.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Really, by and large the concessions that we made would fall into two simple categories. We had hoped to provide significantly more funding to local school districts and higher education institutions.

Again, funding that, for the most part, would be directed at replacing funds that had been cut from those providers, education providers, institutions in the previous few fiscal years, and steps that would be taken to completely eliminate the structural budget deficit.

Our original hope in our original proposed budget was that we would eliminate that structural budget deficit entirely in the '15-'16 Fiscal Year.

What the bipartisan budget agreement would have enabled us to do was to eliminate that structural budget deficit but to take two years to do it. In other words, we would have taken several significant steps to

hopefully satisfy bond rating agencies critical of the budgeting practices that we've been implementing over the past several years. But we would have taken two years, not one year, to get that job done.

The third component, if you will, was part of the Governor's three-year plan to significantly improve the State's business tax climate by significantly reducing our corporate net income tax.

There would have been a cost to that. The first-year cost would have been about \$250 million, together giving up on these three things. But the two most importantly that I alluded to earlier would have been the compromise.

I have to also say for the record that things do change. I often get accused of changing numbers along the way. You know, realities come into play. Declining revenues in our Oil and Gas Fund, declining revenues in our Lottery Fund caused a — you know, as many of you know, we have to make spring update changes to the original budget proposals that are provided.

In that case, last year in early March, we ended up having to reverse about \$125 million in payments that we thought we could transfer from the Lottery Fund to balance the General Fund Budget.

Again, one of these steps we've been taking in

past fiscal years that isn't sustainable long term but we were, because of Lottery revenues, forced to back out about 125 million that had been assumed to be Lottery Fund support.

And similarly Oil and Gas Fund revenues caused us to make revisions in the amount of transfers from those funds to the General Fund to offset principally DCNR appropriations in their budget.

So, in fact, by the time we finally sat down to the negotiating table in April and May, once those spring update changes were made, we were looking at a \$31.9 billion proposed spending plan. And that's what we really compromised down to.

So what we were really taking in full or agreeing to was about \$1.1 billion in total cuts from the original proposal that we had circulated in March.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: So \$1.1 billion in cuts. So now we add from the bipartisan agreement to HB 1460 we add another 500 million cut, which from the original proposal would have taken the change of \$1.4 billion.

Now, you laid out what would be taken off the table from 31.9, I believe you just said, to 30.3. What do we lose going down that next step to 1460?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, the most

significant thing we lose -- and there are two pieces to this. First, without any effort to eliminate the structural budget deficit, it really does jeopardize our ability to go to the B bond market.

We've talked a lot about the inadequacy of that proposed budget for local school districts. And there's been, you know, a lot of confusion about, you know, why we get to the assertion that that budget as proposed would have resulted in about a \$95 million cut if you look at total aid to local school districts.

We get there because, yes, that proposed budget that did land on the Governor's desk did provide modest increases for the basic education subsidy, for Special Education, pre-K programs, things that are important.

But those total increases that would have added up to about 210 million would have been offset by the loss of any revenue that would have been — that we're able to provide to this day to reimburse school districts for their school construction programs, you know, building buildings, repairs, and so on.

The compromised budget agreement assumes that we would go to the debt market and borrow funds, not just to meet those obligations in the current fiscal year.

The original recommended appropriation, just by way of reference, would have been slightly more than \$305

million. So that's how we get to the net \$95 million cut.

But without addressing the structural budget deficit, without taking clear steps to bring our budget into balance, there is no way we can go to the bond market to issue that debt. So what we'd be left with if there's nothing to replace or enhance the subsidies provided, the revenue plans that would support that budget — that budget in itself was already out of balance by more than a half a billion dollars — there is no way that we could go out in the bond market and issue debt that wouldn't negatively impact our future debt rating.

So what that means is we're left with no way to meet these obligations, 270 million in direct payments the districts will incur during the fiscal year, another \$10 million in lease payments that we're obligated to make to charter schools. We have no means right now to fund those obligations.

And again, if we want to or if we're forced to simply fund them from the General Fund, then we have to find the means to provide an additional 300 million that's simply not there right now.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Two questions, give me a very short answer for, if you would.

1 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 2 REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Does legislation 3 dealing with pensions have any impact on this year's 4 budget? 5 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: It does not 6 directly. 7 REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Does any legislation dealing with the sale of liquor stores have any direct 8 9 impact on this year's budget? BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Not in the current 10 11 year. REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Now, what I've heard --12 and I'm just a simple row house guy, so please forgive 13 me. But what I've heard is that from prekindergarten 14 15 through postgraduate years, our kids get short-changed and our students are saddled with crushing debt. 16 What I've heard today is that our senior 17 citizens, Mom and Pop and Grandmom and Grandpop, don't 18 get the services that they need. Certainly, we're at a 19 20 place that we need to look like a simple guy like I am how does government serve us at the end of the day. And 21 22 certainly, I believe the Governor's current budget 23 proposal serves that purpose. 24 Thank you for your time today, sir. 25 And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you,
2	Representative.
3	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
4	Representative.
5	I grew up in a very similar row house to my good
6	cousin over there, Representative O'Brien. And I'm sure
7	some of the members will be talking about the type of
8	revenue that we could have refused from privatization of
9	liquor stores. So I will pass on it.
10	The next speaker is Representative George
11	Dunbar.
12	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13	Good morning, Secretary.
14	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning.
15	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And as I sat over here,
16	I've honestly started scribbling in margins of the
17	paper. I only have a couple of brief questions and then
18	comments based upon some of the things we've heard over
19	the last couple days.
20	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.
21	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And hopefully I can put
22	them in some type of cogent order to make sense of it
23	all.
24	Over the last few weeks, I've heard a lot of
25	different terms, a lot of different ways of looking at

numbers. And I had heard a discussion between a member and the Secretary of Education that talked about programmatic spending in regards to education.

Programmatic spending has decreased since the Rendell Administration. And that's a term I'm not familiar with. Are you familiar with that term?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I think that what he was simply alluding to is that after the deep cuts that were made in the '11-'12 Fiscal Year, we have restored some of that appropriation authority to aid local school districts.

But, you know, as we sit here today or if we look at the '14-'15 Fiscal Year as the base year on which we, you know, judge where school districts are compared to where they were at the end of the Rendell Administration, certainly there are many school districts. And school districts on the whole have not fully recovered from those deep cuts.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And do you agree with the Governor's assertion that HB 1460 represents a \$95 million cut to education?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yeah. If it's helpful, the math is pretty simple. There would be, if you combine the basic education subsidy, if you restore the blue line for that subsidy and include the increase

in the regular block grant, it would have provided about a \$150 million increase.

Additional appropriation increases for Special Education and early learning programs would have totaled another 60 million, for a total of 210 million, but then providing no means to fund school districts. School construction obligations would be a net loss compared to the prior fiscal year of more than \$305 million.

That \$305 million cut along with the \$210 million increase leaves school districts with a net \$95 million less than we were providing them with in the '14-'15 Fiscal Year.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And I appreciate that.

And believe me, I had jumbled numbers around a little bit to figure it out originally. But I did get to the same conclusion you did. That is not programmatic spending then. Programmatic spending in HB 1460 actually increases; is that correct?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Again, the school construction, the line item that provides those reimbursements, is zero. In the previous year it was \$306 million to be exact.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Yeah. And did you -- we also -- the plan was -- and I believe part of the plan that the Administration also agreed to -- to have a bond

issue to cover those costs.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: As I previously alluded to, we cannot go into the bond market right now without dealing in some substantive way with the structural budget deficit.

S&P just a few weeks ago, to buttress that assertion, has been clear. We are on a 90-day watch. As we speak now, that clock is running. And what they have clearly said is, if we don't take steps to change the way we're budgeting our State finances, we're going to receive another downgrade.

And if we would go out into the debt market right now and ask to borrow to meet what is clearly a current General Fund operating obligation, annual payments that we make, that we have already committed to, to reimburse school districts to help them meet their debt service payments for school construction projects, that debt would — that debt may not even be rateable or we would suffer immeasurable harm, you know, in your future borrowing.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And the actual \$95 million cut, there's no specific term to describe that, is there, to take those four items and put them together?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I think for school

-44 **-**

districts it would be described simply as \$95 million less than they received in the last fiscal year. It's math.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: I'm not a wonderful wordsmith. And I don't know about creating different words and terminologies that we seem to be doing recently. I leave that up to the Dr. Seusses of the world to create different terms.

I am -- like my friend the meatman, I'm just a lonely old CPA. We don't deal with different words. We tend to do things with numbers.

Over the years when I would go and visit a client prior to year end, I would walk in the door, talk about, you know, what do you want to do here? What's your concern? Is your concern your taxes or is your concern your financial statement and the banks?

And depending upon their answer, we would certainly make their statements come out to that. What I'm saying is, we could take the same numbers and legally make them say what we wanted them to say. It could be higher profits. It could be for bank reasons or it could be lower profits for tax reasons.

And that's what's been happening here. It just seems like no matter where we go, we're all using the same numbers. We're all manipulating them different

ways. We're calling it \$95 million cuts. One side saying \$95 million cuts. The other side is saying a \$400 million increase.

And Chairman Adolph had mentioned yesterday in yesterday's hearing that no one is lying. No one is, you know, making this stuff up. But we're all just trying to, you know, create our own situation to make our sides look better.

I have a great deal of respect for the other side of the aisle and what they're trying to do and how you represent your constituents, just like we're trying to represent our constituents as well.

But I've heard mentioned over the hearings that we somehow are residing in an alternative universe or a parallel reality. I'm not sure. Like I said, I'm not a very good wordsmith of what exactly the term was.

I've also heard the analogy that was mentioned yesterday that the \$30.8 billion budget was akin to a five-piece puzzle. And the five-piece puzzle consisted of four different chambers and the Governor's Office.

And that puzzle fell apart when Representative Reed pulled away his piece of the puzzle and the puzzle fell off.

I agree it's a five-piece puzzle. But I believe the pieces are liquor privatization, pension reform,

property tax reform, appropriations, and the revenue to support it. Those are the five pieces. And without all the puzzle pieces in place, it doesn't exist.

So, you know, we have to either decide, you know, what are we going to do here? The alternative reality that I see, the parallel universe I see, is continue to latch on to that \$30.8 billion budget, which doesn't exist anymore. We have to admit that it is either missing pieces or completely unbuildable.

Throughout my career, many times I'd go to work.

I have a five-year plan. You make up your five-year plan. And as you're going through it, you know, as time progresses you realize this isn't working. You cast it aside. I can build a bonfire with all the five-year plans I've written over my life.

You know, I worked in construction. We'd do a bid on a job. We'd work for six months on a bid. We don't get the bid. We don't sit there and complain about it. It's time to steer in a different path. Time to steer in a different direction. Time to put it aside and start over.

In the last three weeks, we have had a lot of disagreements. We've had a lot of different things going on. But there is some things that we do agree on here. Now, I think one thing we all collectively agree

on is the desire to get this done, find some way to get this done.

So in all due respect, I think we need to stop with the misleading stories. Stop with the catchy new names. Stop with the mangled numbers and telling stories in different ways. You know, stop with, you know, having — when we just talked about a cut. We just talked on a cut to a budget proposal.

If it was a proposal, you can't be cutting it.

If it was an enacted budget, you could have a cut. But you can't have a cut from a budget proposal or we can't, you know, consistently leave out certain information.

I heard someone read a bond report and conveniently leave out certain items in that bond report to tell the story the way they wanted to tell it.

I heard Chairman Markosek say it earlier today.

And I am in agreement with my neighbor Joe. And I'm in agreement with Chairman Adolph. I don't have to agree with Bill. He's leaving. So I mean, I don't have to kiss up to him or anything like that.

But Billy had said early on in this process that we're at a fork. We have higher taxes. We have spending cuts. There is an alternative path.

Earlier I mentioned Dr. Seuss and making up words. And I had had discussions with Representative

1 Sonney. I don't know how we got off on some Dr. Seuss 2 tangent. So while I was sitting over there I actually 3 did find a Dr. Seuss quote, believe it or not, that fits. And I don't know what it's from. Maybe Red Fish, 5 Blue Fish, Two Fish. I don't know. 6 The quote is, you have brains in your head. 7 have feet in your shoes. You can steer yourself any 8 direction you choose. And what I'm asking you, 9 Secretary, and the Governor is to steer in a different direction. We're at that point. We're at that time. 10 11 We cannot continue down the path we're on. 12 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, 14 15 Representative. 16 Representative Daley. 17 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. 18 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 19 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Good morning, Secretary 20 Albright. It's good to see you. 21 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you. 22 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: I just wanted to start 23 with saying what an honor it is to serve on the 24 Appropriations Committee and to have the opportunity to

sit and listen to the different departments come before

25

us and answer our questions. It's very time-consuming. It's exhausting at times, but it's an honor.

And, Chairman Adolph, I appreciate the work that you do in chairing it, and also, of course, my own Chairman, Chairman Markosek. I wanted to just start with that.

And I also want to just state that I look forward to finding a way to work with the Governor and my colleagues across the aisle to move our budget process forward. Hopefully, we can beat that 90-day period of time that Secretary Albright just mentioned related to addressing our budget crisis.

I think a lot of what I know about budgets comes from when I worked at University of Penn. I was responsible for the budgets. And I was told in my department that the budget is your budget. It's a big responsibility.

I also learned it's a statement of priorities.

And for me the big priorities are restoring past cuts to education and human services. When I say education, I mean education, the whole gamut, all the way through higher ed.

The structural deficit is also one of my priorities. I know we all have our own priorities on how government services are funded and which government

services are important to our constituents. But the slogan government that works has a lot of meaning for me because I know from my own experience when I was in local government that it is possible to deliver government services that people want.

So with that in mind, I believe that we all recognize the importance of cutting costs and being more efficient during times when there's not enough money on hand to cover the costs just to pay for the level of services we had last year.

All of the agencies have testified on their continuing work to improve the efficiency of their operations and find additional cost savings.

I'm pleased with what we heard and I think we should commend all of the hardworking and thoughtful people in our agencies for their efforts.

As Budget Secretary, you have the most comprehensive view of what the agencies are doing to find savings across the budget. Which areas do you believe have the most promise to produce ongoing savings?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I will at this point talk about two. As all of you know, we have tried to provide and we tried to do it on as timely a basis as possible so assuredly before each of the agencies came

before you, you were given very detailed plans for what we call our GO-TIME Initiative, but very detailed agency work plans to find efficiencies, find budget savings.

We're also, as part of that effort, trying to -also in a government-that-works scenario trying to also
better serve and provide better use of the dollars, so
those GO-TIME Initiatives don't always in every case
produce actual budget savings.

Sometimes we have to make up-front investments to realize future savings. But GO-TIME and the biggest part of our GO-TIME Initiative in Year 1 is trying to do a better job of procurement and through DGS's work across all agencies trying to, through strategic sourcing and other means, realize a projected \$100 million of savings in how we go out and purchase goods and services to operate State Government.

But that's not where it stops or what we call -or include under the GO-TIME umbrella or what we don't
and just attempts to work with agencies to share
services, find ways to make a more efficient use of
State dollars, which also includes ongoing initiatives.

First and foremost, a suggestion that we would merge the Department of Corrections with the Board of Probation and Parole, providing immediate administrative savings, yes -- in the '16-'17 Fiscal Year, we believe

it's in excess or north of \$10 million annually -- but also to simply produce better outcomes.

And part of that effort -- and I just spent the better part of the afternoon yesterday at the Governor's residence launching the second phase of our Justice Reinvestment Initiative.

You know, that effort -- and I want to give due credit to the former Corbett Administration, to the General Assembly, and stakeholders that worked through that process a couple years ago that is producing real results, that is producing better outcomes, trying to make sure that when offenders leave State institutions or incarceration or out of county jails, that they become contributing members of society again.

We reduced our corrections population by nearly 850 inmates last year. That's approaching the size of an institution. And so it's those efforts, whether they're specifically under the GO-TIME umbrella or not, that I would also point to as efforts to make government work, to provide better services and service with the dollars that we do spend, but also try to look at critical cost savings where possible across all of our State's operations.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you for that.

Just as a followup on the same but slightly

different. If we put this in perspective, in your opinion, can we solve the structural deficit through savings and efficiencies alone?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, we have a GO-TIME target of 150 million. But the simple answer is no. That's part of it. And it will become an increasing part of what we see as our responsibility and our goals in future fiscal years.

We want those savings to be real. We want to fully account for them in a transparent way. That's why we tried to provide the detailed analysis to the Committee ahead of each individual Cabinet Secretary's testimony. But, no, that isn't in and of itself the simple answer.

And, in fact, you know, as frustrating as it may be, you know, part of that answer probably does include the need to find and identify recurring revenues.

I will say that since the Great Recession, nearly all states have enacted tax increases.

