COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARING

STATE CAPITOL
MAIN BUILDING
ROOM 140
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2016

PRESENTATION FROM MEMBERS

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 HONORABLE MARY JO DALEY
4	HONORABLE MARI JO DALLI HONORABLE MADELEINE DEAN
5	HONORABLE MARIA DONATUCCI HONORABLE STEPHEN KINSEY
	HONORABLE MICHAEL H. O'BRIEN
6	HONORABLE MARK ROZZI HONORABLE KEVIN SCHREIBER
7	HONORABLE PETER SCHWEYER
8	ALGO IN AMMENDANCE.
9	ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
10	DAVID DONLEY, REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RITCHIE LaFAVER, REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CURT SCHRODER, REPUBLICAN CHIEF COUNSEL
11	MIRIAM FOX, DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
12	TARA TREES, DEMOCRATIC CHIEF COUNSEL HONORABLE VANESSA LOWERY BROWN HONORABLE BRYAN CUTLER
13	HONORABLE BRIAN CUILER HONORABLE PAM DELISSIO
14	HONORABLE CRIS DUSH HONORABLE THOMAS P. MURT
	HONORABLE DAVID PARKER
15	HONORABLE SCOTT PETRI
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER NOTARY PUBLIC
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX	
2	TESTIFIERS	
3	NAME	PAGE
4	HONORABLE THOMAS P. MURT	4
5	HONORABLE PAM DeLISSIO	11
6 7	HONORABLE BRYAN CUTLER	16
	HONORABLE CRIS DUSH	21
8 9	HONORABLE VANESSA LOWERY BROWN	26
10	HONORABLE DAVID PARKER	35
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

		_								
P	ъ	\sim	\sim	177	177	_	-	n.T	\sim	C
_	ĸ			м.	m.			IVI		

2

1

3

5

4

6

7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

24

23

25

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Good afternoon,

everyone.

I'd like to reconvene the House Appropriations This segment of the budget hearings is an opportunity for the members of the General Assembly to come before the Appropriations Committee, make suggestions, make comments, make requests, what should be included in the budget, what should not be included in the budget, etc., etc. Chairman Markosek and I over the years have found this information to be very valuable.

With us today to start out the members' statements is Representative Tom Murt. Representative Tom Murt is from Montgomery County, also represents sections of Philadelphia. His District is the 152nd.

Representative Murt, nice to see you.

REPRESENTATIVE MURT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Adolph, Chairman Markosek, members of the Appropriations Committee, and fellow members in attendance, thank you for providing members the opportunity to come before the Committee and offer testimony.

It's no secret that I am an advocate for

intellectual disability and autism services among other causes. I come before you today to testify on the grave concern I have for the current well-being and outlook of the intellectual disability and autism service system and those served within it. I have no doubts that this system is now in crisis.

Pennsylvania's intellectual disability and autism services system was first established by an act of the General Assembly in 1966 and signed into law by Governor Leader. At that time, it was a national model for transitioning individuals with disabilities from institutional settings to community supports and services.

When this law was enacted, 13,500 individuals lived in nine different institutions across Pennsylvania and tens of thousands more went unserved in our communities. The system has come a long way since then. Today less than 1,000 individuals are living in five remaining institutions and there are more than 50,000 individuals being served by private-sector community organizations.

Over the past eight years or so, the tremendous progress we have made has been threatened due to our collective neglect of the community-based service model over the institutional model. I believe this has

1 occu
2 Gene
3 year
4 inte
5 not
6 bein

occurred through an honest misunderstanding by this

General Assembly. We have appropriated more money each
year believing we are addressing urgent needs but the
intellectual disability and autism services system has
not seen a true rate increase for the services currently
being provided to 50,000 individuals since 2007 and
2008.

Just to give you a benchmark, Mr. Chairman, of the population about which we're talking, we're talking about individuals who are adults with special needs, intellectual disabilities in autism, many of whom are 60, 65 years old and many of them who live with their parents. And their parents might be 80 or 90 years old.

That is not uncommon to have two parents living together, 90 years old, caring for a son or daughter that's 60 or 65 and they're on that waiting list for services. So that kind of gives you an idea of the population we're talking about.

The last time this system had a rate increase, George W. Bush was still our President and President Obama was just beginning his run for President.

Meanwhile, operating costs for health care, other insurances, facilities and homes, services, and other products have continued to climb.

The home health market basket index, the most

closely linked inflationary index for these services, has risen 18 percent over this time and the General Fund has grown nearly 19 percent over this time, but there has been no recognition of this in the intellectual disability and autism services rate settings.

