# COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMERCE COMMITTEE
joint with the
URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
PUBLIC HEARING

STATE CAPITOL HARRISBURG, PA

IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING ROOM G-50

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2016 10:00 A.M.

CITY REVITALIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT ZONES

#### PRESENT FROM COMMERCE COMMITTEE:

HONORABLE ADAM HARRIS, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE CHRIS DUSH

HONORABLE KEITH GREINER

HONORABLE MARCIA HAHN

HONORABLE JOHN LAWRENCE

HONORABLE RYAN MACKENZIE

HONORABLE DUANE MILNE

HONORABLE GREG ROTHMAN

HONORABLE JESSE TOPPER

HONORABLE JEFF WHEELAND

HONORABLE JARET GIBBONS

HONORABLE MARK LONGIETTI

#### PRESENT FROM URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE:

HONORABLE BECKY CORBIN

HONORABLE HARRY LEWIS, JR.

HONORABLE CHRIS ROSS

HONORABLE MARTINA WHITE

HONORABLE THOMAS CALTAGIRONE, DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE ED NEILSON

#### \* \* \* \* \*

Pennsylvania House of Representatives Commonwealth of Pennsylvania ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

HONORABLE KAREN BOBACK HONORABLE PATTY KIM

COMMERCE COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER WEETER

MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DAWN WOLFE-GINGRICH

MAJORITY LEGISLATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

BETH HORNE-BEACHY

DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

APRIL ASHE

DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT

URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:

CHRISTINE GOLDBECK

MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

JON CASTELLI

DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## I N D E X

## TESTIFIERS

\* \* \*

<u>NAME</u> PA	AGE_
REPRESENTATIVE PATTY KIM PRIME SPONSOR OF H.B. 1430	. 8
REPRESENTATIVE KAREN BOBACK PRIME SPONSOR OF H.B. 614	10
REPRESENTATIVE MARK LONGIETTI PRIME SPONSOR OF H.B. 959	11
ROBERT DONCHEZ  MAYOR,  CITY OF BETHLEHEM	25
ACCOMPANIED BY: ALICIA MILLER KARNER DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	
RICK GRAY MAYOR, CITY OF LANCASTER	42
RANDY PATTERSON  DIRECTOR,  OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT &  NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION	47
MICAH GURSKY COORDINATOR, BOROUGH OF TAMAQUA CRIZ; AND COUNCILMAN, BOROUGH OF TAMAQUA	61
JEFF CHAPMAN DIRECTOR, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS	77
JOHN MEEDER BUSINESS OWNER AND DEVELOPER, MEEDER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	84

*	*	*

(See	submitted	written	testimony	and	handouts	online.	)
------	-----------	---------	-----------	-----	----------	---------	---

## PROCEEDINGS

1		*	*	*

2.2

commerce Majority Chairman Harris: Good morning, everyone. I want to thank everyone for their attendance today for our joint Commerce and Urban Affairs Committee on the issue of CRIZ, which is a very interesting economic development program. I thought it would be worthwhile to have the Members come and learn a little bit more about it.

I think to get started what we'll do is we'll just have all the Members, starting to the upper left here, introduce themselves.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Jesse Topper. I represent the 78th District in

Bedford, Fulton, and Franklin Counties.

REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: Marcia Hahn, 138th
District, Northampton County. And welcome to our guests
from the Lehigh Valley.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEELAND: Jeff Wheeland, 83rd District. That's in Williamsport, the home of Little League Baseball. Hopefully, we'll get another Pennsylvania team in the World Series this year. But thank you all for coming today.

REPRESENTATIVE CORBIN: Becky Corbin, 155th

District in Chester County, and Chairman of the

Subcommittee on First Class Cities and Counties in Urban

1 Affairs Committee. REPRESENTATIVE DUSH: Chris Dush. I'm from 2 3 Jefferson, Indiana Counties, the 66th District. REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Good morning. I'm Harry 5 Lewis, Representative from Chester County, 74th District. 6 REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Good morning, everybody. 7 I'm Keith Greiner from the 43rd District which is part of 8 eastern Lancaster County. MR. CASTELLI: Jon Castelli, Executive Director 9 10 for the Urban Affairs Committee, Democratic Caucus. 11 MS. HORNE-BEACHY: Beth Horne-Beachy, Executive Director for the House Commerce Committee Democratic 12 13 Caucus. 14 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Good morning. Mark 15 Longietti, I represent the 7th District, which is in Mercer 16 County. 17 MS. WEETER: Jennifer Weeter, Director of the Commerce Committee for the Republican Caucus. 18 19 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: 20 Representative Adam Harris. I chair the Commerce 21 Committee. I represent the 82nd District, which is 2.2 Mifflin, Juniata, and Franklin Counties. 23 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: Chris Ross, I'm a Representative from Chester County, and I'm pinch-hitting 24 25 for Chairman Petri of the Urban Affairs Committee. Forgive me. I used to chair both these Committees, so I sometimes get confused. And unfortunately, he's dealing with a death in the family so he was not able to be here today, but I will do my best to fill in for him.

2.2

MS. GOLDBECK: Christine Goldbeck, Executive Director of the House Urban Affairs Committee for the Republican Caucus.

URBAN AFFAIRS DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Tom Caltagirone, 127th District, City of Reading, Chair of
the Urban Affairs Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Good morning. Duane Milne from Chester County.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Okay. Thank you very much. And we appreciate everyone's indulgence, especially having multiple Chairmen here. I will say, as Chris had mentioned, he was the former Chair of the Commerce Committee, and he sits in front of me on the House Floor. And I will quite honestly say 50 percent of what I learned about CRIZ I've learned by asking Chris. And at the risk of embarrassing him, I will say that he is really an expert in this field and has been a tremendous resource for me and for many other Members of the House to learn about this program.

And we're excited to have, you know, a lot of the municipalities and cities here to tell us how this has

really been working. And I know there's been some problems, and maybe we could learn from those lessons if we do make the decision to do more CRIZs in the future.