Pennsylvania has chosen a different path. You know, in fact, that path has gotten us to the point that we are today where you heard the Governor's budget speech talk about, you know, a budget crisis that we have to confront. You know, we have to find the means.

Again, to your point, savings and efficiencies

-54 **-**

1	won't get us all the way there. We have to work
2	together. We have to find the compromise that is such
3	hard work. You know, the long hours that it took to get
4	to that point that we were just before the Christmas
5	holidays is certainly a clear testament to how difficult
6	that work can be.
7	But we need to find that ability to compromise
8	to find the right answers to serve the State in the best
9	way.
10	REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: I agree with you. And I
11	appreciate the work that you're doing.
12	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you.
13	REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you for your
14	responses.
15	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you,
16	representative.
17	REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
19	Representative.
20	Representative Jeff Pyle.
21	REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Thank you, Chairman
22	Adolph. And before I start, it has been an honor
23	serving with you for these many years.
24	Secretary Albright, thanks for being with us
25	today.

1 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning, 2 Representative. 3 REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: How you doing? BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: There you go. That's all you can ask. Spring training, right around the corner. 6 7 Hope springs eternal. 8 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes. Through the 9 weekend, my team has yet to win a spring training game. 10 So we'll hope things get better. 11 REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Sir, we went 20 years 12 without a winning team. We're okay. BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Right. 13 REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: I'd like to reach out to 14 15 our friends across the aisle. I was not born in a row house. But my dad is, as we affectionally refer to, a 16 I did not have a silver spoon in my mouth. 17 mill hunk. 18 It was low carbon stainless. He made it. 19 Anyway, last year, Mr. Secretary, if you recall, 20 we did some talking about energy, which is very, very important to central western Pennsylvania. 21 22 A few days ago we had the DEP Secretary, 23 Mr. Quigley, in here talking about how the Clean Power 24 Act is going to affect Pennsylvania. And he mentioned 25 to us something that you and I had spoken about last

year, the alternative energy portfolio standards and increasing production.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: The Clean Power Plan, which is Federal, has already forced closure of about six of our coal-fired plants and removed 4 gigawatts of electricity from our grid.

Secretary Quigley seems to think we can fill that 4 gigawatt hole through alternative energy portfolio methods.

In doing the math into windmill generation and to solar panel generation, Mr. Quigley's numbers aren't quite consumer friendly, whereas a windmill or solar panel generates a kilowatt hour at roughly \$72 per kilowatt hour, whereas coal, natural gas, and nuclear are down in the eleven and twelve dollar range.

Now, when I asked the Secretary how we were going to make it up -- and I'm bringing it all around to you -- it's budgetary. Trust me. When we brought it all around, I said, you can't possibly hope to generate that much electricity from alternative energy portfolio means. They simply do not perform like that. We have a decade to prove it.

He said we were going to bring gas plants online. We currently don't have any permitted. But I

noticed -- and this is where it pertains to you, Mr. Secretary. I noticed within your budget or the Governor's budget proposal is a 6 and a half percent severance tax.

I was wondering if we could talk about that a little bit.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: I see in your projection you're saying for next year, you're projecting gas selling at 2.21. I'm going in cubic feet, in mcf.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I thought those price projections really moved from about \$1.50 to \$1.70-something. But I'm happy to go back and take another look at that to be clear.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Sure. I'm not trying to be sticky with you. But I'm looking at it right here. You're projecting for this year --

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Volume. And we do expect some decline in volume. But we still do expect volume production to maintain in excess, I think, of 4 trillion cubic feet.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Cubic feet, right, mcf.

That's an awful lot of natural gas.

Now, the price of this, which I would not debate with you, is not anywhere close to a buck seventy-one in

mcf. This morning it was selling at 92 cents.

Now, if we are going to put up gas-fired electrical generation and use those great reserves of gas we have stored in anticlinal domes under the State right now, how is that going to affect your budget scenario in that we're at 92 cents, you're thinking next year it's going to go to 2.21?

I just don't know how we collect revenue on something that's nowhere close to the projection.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, again, as I alluded to earlier, you know, spring update changes always make adjustments. At the time that we did our budget, those were the best estimates.

We, you know, used global insights. We used the best information that's available to us to project our best estimates about where markets will be. You know, we work with others outside of the Governor's Budget Office conferring with the Independent Fiscal Office and anybody else we can talk to to make the best estimates.

Those were the best estimates available to us when our budget proposal was put together in January. We will revise, you know, with any necessary changes through our spring update and probably sometime in the month of May any appropriate changes.

But we do believe that that market and those

prices will begin to fluctuate upward. Part of that is all about pipelines in Pennsylvania as well. That's a process that we need to also, you know, address together cooperatively.

But again, if adjustments are necessary, we will work with the General Assembly and communicate what we think are the most recent and best estimates.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: But my question is, if it's currently selling at 92 cents an mcf -- and I've got the number right in front of me. For 2016 you're projecting 1.71. For 2017 you're projecting 2.08.

If the price of gas continues to fall as it has been for about a year and we do not achieve \$1.71 per mcf, which is what your revenue collection model is based upon, is it a structural deficit, the difference between what you've projected and what it's actually selling for? I'm asking. I don't know.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: A structural deficit? It would mean that the revenue forecast that we've made -- and this will affect, you know, both the impact fee collections that are tied to price as well as our severance tax proposal.

Let me simply say to go back and put our proposal itself in context, we did try to listen. You know, as you had alluded to already from our dialogue

from last year, we had a much different structured tax proposal last year that included a volume component.

We took that out so that we could be completely transparent where it was easier to explain the competitiveness of the tax plan that we put before the General Assembly. And so it was clear that it was very competitive and consistent with the taxes that all other producers currently have in place.

The 6 and a half percent tax that we propose is actually lower than the tax, for example, you know, that our largest producer, Texas, has in place now. We are the second-largest gas producer.

And we also will not touch in any way the current impact fee. We'll let that impact fee in place and simply allow the folks that pay the tax to receive a full credit for the amount of the impact fee they pay against the severance tax that would be put in place so that the new revenue generated would be a net of that delta.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Okay. We on Approps actually figured out what the local impact fee worked out to percentagewise. And it's anywhere between four two and four four. What you're projecting at 6.5 is the difference between 6.5 and that number I just read to you.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Then that would be the net revenue.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Sir, have we seen any decline in personal income tax collections from gas royalties being down?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: What we have seen is declining receipts from our own royalty payments. I alluded to earlier the adjustments we had to make for the collections in the Oil and Gas Fund, not just from gas royalties but also in our timber industry that also provides royalties to that fund.

So, yes, we've seen some downward turn. But we believe the future is still bright. You know, when you talk about, you know, all of our energy sectors in Pennsylvania, we're still a strong believer that frankly Pennsylvania can become and remain an energy leader in a number of sectors.

We believe that while short term there is price fluctuation that we're going to have to deal with, in the long term, those prices will recover. Part of that again is all about pipelines as well as what's happening in the larger energy markets. But we believe that future still looks bright.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: You mentioned the forest.

Chairman, may I?

1	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Yes.
2	REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: You mentioned the forest.
3	And that is owned pretty much by Pennsylvania and the
4	Game Commission. Do we have any new drill starts going
5	on up in the forest right now that might help us
6	generate more revenue?
7	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: No.
8	REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Good answer. Actually the
9	number of rigs has fallen from over 300 to about a dozen
10	now. I don't think we're going to realize this money.
11	But thank you for your time, Mr. Secretary.
12	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you,
13	Representative.
14	REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
16	Representative.
17	Representative Tim Briggs.
18	REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19	Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
20	I just want to thank you, Secretary, for
21	everything you've been fighting for. It's very
22	consistent with what I've been trying to do up here
23	fighting for restoring the cuts to education that's
24	happened over the last number of years.
25	But I wanted to talk a little bit about the

structural deficit. In 2010 -- and I don't like to talk about this -- I was the only Democrat in the House to vote against Governor Rendell's Budget because it didn't address paying the bills. It left severance tax off the table. It didn't address a billion dollar tax package that he had advocated for.

2.4

I didn't know the term structural deficit, but I knew it didn't make sense. You can't balance a budget without paying for it. And that wasn't the way to go.

That was a hard position for me to take.

You know, I don't want to think that I was right. But it's leaving us in this situation where if we don't pay for the bills and we continue to go down, you know, some can say the middle path, but the same path that we've been going over the years, it's going to just continue exasperating the structural deficit.

Could you talk about what a balanced budget would look like that didn't include any new revenues? How do we balance a fiscally responsible budget without finding new revenues, which I think is -- you know, that's not a budget I want to support. I want to fight for education. I want to fight for the future of Pennsylvania and I also want to deal with the structural deficit. Where does that leave us?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, as you heard

the Governor say when he gave his budget address, what that other path would look like, what those alternatives would be, would be very bleak. They would probably put us on a downward trajectory.

The cuts that we would have to make would probably necessitate even deeper cuts in future years. The reality of our State budget is that much of it is mandated, you know, cost-to-carry expenditures, if you will, programs for medical assistance, entitlement spending that we have to pay, support for our agencies.

You know, PennDOT has to maintain our roads and bridges. We have to maintain our Mass Transit systems. So the discretionary spending that we have available to us unfortunately hits some of the most critical areas of where at least this Administration, our Governor, would like to focus new and increased support.

It's local school districts first and foremost that would probably bear the brunt of the deepest cut. Likely a billion dollars or more in cuts to local school district aid would be necessary. Those would be cuts that would double-down on the deep cuts that were made just a few years ago.

Our State-related universities, non-preferred appropriations, as the word implies, would probably receive no support going forward. Those institutions

play a vital role in our State economy. It's not just about subsidizing or enabling or reducing the cost for students that attend those institutions. They are huge economic development providers.

Our agricultural extension service provides, you know, a terrific service for our agricultural community.

All of those appropriations probably would be gone because they are, as the word implied, non-preferred appropriations that stand in line behind our preferred General Fund obligations.

And finally, it's our human services providers that would have to bear the brunt of the remaining bulk of the cuts. And that would probably likely in most cases, or in many cases, be aid for county programs.

And again, we'd be doubling-down. But now it would be much worse than doubling-down, much deeper cuts than the 84 million that was cut for county human service programs just a few years ago. Aid for home-and community-based services that are, again, trying to right now provide and put services in place to allow aging seniors to stay out or remain and age in place at home, not have to be placed in nursing homes, if you will; people with intellectual disabilities, autism, to, again, be able to be assisted in their homes, not in institutions, all of that opportunity would be lost

opportunity. Those are not cuts that we would in any place or in any way want to make. But they would be cuts that we would have to make to bring the budget into balance.

REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Thank you.

And in terms of -- and that's a billion-dollar cut of education that isn't -- well stimulus money.

This is a cut to education. That's the path that is one of the options that is on the table.

In terms of the middle road, anything that doesn't significantly address the structural deficit -you know, we talk about -- you know, people didn't I
guess fully understand the budget process, you know,
passing the House, going to a separate branch of
government, signing by the Governor.

Anything that doesn't significantly address the structural deficit, I'm not going to be a yes vote for that. So that's 102 minus 1. But, you know, it just doesn't seem to be taken that seriously, that it really is causing us the problem that we've been putting ourselves in.

Could you talk a little bit about PlanCon? A lot of talk last year around reforms and addressing PlanCon. Can you spend a little bit of time talking about what the conversations are now?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Again, one of the things that we had hoped to implement as part of the bipartisan budget agreement was a PlanCon reform program, if you will. We wanted to not only use bond proceeds to meet our current operating PlanCon operations, but also to fully eliminate a backlog that had grown over the past several years as again tight budgets had not allowed us to fully fund PlanCon obligations, as they were coming to us from local school districts.

That bond funding plan would have, over the course of the next couple of years, used a series of debt issuances to fully fund that obligation and then work with the General Assembly to take a hard look at our PlanCon process and talk about future reforms that probably could or should be considered before we resume making new State commitments for future school district, school construction obligations.

REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Thank you, Mr.

Secretary. And thank the Governor for everything he's doing. I know he's getting a lot of heat. But he's fighting the right fight.

Thank you.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you, Representative.

1	REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
3	Representative.
4	Representative Warren Kampf.
5	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6	Mr. Secretary.
7	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning.
8	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Good morning.
9	So I would like to talk just a little bit about
10	the veto, the full veto, in July with respect to
11	schools.
12	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.
13	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Of course, we've all
14	heard that many schools went out into the debt markets
15	and had to borrow. Do you have a ballpark figure on
16	what that extra cost is for school districts for that
17	missing money that was supposed to come from the State?
18	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The compromised
19	budget agreement would have provided a modest
20	appropriation, \$10.7 million, that would have refunded
21	local school districts and refunded some non-profit
22	providers for at least some of the cost that they
23	incurred from their borrowing.
24	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: All right. Well, I'm
25	trying to unpack that. What I asked was, what are the

borrowing costs that the school districts incurred as a result of the Governor's veto in July?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, the \$10.7 million is what we would have provided to reimburse school districts. School districts would have been the largest piece of that \$10.7 million appropriation.

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: So as we sit here, do you know what the school districts actually had to borrow as a result of the veto?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We believe it's in that range.

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Okay. And that's because some effort was made by the Budget Office to find out from school districts?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Okay. All right.

So near as I can tell, that was the only tangible fiscal impact of that veto. It did not generate more money for schools. It did not solve the structural deficit that the Administration is now talking about, although I would, as an aside, harken back to March of 2015. My recollection of the Governor's budget address was largely about school funding, equitable school funding, and not about the structural deficit.

But that borrowing cost, near as I can tell, at least for our schools, is the only tangible fiscal thing that came out of the Governor's full veto.

Do you agree with me?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Not at all. The most tangible outcome that came from that veto was not another round of downgrades from all three bond rating agencies. I think that, as I've alluded to earlier already, Standard & Poor's has made it very clear that we now have 90 days left.

All three rating agencies would have been -REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Sorry. Are you saying
that the veto caused the downgrades?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: No. I'm saying that the veto --

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: I was asking, what are the tangible fiscal impacts to our schools of that veto?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: And I'm trying to answer that the tangible result of that veto was to avoid another round of very damaging bond rating or lower bond rating actions that would have been taken.

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Did it work?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: To this point, it has. None of the rating agencies have further reduced our bond rating. But as I said earlier, S&P has now

1 given us 90 days and then been clear that if we don't 2 change the way that we're budgeting, that budget, had it 3 been signed into law, would have increased the structural budget --5 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: You're claiming that the 6 rating agencies agreed? Is there something in writing 7 from the rating agencies where they said the veto in July was important for not downgrading? 8 9 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: You don't have to take my word for it. S&P was very clear in a 10 communication that they've provided publicly to everyone 11 in the course of the last couple weeks that we can't 12 13 continue to budget the way we were budgeting. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: That's not what I asked.

What I asked is, when the veto happened in July, are you telling us that the rating agencies at that time said they weren't going to downgrade us because of the veto?

That's my question.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I'm telling you that the rating agency --

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Is that what was happening? Is that what happened?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I'm telling you that the rating agencies made it very clear that we couldn't enact another budget like that one, that if we did, then

there was going to be a consequence.

By vetoing that budget, by trying to provide additional time -- and again, I completely understand, as we continue to have this dialogue and conversation, compromise is hard work. It's hard for all of us. We all have hard-felt beliefs about the policy perspectives we bring to the table.

In divided government, we all have to find the wherewithal to compromise. We all have to try to listen to the extent that we can. We have to find the common ground where it exists. And that's what we worked so hard after that veto in the ensuing months to enact.

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Mr. Secretary, let me ask you this question: I viewed that veto at the time and I also viewed the Governor's blue line veto, line item veto, in December as a tactic, a tactic to try to generate more in tax revenue for specific purposes, whether it was for the structural deficit or increased spending or a combination. I viewed it as a tactic.

There's a phrase out there that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again expecting a different result.

So my question to you is, as the Secretary of the budget, at what point is the Administration going to say this tactic is not working? The school districts

for '15-'16 are suffering. We just skipped another \$800 million payment, I think, and they sued us yesterday.

They sued the State yesterday.

At what point is the Administration going to say this particular tactic for '15-'16 is not working?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I think that what the Administration is going to say, as I've tried to say repeatedly already today and will continue to say to everyone, compromise is difficult. It is hard for all of us to find the means to come together to work together to find common ground.

The Governor and all of his staff, myself included, are fully committed to continue to engage, to continue to work with the General Assembly to find whatever that compromise or common ground is that's necessary to bring the current budget to a close.

Now, you know, you alluded to, you know, doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. That's exactly what we've been doing for the past eight years. It's been hard. It's been difficult. The Great Recession forced a lot of very troubling alternatives before us.

But if we don't break the cycle, if we don't finally respond in a different way than we've been responding, if we don't finally stop papering over with

one-time solutions to our budget challenges, the problem is only going to grow worse. The rating agencies couldn't be clearer about that. We need to budget responsibly.