2.4

To further compound this underfunding of this system, midyear rate cuts were imposed in 2011 and 2012 through a negative rate adjustment, which took out over \$100 million that has never been recovered and is hurting the system today.

This is not the only component in the intellectual disability and autism services crisis. The other aspect of the intellectual disability and autism services crisis is a workforce crisis. This workforce crisis should alarm us all.

Right now, PAR, the largest state association of intellectual disability and autism service providers, estimates that there are in excess of 3,500 vacant positions in the intellectual disability and autism services workforce. That means that more than 10 percent of the positions for direct support professionals who are required to provide services to individuals with intellectual disabilities or autism are vacant.

These are the caregivers that work in group

homes caring for adults with special needs. This situation actually increases costs through the payment of overtime and temporary staffing arrangements because these staffing levels must be maintained to comply with State regulations.

The workforce crisis is almost solely caused by the lack of competitive wages being paid to these employees which result in rapid turnover of staff as they seek better wages. In most cases, these direct support professionals have starting wages below that of gas station, fast food, or department store workers and they provide much more critical services.

Without competitive wages, the workforce is never stable and staff turnover breaks critical relationship bonds between these employees and the individuals whom they serve, which is especially difficult for the thousands of individuals with intellectual disabilities or autism who have difficulty communicating.

You can understand and empathize with the families when there's a new caregiver every week in some of these group homes.

The wages aren't competitive because our General Assembly hasn't provided for any growth in rates for the intellectual disability and autism services system in

eight years.

I do want to say, Mr. Chairman -- and I want to thank you and your Committee and Chairman Markosek, because even in the last six to eight years when we were facing some very austere financial times in this Commonwealth, you found a way to make sure that this line item was never cut significantly. I don't think it was ever cut, to be very honest with you.

And you were always very receptive to our request on that area.

For people with intellectual disabilities or autism, any quality of life depends on the competency and stability of the workforce. Our collective lack of attention to increased funding of this system and for the workforce is an injustice to those who are being served and inhibits further our ability to provide services for those on the waiting list, the citizens in our community who need support the most.

It is with these thoughts and critical points in mind that I come before you humbly and ask you to provide for a 4.7 rate increase for the intellectual disability and autism services system in the 2016-2017 budget. Providing services to these individuals is truly a core function of government and manifest compassion.

-9

For 50 years, Pennsylvania has provided these
services in the most cost-effective manner and in the
best manner of care for consumers by providing the
services through private providers throughout all of our
communities. This is Pennsylvania's longest running and
most successful public-private partnership.

Funding is entirely government's responsibility, as there is no private insurance funding, and private fundraising is minimal in comparison to the overall funding in the system. We must tend to this system so that it can thrive once again.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I respectfully, but strongly, implore you to begin to address these issues and rebuild the capacity of this system by providing for this necessary rate increase for intellectual disability and autism services in the 2016-2017 budget.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Chairman Markosek.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
Representative. And thank you for your advocacy.

Our next member will be Representative Pam

DeLissio. Pam represents sections of Philadelphia,

Montgomery County. And her District is 194.

Good afternoon, Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE DeLISSIO: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

My remarks today address the 2015-2016 budget in addition to the 2016-2017 budget. My comments do not focus on any line items in particular. My remarks focus on process. I discuss process at all of my Town Halls, 54 of them to date in the past 64 months that I've been in office, because as I explain to constituents, you can have the best legislative proposals in the world, but if you cannot negotiate the process, it does not matter.

And frankly, in my five-plus years in office, I have witnessed politics trumping policy with the greater good of our citizens an afterthought, if that. So not only are we dealing with the budget proposal, we are dealing with politics and process, some would say all tools of our trade.

There seems to be agreement that we are in unchartered waters. Uncharted waters sound exciting and adventurous. I like adventure and excitement in my life. However, a budget, whether State, Local, or Federal, should not be the source for adventure in the lives of our citizens.

Thank you to all of my colleagues for their collective efforts to date to negotiate a budget in good faith. We have all expended a great deal of time and

energy.

1.3

In November of 2015, I wrote to the Governor and to the House leaders asking them to consider mediation.

In early December, I shared that correspondence and my call for mediation with all of my colleagues in the House.

I had thoughtful and considerate conversations with both Governor Wolf and Leader Reed about utilizing this method to reach a budget resolution.

I offered the concept of mediation both then and now because in my career experience, when a negotiation has extended for this period of time and experienced the ups and downs and twists and turns that have happened over the past eight months and continued today, it is time to take a different approach. In fact, in my opinion, it is well past time.

And most unfortunately, it appears to me that the 2016-2017 discussions will be a rinse and repeat of the past eight months.