So to start the hearing, we're actually going to begin with the legislative panel. We wanted to give some of our legislatives that had legislation relating to CRIZ an opportunity to come and talk about their legislation, how it would affect their legislative districts. So I think if it's okay we'll just pull you up together. We have Representative Karen Boback, Representative Patty Kim, and also Acting Chairman Mark Longietti.

We've been joined by Representative John Lawrence from Chester County. I think we'll go ahead. If it's okay, we'll just begin with Representative Kim.

REPRESENTATIVE KIM: Oh, great.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: All right.

REPRESENTATIVE KIM: Good morning, and thank you for having me here today, Chairmen and Members.

My legislation, House Bill 1430, literally changes three words out of the CRIZ language. House Bill 1430 would change the City Revitalization Improvement Zone program to remove the prohibition of participation of a city that has had a receiver appointed under the municipality's Financial Recovery Act.

Now, the CRIZ program provides critical

opportunities to third-class cities to spur new growth, revive downtowns, and create jobs for residents through the development of vacant, desolate, and underutilized or abandoned space. Unfortunately, the current law excludes a city that has had a receiver appointed under Act 47 from eligibility for CRIZ legislation.

The City of Harrisburg was under State receivership at the time the CRIZ program was established. However, Harrisburg is no longer under State receivership. Therefore, I believe it is unfair to restrict this city, which faces unique challenges as a State capital, from permanent participation in a program that has the great potential to stimulate the local economy improve the lives of the residents and visitors alike.

This bill passed out of Urban Affairs last session, but there was no activity after that. I asked the Commerce Committee to reconsider this bill to allow Harrisburg not to be in the CRIZ, you know, program, but just to have a level playing field to be able to try out for it. Thank you.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Excellent. Thank you very much.

And if the Members don't mind, I think we'll just wait to the end for questions. We'll just let each Member qo.

Representative Boback.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My bill would add eligibility for a city of the second class A, Scranton. House Bill 614 will amend the tax reform code to make a city of the second class, again, Scranton, eligible to apply for a City Revitalization and Improvement Zone, the CRIZ. I believe that there's little difference between Scranton and other similarly sized cities with regard to the issues and problems they face in attracting development and economic activity. And it does not make sense to exclude them from the program. Quite frankly, I think it was an oversight.

Under current law, cities of the third class with a population of at least 30,000 are eligible if they have never been in receivership. Likewise, boroughs and townships with a population of at least 7,000 are eligible to apply for a pilot zone under this program.

In addition to the two CRIZ and one pilot zone that have already been approved, beginning this year, 2016, DCED, along with Revenue and the Budget Office, is allowed, may authorize according to law CRIZs or pilot zones each year. There's no limit on the total number of zones.

To be clear, my legislation would not designate or set aside a zone for Scranton. It would only make them eligible to apply for this program. Once again, I think it

was an oversight because it's a city of the second class A.

There are many aspects of this program that merit review and discussion, including the overall number of zones and the criteria for which types of municipalities may apply. However, to the extent that there will be additional zones authorized this year, hopefully, and beyond, I believe that Scranton should not be excluded from the opportunity to apply. That's all I'm asking for, their ability to apply.

Thank you for the time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Thank you,

Representative.

Representative Longietti?

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Sure. First, I want to thank Chairman Harris, Chairman Ross, and Chairman Caltagirone for scheduling this hearing and for my fellow colleagues in the Commerce Committee for your attendance. I do have written comments that you have. I'm not going to read them, but I'm going to summarize what my bill, House Bill 959, would do.

And it kind of builds on the testimony that we just heard, so my bill not only allows for Scranton to have a place at the CRIZ table and Harrisburg as well, but it would also expand it to other third-class cities. We just heard that you have to have a population of at least 30,000

people in order to qualify for a CRIZ. Well, there's a whole lot of third-class cities that have populations under 30,000. So my bill would allow those municipalities to join in the CRIZ process as well.

And really, the genesis of it was, as you will recall, Allentown was the experiment, right? It was the pilot program. They called it NIZ. It's been very successful, I believe. And we had an opportunity at a policy hearing to be in Allentown a few years ago and meet with some of the developers that were involved in that project. And I asked a specific does this concept work for smaller communities? And they unequivocally answered yes, it does, that it would work well in smaller towns.

And when we look at third-class cities, we know they all have similar problems, right? They tend to be older, core communities. They're landlocked. They have an older housing stock. They don't have a large tax base. A lot of them have lots of nonprofit tax-exempt property, and so they all have similar problems that need to be addressed. And many of them are Act 47 communities, no surprise there. I'll give you an example, a number of examples. Farrell in my district, it was the first Act 47 community and still is in the program. Aliquippa, Clairton, Duquesne, Johnstown, Nanticoke, and New Castle all under 30,000 people, all in Act 47.

And so my legislation would do the additional thing of giving a priority to Act 47 communities. Remember that we just had legislation enacted recently that requires Act 47 communities to exit the program. And not only are they required to exit the program, we took away a revenue tool from them. They no longer can have what they call the commuter tax when they exit the program.

So what we didn't do, unfortunately, in requiring them to exit is we didn't give them any tools to rebuild their communities. And CRIZ would be a tool for them. It would be something that would help allow them to rebuild their tax base. And if we really want them to be successful and not end up in receivership or under State control, then we really need to, I believe, focus on tools like CRIZ and make those available and make those a priority for Act 47 distressed communities.

The other thing that my legislation would do, as Representative Boback mentioned, the pilot program for boroughs and townships, right now, that has a 7,000 population cap. There are many boroughs and townships that are under 7,000, and so I would reduce that to 2,000. And once again, I know there are at least two Act 47 boroughs and townships that have less than 7,000 people. So once again, this would be a priority for them.

So I'm excited about the fact that the Committee

is interested in looking at the CRIZ legislation. I'm not going to say that my bill is perfect by any means, but I think it is a measure that would help a lot of our distressed communities and smaller communities, and I think CRIZ is a good fit.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.2

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Excellent.

Thank you, Representative Longietti.

We did have three other Members submit testimony about some legislation they have, so I'm going to have my Executive Director Jen Weeter just give a brief synopsis of each of their pieces of legislation, and then we will open up to questions if any of the Members of the Committees have questions for anyone on the panel.