There are two paths. There are two alternatives. We can make the deep cuts necessary or we can find the recurring revenue that we believe is necessary to fully and appropriately fund the State's obligations.

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Mr. Secretary, I submit to you and the Administration that this particular tactic of the continuing vetoes, its time should come to an end very soon.

I have a question about the income tax proposal very quickly. If there is no retroactive component to the income tax proposal that the Governor is making, will '15-'16 be in balance at 30.8 billion?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, your hypothetical ignores all of the rest of the aspects of the tax package. A tax package could be put together. And, in fact, the whole issue of whether it includes a PIT is something that as we were trying to --

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: We received a tax package from you with the budget proposal . It included, I think, a retroactive element, perhaps for March, for the

1	income tax. I just want to know if that doesn't get
2	enacted into law, will 30.8 for '15-'16 be in balance?
3	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, not if we
4	don't then adopt some other alternative recurring
5	revenue source to
6	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Fair enough.
7	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: pay for that.
8	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Fair enough. Now then,
9	let's say that doesn't happen again, that '15-'16 is not
10	retroactive for the income tax piece. Will your '16-'17
11	budget be in balance?
12	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Again, if some other
13	
14	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Not without other
15	revenues?
16	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Not without some
17	other expenditure decrease or revenue enhancement.
18	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
19	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you.
21	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
22	Representative.
23	Representative Dean.
24	REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25	And, Mr. Chairman, I want to say it's been a

pleasure to work with you over the past few years. It thank you for your service on this Committee.

And really as we come to the end of three weeks of budget hearings, I was struck, maybe last night, reflecting on where we've been and what we've all been talking about. Budget hearings are a perfect place to sort of reflect on why the heck you're doing what you're doing.

And when I think about when I got into public service, I ran on what I called the three Es, education, the economy and jobs, and ethics and good government.

Not unlike what our Governor talks about, the three points that he tries to make.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: And I say education because I wouldn't be here if my parents didn't build in my DNA the power of education and that you better go claim as much of it as you possibly can so that you can go as far as you can.

I talk about the economy because I'm frustrated.

I'm not an economist. But I'm frustrated by the past and the notion of some that, you know, we can just anemically limp our way along into a robust economy.

Austerity is the way to do it. That's the philosophy.

It's a way of trying to govern. We have tried that.

I was disappointed with that choice. And I think our Governor ran on the opposite and decided and told the Pennsylvania citizens that actually that's not going to grow us out of this economy.

And the third piece is ethics and good government. Boy, how little did I know when I put together my little three Es how interconnected these things are, how interdependent these things are.

Because if we don't have government functioning well, we cannot invest in education. We cannot grow this economy.

Having said all that, the other thing I'm taken by is the language. We can talk about, yeah, the Governor's to blame because he fully vetoed the June 30th budget. People like to say that. They're still surprised by that. There's no surprise in that.

We can say that the Majority Party killed the budget framework. Sure. Blame to go around. We can talk about blue-lining or traditional legislative add-backs. And I have the feeling at home they don't give a darn about those things, nor do they care what they stand for.

What they do get is, here we are eight months later. Schools are probably on the verge of closing. Human service providers have told us over and over

again, one in an op-ed that said, someone will get hurt.

There will be a body count if we don't actually fund
human services. So all that language is gobbledygook.

One of my favorite authors said, how we write and how we speak is how we define ourselves. And I couldn't agree more. How we write and how we speak is how we define ourselves.

And in a sense, that's exactly what a budget is.

A budget is how we write about what we think government ought to do. It defines us. We've defined ourselves very poorly, no matter who we want to blame. We've defined ourselves very poorly at this point because we're eight months without clear funding, without predictable, sustainable sources.

You've identified and multiple other people have identified independently of you and this Administration the high price of that. It literally costs us as a government more, because of our budget failure and unpredictability, to borrow money.

As you say, we now have trouble even going to the bond market. And certainly it costs us more, hundreds of millions of dollars more. I want to define ourselves differently.

So having said all of that, one small piece that I'd like to ask you, even though you're here talking

about next year's budget, what is your vision? What is the Governor's vision for wrapping up last year's budget or the current fiscal year's budget?

If you had a wand and you could make it happen, what would we, as an effective government, do?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Look, you know, his instructions to us, you know, from the day that that emergency spending plan was signed into law is to simply complete our work as soon as possible.

Over and over again the Governor tells all of us, compromise is difficult. We have to be good listeners as well as speakers. We have to work with everybody in the General Assembly, leadership, rank and file members, find the common ground, find the ability to bring closure.

It has to be done in a responsible way, again for all the reasons you've already alluded to. We can't put something in place that simply repeats the mistakes of the past, takes us just further down a road to financial ruin as a Commonwealth.

So we have to find the means to compromise. We have to look at those issues, the give-and-take that's necessary in that process. But we want to bring this to closure at the earliest opportunity.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: And as doom and gloom as I

may sound, I'm really an optimist. Because I think government has an important role to play in the very things that we've talked about.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Maybe nowhere more evident was the failure in Flint, Michigan, about what government should be doing and when government falls apart how harmful it is. That was something so very tangible, tastable, smellable, that we would actually allow our children to be harmed in that way based on government making some choices, some choices to save some money and not bother to test what impact that might have.

And I would suggest that, you know, all of us here, maybe the road to compromise is to figure out what are those common things that we recognize is government's role to play.

I would submit it is in educating our kids and to making sure we restore funding for education. I don't care if you call it programmatic, classroom dollars, just educate our kids better.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: And provide those resources, at least from the State's level, in a fair and equitable way. You know, one of the biggest frustrations I think the Governor has, and certainly an

often repeated statement, you know, through the campaign and through the first year in office, is that we need to find a better way to fund local school districts.

You know, across 500 school districts, we have a very inequitable distribution of resources. Many financially struggling school districts really don't have the dollars available because they don't have an adequate local tax source in a funding system that more than two-thirds of the revenue now has to come from local government and not the State. It provides an untenable funding system as it's currently constituted at the State level.

We have to do a better job at the State so we're fair and can assure all families and children that they have the financial means for a quality education.

REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: It's really at the heart of the matter. The Secretary for Community and Economic Development was one of our first members in here to talk to us and identified that the No. 1 issue facing Pennsylvania is whether or not we're going to have a well-trained, well-educated workforce. So it's a matter of economics. It's a matter of equity, as you point out. It's a matter of our common humanity. And I think if we get nothing else maybe we could figure out that if we want to reverse the trends of poor education outcomes

1	for children, which is actually very costly on our
2	economy, we would invest in basic education, robustly
3	invest in pre-K to reverse some cycles of poverty, and
4	then, of course, not forget higher education.
5	Thank you for the work you're doing. Please
6	thank the Governor. I'm here to help and compromise and
7	close out last year's budget and move forward with a
8	positive next year's budget.
9	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you for your
10	comments.
11	REPRESENTATIVE DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
13	Representative.
14	Representative Fred Keller.
15	REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16	And I just want to echo the remarks of Chairman
17	Markosek. It's been a pleasure serving with you in the
18	General Assembly. I've appreciated your guidance and
19	your counsel. So thank you very much.
20	Mr. Secretary.
21	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning.
22	REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Good morning. How are
23	you today?
24	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good. And you?
25	REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I know some people

mentioned about stories. So I guess we're going to have story time with Fred. How's that?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I just have a scenario that I ask people. And I'm going to run it past you and give you a couple of choices. And I'd just like you to tell me what one you think it is.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I'll do my best.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay.

In Pennsylvania, between the fiscal year of 2002-2003 and 2010-2011, our State spending grew at about a rate of 35, 40 percent. And our State economy grew at roughly half that.

So if we know an individual -- and we'll call him Ed -- and Ed works and he earns money to pay his bills and then Ed goes on a spending spree for a period of eight years and during the eight-year spending spree, Ed's spending grows at twice the rate his income grows at, how do we define Ed's problem? A, does Ed have a structural deficit or, B, does Ed spend too much and not manage his money well?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I think the period of time you're talking about --

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: No. The question is, if

Ed spends -- if Ed's making enough money to pay his

bills and spends at twice the rate at which his income grows and then can no longer afford to pay his bills, does Ed have a structural -- we're talking about an individual. Does he have a structural deficit or does he spend too much and not manage his money well?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I was trying to answer your question. The period of time you're talking about includes the Great Recession. If Ed lost his job, as has happened to many Pennsylvanians in that time period, he has deep financial difficulties.

Over that period of time, as a State Government, we had to do the best job we could to manage the resources that we had, provide for local school districts and municipalities struggling in that financial circumstance as well. And what I would simply say is that in the end of that time period, if we're going to judge it by the state of our economy at that time, at the end of that 2010 calendar year, Pennsylvania had one of the ten fastest growing state economies in the country as measured by net new job growth.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Yeah. And I would say if you want to look at those numbers, Pennsylvania is usually one of the last states to go into recession and the last state to come out. I mean, I think we'd agree

1 on that a lot of times based on our economy. 2 But again, the point is, usually when I ask 3 people that question, 100 percent of the time when I've 4 asked that question -- I've asked that question to many 5 people -- they answer it B. 6 I just want to get onto my questions now. 7 mentioned that we're in unprecedented territory here. And I would assume that means as your tenure since last 8 9 January 20th as Budget Secretary, it's sort of unprecedented times here. 10 11 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: That means from my 30-year time period as a staff member, first for 29 of 12 13 these years for the Senate Democratic Appropriations Committee and now for my tenure here as the Budget 14 15 Secretary. REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Your tenure that began 16 17 last January 20th. Over the last six months of Fiscal Year '14-'15, 18 you presided over the 2014-'15 budget, correct? 19 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Correct. 20 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Okay. During that 21 22 time period, I didn't hear that budget referred to as an 23 emergency spending plan or anything other than the 2.4 2014-'15 budget, correct?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I think I was

25

1 very clear when I was here last year talking about how 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that budget was setting up a fiscal crisis. I think I alluded to the fact that you didn't have to take my word for it, my predecessor, Budget Secretary Zogby, noted again that more than \$2 billion of one-time gimmicks, fixes, whether they are expenditures, one-time expenditures, or revenues, that weren't sustainable that we were on a road to fiscal ruin.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Understood. But the point is, we never called that a partial budget or emergency spending. That was the budget. That budget contained blue-lined items also as this budget does.

And this isn't going to require an answer. just want to make a point. In 2014-'15, when Governor Corbett wasn't happy with the General Assembly, Governor Corbett took it out on the General Assembly. Now we have a Governor that's not happy with the General Assembly and he takes it out on the citizens of the Commonwealth. But I'm going to keep moving on here.

Are you familiar with the website budget.pa.gov?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: No, I'm not .

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: budget.pa.gov?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Are you talking

about our website?

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Oh, yeah. The one with

25

1 your name on it. BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay. 2 3 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: That's the web address. 4 I use that. 5 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 6 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Representative Dunbar 7 mentioned about numbers and different things. I don't go to the Budget and Policy Center of the Commonwealth 8 9 Foundation to get my numbers. I go to the State agency. And you run that website or your Department runs that 10 11 website? 12 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: My staff, yes. REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Yeah. So if I were to 13 go onto that website and look at it -- because I keep 14 15 hearing we don't have a budget. If I go onto that website and look at it, would that have a link on it to 16 Act 10(a)? 17 Um-hmm. 18 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 19 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: The enacted 2015-'16 20 budget? 21 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm. 22 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Now, we might not like 23 the fact that we didn't get what we wanted initially. 24 But then again, instead of taking it out on us, we took 25 it out on the people of Pennsylvania. But there's a

1 budget. There's a budget link there that shows the 2 tracking run? 3 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: There's a tracking run and an emergency spending plan that remain in place. 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: But it says -- if I look 6 at that, does the wording on that budget not say, 7 2015-'16 enacted budget? BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: All right. 8 I don't 9 want to get into a --REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: It's your website. 10 11 your website. It's not mine. BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: It is the current 12 13 budget that is in place that provides for some, not all, spending obligations to the Commonwealth. 14 15 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you. The next thing I want to go to is we mentioned 16 17 -- and it was brought up -- that you mentioned about the '11-'12 Fiscal Year funding cuts, money that was cut out 18 19 of the '11-'12? 20 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay. You mentioned 21 22 that. 23 If I went to your website and looked at the 24 '10-'11 budget, would I see a column in there that says 25 ARRA funding?

1 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The ARRA funding by 2 the '11-'12 fiscal year was gone. 3 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: But if I looked at the '10-'11 budget, I would see a column in the '10-'11 4 5 budget that showed ARRA fund something? 6 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I think you would 7 have at the time. I think that --REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: It's still there. 8 9 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay. REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: It's still there. Okay. 10 11 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay. 12 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: So when I look at your website for '11-'12, it shows no ARRA funding. 13 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 14 Okav. 15 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: So where did the ARRA funding come from? 16 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The stimulus money 17 that was provided from the Federal Government really was 18 in several parts. I think the part that you're 19 20 referring to most specifically was called the fiscal stabilization funds. Those were funds that were part of 21 that Federal stimulus package to give states short-term 22 23 operating assistance. The belief was that the Great Recession caused 24 25 obviously great damage to the revenue base for state

budgets to operate. In Pennsylvania over the course of two fiscal years, our revenue base declined by more than \$2.5 billion when we had a much lower budget base at that point.

The intent of those fiscal stabilization funds was that they were a short-term stop-gap funding measure, that the hope was that the economies, the state economies, would recover over some period of time as we move forward from and out of the Recession.

In Pennsylvania, we used those monies in three areas. It was to avoid cuts in medical assistance. It was to avoid or be able to fully fund our Corrections obligation. And it was aid to local school districts.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay. So the money came from the Federal Government? I mean, I'm looking for the short answer.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: It came from the Federal Government.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: But you have to understand the context in which it was provided. It was a short-term Band-Aid, if you will. The intent was that at the end of that hopefully three-year period, because some of those funds could be stretched over a third year if the State made that choice, the State's revenue base

would have recovered.

In Pennsylvania, in fact, that was the case. I alluded to about a \$2.5 billion cut in our total revenue collections over the two-year period in which the negative consequences of the Recession cut the deepest.

Over the course of the '10-'11 and the '11-'12 Fiscal Years, our revenue base recovered by more than \$3 billion. So, in fact, it actually had its intended impact.

Now, in Pennsylvania, unlike most states, we ended up using those funds for a different policy choice. In Pennsylvania we chose to use that money to fund business tax cuts, not replace those funds to local school districts.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: But the point was -- it was my understanding -- and I wasn't here in 2008-2009.

I didn't come in until the election of 2010. But it was my understanding that that money from the Federal Government was supposed to be used for non-recurring expenditures.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: But that's -REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: We used gimmicks back
then, I guess, if I want to coin your phrase. We used
gimmicks back then to support more spending.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Excuse me. But

that's just absolutely wrong. The fiscal stabilization part of the stimulus package was intended to be short-term operating expenditures to avoid making deep cuts in essential support, in our case for local school districts, to pay for our Corrections budget, and to maintain our medical assistance responsibility.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Was that one-time revenue?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: That was one-time revenue over a two- or three-year period while we were emerging from the Great Recession to avoid making deep cuts that would, again, have an even worse fiscal consequence. And in Pennsylvania, as I've already alluded to, it actually had that impact. It avoided the necessity to make deep cuts.

In fact, over the course of the '10-'11 and '11-'12 Fiscal Year, our revenue base did actually recover substantially more than a \$3 billion increase over those two years together. We simply made different policy choices about what to do with that additional money once it was received.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Well, if our revenue base recovered enough to replace that spending, then why are you telling me there were cuts the next year?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We chose to use that

1 m
2 o
3 d
4 w
5 t
6 e
7 s

money instead for business tax cuts, the largest chunk of which you may remember was something called bonus depreciation to give businesses a 100 percent consistent with Federal tax law rather than the 50 percent at that time under State tax law credit for depreciation expenses. We continued the phase-out of the Capital Stock and Franchise Tax.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I'm glad we did that.

In fact, the Governor took credit for that and was
patting himself on the back in a press release.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Those two choices and other tax changes that were enacted is how we chose to use that revenue in the alternative.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay. The other thing, we talk about the structural deficit. I know I made my illustration earlier. But the structural deficit that you're reporting is \$2.2 billion; is that correct?

and if we were to enact no revenue enhancements as we look — and we base that estimate not on our proposed budget but the budget that did land on the Governor's desk, 1460, if we enacted that budget and then only enacted continuing increases to maintain State support at current funding levels, yes, the deficit would exceed \$2 billion.

And let me just also add, you don't have to take my word for it. The Independent Fiscal Office came to roughly the same conclusions in their estimates. And the only place they differed is to assume that we could still make about \$200 million in lapses for current year appropriations, lapses that we can't make if we don't fix underfunded department budgets and several other appropriation needs.