The Wikipedia website defines mediation as follows: mediation is the attempt to help parties in a disagreement to hear one another, to minimize the harm that can come from disagreement, to maximize any area of agreement, and to find a way of preventing the areas of disagreement from interfering with the process of

seeking a compromise or mutually agreed outcome.

In the 194th, constituents continue to urge me to find that necessary compromise that will address the structural deficit and fairly and predictably fund public basic education and our critical human services programs.

As a rank and file member of the House, I have had discussions with leadership on both sides of the aisle, have talked to colleagues, some of whom I have gotten to know even better in the Majority Party, and convened with my gal pals, including gal pals from the Majority Party, on many mornings from the end of October through December as we tried our best to foster the relationships that would permit dialogue that would hopefully lead to a budget resolution.

And as I testify today, March 10th, it is clear that we have not yet succeeded.

Mediation is not the admission of weakness or deficiency. It is the recognition that we are in a situation that is unique and without precedent.

Regardless of how we got here, it is imperative that we find the path forward.

The Pennsylvania Council of Mediators is one resource for identifying and helping members to understand the benefits of mediation in this particular

instance.

As a result of legislation passed in the early 1990s, mediators have a confidentiality privilege comparable to that enjoyed by social workers, clergy, and psychiatrists. This was an important step in protecting a cornerstone of the mediation process. Confidentiality permits the participants in the negotiation to be honest about their concerns, their frustrations, and ultimately what they are willing to do to reach consensus.

Chairman Adolph and Markosek, I am calling for mediation because over the past eight months of the 2015-2016 budget negotiations and since the Governor's budget address presenting the 2016-2017 budget program, I am concerned that things have been said that cannot be unsaid.

In fact, my concern goes back to the evening of June 30th when the Governor vetoed the budget bill and when the Majority Party held a press conference. By nature, I'm an optimist, a glass-half-full kind of person. However, everything I heard that night gave me great pause for concern.

As a result of the remarks made that evening by both the Governor and the Majority Party, I held a press conference on July 10th with 11 human services agencies

that serve the 194th to talk about the impact that a protracted negotiation would create. Also discussed was the need for predictable and sustainable funding, as these programs support our most vulnerable citizens and the reduction of funding to these agencies has been well documented.

On August 4th, I held a press conference with students representing many of the public schools in the 194th. The students, ranging in age from 11 through 18, were articulate and thoughtful in their remarks regarding the need for equitable and fair funding and what impact a protracted budget negotiation would have on their education.

Sadly, these press conferences were prescient as here we are on March 10th with the 2015-2016 School Tax and Fiscal Code Bills yet to be passed by both chambers and my strong concern after hearing some of the testimony over the past three weeks that next year's proposed budget will follow a similar process.

Thank you for your strong consideration of my suggestion for mediation. It is past time to approach these negotiations differently.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you very much, Representative, for your suggestions regarding this budget impasse.

The next member will be Representative Bryan Cutler from Lancaster County.

REPRESENTATIVE CUTLER: Good afternoon.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you,
Representative DeLissio, for your comments. It's always
been a pleasure working with you on some of the issues
that we've been successful on. And I think that is a
good model as to how we should approach things.

Chairman Markosek, Chairman Adolph, I want to thank both of you for the opportunity to come before you.

And as is my custom, I want to come and talk about the ALS line item as well as many of the other disease-specific and healthcare-related line items because of the importance that they have in the budget.

For those of you who may not know, I do believe that we need to do things differently here in State Government and specifically with how we take care of our long-term and terminally ill individuals.

And when you look at how we need to approach that, I would simply offer that all too often, State Government wants to rush and say we simply need more money to fix a problem, when in actuality I think that there are some uniquely different ways that we can approach things.

And I would offer that many of these line items in the budget help to do that. And that's why I've historically supported these line items.

On a personal level, obviously, ALS or Lou

Gehrig's Disease, is a very important issue for me. As

you know, both of my parents did have that disease. So

I saw firsthand the impacts that that had in terms of

long-term care, disruption to home life, and the impact

on social services and myself and my sister when we were

younger.

The good news is we had a strong network of friends, family, neighbors, our church, and our community that were able to help us. And we have always been eternally grateful for that. And that is truthfully one of the reasons why I ran for public office, was an opportunity to say thank you to my friends and neighbors who helped us.

And when you look at the budget, these costs will continue to climb specific to Lou Gehrig's Disease. We have consistently provided the highest number of National Guard troops in the war on terror. And our military veterans are twice as likely to come down with Lou Gehrig's Disease.

For those of you unfamiliar with the disease, it's a debilitating disease that has no known cause, no

known cure. And treatment is only successful at lengthening life, not reversing the disease.