MS. WEETER: Representative Harhart's legislation does several things. First of all, it's House Bill 1058. It expands the definition of pilot zone to allow for contiguous municipalities to work together. It also allows for industrial and commercial development authorities to serve as the contracting authority. And finally, it contains a technical piece to include a section calling for the local tax authority and how you verify the baseline tax.

Representative Toohil's legislation reduces the population requirement for third-class cities from 30,000

to 25,000 for them to apply. This would then allow for the Cities of Hazleton, Williamsport, East End, and Lebanon to be able to apply for a zone.

And then finally, House Bill 1869, Representative Flynn's, would include a city of the second class A, Scranton, much like Representative Boback's legislation.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Sorry. Do any of the Members have any questions for -- I see at least one, Representative Ross.

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: I thought we were going to get off the hook.

making your presentations here today. And I appreciate the effort that you've gone in and also the other Members who have prepared legislation. And really all of your bills raise a fundamental question, which I had when I first looked at this program and I saw that a borough, in this case Tamaqua, third-class cities in other cases were being chosen and others were interested. And then by your legislation and the others who've been presented here, we have townships, we have smaller cities, we have second class A cities. Do any of you have any reason why any particular type of municipality should not be allowed to have a CRIZ?

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: If I may, I think

that's an excellent question. And I really think that I can't say no to that question. I really think that making them available to a host of municipalities makes sense, and then let the marketplace figure out whether they work in those municipalities or not. You know, you're going to have to -- we all know that developers have to put 20 percent of resources into these CRIZ zones at least. So, you know, they're going to rise or fall on their merits, I believe, if you make it available to them.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: Anybody else?

REPRESENTATIVE KIM: My answer would be I don't think anyone should be excluded, but the ones who are going to really take advantage of this program to have developers and the economic development team already have plans together and are pretty ready to go should rise to the top. Again, what Mark has said that this is really a great tool for a lot of municipalities who are struggling, shrinking tax bases and whatnot, and this would be very beneficial for them. But I think we should level the playing field and let the best rise to the top.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: And also, if I might add, surely there are studies as to who succeeds and who has not succeeded under the original CRIZ program. I'd love to see that and to see why they did, why they're not using it, are we losing money on the deal. I mean, I think that all

comes into play, Representative Ross, to see the success of the program.

From what I'm told and from what I've read, it has been successful and it's been limited. And I think now, if it is -- in truth, looking at numbers, if it's that successful, then we add to the program.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: And just one follow-up if I may with my co-Chair's indulgence, is there any reason to limit the number of CRIZs?

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Why would you limit them if they're very successful is my question. But of course it's money to the Commonwealth, so that's first and foremost in my mind. Are we making money, are we losing money, are we attracting businesses, are we taking away blight from major cities, from boroughs, from townships. That's what I would look at.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: Well, it's entirely possible that you may move a business from one part of the State to another part of the State, so what one municipality is winning with, another municipality may be losing with, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: And perhaps that should be a part of the formula.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: So essentially, none of you have a particular limit in terms of the number of CRIZs

that might be instituted throughout the Commonwealth?

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: My comment, kind of to piggyback on Representative Boback, it depends, I suppose, is this revenue-neutral? How does this affect the Commonwealth's budget? Should there be a limit for that reason? You know, I think that needs to be taken into play.

I think you also raised the point, are we just playing a shell game? Are we just moving businesses from one location to another in Pennsylvania? Obviously, that would not be our desired purpose. So, you know, I think the details of the CRIZ program may drive an answer to those questions.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: I think it's pretty clear on the revenue neutrality that it's not revenue-neutral to the Commonwealth, that we are diverting funds that would have otherwise come to the Commonwealth. So unless there's a multiplier effect beyond that that people can calculate, in the short run at least, we're sacrificing some revenues.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: See, and you have the statistics, but for me it's all about the revenue to the Commonwealth, period.

REPRESENTATIVE KIM: And I also know that the CRIZ is not going to be a panacea. It's not going to save a borough or municipality. But let's also compare the

costs with a municipality like mine in Act 47, how much that has cost the Commonwealth also with the State receivership. I know it wasn't cheap, but if I could prevent boroughs and municipalities from going to Act 47, I think there's a savings there.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: And I would just add, you know, to clarify my comments that I'm not saying that it needs to be revenue-neutral. I think we do need to dedicate some State funds to this program. And if we're serious about trying to deal with the problems that so many cities and towns and smaller towns face, particularly as Representative Kim said with Act 47 communities, we're going to have to put some resources in.

You know, many times, these are core communities. If your core dies, then the surrounding communities have a significant detrimental effect, and we just can't allow our core to die.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: Thank you.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Thank you very much. I just would like to recognize Representative Mackenzie and Representative Rothman have joined us. And I believe Representative Milne has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representative Longietti, you raised some interesting observations about Act 47 writ large and then

some of the particulars of the ramifications of the legislation that the Legislature has passed. And I'm instinctively empathetic to the notion that those kind of communities probably should get some priority consideration in this whole process.

So I'm just wondering if you could maybe flesh out a little bit your thinking about how Act 47 municipalities would get treated. Would this be a methodology where Act 47 municipalities all go to the top of the list and we work from top to bottom and fill in until we can and then everybody else would be in some sort of maybe second category? Or is this maybe extra preference points across the board for the regular application process but perhaps preference points, extra points, whatever you want to call it, like veterans' preference points analogy for those kind of municipalities that would compete otherwise in the regular process.

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: The latter seems more appealing to me than the former. And I am certainly open to discussions amongst legislators, amongst departments to consider what makes the most sense. But it seems to me that a scoring process would probably be in place, and the idea of giving additional points in that scoring process to Act 47 communities makes some sense to me.

You know, as I said, I mean, we all base things

upon our own experience, so as I mentioned, the City of Farrell is in my legislative district. It's in Act 47. And from what I see, they're taking the legislation that was enacted seriously, and they're taking all the right steps to exit Act 47, but essentially what that means is they're raising taxes in a community that is a high-crime area because it's hard for them to afford the police protection that they need that has lots of challenges.