And in their estimate, then a 1.8 are added to their 300 million estimate, about a \$2.1 billion structural deficit --

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: -- for S&P.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay. I got a note here I've got to wrap up. And I've got a couple other things I want to do.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: The proposed tax increases, how much are they going to be if we were going to do the 30.8 billion in next year's?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Fully enacted, fully annualized in the '16-'17 Fiscal Year, that tax package would be generating about \$2.7 billion.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: So if our structural deficit is \$2.2 billion --

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: -- we're raising taxes \$2.7 billion, an additional \$500 million or roughly 20 percent?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: And if we're in that bad of shape that I need to dig deeper into Pennsylvanians' pockets for what we call recurring revenue, why would I not take care of the structural deficit and not keep digging a hole? And I don't need an answer for that.

It just puzzles me that we're saying we're in that bad of shape. I've got to raise taxes. And then we're going to expand government, which comes down to the point of, when we're looking at our fiscal house — and, you know, we can't spend what the taxpayers don't have. And that's another avenue we could look at.

I mean, you say we have 90 days to fix our issue from S&P -- or S&P says that, okay? And that is to either raise taxes, cut spending, or do a combination of both.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: But we're going to raise taxes and raise spending. You know, compromise -- our inflation rate last year was less than 1 percent. Okay. That's Federal Government stuff. People on Social

Security got nothing. We put a budget on the Governor's desk that increased spending -- or a spending plan of roughly 3 and a half percent. And people are saying we don't want to compromise. We have recurring revenue.

Our sales tax and our income tax are a percentage of what people earn and what they spend. And as they earn more and spend more, we get more revenue. We get more recurring revenue. And we need to start looking at -- and those are our two biggest areas. I realize that's not every area. But they're our two biggest areas we need to start looking at.

I think people really want us to examine why we can't live within our means, why we're going to, as DGS said yesterday, borrow money to make payroll and project managers that are Commonwealth employees.

And then I get told that my budget's gimmicks.

And again, the information I use is from the Governor's and your own website. So I can't be accused of pulling numbers from a special group. That's the State website.

So wrapping this up, I'm just going to say, I think there's a different path in how Pennsylvania can go. And it's not always going to look to the taxpayer.

And I know I asked this question last year and we talked about the stimulus funds. I'm going to ask it. Have you or the Governor asked --

1	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Representative, I
2	have asked every member and the Secretary you're well
3	on to 17 minutes, okay, 17 minutes. We have at least 13
4	more members. We'll never get to these other members.
5	You've got to say good-bye.
6	REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Good-bye.
7	But it wasn't my whole 17 minutes. I mean, we
8	could have gotten some of those answers a little more
9	quickly.
10	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Representative, I've
11	asked the Secretary and I've asked the members of the
12	Committee, short questions, to-the-point answers. I've
13	given a lot of leeway here to both sides. If we get
14	into 17, 20 minutes, we will not have the Secretary here
15	long enough to have all members ask their questions.
16	We're not breaking for lunch. And the Secretary
17	has agreed that he'll stay here until about 2 o'clock,
18	from what I've been told. Please, please, short
19	questions, to the point, short answers, to the point.
20	Mr. Secretary.
21	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes. And, Mr.
22	Chairman, if we are any
23	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: That's enough.
24	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: No. It's just
25	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Representative Maria

1 Donatucci. 2 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I was just going to 3 offer, Mr. Chairman, if there's any further dialogue for individual members, I'm happy to come to their offices 4 5 at their convenience to complete conversations we can't 6 complete today. 7 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Representative Maria Donatucci. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 11 And, Chairman Adolph, even though we've had differences through the years, I will surely miss you. 12 It's been an honor serving with you. 13 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 14 15 REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Good morning, Secretary Albright. 16 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning. 17 REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: We sit here today 18 with only four months left in the current fiscal year. 19 20 We are looking at a structural deficit. Whether or not both sides agree on the number, there's still a 21 22 structural deficit. 23 Pennsylvania's credit ratings have been 24 downgraded. From my constituents, I'm in Harrisburg

with budget hearings. They ask if I'm coming home with

25

a budget. And I explain to them, this is for '16-'17.

And they want to know, how are you working on a new budget without resolving the last one?

It's almost embarrassing. It makes us, as legislators on both sides of the aisle, look ineffective. It makes us look uncompromising. It makes us look uncaring. Yet in December we had a bipartisan agreed-upon budget because we can compromise and we can make concessions. Yet here we sit today with four months left in the current fiscal year. The window is closing quickly. Constituents remain at risk. Students are at risk. Human services are at risk.

The Governor outlined a revenue package similar to the plan in December. Sometimes people in this building forget that the Revenue Department needs to implement any tax changes that the General Assembly makes. It's not as easy as pushing a button. The money isn't going to appear overnight in a magic hat.

Had we passed the budget in June or even December, the Governor wouldn't need to propose retroactive effective dates.

Secretary, when do we need to pass a budget by in order to meet those revenue estimates, as they were based on presumed effective dates?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I think you make a

2.4

very good point, Representative. With every passing day of delay, the cost gets steeper. The proposed budget, as has already been talked about, would have made the proposed PIT increase retroactive to the beginning of the fiscal year.

As we move deeper into the fiscal year, the opportunity to do that begins to lessen or goes away altogether. Sales tax changes. Many of the provisions can only be made -- or have some lead time before they can be put into place.

So with every passing day, you know, to generate the recurring revenue necessary to meet those obligations, it becomes more difficult. And we simply have to increase rates or add additional items to generate the same amount of revenue as proposed.

REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: I think you may have answered my second question because I wanted to know what would happen if we failed to take action by the timeline that you're assuming.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Normally,

particularly for the PIT, normally you would make

adjustments or changes to that rate on a quarter. So,

you know, without a budget resolution, you know, by

April 1st, for example, then that imperils our ability

to make that change retroactive.

1	REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Thank you, Mr.
2	Secretary.
3	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: You're welcome.
4	REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Thank you, Mr.
5	Chairman.
6	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
7	Representative.
8	Representative Keith Greiner.
9	REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Thank you, Mr.
10	Chairman.
11	Good morning, Mr. Secretary.
12	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning,
13	Representative.
14	REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: I want to go back to
15	the education issue. I know Representative Kampf had
16	talked about it. In December of this past year, the
17	House and the Senate passed a \$10.7 billion amount of
18	funding for public schools. That's the highest amount
19	ever, the highest amount in Pennsylvania history.
20	However, the Governor then subsequently vetoed
21	over \$3 billion of that funding in order to what
22	appears to be a leverage for a huge tax increase on the
23	residents of Pennsylvania essentially using
24	Pennsylvania's schools, their parents, the students, as
25	hostages. I think a lot of my constituents feel that

way.

I mean, what was the thought process behind this devastating cut to school districts? Do you actually agree with the strategy?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The Governor has made clear, both on the campaign trail and throughout his first year or more of governance, that providing increased support to local school districts is his highest priority.

We currently have a very inequitable funding system for local school districts because of overreliance on local property taxes. That means that, according to your zip code, where the local tax base can afford to provide significant resources, those school districts, those students, those families, enjoy relatively well-funded districts.

In those communities that are economically disadvantaged, it is much more difficult. And, in fact, as we sit here today, there are many financially struggling school districts.

The Governor's intent -- and much of this budget struggle going forward as we try to again find a happy medium, find the compromises necessary to come to a final agreement -- is the Governor's strongly held belief that we have to provide a much more significant

State share to support local school districts. It's the only way to create a fair and more equitable funding system.

You know, I will say that we had a bipartisan Basic Education Funding Commission that did complete its work last year. To their credit, they were an example where bipartisanship can work, providing the means for a funding formula going forward that we think is fair and appropriate.

Now, the discussion is, you know, around how much new State resources can be invested in that formula.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: If I get an opportunity in a second round, I might want to follow up on that.

But getting back to what you said. There's school districts that are hurting right now. Did cutting this funding -- I mean, was it actually beneficial to Pennsylvania school districts? I'm hearing about school districts potentially closing their doors. The money is there; \$29.7 billion has been certified.

I mean, how has cutting \$3 billion helped out some of those schools? We've seen them in the paper here. There's a number throughout the State. I'll let you answer that. I just don't -- I can't make sense of

that.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: To make the clear statement that it's not enough. School districts are struggling. There is a reaction or there is a result. If we don't adequately fund our school districts, local property taxpayers will have to bear the burden of that.

Unfortunately, again, because of the variations across 500 districts, you know, in many financial struggling districts, they simply don't have the means to be able to support local property tax increases or local revenue to make up for what the State doesn't provide.

But in most districts across the State, the lack of State funding will continue to result in significant steep increases in local property taxes rather than shifting that tax burden. We believe it more appropriately should be shifted to the State.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: I appreciate your honesty that the Governor is just trying to make a statement, even though kids want to be in school and they need an education. As one of my colleagues over there, I can't stress education -- I'm a CPA. Education is important.

Followup. The Department -- and I talked to Secretary Rivera about this. The Department of

Education distributed a document on how to close the school. And given the current environment, we know we talk about compromise. You said compromise is difficult. So we're sending out a document telling schools how to close.

Quite frankly -- and I explained this to

Secretary Rivera -- it appears that the Executive Branch
is trying to create a crisis in order put pressure on
the Legislature to pass these tax increases.

It just seems incongruent to me that there would be a document like that when we say we have 30 or 90 days to come up with some kind of budget to help our bond ratings. Maybe you can comment on that, on that document that was sent out.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Sure. Again, the bipartisan budget agreement that didn't get finished right before the Christmas holiday was a lot of hard work. But it is meaningful compromise. And it's that level of meaningful work and compromise that we need to continue the work to complete.

It's our hope that sooner than later that budget agreement can be put into place to provide a much richer amount of State assistance to local school districts to avoid some of the property tax increases that would otherwise be necessary at the local level if we don't

enact increasing State aid for our local school districts. The hope is that we get that work done as soon as possible.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Like I said, I appreciate your honesty.

One last closing comment. I understand we have a structural deficit. I get that. You know, make it around \$2 billion. It needs to be taken care of. But we have to understand, too, that if we're going to raise revenues, it's on the hardworking people of Pennsylvania.

And going back to Representative Keller's comments. We need to be filling the hole to take care of our financial difficulties rather than trying to fill the hole and also have increased spending at the same time. It's incongruent. It doesn't make sense.

I've worked with a lot of businesses over the years. And I would hope that, you know, in some fashion we come up with a responsible plan that takes care of that. I just want to note that.

And I do want to note, going back to some of the dialogue we had today, there's a couple of us that do have a financial background. You know, let's be honest. Let's be honest about the numbers and how we approach them and talk about things. Because when we're honest

1 about it, that's how we're going to come up with good 2 solutions. I appreciate your time. 3 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you, 4 5 Representative. 6 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, 7 Representative. 8 I have been remiss to acknowledge the presence 9 of Representative Bryan Cutler who's been here for the 10 hearing. 11 Representative Rozzi. 12 REPRESENTATIVE ROZZI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Seems like the word of the day is compromise. 13 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 14 Yes. 15 REPRESENTATIVE ROZZI: Hopefully, we can get to that word, compromise. 16 17 I just have a couple things I want to say and 18 then a question at the end. I really just want to note 19 and thank the Governor for his proposal for the Reading School District over House Bill 1460. It was almost a 20 \$7 million difference. 21 22 When we talk about Reading and we talk about 15 23 percent of our residents have graduated from college and 24 maybe 60 percent have graduated from high school, 25 investment in dollars to Reading is the only way we're

going to give our children the tools necessary to succeed and get out of the thought that we're still the poorest city in Pennsylvania.

Another thing that I thought the Governor was taking the lead on was the reduction of property taxes, even though a lot of people in my district would like to see the elimination of property taxes.

Over the past week here I've been dealing with the issue of the sexual abuse at the Altoona Johnstown Diocese. There's a lot of victims reaching out to me from Johnstown and from all over the State. A lot of victims tell me their stories. And a lot of times it's always tied to alcohol addiction, drug addictions.

And the way I see the picture is a lot of these victims don't have the recourse to go back and go after their perpetrator or the institution that protected the perpetrator. In the case of Johnstown, the Bishops and Monsignors actually appointed the police chiefs so there was no way for victims really to get justice.

So where do they end up? They end up in the State system in our programs that we're spending the dollars taking care of these victims.

Do you believe the \$5 million increase to the Drug and Alcohol Program is substantial? Is it enough?

And how is this money then being disbursed to our

counties?

And like in the incident that is happening in Johnstown right now where there's about 150 more phone calls coming in and there's so many victims out there, hundreds of victims that will get no recourse or justice, no help from the people, from the abuser or the institution that protected them. Is it enough money right now what we're offering in the State to be able to help those victims or should we actually, you know, set up something special for Johnstown and those victims that are suffering out there?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I think the honest answer is that it is arguably not enough. It's as much as we can afford at this point to be fair.

The 5 million you alluded to in a line item that hadn't been increased for many years, you know, far before we actually created DDAP itself as a dedicated department to fund those programs was really dedicated for the Heroin Opioid Initiative.

I forget who, but as has been alluded to earlier and, as I said to everybody here last year, if you haven't been touched already directly, anecdotally, you know, by a family member, a friend, a neighbor, someone who has been affected by that epidemic, you're the lucky one and you likely will be.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, part of our proposed budget is to continue that \$5 million initiative in the DDAP budget, along with some additional smaller appropriation in the behavioral health line and now a new \$34 million initiative to create health homes to provide a more comprehensive way through the DHS budget with matching Federal funds to really try to help those families, those individuals, you know, deal with their addiction, become, again, contributing members of our Commonwealth, find jobs, you know, find their way back to their local communities.

No, it's not enough.

REPRESENTATIVE ROZZI: I mean, I know Berks County is one of the counties that is spending a lot and they still said they need more.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We want to do and work with the General Assembly to do as much as we can. It's something we struggle with every day, particularly in the DHS budget. We still have waiting lists from many critical programs, starting with autism and intellectual disabilities.

Our proposed budget is simply doing at least as much as we think we can fiscally afford right now.

REPRESENTATIVE ROZZI: Thank you for those comments. I just feel that if we're going to, you know,

1 have these grand juries and we're going to open up a lot 2 of things, there are going to be a lot more victims 3 still coming forward that are going to need help. 4 We better do what we can in Pennsylvania because 5 we don't want to hold the predators or institutions 6 accountable so we're going to pay it forward out of our 7 own pocket. So thank you for your answers. 8 9 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you, 10 Representative. 11 REPRESENTATIVE ROZZI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 12 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, 13 Representative. 14 Representative Sue Helm. 15 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Chairman, I want to say when I was 16 17 first elected ten years ago, you were my Chairman on 18 Professional Licensure. And I learned a lot from you there. And now I was fortunate enough to follow you to 19 20 the Appropriations Committee. And I just want to thank you for your guidance and professional leadership on 21 22 this Committee. 23 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 24 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Secretary Albright. 25 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT:

1 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Welcome. 2 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning. 3 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Good morning. Recently the Administration released a blog post 4 5 about skyrocketing school property tax. Can you tell me 6 the average percent increase in school property tax 7 growth over the past three years of available data 8 collected and reported to the Department of Public 9 Education? BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Let me say that 10 11 while that percentage might look modest, it is masked a 12 little bit. What I mean by that is that what that data 13 doesn't include are countywide reassessments. Often those reassessments also result in 14 15 substantial increases for some local property taxpayers when counties and municipalities, local governments, 16 17 that haven't reassessed for years finally reassess or move their tax system to a full value reassessment. 18 19 saw in our largest school district in the City of 20 Philadelphia, they just completed implementing an AVI, they refer to it, reassessment two years ago. 21 22 So let me just caution that when you look at 23 that, that it's not telling you the whole story. 24 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: What figure did you give

25

me?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Pardon?

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: What figure, what percentage did you say it was?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I said that while those on a percentage basis -- while those increases year over year may appear to be modest, I said they may mask the total, the actual impact to individual property tax owners.

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: I believe the amount reported was 2.2 percent. And what my question is, if 2.2 percent is skyrocketing, how would you describe your proposed 11 percent retroactive income tax?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The income tax increase that we propose we think is fair. I will simply say that at a 3.4 percent tax rate, we would still have the third lowest PIT rate as a base rate of all of the states that impose a personal income tax.

We think it would be fair to both the individuals and the businesses that pay that tax.

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Okay.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: And we think, you know, again, as we had talked about earlier, it would create, to the extent that those revenues are used to more fully fund aid to local school districts, a much more equitable, fair way to fund our education system.

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: I don't know. I was kind of asking you how you would describe it. All I could think of was astronomical.