The good news is there's been an abundant amount of research in this particular area because of most notably the Ice Bucket Challenge recently. But the fact remains that historically and then prospectively looking forward, we will have a very large patient population most likely directly linked to our veterans' population for individuals who have a high likelihood of coming down with this disease.

When you look at the health care line items that are in the budget, I would offer that it's a different approach on how to spend our State money. We can choose to allow these individuals to end up in nursing home facilities or on Medicaid. That could cost the taxpayers as much as \$91,954 per person per year.

And yet with a minimal investment of State dollars and a variety of unique programs — and I give the Governor credit in his approach to long-term care specifically. He's obviously looking for a different way to do this. And I would offer that these line items are a supplement to that.

But we need to restore the cuts through his veto from last year as well as look at it prospectively going forward into the next budget year because on average, it

only costs \$470.95 per person to provide equipment for home modifications or other items that allow individuals to be cared for in place, in their homes, by their family, or by, you know, workers who come into the home for short periods of times.

I would offer that all of these not only are a better approach in terms of outcomes but also for us as policymakers as we look where to spend our scarce resources and financial resources that we have, which are ultimately always the taxpayers.

We need to be good stewards of those dollars.

And these programs give us that opportunity.

To broaden out to many of the research lines — and you all have been very supportive of not just the ALS line item — and I thank you for that. But, you know, there's the Lupus and the biotech and the research and the cancer research line items, all of which play similar roles.

But in addition to that, we have the critical access hospital line items, the trauma center line items, and the burn center line items. These are line items in the budget that in terms of whole dollars don't represent a very large percentage. But they do represent a very large impact to those individuals who need those services at that time.

So I would encourage us collectively to continue
to look at these line items as we move forward and have
budget discussions. I believe that it is truly a more
effective way to better utilize and more efficiently
tilize the tax dollars that we've been entrusted with.

So to the extent that the support has been there previously, I thank you. And I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to share that.

As always, I'll make myself available for questions about any of the line items. You know, obviously, this is the one that I am most intimately involved with given my family history. But I think they are all equally important and should be revisited very soon.

Thank you for your time, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
Representative, for your leadership and advocacy on
these issues. We're looking forward to working with
you.

REPRESENTATIVE CUTLER: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: The next member of the General Assembly is Representative Chris Dush.

Representative Dush represents the counties of Jefferson and Indiana, I believe. And his District is 66.

Good afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE DUSH: Good afternoon.

1.3

2.0

Thank you, Chairmen, both Chairman Adolph and Chairman Markosek. Also thank you to the members of the Appropriations Committee and the Appropriations

Committee staff.

You've all worked long hours over the past year and been diligent to produce the information that's been asked of you in order to help us make decisions that affect the lives and livelihoods of every Pennsylvanian.

I want both members and staff to know that I truly do appreciate the work that has been done because I know that what is to follow could be misinterpreted and taken as a personal attack rather than a wake-up call for all of us.

During the investigation conducted by

Representative Grove and me, it has become obvious that

the Executive Branch has the ability to maneuver funds

through a number of accounts and make it virtually

impossible for anyone without the skills and training of

a forensic accountant to decipher.

As the impasse went on, I was trying to find out where the money the Governor was spending was coming from. Again and again I heard the term ledger five.

When I inquired as to where this ledger was and who controlled the money, I was told to think slush fund.

Okay. But who has it? Where did the money come from and how much is in it? No one seemed to know.

2.0

After months of asking, Treasury tells us in a meeting with Senators and the Auditor General that it is not a fund but it is a list of rules on how to raid funds for money during an impasse.

It was the first time most of us in the room either learned of its existence or became aware that it is not actually a ledger of credits and debits as one would normally consider to an account but rather an operating manual for raiding funds.

It has become painfully obvious to me that there is a lot that this body does not know. For the sake of the people we serve, we need to know. For the sake of our constituents, we need to be seeking the facts in order to gain understanding.

Again, my comments are not meant to degrade anyone. The Legislature has been relying on prior practices of simply trusting the Executive Branch to provide complete and accurate information for years.

This goes across party lines. It doesn't matter who's been in power in the Executive, but it is a practice that we've come to accept. But the events of the past year have proven that we need to make some changes.

I do not know the resumes of everyone on the team; but to the degree I have been able to detect to date, this body does not possess the ability to conduct a complete and accurate accounting of income and expenditures to the level of a trained forensic accounting team.

2.0

Total revenues, State, and Federal for the

Commonwealth puts us on par with Fortune 25 Company

Marathon Petroleum at \$91.4 billion. Shareholders of

Marathon would consider it a complete abrogation of the

corporate Board's responsibilities not to have qualified

accountants reporting directly to the Board and

accountable to it nor providing accurate data on where

the money is going.