So, you know, you look at that and you say, well, how do you rebuild your community. If you've got to raise taxes and make it less attractive to come there and you have all these other challenges as an Act 47 community, then what tools are out there? What do you have in your arsenal to try to make your community an attractive community to bring people in?

So, you know, I think it's important that -- I think a scoring system makes sense, but I think there has to be a significant additional score for an Act 47 community like that.

REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: And maybe just a followup, I think there may be an embedded question in here
somewhere, but certainly within the continuum of Act 47
municipalities, there is a significant difference between a
major urban area and a small borough. So there's a
tremendous variation of Act 47 cases. How might we take

that into our thinking here?

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Well, you know, obviously, just because you open the program up doesn't mean that every community that qualifies is going to be able to viably have a CRIZ zone. You've got to have, you know, elements. You've got to have interested developers who want to put in significant resources of their own to establish a CRIZ.

So, you know, I don't know -- inasmuch as I'm a strong advocate for reducing these population requirements, I'm sure it's going to be difficult for some small communities to be able to attract the development that's necessary to try to establish a CRIZ. Maybe they join together with adjacent communities. I know that was part of one the bills that was mentioned.

So, you know, I think that priority status still needs to be there, but obviously, you're going to have to be able to attract developers and development --

REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Thank you. And I appreciate the dialogue you've initiated on this dimension of the whole question.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Thank you very much. I'd like to recognize we were joined by Representative Neilson. I think we have pretty much a full

1 panel now. This has been an excellent turnout. I quess 2 everyone didn't want to go out and enjoy the beautiful 3 weather today. But we appreciate everyone being here. Representative Lawrence does have a question as 4 5 well. 6 REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Thank you, 7 Mr. Chairman. And this question actually might be for staff. 8 My understanding of the CRIZ program is that the bonds that 9 10 are issued are serviced by the increased -- over and above 11 what would have been the increase in tax revenue both on a 12 local and what would have come to the State. Am I correct 13 on that? 14 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: That's not 15 too far off. I mean --REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Okay. The basic 16 17 understanding. COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: 18 That will 19 work for our purposes here. 20 REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Okay. Thank you, 21 Mr. Chairman. 22 My question is what happens if, for whatever reason, the developer goes bankrupt and the project doesn't 23 get completed or just there's some sort of disaster? Who 24

is on the hook for the debt through the servicing of the

25

1 debt that's incurred? 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Am I being [inaudible]? 3 REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: No, no, no. And if we can get the answer later, that's fine. 4 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can certainly look into 6 that. My first inclination would be it would ultimately 7 fall back most likely on the Commonwealth. 8 REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Okay. Thank you, 9 Mr. Chairman. 10 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: No --11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can answer that 12 question. 13 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Yes, 14 gentlemen, why don't you hold that for later? But 15 basically --16 REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: I'll hold that for 17 later. We have some folks in the audience who are very 18 eager to answer that question. 19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. There are 20 bondholders and you create an authority or have an 21 authority hold the bonds, and that would be the ultimate 2.2 responsible party for the debt. 23 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: All right. 24 And with that, we will dismiss the panel, and we say thank 25 you very much for being here and taking a little time to

tell us about your legislation. Thank you.

Okay. Now, our first testifier from the real world where this has actually been in place and we're very excited to hear your experiences and your recommendations of how this program could be better, we're going to call up from the City of Bethlehem we have Mayor Robert Donchez and the Director of the Office of Community and Economic Development Alicia Miller Karner. Welcome. You may begin whenever you're ready.

MAYOR DONCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, thank you for the invitation. I appreciate it very much.

Twenty years ago, steelmaking in Bethlehem ended. A four-mile long steel plant that traced it roots to a mid-19th century iron foundry and once employed 30,000 workers on 1,600 acres, was shut down and closed. With the end of steelmaking, the City of Bethlehem lost 20 percent of our tax base. The loss was devastating.

Bethlehem's leaders did not sit around and wait for something to happen. Over the last 20 years, four different mayors worked aggressively with Federal, State, and local officials, and the private sector, to resolve major environmental issues, secure public funding to clean up the site, and install modern infrastructure that would attract private developers. These actions have made the

redevelopment of the Bethlehem steel plant a national model.

2.2

As a result of the Federal, State, and local support, millions of dollars in private funds have been invested to turn an old rusting steel mill into a vibrant, multiuse development that hosts a major campus of Northampton Community College; the largest outdoor music festival in the country, Musikfest; one of Pennsylvania's most successful casinos, Sands Bethlehem; a number of manufacturing plants like Lehigh Heavy Forge and Curtiss Wright; and large logistics warehouses for major companies like Walmart and Primark.

The private investment would not have occurred without significant public funding. Almost every Federal, State, and local economic development program has been used to provide the necessary funds to improve the infrastructure and spur private sector investment. Without those government funds and the forward-thinking environmental policies, many of those businesses and organizations would have located on a suburban greenfield, and Bethlehem residents would be still looking at a vacant steel mill.

The list of programs used to bring new life to old steel reads like an alphabet soup of economic development. Federal EDA grants, CDBG loans, State RACP

grants, Opportunity grants, Pennsylvania First Grants, Job
Creation tax credits, and the Keystone Innovation Zone have
been used to spur development and lure companies to the
site.

The Business In Our Sites program provided one of the largest grant and loan packages, enabling Lehigh Valley Industrial Park, LVIP, to tackle the redevelopment of more than 1,000 acres. A local TIF and LERTA district was established, and Northampton County floated an economic development bond that provided more than \$12 million for a much-needed access road.

Even after significant public sector and private sector investment, there were still major holes in the redevelopment of the former Bethlehem steel site.

Bethlehem's 2013 City Revitalization and Improvement Zone application was designed to provide the necessary incentives to fill these holes and successfully complete the reuse of the former Bethlehem steel property.

The CRIZ is also a good deal for Pennsylvania.

Unlike most State programs, the CRIZ provides only those

State funds that are equal to the new tax revenue generated from development. Bethlehem was awarded the CRIZ designation, along with Lancaster, on December 31st of 2013. In 2014, Tamaqua joined us.