But let's talk about job creation.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Last week I was looking at the Department of Labor and Industry Pennsylvania's monthly work stats report that contains December 2015 data. I notice that the number of non-farm jobs created in 2015 were just 38,000. And Global Insight had projected that Pennsylvania employers would create about 74,300 jobs in 2015, about two times the amount of jobs actually created.

Can you tell me what might have impacted job creation during the Governor's first year in office?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I will say that that job creation was still significant. It has taken employment at the end of the fiscal year to the highest level in our State history. We finally have recovered the employment losses that were suffered in full during the Great Recession.

There are many steps that the Governor has proposed taking to continue to grow the State's economy. Some of those things are most significant that were part of last year's proposed budget, however, are not part of

this year's budget, particularly the proposal to create
what we believe would be a more competitive tax system
by reforming the corporate net income tax, making sure
that everybody pays their fair share, but actually
lowering that tax over the course of the next several
years to take it from being one of or the highest rate
at 9.99 percent all the way down to 4.99 percent.

It was the Governor's belief that because of the crisis that we face and the importance of first dealing with the structural budget deficit and putting our own financial house in order, that and his proposal for broad-based property tax relief were not part of his proposed budget this year.

That doesn't mean that he doesn't continue to support those efforts along with, again, recapitalizing, fully funding the State's arsenal of job creation loan and grant programs that are all part of, along with providing for a trained labor force, the steps that are necessary to grow jobs and new development in the State.

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Well, you know, I have a lot of people coming to me and asking me to do whatever for them. And the one thing that breaks my heart is when people come to me. They want to work. They're looking for a job. And they can't find one. Now, with the Governor's proposal of increasing the minimum wage,

1	I'm even more concerned about that.
2	So I hope over the next year you will really
3	look at job creation and do as much as we possibly can.
4	And maybe some of these people from my district that
5	would love to work can get a job.
6	Thank you very much.
7	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you,
8	Representative.
9	REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.
11	Representative Schweyer.
12	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Thank you, Mr.
13	Chairman.
14	Mr. Secretary, good to see you. Thank you for
15	being here.
16	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you.
17	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: This one is for the
18	Chairman. I know you so enjoyed this lightning round of
19	questioning last year, so I'm going to throw this at you
20	again.
21	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I'll do my best to
22	try to match it.
23	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Do your best.
24	Yes-or-no answers. That would be great.
25	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I'll do my best.

1	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Mr. Secretary, again,
2	this is to the best of your ability. Is the
3	Commonwealth currently facing a \$1.9 billion structural
4	deficit?
5	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes.
6	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Was HB 1460 as sent to
7	the Governor in December structurally imbalanced by at
8	least \$300 million?
9	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: With the caveat, at
10	least, yes.
11	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Has the State's credit
12	rating been downgraded as a result of inaction to
13	responsibly balance a budget?
14	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes.
15	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: What is the cost
16	and this is not a yes or no. But what is the
17	approximate cost in real dollars estimated as a result
18	of these credit downgrades?
19	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: \$10 million for each
20	billion dollars that we issue. If we would spread that
21	over the 17 billion that we are proposed to incur, if we
22	include PlanCon and some of the other proposals in front
23	of us, about \$140 million based on our current bond
24	rating.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: So currently right now

1	the State would incur an additional \$140 million as a
2	result of this?
3	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Annually.
4	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Annually. Okay.
5	Is it safe to say that Pennsylvania has missed
6	out on an estimated approximately \$1.8 billion in
7	revenue since 2011 by not enacting a severance tax?
8	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We'd have to go back
9	and look.
10	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Okay.
11	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I can't give a
12	lightning answer to that one.
13	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Okay. And if
14	compromise is defined as the settlement of a dispute by
15	mutual concession and compromise is the word of the
16	day and certainly a word that we need to realize was
17	HB 1192 as sent to the Governor in June and subsequently
18	vetoed arrived at mutually?
19	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: No.
20	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Was HB 1460 as sent to
21	the Governor in December and consequently blue-lined
22	vetoed arrived at mutually?
23	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: No.
24	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Mr. Secretary, two
25	weeks ago three weeks ago two weeks ago the IFO

the Independent Fiscal Office, testified that somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 to 90 percent of the proposed increases in spending in the Governor's budget proposal are as a result of mandatory cost increases.

Do you concur with that testimony?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Of the remaining proposed increase in spending, can you expound briefly on what that would go towards?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The bulk of it is aid to local school districts.

To allude to a question that I didn't get a chance to answer earlier, about 500 million is the delta between the tax increase as proposed and the additional beyond-mandated expenditures included in the '16-'17 budget.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Would State aid to local school districts stem the increase of property taxes at the local level?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: I think I'll just end with this, Mr. Secretary. As was mentioned at the onset of this hearing today, the last time a Governor had fully vetoed an entire State budget was in the '50s.

And that was Governor George Leader. The first and only

1	other Governor from York County, these two Governors
2	have clearly shared their willingness to stand up to
3	complacency. And Governor Leader had an excellent quote
4	that he had once said. The best way to break the cycle
5	of poverty is through education.
6	I'd like to thank you and thank our Governor for
7	fighting to restore cuts and equitably fund education in
8	our Commonwealth.
9	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you.
10	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Thank you, Mr.
11	Chairman.
12	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you for that
13	lightning round.
14	Representative Dave Millard.
15	REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Thank you, Mr.
16	Chairman.
17	Welcome, Mr. Secretary.
18	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning,
19	Representative.
20	REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: I'd like to talk to you
21	about State correctional institutions. I was surprised
22	to see that the Governor vetoed over 900 million in
23	funding for the State correctional institutions
24	appropriation for 2015-'16.

Can you tell us, what was the rationale behind

25

this veto?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The rationale was, when he signed the bill, as he said in the public press conference when that bill was signed, he signed that bill into law as an emergency spending package. It was intended to provide a temporary relief, if you will, from some of the negative impacts that had ensued from the six months of budget impasse.

It was not intended to be a long-term funding plan. The intent was that that spending plan would be in place for a matter of weeks until the General Assembly could come back following the holiday recess and complete the work on the compromised budget agreement that, you know, we had hoped to enact but didn't right before the holidays.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: But now that there's a budget in place but no money for State correctional institutions, can you assure us that only those payments that are truly critical and necessary for the Department of Corrections to safely operate our prisons and satisfy State and Federal constitutional obligations are being paid?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes. And we've already put systems in place, working directly with our comptroller shop, working with the Department, and

working with the Treasurer, to ensure that only the
essential payments for the operation of our State
correctional institutions that we are able to fund.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Can you give us
examples of expenses that are not being paid?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: There aren't a

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: There aren't a lot.

I mean, most of those obligations are essential to the operations of our institutions.

A simple example I'll use is travel to a conference that maybe correctional officers might have been a part of is not a necessary occurrence and wouldn't be funded during the impasse.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Well, Mr. Secretary, let me give you two other examples of expenses that are not being paid.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Fayette Thermal, LLC, has been providing steam for heating, cooling, and cooking to SCI Fayette since it opened. It's the only source of steam for that facility. They can't operate the facility without this steam.

On January 20, 2016, an invoice was presented for about \$195,000. It was approved. But as of this date, this minute right now, it's not been paid. A February invoice for nearly \$220,000 is stalled in what

the controller labels as, in process.

Now, to these individuals, that means it's not even being considered accepted yet to render full payment.

Can you comment on that?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, again, we did take the necessary steps to put the controls in place to review expenditures to make sure, to your point, that they did meet the test of mandatory necessity under the current circumstances.

So all of those obligations will be paid. And since you brought to my attention that specific circumstance, we'll have the office look into that and give you a clearer idea, you know, maybe with some date of when those obligations will be fully paid.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: And now I want to go right back into my backyard in Columbia County. I just got off the phone with somebody this morning. And I left this hearing just a few moments ago to double-check. I still have not received a confirmation back from them.

A Mom and Pop operation that supplies fruits and vegetables to a number of correctional facilities, they have not been paid since December, \$632,000. And they're going to submit another bill today or by the end

of this week that will bring this total to over \$700,000.

A Mom and Pop operation that provides jobs in my local community. They've met their obligation contractually to provide this service so that these institutions can feed, you know, the residents that are in there and they haven't been paid.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I assure you they will be. And again, we took the time to make sure that we had the necessary controls and reviews in place.

Those are conversations that cross multiple agencies and the Treasury itself.

But, you know, as you already heard from the Treasurer when he testified, I think, here before the Committee earlier in the month, that all of those obligations will be met and paid in full.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: So what I'm hearing from you is that you clearly do not agree with the Governor's decision to willy-nilly take his pen and blue line certain things out and cause disruption in all of our communities for these providers, the small Mom and Pop operations, the small job providers, all across this Commonwealth?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I absolutely agree with the Governor's intent to work with the General

1 Assembly to find a meaningful compromise that we can all 2 agree upon to put a responsible budget in place for this 3 fiscal year and the next fiscal year to fully meet the 4 State's obligations. 5 REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Well, again, I'm glad 6 to hear you say that, because what my interpretation of 7 this is that, you know, this is rude. It's crude. in your face. It's a kick in the gut. It's dereliction 8 9 of duty on the part of the Governor to blue line such items out there that cause so much harm to so many 10 11 people across this Commonwealth. 12 These are the people that we depend on to pay 13 14 15

their taxes on time so that we can pay our bills at the State level. So thank you again for agreeing with me that, you know, it should be paid. And I certainly look forward to your intervention in this to ensure that these individuals do get paid.

It's

Thank you.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, Representative.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

We're going to take a ten-minute break to give

1 you a chance to stretch your legs and give the 2 stenographer a chance to stretch her fingers and other 3 things that we may have to do. 4 We'll reconvene at 12:20. 5 Thank you. 6 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you. 7 (Recess) MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: I'd like to reconvene 8 9 the House Appropriations Committee. The next question will be asked by 10 11 Representative Bullock. 12 REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Thank you, Chairman. And I also appreciate that break. I think we all needed 13 to stretch out a little bit. 14 15 Secretary, I appreciate you coming this afternoon or this morning and staying throughout the 16 afternoon. 17 18 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you. 19 REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Earlier we heard from 20 some of my colleagues about some puzzles, five-piece puzzles or such. And I would say that depending on who 21 22 you are, that puzzle piece may look a little different. 23 It may include education or it may include seniors or 24 justice, criminal justice issues. 25 One of those puzzle pieces that I'd like to talk to you about is our seniors. You know, Secretary

Albright, I'm not a gambling woman, nor do I bet. But

since I've taken office, I've encouraged all of my

constituents to play the Lottery and play it often

because one thing I don't want to gamble on is the

security and the quality of life of our seniors.

As we know, the primary purpose of the Lottery
Fund of Pennsylvania when it was created in the 1970s
was to generate funds for programs that benefit
Pennsylvania seniors, programs like PACE, programs like
the Shared Ride, and the Property Tax Rent Rebate
Program that's very popular amongst most of our
districts.

Over the past year, the Lottery revenues have been used to fill gaps in our General Fund. And in that process, the Lottery Fund was virtually wiped out.

Secretary, what is the Administration's plan to stabilize the Lottery Fund? What is being done to assure that it can continue to meet the obligations to our seniors?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Representative, I share your concern. As I alluded to earlier, we had already in the course of just the '14-'15 Fiscal Year already had to begin to shift, assume transfers that originally were budgeted to offset General Fund

expenditures from the Lottery Fund and pay for those obligations directly with General Fund revenues.

We are in the midst right now of compiling several initiatives in the Lottery to look at ways to experiment with new games, new processes, new procedures to grow Lottery revenue going forward. We continue to root for those high Powerball jackpots that are so significant.

The good news, if you will, is that currently we are confident and believe that we will meet our projected revenue assumptions for the current fiscal year and believe or have confidence that our revenue assumptions for the next fiscal year will also be met.

But it is something that in the longer term we continue to monitor. We'll do everything we can to grow Lottery revenues. But we have serious concerns about — you know, I've often used the word gaming fatigue, if you will — other steps that we make to maybe look at other gaming options that could, in fact, if we're not careful, have an adverse effect on the Lottery.

So it's something we need to keep a close eye on. We need to be wary and mindful of making sure that those Lottery-funded programs have the revenue to fully fund them in future years.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Thank you, Secretary.

2.4

I keep wishing maybe one day I'll hit that

Powerball. It's not quite been in my favor of late.

The other issue or theme I'd like to just talk briefly about and all of the departments about are workforce efforts to have a diverse workforce in the Commonwealth.

I would like for you to share what your office's role has been, just in your office and just across the agencies, and the conversations you've been having and the priorities you've set in regards to the budget while also promoting diversity among our workforce.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: This was a simple and pointed directive from the Governor Day 1 when he took office when he first addressed the Cabinet, that we want to create a workforce within all of our agencies that looks like the Commonwealth does.

So we have taken every step possible to make sure that in all the hiring decisions, as we particularly try to attract new millennials, for example, you know, to our workforce, that minority recruitment, that making sure again that we have a State Government that looks like the Commonwealth is a first priority of every Cabinet officer.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Thank you, Secretary.

And I appreciate the Governor's commitment to that. I

1 agree we should have a workforce that reflects and looks 2 like the people we serve here in Pennsylvania. 3 Thank you for your time. BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you. 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Thank you, Chairman. 6 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, 7 Representative. 8 Representative Marguerite Quinn. 9 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. And I'm not going to mention anything about you leaving 10 11 because you're here for quite some time. You still have 12 a budget to get through. Mr. Secretary, thanks for being here. 13 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 14 Thank you, 15 Representative. REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I appreciate your time 16 17 and effort that you have in helping get this budget 18 passed. We all know that we have a fiduciary 19 responsibility to the taxpayers of the Commonwealth. BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 20 21 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: With this in mind, in 22 advance of many of the hearings and after some of them, 23 I've sent letters to the various secretaries and agency 24 heads in an attempt to drill down on the complements of 25 Pennsylvania employees and really get a sense of

1 increases from this present year to the next present 2 year or the anticipation with regard to salaries and 3 what percentage of that increased GGO that is and the health care benefits just to see what percent that's 4 5 going up. 6 And while I have some responses, I look forward to others. But I was hoping that you could help me shed 7 some light on that. I understand that you are one of 8 9 the Commonwealth trustees for the Pennsylvania Employee Benefit Trust Fund. 10 11 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: That is correct. 12 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: With that, could you please tell me how many active members there are? 13 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I don't know that 14 15 number off the top of my head. REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Approximately. 16 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: But I will 17 certainly, you know, get it for you. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Approximately, are we talking 10,000? 20,000? 50,000? 20 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Our State workforce 21 22 is more than 70,000 employees. We have retirees that 23 receive health care benefits as well as the current 2.4 workforce.

But to come back to your earlier -- the way you

25

1 started the question. REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: 2 Sure. 3 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I know you have provided those requests to individual agencies. We're 4 5 going to do that work for you. We'll compile for each 6 of --7 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: For me or for them? BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Pardon? 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: You're going to do that work for me or for them? 10 11 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We're going to do 12 that work for -- we're going to provide that information 13 to you, to the Committee, and all the members of the Committee. So we'll compile, you know, for each agency 14 15 across all of State Government the complement and benefit factor, as we did last year, the benefit factor 16 17 information that provides the breakdown of health care, 18 of pension, and other benefit expenditures by agency. 19 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: At what point should I 20 expect that? I have it from some. 21 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We're working to compile that information now. We'll get it to you as 22 23 soon as we can make it available. 24 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Is that within the next

week do you think?

25

1	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I don't want
2	REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I'm not trying to be a
3	pain in the neck. But I've asked the agencies. I've
4	got it from some. And then I had a couple of phone
5	calls to the office saying, we got it together but we're
6	not allowed to give it to you. We were just told from
7	the Administration not to give it to you.
8	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I don't know how
9	soon. My commitment to you is to get it to you as soon
10	as possible. Hopefully we can get it to you before the
11	end of next week.
12	REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay. Thanks.
13	You said that the State workforce is about
14	70,000. Approximately how many retirees?
15	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Our State complement
16	is, I think, about 73,000 as we sit here today.
17	REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay. And your retirees
18	in the system are approximately?
19	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I don't want to give
20	you an incorrect number so we'll provide that to you.
21	REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Greater than? less than?
22	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Pardon? Again, I
23	don't want to give you a wrong answer.
24	REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay.
25	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I'll provide that

1 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thanks.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: -- to you.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: When you provide the information, could you please -- since you're taking it on, I don't have to send out follow-up letters. But could you please -- in addition to the active members, could you provide the number of dependents?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We'll see what data we have available and provide everything that we have to you.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you.

If you followed other lines of questioning that I have, I've cited return on investments that other states have realized, 3,500 percent, 2,500 percent, 1,850 percent return on investments of actually conducting a dependent benefit eligibility audit.