They would demand as well the ability of the Board members to quickly gain access to information as to the purpose of both expenditures and the shifting of funds from one account to another. So far we have not been able to get that information.

Corporate Boards, either on their own or at the direction of a majority of their shareholders, will hire an outside team of forensic accountants to conduct a complete review looking for fraud, waste, abuse, or misuse of corporate assets when there appears to be a breakdown in accounting and reporting methods such as

we've seen over the past year.

Although we have a team of accountants managing the over 150 accounts the Commonwealth maintains, I have serious questions as to whether their responsibilities individually include more than a couple of funds or to monitor how those funds are shifted from one account to another under the nebulous ledger five rules and to what purpose.

I've been told that within the past ten years a commission or other body has recommended a forensic accounting review of the State's spending. It is further my understanding that such a review was never accomplished.

Last year I observed the budget hearings via PCN and was dismayed at what I observed that seemed to be merely a scratching at the veneer of the Executive Branch's reporting of its spending.

This year I've attended as many as possible. While I've seen increased probing this year of the particulars, these hearings lack the definitive resources for in-depth review of expenditures of our citizens' money.

Because of these issues and those that were brought to light during the course of the investigative work Representative Grove and I conducted, as well as

the Senate Joint Appropriations and Finance Committee hearing the day preceding the Governor's budget address, I respectfully call on the leadership of the House to initiate a forensic accounting of the Commonwealth's spending for the past 32 months from the beginning of the 2014-2015 budget.

My recommendation as to who should be hired is only that it be a firm with a reputation for rooting out fraud, waste, abuse, and misdirection of funds in corporations within the Fortune 100 Level. Publix Supermarket chain is at the 101 Level and has revenues similar to the Commonwealth's State revenues at just over \$30 billion.

Our shareholders, the citizens of the Commonweal or Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, deserve to know the money that is taken from them is being spent wisely and that the people they hire are obtaining complete and accurate information in order to make wise decisions.

I thank the committee for its time, its efforts. And again, like I said, this has not been a criticism of the team, because we have been relying for many years on a method of just accepting what the Executive Branch does. It wouldn't be accepted in corporate America. It shouldn't be accepted as our corporate responsibilities within the House.

1 Thank you again. 2 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you, 3 Representative. I'm not going to comment on it. But I certainly will take your statements and we'll look into 4 5 it. 6 REPRESENTATIVE DUSH: Thank you very much. 7 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you. The next member of the General Assembly is 8 9 Representative Vanessa Lowery Brown. Good afternoon. 10 11 REPRESENTATIVE LOWERY BROWN: Good afternoon. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: I'd like to welcome 12 13 Representative Brown who represents the residents of 14 Philadelphia in the 190th Legislative District. REPRESENTATIVE LOWERY BROWN: Thank you so much. 15 And I appreciate the time of the Committee to 16 17 let me be selfish in my indulgence today. 18 As the Chairwoman of the Pennsylvania Legislative Black Caucus, I would like to take an 19 20 opportunity to bring several specific line items of the 21 Governor's proposed 2016-2017 Budget to the Committee's 22 attention. 23 The first proposed line item of importance to me 24 is Line Item No. 13, which involves the Pennsylvania 25 Human Relations Commission. Specifically, the

Governor's proposed budget seeks to allocate a total amount of \$10,148,000, which represents an increase this year of \$498,000.

As an entity that has been created to serve as our Commonwealth's foremost agency for rooting out racism and discrimination within the workplace and in our academic institutions, a priority definitely needs to be given to the agency, as over the course of the last five budgetary cycles, the Human Relations

Commission has either seen its funding cut or has been flat funded.

It is worth noting that the Commission has experienced these longstanding funding woes despite a spike in the overall number of cases brought before the Commission over this same time period.

As Chairwoman of the Pennsylvania Legislative Black Caucus, I and my staff have witnessed firsthand the large volume of allegedly aggrieved employees that contact our office only to be subsequently redirected back to the Human Relations Commission for redress.

In summary, this is an agency whose existence is not only absolutely necessary, but an agency of which we can rest assured in the fact that our investment in it directly contributes to the overall betterment of our Commonwealth.

And I just want to say we've been working with the Commission staff. And they have exemplary staff that are committed to making sure that the claims that people are filing on racism and discrimination are thoroughly investigated and if they find that it is founded that they helped these people get resolution.

They are doing it under distress because they don't have enough staff to do so. And that's why I'm here today, to ask that you please consider that line item in making sure that it stays where it is today.

The second proposed line item of significance to me is Line Item No. 28, which involves the Pennsylvania Board of Pardons. Specifically, the Governor's proposed budget seeks to allocate a total amount of \$668,000, which represents an increase of only \$25,000.