I took office in January 2014, and my economic

development team began working with the CRIZ developers to use the program to get projects done, but we immediately encountered hurdles and problems. Over the past two years, we have had numerous phone calls and meetings with the staff of DCED, the Department of Revenue, and the Governor's Office to get answers. All of these meetings have been polite and very professional, but the meetings end with more unanswered questions.

2.2

Our contracting authority, charged by the law to oversee Bethlehem's CRIZ, has spent countless hours and a significant amount of money on legal help to make sense of the law. Our private developers, all who have extensive experience on brownfield projects and represent some of the most successful national and regional real estate developers, have only completed one small restaurant project.

After all of this work, we have determined that the law needs significant changes. We can no longer rely on opinions or guidance from the Department of Revenue or DCED. We need a change in the legislation if CRIZ is going to be able to finance significant redevelopment in urban communities.

Specifically, the following changes need to be made in order for the law to be workable and effective:

1) We need to calculate baseline on a parcel-

specific basis, eliminating the current crosscollateralization model which puts the risks
of one development project on the balance
sheet of another.

- 2) We need to establish precise and detailed definitions for CRIZ eligible taxes in the law to reduce confusion, misinterpretation, and misunderstanding. Clarity on which taxes are subject to the baseline calculation in the law and which taxes are not is needed so that a developer can calculate how much funding they will have from the CRIZ to finance construction and improvements.
- 3) Presently, the law is very specific that no
  CRIZ funds may be used for professional
  services, administrative costs, or compliance.
  This needs to be changed, and the law needs to
  reflect standard operating procedures for all
  other authorities. CRIZ funds should be
  allowed to be used to pay for the normal and
  reasonable costs of compliance and
  professional services.
- 4) We are also seeking legislative clarity of the duties and functions of the contracting authority and what is the eligible use of bond

2.2

proceeds is needed to insure that funds are spent appropriately.

- 5) Legal certainty is needed so that lenders can know that sections of the law cannot change once financing has been established.
- 6) We need the flexibility to decertify parcels that continue to see long periods of inactivity so that projects that are further along in the development can benefit from the CRIZ.

2.2

These changes must also be done in a way that expands the development in the Commonwealth and does not merely relocate companies and businesses from one area of the Commonwealth to another.

We are sensitive to the concerns voiced by the Department of Revenue, the present administration, and legislators. They do not want to see Pennsylvania businesses move from outside the CRIZ into the CRIZ solely to take advantage of the subsidy. And neither do we. We want new job growth for the citizens of Pennsylvania, but the current law is so problematic that I fear no development can occur.

And allow me to add, expanding the eligibility criteria for municipalities will do nothing to further

1 development in those cities and boroughs as long as these 2 issues remain unresolved. Those cities seeking CRIZ 3 designation will find themselves struggling to attract development if we don't make this legislation more workable. 5 6 State economic development help is vital to make 7 brownfield redevelopment a reality. The CRIZ can be an excellent tool, but right now the CRIZ doesn't work. 8 9 Important changes are needed in order to make sure that the 10 CRIZ can help cities like Bethlehem and Lancaster and 11 boroughs like Tamaqua. 12 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Members of 13 the Committee. 14 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Excellent. 15 Thank you, Mayor. Alicia, do you have anything to add or are you 16 17 just more here for questions. MS. KARNER: I don't have any prepared comments, 18 19 but I'm happy to help answer questions. 20 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Okay. 21 you. 2.2 Chairman Ross has a few questions. 23 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: Thanks. 24 And I want to compliment you on your efforts to

rebuild Bethlehem. I think that's a really outstanding

25

effort that you all have made so far. And I know that you're trying to complete that job and really get the city back into a strong condition --

MAYOR DONCHEZ: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: -- as soon as possible, and I'm all for it.

And I also wanted to make it plain to the other Members here that your excellent lobbyist, our former colleague Mr. Uliana is sitting back there quietly pretending like he has nothing to do with all of this, as spent a lot of time working on all of these details with myself and others, I know with Chairman Harris and our staffs and so forth, working through in great detail to try and make the terms under which you're trying to operate a little bit more clear and a little more workable for you.

I did want to take this opportunity to address what may have raised a few eyebrows from my comment earlier where I mentioned that it was pretty clear that there was a net loss of revenue to the Commonwealth. And I know that you have stated in here that CRIZ is designed to really only soak up those new tax revenues that are coming into the zone, but you very kindly also mentioned to me in the beginning on your first page that "Without the government funds and forward-looking environmental policies, many of these businesses and organizations would have located on a

suburban greenfield."

So just to clarify my point, we have no way of knowing when someone does business and creates an expansion or puts a new business or an expanding business into a CRIZ, that if they had not done that, they would not have gone somewhere else in the Commonwealth. Some perhaps are new. I won't deny that that's possible. But it's reasonable to assume that many of them are looking in multiple choices and choose the CRIZ because the terms there are better than they would be in another municipality.

And my earlier questions are to point here because when we consider economic development programs, we need to be thinking carefully about why we're doing it.

Each individual municipality has great reason to want one of these zones because they can use it for a development tool and induce people to come there. But it does also raise an important question about whether or not we are taking things from other municipalities.

Now, we have distressed municipalities, Act 47 municipalities. I'm very aware of that from having worked on that problem, too. So there are times when we want to provide a little extra benefit because those municipalities might otherwise have some less-attractive features about them. So we may be leveling the playing field.

But when this program was created, I had serious questions as to why some and not others. And I don't think that we have, from a policy point of view, clarified that to this day. And I don't think we had a clear picture when we created this program as to why some and not others. I have some theories as to why some and not others, but we won't go there. So I did want that to be made clear.

I also want to really emphasize and focus even internally within a city that when you have a particular business in a CRIZ zone, which is not your complete municipality; it's a section of your municipality -- and you have a competing business that is outside the CRIZ zone, the firm that it is in the CRIZ zone has very favorable terms to borrow under, and they have very favorable terms under which they pay them back because they are paying monies that would otherwise be collected and paid anyway.

The competing company, not having that opportunity, has to go to a bank, pay all their regular taxes, and then turn around and pay the bank on top of that. So Company A in the CRIZ has an economic advantage over Company B in your same municipality outside of the CRIZ.