And, you know, I've seen cost savings going forward as 9 million. The California Retirement System was like \$80 million just from cleaning up the rolls, really not looking for criminal activity, but just the normal slippage.

So given a workforce of about 73,000 people, it would seem to me that this would be a great way to just, you know, tighten things up, make sure that we're being responsible to the taxpayers and that those people who

are receiving our benefits are actually eligible for them. Are you aware --

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We will certainly work to make sure, as we do every day, that we're only providing benefits to those who are appropriately eligible. We already do and take measures to make sure that where, you know, a spouse or other dependent has other health care or has access to other health care benefits, that we're not paying twice, so to speak.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: But we will continue to, frankly, even as we negotiate our upcoming rank and file labor contracts -- health care is always part of that conversation --- and look to, again, make sure that we're doing the best job possible to be fair --

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: -- to employees but to also be prudent with taxpayer dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I'm looking to be fair to employees and prudent with taxpayer dollars. And I was pleased when I saw page 2, bottom right-hand corner, of the winter newsletter for the PEBTF, notification that headlines, PEBTF may cancel your coverage for fraud or intentional representation.

That's one thing. You know, I expect a proper

audit would pick that up, but also just the normal slippage that happens when one forgets to notify HR of a change. So thanks. Would you support an audit of that type?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Sure. And I will add to this conversation, frankly, to have a healthier workforce is a big part of this.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: And your paperwork here really stresses that. It sounds like some good measures are being taken.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: That's right. We would really like to champion the fact that now more than 80 percent of your workforce has participated in that process to, again, make sure that healthier outcomes can mean, you know, savings for tax dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Yeah. I see the Executive Offices has the gut busters team in there. Maybe we should come up with a team here.

I want to talk to you a minute about the educational improvement tax credit and the opportunity scholarship tax credit.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: As we all know, the tax credit programs are not subject to an annual appropriation amount in the general appropriations bill.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Statutory language for the tax credit program exists in the Tax Reform Code along with statutory cap amounts.

Furthermore, unless there's a specific tax credit program, unless the specific tax credit program has a limitation on its existence known as a sunset date, the tax credit program exists in each fiscal year as well as the amount of tax credits that could actually be used in that fiscal year.

I just chatted with the kids outside or at least members from the Administration of the school that we hear serenading us. They're recipients of the EITC dollars. And they extended a thank you.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: And they're also pleased that they got their textbooks at the end of January.

Article 17(f) of the Tax Reform Code provides for educational tax credits. Section 17(f)(a)1 provides for \$100 million in the EITC tax credits for the fiscal year. And there's another article that provides 50 million for the opportunity scholarship tax credit.

Given the fact -- here's my question. Given the fact that the tax credit programs are not subject to annual appropriation amounts in the general

appropriations bill and Article 15(f) of the Tax Reform

Code provides for the \$150 million of educational tax

credits every fiscal year, can you please explain to the

Committee the reasoning behind the Department and the

Administration's delay to awarding the EITC and the OSTC

tax credits this year?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Because until we conclude a final budget, everything is on the table. We can't presume anything about what final expenditure amounts will be or what tax credit allocations will be.

Those of you who were here and part of the 2009 budget process know that in the end when we came to a final budget agreement, then we reduced those tax credit programs significantly for several of the tax credit programs over the course of the next two fiscal years.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Excuse me. Were these tax credits reduced? I was here then. And my recollection is that it was the film tax credit that was reduced. I don't recall in the past year --

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The film tax credit wasn't the only one. There were several tax credit programs --

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Which other ones?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: -- that had very significant reductions over the course of the next

couple fiscal years. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Were these two programs 3 part of those with significant reductions? BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 4 Those -- well, the 5 OITC program didn't exist at that point. 6 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay. Was it --7 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The EITC program was not part of a reduction at that point but it --8 9 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Because we're --BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: -- could be. 10 11 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: But nor do I recall --12 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We can't presume or we can't make any assumptions. We have to responsibly 13 withhold any decisions that we make until there is a 14 15 final budget agreement. At the point that the budget did land on the 16 17 Governor's desk or simultaneously with that conversation 18 we did make an executive decision at that point to 19 release the tax credit allocations. 20 Had we enacted the compromised budget agreement 21 that had been in place, we would have actually increased 22 assistance for the EITC program by an additional 10 23 million. 24 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I guarantee you that those people who are waiting who came out here who 25

weren't sure if their schools were going to close, they were just looking for the 150 million in it. And quite frankly, the fact that the EITC is a self-executing -- it's self-executing by statute. I just can't see how by delaying it you didn't thwart the implementation of that statute.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: So was the film tax credit program and other tax programs --

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I'm not speaking about the film tax credit.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: -- that were reduced as part of a final budget solution in prior fiscal years.

You want to make an assumption about what a final outcome will be. We can't make that assumption. We have to wait and see what the final will of the General Assembly is.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Secretary, respectfully, they were dollars that were being driven out through the Treasury throughout the time period from July 1st up until December 29th. There were then assumptions made at that point by the Administration.

I'm going to say that my recollection in my time on this Committee, any piece of paper that we had in front of us, not at one point were the dollar amounts

for the EITC or the OT -- I get those initials mixed up.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: OSTC.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you. A, b, c, d, e

-- OSTC not at one point was there discussion for

actually lowering them. So holding them up because they

might be increased makes no sense.

I'm going to translate that. I'm just going to parlay that to when you were answering one of my colleagues with regard to the education funding. You said that the goal was to make a clear statement that the funding was not enough.

So here we are holding up dollars to make a clear statement that the funding was not enough where we have throughout the Commonwealth schools closing. The domino effect of that is outrageous.

I know of people who have called their employer. What if I have to take off work? What does this fit?

Does it fit under the Family Leave Act? Mom, could you like book a flight but don't really book it because I don't know if I'm going to need you to come in?

I mean, there's just minimal things. To have to send out letters about how to go about closing a school district, it just boggles my mind.

There was creative thought with regard to covering PACE. Okay? The Motor License Fund loaned \$96

million. \$92 million was loaned to the Purchasing Fund from the General Fund. \$50 million to the Lottery from the General Fund.

Where's the creative thinking when it comes to what we all agree in this room is our highest priority, our children?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The creative thinking in this case were extraordinary administrative steps that were taken with revenue and DCED working together to execute and get award letters out to potential eligible recipients before the close of the State fiscal year -- or, excuse me, the calendar year.

We did extend for State tax purposes the allowable credit for the 2015 tax year. So that even if in the end those awards were made after the 1st of January 2016, the claimant, the eligible recipient, would still be able to use or bank those tax credits against their 2015 tax liability.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I recognize you did that.

And I wish to God that it was able to help on the

Federal tax credit, which is, you know, part and parcel
with that plan and one of the beauties for our

businesses to participate in it.

But I'm going to go back to, you know, with regard to the general education funding. Your goal was

to make a clear statement that it wasn't enough money.

What it seems to me with that, as well as with the EITC and the OSTC dollars, a crisis was developed to make this point, that it's not enough money.

And it's just unacceptable for the families that don't get it and who have been watching and point on each side, this dollar and that -- you know, we have the money in the Treasury. I heard that \$29.7 billion has been certified. People think out there that there's a budget crisis and it means we don't have the money.

When we explain to them, oh, we have the money.

We don't have a vehicle through which we can drive out

the money because once that Sharpie is picked up and the

blue line goes, it puts everyone into crisis mode.

Secretary, I respectfully request that as we're looking to make a clear statement that it's not enough, that we recognize that it's the families and the children of Pennsylvania that are held hostage by this.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I would say -- and I believe it's the Governor's perspective -- it is children. It is families. It is health care providers. It is many people throughout the Commonwealth who have been suffering from budget decisions that we don't believe have been in the best interest of serving the Commonwealth for many years now. It's that budget --

it's those budgeting decisions.

We're now paying our MCO providers three months late for most of the work that they do. That work totals more than — or nearly a billion dollars in annual payments. The interest on those late payments has to be paid by us, the Commonwealth taxpayer, when we negotiate rates paid to those MCO providers in the next fiscal year.

It's these budgeting decisions that bring great hardship, cuts that have been made to county human service providers several years ago that still haven't been restored that would in the compromised budget agreement return \$28 million in funding for county programs across those seven line items.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: We need to live in the present.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: These are the expenditures. These are the expenditures that would have been part of that bipartisan budget agreement. These are the things that we worked long and hard many, many long days, many long weeks, many long months, to put together and find the compromise necessary to come to a common agreement.

We didn't get to that --

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Secretary --

—145 **—**

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We didn't get to that point before the holiday recess. We do hope to get to that point as soon as possible. We stand ready to begin those conversations immediately following this hearing.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you.

You mentioned that the interest payments through the MCOs that you're going to have to pay in the first week of August, the Governor announced with regard to the school districts and counties that the Commonwealth will assume their interest payments on any loans that they have to take.

Did that also include the costs, like any finance fees for the loan? And what is your estimate right now of those current interest loans? Because \$10 million was put into the compromised budget. And my understanding is that those dollars were higher and the Auditor General's report in December also — maybe it was November — also indicated that those dollars are significantly higher than the \$10 million.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Some late payments for interest are already paid under current State law so that there are individual categories. Payments to school districts, our non-profit providers, are principally what we're talking about reimbursing in that

1	\$10.7 million line item.
2	In the case of the MCO providers that I just
3	alluded to earlier, those interest expenses are paid in
4	full in the rates when we negotiate the new rates paid
5	to those providers in the next fiscal year.
6	And I should be fair to say also that the late
7	payment to those MCO providers isn't just something that
8	began in the prior Administration. That practice has
9	spanned, you know, two prior Governors, including
10	Governor Rendell.
11	REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I'm going to stop now.
12	But I just think it's important as we go forward that we
13	stay in the present.
14	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: It is the present
15	now where we're incurring more, again, interest on a
16	billion dollars in payments that are made late every
17	fiscal year.
18	REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thanks, Mr. Secretary.
19	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you,
20	Representative.
21	REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.
22	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
23	Representative.
24	Representative Schweyer.
25	REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

And, Mr. Chairman, I had some really nice comments to make about you, about your service to the Commonwealth, and all that you've done for us. But the previous speaker made me feel guilty about talking about them because you're going to still be here. So I stopped. I was trying to be funny and it didn't work.

All right. I'm moving forward. I am just a freshman after all. But I am going to start my comments today with having a bit of optimism because I think we need a little bit right now.

In the months prior to the start of these hearings -- and if we're being honest with ourselves, we know this to be true -- there was little understanding or there certainly wasn't the level of bipartisan understanding that we did, in fact, have a structural deficit, that it was real, that it was meaningful.

And now people on both sides, many people on both sides of the aisle are, in fact, acknowledging this. That's progress.

As House Bill 1460 was passed, we were told that it was a balanced budget. But during these hearings, we have heard time and time again an honest acknowledgement, frankly, in some cases, a difficult acknowledgement for some folks, that it was actually

anywhere from three hundred to five hundred million dollars out of balance. This is good news. It's good news that these three weeks have given us a stronger foundation for understanding the true fiscal picture in which we find ourselves.

And perhaps in the coming weeks, hopefully sooner than that, coming days, that we have a better understanding to negotiate a final budget. Again, this is apparently what passes as progress for us in the Commonwealth these days.

Now a big picture question, sir.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: If the Governor would have accepted House Bill 1460, because that was the most recent proposal that he had the opportunity to sign, what would have the budget deficit or the deficit have been for this coming budget year if we would have accepted that?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Our estimate was that it was about \$510 million out of balance.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Okay.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Now, I have to quickly say that that assumes that the State-related appropriation bills that have not reached the Governor's desk would have also reached the Governor's desk in

their current form that provides, I believe, a 5 percent increase to those appropriations.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Okay. And what would the structural deficit have been then at that point?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We are, again, continuing to struggle with the structural budget deficit that we believe, you know, will exceed \$2 billion in the '16-'17 Fiscal Year unfunded.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Okay. And so with that \$2 billion unfunded deficit, we would probably collectively be looking to not only increase taxes by \$2 billion, which is an astronomical number I think a lot of folks have said, but we would most likely be looking to cut spending in some way, shape, or form or another?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Look, you've now heard from all of the Cabinet secretaries. Frankly, we had to disappoint many of them in the budget plans that were put together.

Our budget proposal for the '16-'17 Fiscal Year is essentially a cost-to-carry budget, meaning there are no program initiatives. We're simply paying for current programs and current expenditure levels and nothing more.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Okay. The education budget is about 30, 35 percent, give or take, of the

1 overall General Fund. 2 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm. 3 REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: If we were looking at cutting funding, would that be an obvious spot, past 4 5 practices being an obvious spot where there would be 6 reductions? 7 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yeah. that's the most unfortunate part of the conversation, 8 9 you know, again in the two past scenarios as the 10 Governor outlined it in his budget speech. 11 But, yes, aid to local school districts because 12 it is, you know, one of the few areas where we would be able to make substantial revenue cuts. And it's still 13 14 discretionary what we do provide to local school 15 districts. So we believe that aid would likely have to be cut by a billion dollars or more. 16 17 REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Okay. Cutting 18 19 20 taxes, class sizes, fewer options for our kids. 21

22

23

24

25

millions or billions of dollars from education is scary. We talked about loss of teachers and higher property I'm just curious. Has any member of the General Assembly come to the Administration, either directly or indirectly, and said, cut my school district first? BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Obviously not. REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: I'm shocked to hear **—**151 **—**

I mean,

that. Now, the reason why I'm shocked to hear that -let me give you some statistics about the only school
district that I represent, which is the Allentown School
District.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Okay

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: In the four years prior to this most recent budget, the Allentown School District, not in one fell swoop but over four consecutive budgets, lost a grand total of 400 teaching positions. That is one-quarter of the entire complement of educators that Allentown had.

In anticipation of the restoration of funds or restoration of some funds from the Commonwealth in their 2015 budget, the Allentown School District agreed to restore, stop cutting and restore a portion of those lost teachers. Again, we lost 400 positions. They were bringing back 30 of 400. And we were celebrating this fact.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

me what am I willing to do to compromise. I compromised 370 lost teacher positions. That's not an insignificant compromise. I think a lot of folks up here when they're talking about -- and this is both sides of the aisle -- what they're willing to do and what they're asking their

1 constituents to give up in order to get a budget passed 2 that is balanced and starts the process of restoring 3 these cuts, my school district was willing to accept an overall loss, a net loss, of 370 teachers. That's 4 5 compromise. 6 Thank you, Mr. Secretary. 7 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Thank you, Mr. 8 9 Chairman. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: 10 Thank you, 11 Representative. 12 Representative Karen Boback. 13 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Hello, Secretary Albright. 14 15 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning. REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: My question has to do 16 with the enhanced liquor proceeds. On page A1 through 17 18 17 of the 2016-'17 Governor's budget under the initiatives relating to government that works, the 19 20 modernization of Pennsylvania's Wine and Spirits system states the following: The next steps in 2016-2017 will 21 22 generate an additional 100 million for the Commonwealth. 23 And I found that intriguing. Moving forward, a 24 bipartisan stakeholder group will be convened to look at

ways to further maximize the value of our liquor system

25

and assess the magnitude of proposals before the policymakers.

Now, it goes on to say who will be included in -- or I'm going to go on to say, who will be included in this working group? When will it be convened? And can you tell me how you came up with that number, approximately \$100 million in proceeds?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm. We worked with the LCB to develop those assumptions. I believe they were already here to testify to the specifics of those proposals. You know, there is — and part of the original bipartisan budget agreement would have been a bill that still awaits House action that was already passed out of the Senate that would make significant changes to our current liquor law.

Many of the components of the steps that we would want to take to generate that new \$100 million in increased revenue which were returned to the Commonwealth taxpayers would require statutory authorization.

Many of those steps were included in that piece of legislation. That legislation would have also set up a Commission. And that Commission, had it been enacted, would be meeting right now to talk about much more significant steps that would be taken in the future to

both increase the customers' experience, customer 1 2 convenience, if you will, but also look at other 3 delivery systems for how we sell liquor and wine in the Commonwealth. 5 You know, in lieu of that, if that bill isn't 6 now part of an agreement to move forward, then it would 7 be our intention to possibly, on a more informal basis, convene a working group of stakeholders. We would look 8 9 to the General Assembly. We aren't going to assume who the participants should be, but work with each of the 10 four caucuses to, you know, sit down together, you know, 11 12 with the appropriate members, the other people who 13 represent the system, and try to see if we can look at meaningful ways to, again, create a better experience 14 15 for customers and a better return to the Commonwealth. REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: 16 Thank you, Mr. 17 Secretary. 18 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Sure. 19 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 20 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, 21 Representative. 22 Representative Matt Bradford. 23 REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Thank you, Chairman 24 Adolph.