As the members of this Committee are probably well aware, the clemency process is currently the only form of legal recourse in Pennsylvania for an individual convicted of certain misdemeanors or any felony that seek to officially put their past indirection behind them.

At this writing, the Board of Pardons has a backlog of nearly 1,000 clemency applications that need to be reviewed and processed. However, in order for the clemency process to be a viable one, the Board has to

have the resources necessary to execute its administrative duties. It is my belief that the proposed increase of \$25,000 would go a long way towards enabling the Agency to function in a fair and efficient manner.

2.0

This year, we were successful as a legislative body in expanding the scope of expungement rights for all citizens. And I want to congratulate all of our members for doing that.

One way that we can continue to ride this momentum of providing a pathway towards redemption for our returning citizens is by making Pennsylvania's clemency process more efficient. Therefore, I would like to request that the Governor's proposed 2016-2017 line item for the Board of Pardons be preserved.

The third set of proposed line items I would like to highlight my support for are Line Items 142, 143, and 144. These line items involve basic education funding, Pre-K Counts, and Head Start Supplemental Assistance.

While I can certainly eloquently state the general merits of increasing education funding in our Commonwealth, I instead would like to take this opportunity to cite a recent article by our current Secretary of the Department of Corrections, Mr. John

Wetzel.

Specifically, Secretary Wetzel has highlighted on numerous occasions the link that exists between education and incarceration and our need to make an investment in our children to prevent them from entering into the criminal justice system.

I know this personally because my District is the 190th District. It resides in west and north Philadelphia. When I asked the Department of Corrections for the number of people from my District that were incarcerated within the State system, the number that I received was astounding. It was over 3,000 people from my District that were incarcerated in the system.

So that is why it is vitally important that I'm here fighting for education for our young people so that we can redirect them from the prison pipeline to a better life in getting their education.

Not only is it Secretary Wetzel that is making this assertion, this narrative is supported by reputable studies commissioned by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT, and the Correctional Education Association, just to name a few.

Each budgetary cycle the members of our General
Assembly express their collective frustration over the

level of funding that we allocate to our Department of Corrections. This budgetary cycle presents us with the perfect opportunity to take a direct and active role in curbing the overall incidence of crime and ultimately reducing the Commonwealth's prison population. As such, I would like to request that the Governor's proposed 2016-2017 line item be preserved.

The next proposed line item that I would like to bring to the committee's attention is Line Item No. 206, which involves higher education for the disadvantaged, of which I talked about last time I was here. And you currently know this program is the Act 101 Program.

For those of you who may be unfamiliar with the Act 101 Program, the purpose of the program is to support undergraduate students whose cultural and economic and educational experiences places them at risk for degree access and completion.

I'd like you to know that I myself was a recipient of the Act 101 Program when I was in college and in high school. And I was very grateful for that.

And I think that is what helped me to be who I am today.

While I recognize that this line item is being level funded from the previous budgetary cycle, it is important to recognize that over the last decade this program has been seeing a funding cut by more than \$7

million.

This program has essentially been gutted,

despite data clearly exhibiting that Act 101

participants consistently earn a higher GPA than their

non-participating student peers in remedial courses and

that first-year retention rates for the Act 101 students

exceed the national average.

In other words, the Act 101 Program plays a very integral role in supporting our students who desire to pursue postsecondary education and is often rivaled by the difficult societal circumstances from which they emerge.

I mentioned earlier in my testimony about how early investment in education of our youth yields a considerable and lucrative return. That exact same thing can be said about ensuring those that wish to pursue postsecondary education as a means of lifting themselves out of poverty are provided with the support and resources to do so.

Therefore, I would like to also request that Line Item 206 be increased by at least 5 percent from \$2,246,000 to \$2,358,300.

My last proposed line item -- and I know you'll be glad to hear it's my last because this has been a very difficult budget cycle this time, budget hearings.

The last proposed item of great concern to me is Line

Item 262 relating to Sickle Cell funding. As most of

you may remember, the last two budgetary cycles, both I

and the members of the Pennsylvania Legislative Black

Caucus had been briefed on a drug treatment called

Hydroxyurea, which dramatically reduces the severity of

Sickle Cell Disease by stimulating the production of

HbF, also known as fetal hemoglobin.

As a result of this phenomenon, we have appealed to both this Committee and our fellow legislators to allocate an additional \$60,000 towards the line item for the purpose of providing greater outreach and education on groundbreaking treatment.

And I would like to say thank you for continuing to put that in. But this year that line item is not — it hasn't been appropriated.