So when we do this, we need to be very thoughtful about fairness. And your individual comments otherwise I

certainly have taken into consideration, and if we continue down this zone and work and you already are in it so we have to work with you to try and make it work well for you, but I did want to mention those other issues, which I think are very important.

And I think generally that we rushed into this program without having really sorted out our philosophy, our thinking, and how it will develop over time.

Thanks.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Thank you very much.

And I would like to recognize Representative White is here. She's joined us.

And Representative Mackenzie has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE MACKENZIE: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. And welcome, Mayor Donchez. Thank you for
joining us today. And welcome to everyone else from the
Lehigh Valley who's here in the audience as well.

I do just have two specific questions on some of the changes that you mentioned. The first point you mentioned is about the parcel-specific basis versus the current cross-collateralization model. I can see benefits to both possibly, so I'd love just for a little further explanation on your thoughts there.

MS. KARNER: So right now, the zone is the whole

130-acre designation, and the Commonwealth doesn't differentiate between each parcel or each project even, so what comes from what project. If a developer constructs a building and brings in tenants that are existing PA companies and they operate and start to underperform, meaning they don't hit the baseline -- after a year of existence in the CRIZ, they have to have established a baseline if they're an existing company. If they underperform, the Commonwealth doesn't differentiate between, you know, Company B that is a new company to Pennsylvania that's generating increment that's positive. It will take the increment from Company B -- that's a company that's successful -- to repay or to compensate for the loss of the company that is underperforming.

And so when you're talking about different developers doing different projects, that means they're all relying on the success of each other, which creates problems not just when calculating baseline and generating increment, but it creates problems for financing and banks are unwilling to lend under the existing model.

REPRESENTATIVE MACKENZIE: Okay. So your concern is more on the downside risk. Is there a potential benefit in that cross-collateralization model for the upside? I mean, is it more beneficial once projects start developing and occurring that then they can use those revenues for

other projects?

MS. KARNER: There is the theory that that's possible if we have a user that hits it out of the park essentially and that we're able to support other development.

Right now, we've been able to attract one business, so we are not proven when it comes to the success of the businesses. This was a new business and it is generating last year. We did receive approximately \$18,000 in revenue, which is significantly less, as I'm sure you can appreciate, than what we had expected the CRIZ to generate for the City of Bethlehem.

And so when we're talking numbers that are that small, I don't think that it is likely that we'll see the positives of a comprehensive zone based on the success of multiple companies supporting, you know, other businesses for a long time.

So relying on that parcel-by-parcel model, we believe it will accelerate development and make the CRIZ more successful, particularly in the near term.

REPRESENTATIVE MACKENZIE: Okay. And then my second question is just on the second point here, confusion around specific taxes that are eligible. Which ones are most commonly --

MS. KARNER: Liquor, the liquor tax --

1 REPRESENTATIVE MACKENZIE: Okay. MS. KARNER: -- for instance. I mean, there have 2 3 been policy decisions when we talk to the Department of Revenue. There are determinations on how they're going to 5 treat certain taxes, but because it's not specific to the 6 legislation, there's concern that with a different 7 administration, we'll get a different policy decision. REPRESENTATIVE MACKENZIE: 8 Great. MS. KARNER: Hotel tax is excluded. There's a 9 10 number of taxes that are not included or there's questions 11 on how they're being calculated. 12 REPRESENTATIVE MACKENZIE: Okay. Great. Thank 13 you, Mr. Chairman. 14 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Thank you, 15 Representative Mackenzie. 16 Representative Topper? 17 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 As someone who represents an entire county that has less than 15,000 people, obviously I'm not too familiar 19 20 with the City Revitalization and Improvement Zone program. 21 So I have a question, though, and Chairman Ross 22 kind of started to go there a little bit with his comments. Mr. Mayor, on page 2 of your testimony, you said that 23 24 "Unlike most State grant programs, the CRIZ provides only

those State funds that are equal to the new tax revenue

25

1 generated from the development." Is that projected revenue? Because I'm assuming the money and you're getting 2 3 involved in the program before these taxes can be generated locally. Should the word projected be in there or is it 4 5 literally you're only going to get as much as you raise? 6 MS. KARNER: You literally are only getting as 7 much as you raise. So there is a lag time. After the close of the 2014 year, for instances, businesses have 8 9 months to report. The Commonwealth has months to evaluate 10 the reports, and we see the funds sometime in November. So 11 11 months after the close of a year, of a calendar year, a 12 fiscal year, we're able to receive the actual --13 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Okay. 14 MS. KARNER: -- revenue that's generated. 15 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: And if there's not any, 16 then the State is not going to provide that money, is that 17 correct? MS. KARNER: Exactly. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Okay. Thank you very 20 much, Mr. Chairman. 21 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: It's 22 important to note that the businesses need to report. 23 think our next testifiers from Lancaster will probably 24 expand on that, what can be a problematic issue. But next 25

up, Representative Dush has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE DUSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representative Mackenzie addressed part of my initial question and your point #1 on cross collateralization, but it brought up another question. The success of the business when you were describing that, you said about an existing business moving into the CRIZ. Is it evaluated based on just the success of new revenue produced out of that site or is it a percentage increase of the entire company?

MS. KARNER: So what happens is that the portion that locates in the CRIZ, if it's an existing PA company, must operate for a full calendar year. So even if they move in midyear, they have to operate for a full calendar year before establishing the baseline for that portion of the company or that company if it's the whole company that's moving in.

So that is not compared to the revenue generated in a prior location within the Commonwealth, and it is based solely on the revenue generated within the CRIZ.