Thank you, Secretary. And I want to begin by

25

thanking you for acknowledging something Representative Schweyer rightfully said. One of the positive things that's happened in recent weeks through these budget hearings is a recognition of the size and scope of the structural deficit.

And I think you as you began to start dealing with a truly balanced budget for the current year as well as for next year, just dealing with a level set of facts I think really is a positive improvement over where we were a year ago. Maybe that's a glacial pace. But it is a recognition to the size and scope of the problem.

I also want to recognize, though, the fact that you noted something, which was the late payment of MCOs. And, you know, it seems like a small thing and it seems like inside baseball. But it's one of our largest expenditures.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: You recognize it. But you also recognize the same gimmick of delaying payments a month which was done under Governor Rendell as well as Governor Corbett --

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: -- and is now being proposed in 1460 and such.

I think it needs to be recognized that the problem -- we can both engage in the food fight and relitigate the battle, not just of the last 18 months but probably the last battle since the Great Recession, as you did.

2.4

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: These gimmicks have been done on both sides of the aisle. We can talk about collaring pensions. We can talk about increasing pension benefits. All of the problems have fingerprints, blue and red, Democrat, Republican. And I think it's important that you recognize and point out that Democratic Governors did it with the support of Republican legislators. Most of those times, there was Republican majorities.

And I just want to thank you for kind of pointing that out.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Sometimes I think it gets overheated in terms of how this plays out.

I also noticed that there's a level of frustration that is shared on both sides of the aisle and sometimes anger. I was trying to think, well, where does the anger come from?

One of the things I've said repeatedly during

7

8

16 17 18

19

15

24

25

these hearings is, you know, if we're really angry -and I think we are -- there's a need to take a look in the mirror in terms of culpability, because a lot of those mistakes rest on the leadership of this body, and not just the current leadership but the leadership over many years. These problems are of our cumulative making.

And one of the things -- and I was trying to figure out, you know, when we've relitigated the education funding. And I know Representative Grove pointed out, you know, his chart and our chart. And I literally was reading the articles from seven or eight years ago to try to find out, you know, how we arrived at this point.

And I'm trying to say, okay. Well, I get it. They very vehemently say they're putting more money in education. And I think most people recognize in the Commonwealth less money is getting into our schools.

And the reality is, you know, you look at the chart and you see and I can see what my Republican brothers are seeing, which is, you know, expenditures going up.

But if you notice that red and green, which you can't read the fine print, but that would show you what the unfunded liability and what the pension payment is

doing.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: And I understand if I was a conservative Republican -- I'm not -- I would feel like we're putting more money in and less is going to our schools. But that's the price we pay for doing things like deferring pension payments, for not making our MCO payments on time, or playing these gimmicks.

You know, in 1460, I would argue some of those same ideas are in there. And again, it's not to engage in more of the finger pointing and to create more anger and frustration because there's already too much of it.

But when you go down the list and you say, oh, we're going to capitalize, we're going to borrow to make the PlanCon payment this year, you know, we're going to go from cash to an accrual on the County Human Services Fund, you know, these are feel-good things. But is that really good budgeting? Is there anything conservative?

I'm slightly to the -- not quite as conservative as Representative Greiner. But when he mentions there's a \$2 billion structural deficit, I'm like, wow. This is good. This is progress. This is moving in the right direction. That man is a CPA. That's progress.

But when you look in 1460 and we say we're not going to make the Social Security payment this year or

we want to skip a quarter and we're going to punt it off, you realize we're not being honest. 1460, the difference between when we talk about the \$300 million and the \$500 million shortfall, it's those three gimmicks that's a big driver of that.

2.4

Is that pretty much the Administration's position? That's the difference between where 1460 is out of balance, how far out of balance it is.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I would say the essence of the compromise, as I had stated earlier, our willingness to maybe take two years, not one, to eliminate all of those one-time expenditures and gimmicks, so to speak, to balance the budget.

But again, to your earlier point, to reiterate, you know, the responsibility has to be shared on all parties over the course of the last eight years or more.

Budgets have been difficult since the Recession hit and even before. You know, we need to simply, you know, be responsible. We need to be transparent. And we need to, going forward, find a more responsibile budget solution. That's what the rating agencies have been telling us. And that's what we need to — that's the call we need to hear to make responsible budget decisions.

Now, to your point, I would consider myself to

be a glass-half-full person myself. You know, I think that all of that work that didn't get to a finished product before the holiday recess was not work that was wasted. There was a lot of common ground reached, I think. There was a lot of significant progress made.

And again, I think, you know, we're -- you know, the responsibility for all of us is to as soon as possible, you know, take that work, build upon it, and find the final compromises necessary to bring a final solution.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: You know, I agree completely. I was looking over the S&P warning and kind of the clock they put us on to get this done. And, you know, it made me again — and Representative Quinn rightfully says, you know, we shouldn't keep looking back. And I know we can relitigate why the framework fell apart in the House but, you know, you go back and I was just reading through it.

And again, there is something to be said for past is prologue. So I was looking at some of Secretary Zogby's comments as he was preparing for the '14-'15 budget. And you had mentioned that in passing in one of your answers. And, you know, we had a conservative Republican majority in the House and Senate then and we had a pretty conservative Republican Governor.

And I'm reading his quotes where he talks about,

I think we've reached the threshold for pain for

additional cuts. I think -- and the Governor is at the

top of the list -- we've been exhausted by the cuts.

And, you know, Charles, good man. I mean, he was not a -- he was not a hair-on-fire liberal by any means. You know, some of his quotes are really illuminating. I think he said, we've faced these kinds of deficits each and every year in the Corbett Administration.

The reality is that the dynamic that the new Governor, meaning Governor Wolf, is going to be walking into is no different than the dynamic that has faced this Governor each and every year over the last four years.

He's talking about a structural deficit that continued unabated through the Corbett years. We're making cuts. But we were plugging holes with these fixes. We've got to get away from them.

You know, I know we have fiscal conservative

Republicans on this Committee who must realize that we
just got to deal with the day of reckoning and we've got
to align revenue and expenditure in a more honest way.

And I've got to say, you know -- and this isn't to give anybody a pass because Secretary Zogby goes down

and talks about the cost drivers. And he talks about the pension. And again, I realize it's heresy for Democrats sometimes to talk about pension. But the Governor, to his credit or detriment, put his neck out there on a pension bill.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: I don't know how we continue to belabor the point if we don't learn from the past a little bit to say we've got this \$2 billion structural deficit. A Republican Governor with a Republican House and Senate was unable to come up with cuts significant enough despite making unbelievably significant cuts to balance the budget.

What is the way forward? You said compromise. But what does that look like going forward?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: What it looks like, again, is to, you know, have to make the painful decisions to, you know, not grow, you know, most programs across the State budget in the current or next fiscal year.

It means prioritizing, in our view, education spending as the one exception to that to provide aid to local school districts because we believe if we don't provide that aid, then that's simply a license or necessitates even greater local property tax increases

that are simply passing the buck to a local level.

But it does mean enacting real and in a fair way, in a way that can be affordable to Pennsylvania's families, real recurring revenues, you know, appropriately cast to, you know, meet the State's funding responsibilities.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: Let me conclude with this one thought. One of my colleagues on the other side said that you want to, you know, raise revenue at the time you want to grow government. I think it's important, again, to try to be conciliatory but to be really honest about it. When some say grow government for the folks at home, they've got to understand we look at — we represent a lot of districts like Representative Schweyer talked about.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE BRADFORD: And when they're talking about growing government, you're talking about restoring teachers to school districts that were decimated over four years.

You know, I can show you the chart again and say, you know, we can relitigate stimulus money versus

State dollars and back and forth. But you only need to go to a PTA meeting in your home district or go to a

School Board meeting or talk to some moms and dads to

realize the cuts are real and they happen.

So when we get into that tea party rhetoric about growing government, I wish we would kind of step away from the brink a little bit and say, hey, this is about getting back to funding the schools.

Again, I don't want to sound partisan about it.

I just want to say we've just got to stop doing that.

It's absurd.

And, you know what, I'm going to conclude with this because, again, I started with Secretary Zogby. And again, I don't think I agreed with him on almost anything while he was here for four years. But when he left and the food fight had already started and this was in his final midterm budget analysis and, you know, the new Governor was coming in and the writing was on the wall, he says, Corbett's Budget Secretary told reporters, folks need to get out of campaign mode and into the governing mode and avoid taking the cheap shots.

Corbett and Zogby have talked about looming deficit since last summer when lawmakers tapped one-time revenue sources while finalizing the budget. He concluded lawmakers have hit a wall in terms of spending cuts, Zogby said, and a discussion of new revenue would be appropriate.

And then you look and to his credit he goes into, you can look at pension costs and selling liquor stores. And he mentions, you know, you can continue to taper the collars and such. But he said, folks are in for a reality check.

I think we may be 18 months late in getting to that reality check. But recognition of the size and scope of this structural deficit, the cuts that have already been made, the ability to have a conservative Republican with Republican-led Legislatures to do additional cuts and the recognition that these one-time cuts are costing us in terms of the rating agencies and the ability to function as a Commonwealth I think leads us to one simple conclusion. We've tried it all on one side of the balance sheet. And we've got to get honest with our people at home and to do what S&P said, which was show the political will to pass a balanced budget.

So I'm going to thank you, Secretary.

And I'm going to conclude by thanking Chairman

Adolph for his leadership of the Committee. And our

loss is Diamond Beach's gain, sir.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: That is correct.

Representative Seth Grove.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Chairman, thank you.

1 I just want to echo we appreciate your 2 leadership. You're a statesman. You're a gentleman. 3 The General Assembly will have a huge hole to fill in your absence. Best travels -- not for a little while. 4 5 Although I did hear that Joe Markosek is hiring a budget 6 I don't know what your retirement plans are but your expertise may be wanted over there. 7 8 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Well, next session 9 when I'm the Majority Chair. 10 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Oh. 11 Mr. Secretary, thanks for joining us. 12 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Good morning. 13 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: It's been a long day. Some humor is good. 14 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes. 15 afternoon, I should say. 16 17 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: First question, have the 18 PERC employees who were illegally transferred to the 19 Budget Office been transferred back to PERC to ensure 20 the independence of their pension analysis and Act 205 money can be distributed on time? 21 22 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The PERC employees 23 -- and thanks for the opportunity to clarify. People 24 misunderstood. You know, the Commission continues to exist. You know, we can't change that. You know, 25

whatever the future of PERC is is and can only be determined by the General Assembly statutorily.

The employees we continue to maintain currently in the short term on the Budget Office's payroll.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: But they continue to provide the functions that they had been providing. All responsibilities, particularly as they pertain to our municipal pension systems, continue to be carried out.

And that is our intention going forward.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. I'm glad for that clarification because obviously your budget book and your PR is we're eliminating PERC moving forward. So I'm glad to hear we're going to continue PERC operation. And I'm glad to hear that you're going to work with the General Assembly.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Because believe it or not, there are individuals in this institution that would see a change moving forward.

I believe Representative Kerry Benninghoff will be introducing a bill shortly to do some adjustments. Hopefully we can work on that moving forward.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We have had and had had, you know, prior to taking any action, conversations

with all four caucuses. We believe, again, the priority here is that we believe, as currently constituted, you know, PERC was carrying out what we believe to be redundant functions.

You know, it is part of efforts. And we've talked a lot this morning about trying to look across all programs, all operations of State Government and determine where future efficiencies, you know, better ways of doing things, better ways of delivering State services can save taxpayer money. This was clearly one of those cases.

But we look forward to a conversation with all four caucuses, all of the General Assembly stakeholders, if you will, to find a solution that we can all agree upon.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: I appreciate that.

I just read an article about defending right-to-know requests. Do you know how much we're spending on those?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I do not know off the top of my head.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right. If you get a chance, it would be nice to know at some point.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Let me simply say transparency, you know, it does come with a price tag.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Um-hmm.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: But, you know, we will comply, you know, for whatever information requests, you know, come our way in an appropriate fashion.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. Speaking of cost savings and finding efficiencies, you said earlier about GO-TIME total allocation of \$150 million. I greatly appreciate the detailed analysis each department has provided on all their analyses of where they're spending money, what they're doing, whether it will save future or current.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: My question specifically is within the Governor's budget book and in the documents I've seen, I have yet to see the subtracted amount anywhere in his books. And it should be as simple as savings. If I am buying a product for \$20 and I go to the cash register and it's a 50 percent off sale — and that's basically what savings are; I'm getting a discounted price somehow some way — I should be walking out with \$10.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: That's not driven out in any budget documents I have seen.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Could you provide specific line items of reductions for those so we can take a look at exactly where those savings are attached to those line items?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We have tried to provide, as you already have alluded to, very detailed GO-TIME updates from each agency. We are going to take the last step in that process now that it's been completed to compile all of that into a simple, you know, comprehensive document that we will provide to the committees.

You can assume in each case that if those expenditures -- or if those initiatives had not been done, then they would have required increased expenditures within our proposed budget to fund the necessary obligations of those departments.

Now, let me simply say that GO-TIME is an organic process. It continues to evolve every day. And so, you know, over the course of the coming months, all of those projections will continue to evolve and change. That's why we try to wait until the last moment possible to provide the most recent GO-TIME estimates.

Certainly, you know, what we do accomplish ultimately for this year and going forward, again, will

change but we'll try to continue to work with the
General Assembly to identify those changes over the
course of time.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: But there's definitely savings, correct, without a doubt?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The savings -REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: \$150 million savings,
correct?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The savings we believe are real and you can in every instance assume that if those savings are not realized, those are necessary additional expenditure increases that would have to be provided in our proposed spending plan.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Because your DGS

Secretary, Secretary Topper, just last evening told

me -- he was sitting right there and said, there aren't

actually any savings and we spent all the savings.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I'm not sure what the miscommunication might have been. I think what he was trying to explain is that — and he would probably be the biggest — or he would have the greatest concern about misunderstandings. In other words, when we talk about initiatives for strategic sourcing and savings and procurement, that doesn't mean that his \$100 million savings target if realized means that we reduce

expenditures in his DGS budget. Those procurement initiatives are spread throughout every -- or many, let me say, budgets.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: We went through that exercise yesterday. He used the example of we saved PennDOT \$10 million on a salt purchase. And I asked, well, what's that salt purchase attached to, maintenance? He said, oh, no, no, no. They spent it. The Department spent that \$10 million.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well --

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So literally the same example. And believe me, we painfully went through this exercise last night. And the conclusion was the savings do not exist and we spent the money.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, again, maybe what you're misunderstanding is that without that initiative, then the PennDOT budget would have to have been — to maintain that same level of service, the PennDOT budget would have had to have been increased by that amount of money or that service couldn't be provided.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Yeah. But they budgeted

X amount for salt supply. So if I'm spending \$20

million on salt supply, I saved \$10 million, there's \$10

million of savings.

1	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: But it's
2	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: It's \$30 million then if
3	I didn't get that \$10 million of savings. Savings are
4	savings.
5	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Savings are savings.
6	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Yes.
7	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: And again, the
8	expenditures of every agency, as we've talked about
9	throughout much of the conversation today, this is in
10	essence a cost to carry budget. If we didn't realize
11	those savings throughout all of
12	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: It's a cost to carry
13	budget? There's a lot of additional spending that your
14	Administration put in here.
15	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Throughout all
16	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Your initiatives, Mr.
17	Secretary. It's not cost to carry.
18	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Throughout all of
19	the agency budgets, if we didn't realize those savings
20	from those GO-TIME initiatives, then we would have to be
21	either asking one of two options: asking for increased
22	expenditures to support those obligations or making
23	further cuts in those programs that we are recommending
24	that we fund in our proposed budget.
25	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So you're saying the cost

2.4

savings are built in here but they're not reflected in here? Even before printing this, you know, the original press release from GO-TIME -- and I have it right here. Let me see if it has a date. Here is from 12/9/2015.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: As part of Governor

Wolf's GO-TIME Initiative, PennDOT is now relying on a

new monitoring system to check drivers license centers

and take immediate steps to provide improvements for

customers. These efforts are expected to generate up to

\$150 million in savings in the current fiscal year.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: When this budget book was printed, these cost savings should have been ingrained in this line by line. Why weren't they?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: GO-TIME is --

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: You know, your initial one was sent out February 26th, 2015. And you were talking about \$100 million improving procurement, \$3 million modernizing technology, \$6 million streamlining and consolidating administrative functions.

That was over a year ago and yet you have not produced any data whatsoever that verifies any of those savings.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: GO-TIME, as I had

alluded to previously, is an on-going organic process.

At the time that we did those final budget

recommendations for our proposed and final '15-'16 and
'16-'17 funding plans, those assumptions, to the best of
our ability, were built into the requested appropriation
amounts for all agencies.