I am proud to say that over the last two budgetary cycles this Committee and our General Assembly has responded favorably in allocating this much-needed funding. However, we are now at a juncture where both our Caucus and our Commonwealth's Sickle Cell advocates are attempting to find a clearer and more effective means of ensuring that the additional allocation is disbursed for its intended purpose.

What I mean by that is that even though we've

allocated the \$60,000, it's been hard to find out how to disburse the money, which is so desperately needed.

At this moment, neither I nor our affiliates thoroughly believe that we can say that we have yet to meet this task. It is for this reason that I would like to urge this Committee to sincerely consider restoring that \$60,000 that was initially added to the 2013-2014 budget and is presently absent from the 2016-2017 budget.

This would increase the Sickle Cell line item in the Governor's proposed 2016-2017 budget from \$1,200,000 to \$1,260,000.

In closing, again, I would like to thank
Chairman Adolph, Chairman Markosek, and the House
Appropriations Committee for this afternoon. It is my
sincere hope that the members of this Committee find
merit in all of the items that I've mentioned today. I
would love to work with you to see a success.

And I just want to say thank you and commend you again for another successful budget hearing cycle.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,

Representative, for your advocacy. And we certainly
take your request under consideration.

REPRESENTATIVE LOWERY BROWN: Thank you.

25 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you so much.

The next member of the General Assembly to testify before the House Appropriations Committee will be Representative David Parker.

David represents the 115th District in the House of Representatives and is from Northeast Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's Monroe County, too, just so I make you

aware.

And I want to thank Representative Brown for her comments on education funding, which is what my remarks will be primarily about.

Chairman Adolph, Chairman Markosek, and

Committee members, thank you for the opportunity to

testify today. And thank you for the excellent

questions you asked of the Secretary of Education on

Tuesday.

In the interest of time today, I will quickly provide a summary of my testimony and submit more detailed testimony in writing to the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, the education questions on Tuesday validated my concerns about the funding allocations announced in January by the Department of Education.

Despite the fact that we now have a bipartisan unanimously recommended Basic Education Funding Formula, the Department instead chose to extend bad policy

another 24 years by picking winners and losers based on politics and political expediency.

Mr. Chairman, with the new Basic Education

Funding Commission Report and its recommended formula,
we have the opportunity to fix 24 years of rotten
injustice. The BEF Commission identified 180 school
districts have been unfunded by \$937 million annually.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be very clear because this is nearly a billion-dollar problem here. In June 2015, after the bipartisan BEF Commission received thousands of pages of testimony from hundreds of education advocates and leaders, and reviewed all the data, the Commission determined 180 school districts were unfunded by more than \$937 million. Now is the time to fix this problem.

If we do not address the 180 underfunded schools first, these 180 schools will be doomed to remain underfunded for another 24 years and beyond. And that is devastatingly wrong. It's dreadful.

The State's poorest school district, Reading School District, is underfunded by \$95 million.

Literally, Reading taxpayers, students, and educators have been shortchanged \$1 billion over the last ten years.

No one in the Equity First Coalition is

demanding that the 320 over-funded school districts refund their overpayments. In fact, Equity First simply wants underfunded school districts to be made whole and brought up to their rightful level of funding ASAP.

Then, when equity is reached, all dollars would flow through the new BEF Commission formula to all districts.

Citizens can support Equity First by visiting supportequityfirst.org.

Mr. Chairman, our time is short, but this year we can start to fix 24 years of injustice. All new education funding should go first to the 180 underfunded school districts until they reach equity. And then all funds should be distributed via the June 2015 bipartisan Basic Education Funding Formula.

My written testimony amplifies the many reasons we need equity first, school consolidation, benchmarking, and performance metrics as well. And the rest of it will be in the testimony that you receive.

So thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts. I hope you continue to push for equity first in school funding.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you,
Representative Parker. And thank you for your
leadership in this education funding issue.

REPRESENTATIVE PARKER: Thank you.

1	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN ADOLPH: Thank you.
2	Seeing no other members of the General Assembly
3	present, I'd like to adjourn the 2016-2017 budget
4	hearing for the House Appropriations Committee.
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	

-38 -

(The following written testimony was submitted by State Representative Katherine Watson, Chairman, House Children and Youth Committee.)

REPRESENTATIVE WATSON: Good afternoon, Chairman Adolph, Chairman Markosek, and members of the State House Appropriations Committee. My name is Katherine Watson, State Representative of the 144th Legislative District located in Bucks County.

In addition to having the privilege of serving the 144th for the past 16 years, I also have the distinct honor of serving as Majority Chairman of the House Children and Youth Committee for a second consecutive legislative session.