REPRESENTATIVE DUSH: Okay. And I think

Representative Topper's question also answered my second

one, but I just want to verify that. In paragraph 3 you

had said about "The funds may not be used for professional

services, administrative costs, or compliance." What I was

concerned with is are you talking about services that were

1 provided ahead of time and then you subsequently get 2 reimbursed? 3 MS. KARNER: The law obligates the authority managing the CRIZ to comply with a number of deadlines 4 5 within the law. And so both Bethlehem and I'm sure 6 Lancaster will tell you, too, we've spent \$100,000 or more 7 in solicitor fees in trying to understand the legislation and hiring a compliance consultant to work with the 8 9 businesses to submit the appropriate forms. And aside from 10 auditing reimbursement out of the CRIZ, there is an 11 opportunity to recoup those costs directly from CRIZ 12 dollars. 13 REPRESENTATIVE DUSH: So it's basically the 14 authority that absorbs all that cost? 15 MS. KARNER: The authority absorbs all that cost, 16 yes. 17 REPRESENTATIVE DUSH: Thank you. COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: 18 Thank you. 19 And I'd just like to note we were joined by a gentleman who 20 yesterday was a rank-and-file member but became a chairman 21 yesterday. Representative Gibbons, congratulations. 22 Seeing no other questions, we just want to say thank you very much for your participation. 23 24 MAYOR DONCHEZ: Thank you. 25 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: We like your

very concrete suggestions, and we will keep them in mind as
we move forward.

MAYOR DONCHEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MS. KARNER: Thank you.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Next up from the City of Lancaster, we have Mayor Rick Gray and Randy Patterson, the Director of the Office of Economic Development and Neighborhood Revitalization.

MAYOR GRAY: Good morning. I'm going to talk a little bit from 1,000 feet up and Randy's going to get down in the weeds for you.

This is viewed by many as an economic development tool. Quite frankly, I view it as a property tax relief tool. Currently -- and I hope I don't offend anybody -- when developers come into our office, I tell people that developers shake hands this way. What can you give us? We have an older community. We have many warehouses in the city. The cost of redoing and rebuilding and utilizing those properties is far more than you would spend doing greenfield development where you take the top six inches of topsoil off and just build a new building.

We have old buildings. I live downtown. I live in a house that was built in 1820, not uncommon in the city. We at one time had 100 tobacco warehouses.

So when a developer comes in and wants to do some business in Lancaster and they're there, generally, they're not looking at greenfields. They want to be in Lancaster. They want to do something there.

How can assist? And well, there's these other programs that we talked about, but generally, what we end up doing is giving property tax abatement. Now, that's in a city that has about probably a third of the property already exempt from property taxes. It's the only tax really that we can raise, and raise it we have and continue to do.

abatement, the police still want to be paid, the firefighters still want to be paid, our schools have to be run, our public works people have to be there. Who make that up? Who makes the property tax relief that we give to many developers? Who makes it up? Well, the taxpayers make it up. So their taxes go up. It's a tradeoff and we understand that.

When, for example, let's say they're developing a hotel, and I'll just pick a hotel out, building a new hotel. People will say to us, well, you know, you must be doing pretty well because there's these new buildings and new things moving on. First of all, there's property tax relief that has given on most of that; and second of all,

if you're going to economically develop your way into financial security, it's way down the road before those properties are reassessed and become producing revenue equivalent to what you need.

So if the new hotel is built, who gets the revenue? Income tax, business tax -- we don't have a business tax in the City of Lancaster -- liquor tax, hotel tax. We, by reducing or giving breaks on our property tax, end up producing revenue for the Commonwealth.

The philosophy behind the CRIZ is that the additional tax -- now, this is not the NIZ, and very often, the NIZ is in Allentown. The additional tax that's produced, because of the development in the CRIZ district, goes to the Commonwealth. The idea behind the CRIZ was we'd get that back. That's it. And we could continue with property taxes on that property. We could let the property taxes go up and there'd be revenue for the city. We did it in a way that we thought was fairly revenue-neutral. If the development wasn't done, the taxes that the State would get, they wouldn't get. There wouldn't be taxes. That was the idea behind the CRIZ.

Now, as far as moving people in from outside, the NIZ, which Allentown has, from what I understand you could move from a township Macungie Township, and move into the NIZ district, and the NIZ district would get the benefit of

those new employees and whatnot, not the case in a CRIZ district. If you move from Manheim Township, which borders on the city, into the city, we might get a small increment if there's additional people hired, but in NIZ, you produce new taxes, State taxes. We don't get it.

So again, a business from outside the city in the Commonwealth moves into the city, moves into the CRIZ district, we don't get that money, and we shouldn't.

Representative Ross is correct. You don't want to just encourage people to move around.

One of the ideas, as I listened, there was a question -- I'm sorry, with my bifocals -- Representative, you had about who guarantees the bonds and whatnot. Our CRIZ district has taken a position we don't issue bonds, that we'll work with the developer, we'll see what we can provide that's difficult. And Randy will tell you some of the problems we're having because banks have trouble dealing with this. But we'll provide the revenue you produce to you to pay your own loans off. We're not going to guarantee your loans.

We issued bonds for the hotel/convention center update and for another nonprofit that's working in the city, and what was it, \$5 million, I think, \$5 million.

That's all the bonds we're issuing. The idea would be you produce the revenue, you get the benefit once it goes

through the State and comes back to the city in the CRIZ district. If you don't produce the revenue, it doesn't come back. You don't get anything as a developer. So you're the one that takes the risk, not us. And that was the way that we were doing it.

One other thing, as I listened here, you know, if you look at the cities or the communities that are dealing with this -- and I don't know about Tamaqua -- we have by far the highest property taxes in the County of Lancaster. We have the highest property taxes. Our school taxes are about double our city taxes, and our city tax is around 12 mills. And then you add county taxes on top of it. We can't continue to ask people simply because they own property -- it's a futile assumption that you have money because you own property. We can't continue to ask them to pay police, fire, public works, schools by property taxes. There's got to be some relief. This is part of that relief.

This just gives us an opportunity to do some things, let the property taxes go up. And on the other hand, take funds that are produced because of this program and put them back in to encourage developers to pay the extra cost that they would normally pay in a city.

On that, that's just sort of the idea behind -- don't confuse the CRIZ with a NIZ, though. So often I hear

people say, well, that's costing us a lot of money. We got \$2,800 last year. Randy didn't get a salary increase because of that \$2,800. That's what we got from the CRIZ last year, and Randy will tell you some of the more specific problems we have.