We do, as I've alluded to earlier, always have a spring update process. I guarantee you that at the point of that May or June, depending on how soon that spring update plan is ready, we'll reflect further changes from other GO-TIME savings assumptions as well as how we reflect then that GO-TIME experience particularly in the '15-'16 Fiscal Year to fully fund whatever the State's obligations are for the current year.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Consolidation of HR services, \$1 million savings. You consolidate it.

There should be less staff. So that should have been reflected. That's not reflected anywhere.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I can't say it enough times. All of the assumed GO-TIME initiatives, to the best of our ability, when --

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Why assume them? Why not put it in there? Why not put the data in there? You have to account for it. It should be part of your

accounting process.

2.4

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I don't think we could have been more specific than the GO-TIME reports that were provided to you for each agency. Those are very detailed plans with very clear fiscal assumptions.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: And we've asked each
Secretary for the line item that they are directly
attached to. I asked the DGS Secretary what line items
these are directly attached to. I got no answer. The
answer I did get is the Secretary spent that money
forward.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The DGS Secretary -- REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Is he wrong?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The DGS Secretary can appropriately answer questions about the DGS budget. In fairness to the DGS Secretary, he can't answer questions about the detailed budget decisions that were made for every other department and how the procurement savings that were part of his strategic sourcing and GO-TIME savings to provide a more efficient, cost-effective way to procure services for the State are then reflected in that individual agency's budget.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: But they're not. They're not.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I can't answer the

1	question any other way than I've answered it multiple
2	times.
3	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So should the DGS
4	Secretary come back and renege his testimony that the
5	Administration spent all those dollars forward on other
6	areas?
7	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Again, to be fair to
8	the DGS Secretary, he was speaking to you about what he
9	does know about his own budget.
10	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: And he said
11	Transportation spent the money.
12	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: And in the case of
13	Transportation
14	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Is he wrong?
15	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: And in the case of
16	Transportation and any other State agency, he can
17	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So they could have?
18	Could they have spent the money forward?
19	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: And in the case of
20	Transportation and any other Department budget, if they
21	hadn't realized the savings from those procurement
22	initiatives, then they would have had to make one of two
23	choices. They would have had to increase other their
24	requested appropriation amounts.
25	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So they did save it And

1	then they put it in their budget to spend it in other
2	areas? That's why it's not a reflected negative.
3	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: They had to make
4	choices about how those savings were to be used.
5	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So they're not really
6	savings?
7	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Again
8	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: They were spent
9	elsewhere. You saved it here. And then you spent it
10	elsewhere so you wouldn't have to reduce that line item?
11	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Representative, Mr.
12	Secretary, I believe the question has been asked
13	numerous times. I don't believe the Secretary is going
14	to change his answer.
15	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: I know. I'm just trying
16	to find some money, Chairman.
17	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: We all are.
18	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Yeah.
19	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: We all are. I think
20	we know the answer.
21	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay.
22	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: And if you could,
23	you're up close to 14 minutes.
24	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Will do.
25	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: I certainly

appreciate you waiting as long as you have today. So

I'm giving a little leeway. You know, quick questions,
quick answers.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: When will Act 146 waivers be reconciled within your budget?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Our attempt to do that will be complete when we have a complete budget.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So are you going to be using Act 146 waivers to increase spending moving forward?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Our continued use of waivers is particularly important as we reconcile our agency budgets. As I had alluded to earlier, among the many inadequate aspects of the bill that did land on the Governor's desk, 1460, is that many agency operations are not fully funded for the full fiscal year where we had prior year appropriation authorizations. And waivers can help to mitigate those funding inadequacies.

We will continue to take advantage or use that opportunity. Our hope is and as soon as we get a final agreement in place, we will then reconcile all of those expenditures, appropriately apply them to the appropriate fiscal year and provide a full and transparent accounting to the General Assembly.

We did as part of the compromised budget

agreement believe that \$200 million in lapses of current year appropriations from that process would then be made available as part of the revenue to balance the '15-'16 budget. And we still hope at this point to meet that threshold in a final budget agreement.

2.4

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So when the

Transportation Secretary testified that her lapse

funding that she received, she reconciled it and she

spent it on transportation projects.

The Department of Health Secretary testified in front of us that she utilized her waivers for stacking and GGO line items. Her GGO line items have been approved by the Governor. She received them. There should be reconciliation. And the money she used for a GGO should be returned to the General Fund.

I would say that within your Act 146 waivers themselves, you approve new funding and new programs. It's listed all over there -- I'm cut off at this. I appreciate the Chairman for some flexibility. But I would I say there's a lot of room for a lot of money that is not being accounted for in this budget to defer raising taxes.

And I would also point to the \$500 million that the DHS Secretary is accounting for in Medicaid savings that again are not accounted for in this book.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

Representative Gary Day.

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: You said you'd be here until 2 o'clock. Does that mean I get 30 minutes, Mr. Chairman? He won't even answer that.

Mr. Secretary, thank you for being here today.

I have a couple comments. You know, recently I just received an e-mail today from a Democrat in my district.

I'm a Republican, if you don't know that from where I sit.

And, you know, one thing he asked me is, what are you doing? You know, yeah, yeah, yeah. We hear your points. We hear their talking points. What are you doing to move the process forward? So I'm going to eventually get to that.

Some of the things I want to say, the gentleman from York County, I think he touches on one of the cornerstones of the problems of the budget impasse. And that's that the Administration works to save money. And I know. I did this. The way I got my bureau managers to cut and save money when we worked in the city of Allentown was I said, whatever you save, you get to keep. I'm not going to take it back. Just work on finding efficiencies. And then you'll get to spend it

on the next service that you want your bureau to be doing.

And then what turned out was if they saved 10 percent, they actually did give back 2 or 3 percent, which we didn't anticipate. So I understand what you're doing. When you save the money, you want to keep it. You don't want to come back to the Legislature. You don't want to ask for re-approval of that saved dollars. You want to keep it and spend that.

But the point that my colleague from York makes is that we build the budget. And we're trying to be transparent with the people on both sides of the impasse. We build a budget based on if there was a \$100 million here and you save 10 percent, then why are we starting with \$100 million in that line item for next year? That's one point of it. That savings went and was spent somewhere else. Let's say why that was spent. Let's reallocate that.

So I think it's very valuable that I get up and just underline. I wouldn't even bold and italicize.

I'll just put one little mark on it that underlines what he's saying is very valuable to the Republican Caucus in getting through this budget impasse.

The gentlelady from Bucks asked for data, went to the, you know, different folks in the Administration.

I'm going to touch just very lightly on this. That's something that's very important to us as well.

Let the data go. You don't need to keep it, scrub it, and then present it to us. Let us both mind the data. Let us both make our opinions on the data and then convince us why your perspective of the data is better.

So I want to -- my colleagues are very passionate about this and should be and really should spend twice as much time as they did.

To my comments, it's been said that there's a \$300 million shortfall. The Governor vetoed 6 billion. You very eloquently answered many different versions of questions about that and the rationale. I appreciate those answers.

But if we knock off the zeros, it's like the Legislature gave \$3,030 and your team said, hey, we're \$30 short on it being balanced so we vetoed 20 times that. Then someone probably said to the Governor, hey, listen. Let's use some basic psychological ploys.

Number 1, when we started last year this time, offer a spending plan that's 4 billion. We put it before the House. Not a single vote. And then offer 4 billion so that we compromise to where we want to be at 2 billion or 1.8 or somewhere like that. That's a

rudimentary psychological ploy.

Number 2, veto things that we know Republicans want to fund. So maybe we can show some hypocrisy or something like that, agriculture, hospital burn centers, even education.

Number 3, stretch negotiations out. Wear them down. Governor Rendell tried this in 2009. You were in the building. You saw that. That was my first year in the Legislature. And he quickly tacked away and said, hey, this isn't working. I'm urging you to do the same thing and advise that to the Administration.

What if we go away from these things? Who's right? Who's going to win? I think the people are right. And I really believe that, you know, you have the skills, my Democratic colleagues have the skills, and my Republican colleagues have the skills to give persuasive speeches on why we should go a certain direction.

It's our job to convince them that we think we can do better with their money than they are. So here's what I propose for the negotiation going forward. Let's make our best case and then let the people decide.

Let's be as transparent as possible. That's why I underlined those two things that I talked about at the beginning just as examples. And let's let the people

decide which way we're going to go.

They'll call us. They'll let us know. Let's make a decision that we are going to agree on something. I'm going to compromise on something today. We're going to agree to do whatever we're going to do by a certain date.

When you hear us use one of our great lines that we like to say -- and we all -- the Republicans in the House like to say on-time budget. We've all defined what that means. But in this process if we all agree on a date, let's say June 15th, doesn't have to be the 30th, maybe two weeks early, now that puts the burden a little more on people who want to raise taxes and propose new ideas. But we've been proposing those for the last year. So I recognize -- and we would recognize -- that that puts a little bit more burden on the Governor. But if you're really frustrated, let's agree on a date. It's our job to get something done.

So I'm trying to figure out when I was in the private sector, when I was in local government, what did we do? There's structures in place that people have been at impasses for years. Let's employ those. One of those is decide on a date and time. The people will agree. You know, they'll be paying attention in June. They'll get engaged. They'll respond. And we'll pass a

budget.

And again, Gary, what if the people are wrong?

Well, Mr. Secretary, you know -- and it's been going on
a little bit -- if the Governor and your team and other
people who want to go along his path are not successful
with that and he doesn't get his -- you know, it was a
large -- I'm cutting down some of the words. I'm not
going to say billions of dollars in new taxes. I'm not
going to say that. I'm going to say if he doesn't get
the direction that he's going in.

I don't recommend it. But the Executive has the authority to guide or not guide monies. And as a matter of fact, you're kind of doing that now. And to some of my Democratic colleagues in Reading, Allentown, Harrisburg, I don't know why they're not beside themselves on some of those decisions right now.

I'm not going to talk about going off onto that.

I'm going to stay on point about on-time budget. Will you commit the Governor and your negotiating team to compromise right here and right now or immediately following this hearing? I really think you have the authority to compromise right here and say, we'll agree to on-time budget, which I think should include a series of dates to me leading up to that on-time date set.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Here's what I'll

commit to. And I'll do it here in a public setting, much like, you know, I allude, if you likely remember, to a private conversation late one night we had in the basement of the parking garage many months ago, probably about 9 or 9:30 at night when we were both here working overtime, so to speak.

As the Governor says, and as I've repeated many times today, compromise is hard. You know, we have to be good listeners. We have to figure out how we find common ground.

We are committed to -- and I will publicly commit today that we would like to, not in a matter of months but in a matter of weeks, bring final closure to this year's budget.

Part of that is, you know, making difficult decisions, finding where we couldn't find closure in all of the work done on that compromised budget agreement that eluded us just before Christmas, that we do find and close the gap and finish the unfinished work for '15-'16.

And then it is certainly our hope that part of that conversation can actually provide -- and I'm reluctant to use framework because it wasn't a successful word as applied to that compromised budget agreement, but to even possibly agree to some aspects of

what's necessary to find common ground to reach a timely '16-'17 budget.

You know, I think, again, all of the work that's been done, you know, since we started this process last year, from the time, let's say, that I testified before you at last year's hearing, we have made significant steps to understand all sides of this argument. We have taken and made significant progress to understand everybody's perspectives.

Our commitment, my public commitment to everyone here, to you, is that we will take what we've learned to see if we can enact in a meaningful compromised fashion a budget that we can all say is doing the right thing for the Commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: I appreciate that. You know, I talked with my daughter at Penn State in her second year and has all these different courses. And we talked if this was about sticking to, you know, saying the word compromise, saying the word we'll launch from the, you know, framework that never really got enough materialization, you would get an A for, you know, staying on message.

But what I was trying to do with this question was try to break a little bit from this back and forth, this tennis match that the people get to view, trying to

say that one of the things that you put in place in an impasse is a date set in the future. I think that's a no that you can't compromise.

2.4

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Representative, I think the rating agencies have set that deadline for us. I think they've clearly said that you can't continue to budget the way you've been doing it.

Over the course of more than a decade that the irresponsible budget decisions that we continue to make have resulted in -- up to this point over the course of the last five years, five downgrades in our bond rating in 2014, all three rating agencies lowering our bond rating.

And S&P has said unmistakably in the clearest terms possible, if you don't, over the course of the next 90 days, find the common agreement, find the compromise necessary to enact a balanced budget, whether that means expenditure cuts or whether that means revenue, recurring revenue increases, that we're going to face yet more downgrades and more negative consequences.

So I think the rating agencies or at least in the case of Standard & Poor, they've already set that deadline for us.

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: So in that classroom idea,

you know, you pass the first test, the second test, and the third test. You got an A, 100 on each one of them, for going back to the talking points of what you came here to do. It's a theme throughout your every answer and I appreciate that.

I want to actually tip my cap. But I do have to say that I need the Governor to know that it's these people who continue to say the same things over and over again that I think contribute to the budget impasse rather than move us past it. This is a very tough situation to be in.

Somebody has to start. There's many people on both sides of the aisle that are standing up and starting to say, we need to go in a different direction. We need to go a different way. And we need to employ some of these things that work. I've seen them work. And the only reason we don't want them to work is because we want to control the outcome.

I'm willing to trust the people, let the people tell me what to do. Our system puts great burden on all elected officials who want to take more and increase programs to justify them to the people that they represent. That's the very foundation. I was criticized for giving a civics lesson. But I think it's very pertinent in this impasse that there's particular

roles. Our role is to put a bag of money over there with line items in them. And the Governor's role is to execute those things.

The Governor and your team are trying to change what the Legislature's role is through many different ways. And I need to push back against that.

If a supplemental appropriation was sent to the Governor, will the Governor compromise and sign a bill to release funds for 4-H and Penn State extension?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: The Governor will engage in, as he has, as the compromised budget agreement represented, whatever meaningful compromise is necessary to enact an appropriate final spending plan for the current fiscal year.

He is not going to choose one appropriation over another. He is not going to pit 4-H programs, for example, against the needs of students in classrooms and struggling school districts throughout the State.

That's not a winning formula.

What we need to do is appropriately fund and address all of the State spending needs and not place value judgments to create or assume that one is more important than the other.

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: So if I would ask you if a supplemental appropriation came on the Governor's desk

for higher education, the State System of Higher

Education -- I'm the Caucus Chair; I have to ask you
that question as well because there's many members on
both sides of the aisle that is interested in that
issue -- would your answer be similar?

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: My answer is going to be that we want a final budget that addresses all of the State funding needs. We're not going to pick favorites. We're not going to prioritize one of those needs over the needs of others. All of those things are important. And we want a final budget as soon as possible that appropriately and adequately addresses those needs.

REPRESENTATIVE DAY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your time.

And, Mr. Secretary, I wish you the best going forward. I pledge to continue to listen and consider all issues that are before the Legislature and anything to do with this budget. I wish everybody the best going forward.

And I think setting a date and time is an important thing to do. I would appreciate it if you would take that back to your team.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,

1 Representative. 2 Representative Kampf, you have a request. 3 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Mr. Chairman, my 4 colleague, Representative Stevenson, had a series of 5 questions on social impact, financing Pay for Success 6 and some of the safeguards that might be put on that. 7 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Sure. REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: So could I submit those 8 9 to you, Mr. Secretary? BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: 10 11 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 12 BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: And since you brought it up, let me acknowledge his efforts. 13 whole process really was something that he had taken the 14 15 initiative on before we even took office. It was, you know, largely his actions that enabled us to have a 16 17 Harvard fellow who has been working with us over the 18 course of the last year to put those savings initiatives 19 in place. 20 And so we certainly want to in this forum 21 recognize publicly his efforts in that regard and happy 22 to provide those detailed answers. 23 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. 24 Mr. Secretary, thank you so much for taking the

time to be with us today. We appreciate your

25

information. We understand that you're heading to

Pittsburgh later on today. I hope you have a safe trip.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Just on a personal note, I want to thank members of this Appropriations

Committee for working with us over the last three weeks.

We will have to get together and see if we can get this over the finish line.

I think the distribution of basic education funding is very important to a lot of us. I think that's an issue that is going to be talked about in the next couple weeks. I hope this comes to an end real soon.

BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, if I
may, let me certainly echo -- Chairman Markosek began
the day certainly, you know, giving the very appropriate
recognition to you for all of your years of service.

I spent much more of my personal time serving, as Dave and Miriam are, over in the Senate as a Budget Analyst for the Senate Democratic Appropriations

Committee but have worked with you for many years. It's been an absolute pleasure to serve with you. And I certainly thank you for that service and wish you the best.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.

2.4

1	For the members' information, the Committee will
2	reconvene at 2 o'clock for members' statements.
3	Thank you.
4	BUDGET SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you.
5	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	I hereby certify that the proceedings and
2	evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes
3	taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a
4	correct transcript of the same.
5	
6	
7	
8	Toon M. Donie
9	Jean M. Davis Notary Public
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

-197 **-**