As you know, during my tenure as Chairman, the House Children and Youth Committee has been as productive as it has in the recent history. The Committee played a key role in developing and shepherding to enact the first comprehensive update and improvement of Pennsylvania's child abuse and child welfare laws in nearly two decades.

Enacting landmark legislation to better protect
Pennsylvania's children was a major accomplishment, and
I am very proud of the Legislature's actions. However,
the real work began after enactment of those 23 bills,
and it continues today.

The formidable challenge of implementing the sweeping changes that the Legislature has made to Pennsylvania's Child Protective Services Law is now what faces the Pennsylvania Department of Human Services, its Office of Children Youth and Families, and the 67 county Children and Youth Services, CYS, agencies across the Commonwealth.

1.3

The dedicated child welfare professionals who work at the county and State levels have applauded the Legislature's action on behalf of children and have accepted this challenge. And, to their credit, those CYS directors, supervisors, caseworkers, private providers and DHS staff have spent the past year doing their best to meet the increased demands brought on by the new legislative mandates, especially with regard to the reporting and investigation of suspected child abuse.

It is imperative that they have the resources to deal with an expanded mission.

Counties have a fundamental responsibility under State and Federal law to provide services to protect abused, neglected, and delinquent children. The new responsibilities placed upon counties only reinforces the fact that there is a critical and ongoing need to address funding challenges facing the County Child

Welfare System.

Efforts to enhance staff recruitment and retention are imperative if the counties are to maintain a stable and well-prepared workforce in the child welfare system. Current staff-to-child ratios are unrealistic and insufficient in most of the counties' Children and Youth Services agencies.

If we do not address this issue, county agencies soon may be unable to provide even the most critical of services.

And that brings me to why I am here before you today, to strongly advocate for the additional \$200 million in State funding that is being requested in the County Child Welfare Needs-Based Budget for 2016-2017.

This amount includes the roughly \$166 million rollover of the fourth-quarter payment from Fiscal Year 2015-2016, in addition to the County Child Welfare Needs-Based Budget request of an additional \$23 million in State funds for 2016-2017.

Providing this additional funding will help to ensure that county CYS agencies have the resources they need to protect children from abuse and neglect, as well as to provide essential services to families.

Statistical evidence of the increased demand on county CYS agencies supports that this additional

funding is warranted. Consider these statistics provided by DHS:

The number of children in Pennsylvania who received CYS agencies supports services in Fiscal Year 2014-2015 was 181,371 as compared to 167,582 in the previous fiscal year.

The number of children in Pennsylvania who were placed in out-of-home care in Fiscal Year 2014-2015 was 15,296, as compared to 14,379 in the previous fiscal year.

The number of child protective services
investigations conducted in Fiscal Year 2014-2015 was
36,494, up from 28,036 in the previous fiscal year.
Child Protective Services investigations respond to
allegations of abuse, as opposed to General Protective
Services investigations, which focus on alleged neglect.

These investigations are prompted by reports of suspected child abuse or neglect, which come in to DHS via Childline. In 2015, Childline received 62 percent more reports of suspected child abuse and neglect than it did in 2013, the year before the changes to the Child Protective Services Law were enacted.

One of those amendments to the CPSL allowed for reports of suspected child abuse or neglect to be reported online, in addition to over the phone. Online

reporting went into effect in 2015 and DHS received roughly 110,000 online reports. That was in addition to 146,367 reports received via the toll-free Childline phone number. So a total of more than a quarter-million reports of suspected child abuse (CPS) or neglect (GPS) were received last year.

The evidence is overwhelming, just like the demand itself. In addition to driving more money out of the counties to provide child welfare services, I respectfully submit that additional funding, or a reprioritization of existing funding, be allocated to sustain Childline and ensure that it is sufficiently staffed to handle this unprecedented influx of reports.

As the House Appropriations Committee wraps up its month of hearings today, you as a Committee have heard many voices from across State Government advocating for their respective agencies and initiatives.

Requests for State funding do not diminish, even as tough fiscal times persist and even with the Commonwealth facing a substantial budget deficit. I understand that you face innumerable tough decisions in the weeks and months ahead.

But, in closing, I would ask that you give serious consideration during this budget process to the

fact that the efforts of the Legislature on behalf of the children of this Commonwealth do come at a price. We cannot ignore that fact. The Department of Human Services' Office of Children, Youth, and Families as well as the county Children and Youth Services agencies have been tasked with an expanded mission of critical importance.

I think it is incumbent upon us, as legislators who developed and authorized that expanded mission, to provide the resources necessary to execute that mission in order that the children of Pennsylvania are protected and served to the greatest degree possible.

I thank you for this opportunity to come before the Committee today.

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	Jean M. Davis
9	Notary Public
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

5 **-**