MR. PATTERSON: I provided you with written testimony as well. I'm not going to read that either. I just wanted to highlight a couple things. And the beauty of the CRIZ program is that each community can establish the program to most benefit that community. In the City of Lancaster our CRIZ is also 130 acres, but we have 732 businesses, existing businesses within those 130 acres.

Our program is really designed to address the underutilized and underdeveloped properties that exist within those 130 acres, some that have sat vacant for years and some for decades. The CRIZ provides that opportunity.

We are looking actually to level the playing field. Lease breaks in most major urban cities today of third-class cities do not cover the cost of construction. So financing for developers in an urban center is challenging. The CRIZ program provides an opportunity to help offset that. We're not looking to provide lease breaks to businesses moving in. We're actually trying to build our lease market within the City of Lancaster, and when we've talked to our developers, we're mentioning that

this is to assist you in providing financing to cover those gaps between construction costs and lease rate revenue that you're going to get.

The financing challenges are the same, though, as Bethlehem's. Bethlehem's financing challenges are no different than ours. A developer cannot get private sector financing today knowing that a lot of a business over here is going to affect his ability to receive the increment that he actually created. And I will give you one example for the City of Lancaster. In our baseline year, 732 companies, we had about 50 percent reported. We had one company that had a seven-figure revenue figure. In 2014, the first reporting year, they had a '15 figure revenue. All the other businesses within that CRIZ are now making up that difference.

That was not the intention of revenue neutrality to the cross-collateralization point. The intention was business by business, that the State would continue to receive the revenue that business generated up to the baseline year we would have available to us afterwards.

As the Mayor said, our financing model is not to do bonds. Our financing model is the developer is responsible for getting their own private financing based on the model of that business, just like any other project being underwritten in the private sector. They get what

they make. If they don't make it, they don't get additional revenue from us. They have to make that up someplace else.

The Mayor mentioned \$2,870. So 732 businesses, our calculation method of revenue neutral is business by business. According to our calculation, the city would have received about \$1.5 million last year. That would have been enough to generate the revenue, the increments expected to be created by the developments that were occurring. Instead, we had \$2,800. Twenty-eight hundred dollars is not a successful CRIZ program. Our expected revenue stream was somewhere between \$750,000 and \$1.5 million annually from the 732 businesses.

And then as new businesses were developed or new projects developed -- you'll hear from one of our developers today -- we expected that number to go up, but those dollars are being passed through to the developer to pay their debt service. It's not being retained by us.

And as the Mayor said, the only bond we did issue was for our neighborhood nonprofit economic development project, and the city is guaranteeing that bond, not the State.

I think the recommendations from Bethlehem are our recommendations as well. There are a couple others that we put in in our proposal that we've talked to Bethlehem about as well, and that's infrastructure

improvements. Sometimes infrastructure improvements are located outside of the CRIZ, but they're dependent to have a project developed within the CRIZ. Currently, today, you can't use CRIZ revenue to help finance that improved infrastructure.

2.2

Our biggest one for you would be to say not to require us to have 130 acres at the outset. The way the current program was established when you apply, you must apply for 130 acres. If you apply for less, that's your acreage for the balance of your program. So if you only apply for 50 acres, that's all you have for the remainder of the program year.

Our preference would be to allow us to build as projects come online. So we have 130 acres over the life of the program, but a community could apply with only 50 acres at some point in time and then add. That would also reduce the number of 732 businesses that we have to have report every year.

So the issue of compliance spending, we spend a great deal of money to provide technical assistance to those small businesses to do those annual reports to the State.

I think questions would be appropriate from here.

I think, again, reading the testimony, you could see the rest of our issues.

1 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Excellent. That is very helpful because that was my first question is 2 knowing what you know now, would you have done the CRIZ 3 that large? But as you said, you had to do the CRIZ at the 5 130 acres. You captured a lot of businesses that were 6 already in the zone. And for a very busy businessperson, 7 it's probably hard for them to understand that, well, this is probably going to be development around me but I have to 8 9 take time out of my day to do this reporting to make the 10 whole thing work. I think that's very --11 MAYOR GRAY: My wife's an artist, and her studio 12 is in the CRIZ district. We all know how constituents can 13 be. How would you like to get up in the morning and hear 14 I've got to fill out another one of your blank forms today? 15 And believe me, she doesn't impact the CRIZ. 16 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: And that 17 certainly is a unique challenge, but hopefully, as the business owners learn about it -- and I wish you the best 18 19 for that. I don't know that I have any recommendations --20 MAYOR GRAY: Well, it's made it for 43 years. 21 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: I've only 2.2 been married 3-1/2 years so I --23 MAYOR GRAY: Forty-three years --COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: -- haven't 24 25 got it figured out.

1 MAYOR GRAY: -- we've made it, so --COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Chairman 2 3 Ross. 4 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: Thank you. And just for 5 the Members, because they may not know this, the CRIZs 6 don't require all the parcels to be contiguous. You are 7 able to pull parcels out if you choose to. So I just want to make that point. 8 9 And, Mayor, it's good to see you again, first of 10 all. My hat's off to you for the work that you do in 11 Lancaster, and you've made a lot of progress with your 12 staff --MAYOR GRAY: Well, thank you. 13 14 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: -- and it's --15 MAYOR GRAY: Thank you for shopping in Lancaster, 16 too. 17 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: I still do that sometimes, 18 too. 19 And I did want to clarify again because you 20 brought it up again so I'm going to clarify it again, what 21 you say about the revenue neutrality of this program from 22 the State's point of view does assume that those expansions and those new businesses that locate in the CRIZ would not 23 24 have gone someplace else in the Commonwealth and then paid 25 those taxes through for us to use in the general fund.

certainly, while we are interested in seeing you help, we also are short of money right now, too, as you well know, and we're being beaten up regularly on the idea of how are we going to match up our revenues to our expenditures. And you saw how well we had that debate last year.

That having been said, I still agree, again, from my experience with distressed municipalities and other municipalities that aren't distressed and are trying not to become distressed, that there are some legitimate reasons to favor some of our municipalities. I do think we've got to have a criteria and we've got to be clear and everybody in the General Assembly and the population of Pennsylvania ought to know why we are locating these zones someplace and not in others. So that is one thing that I feel pretty strongly about.

The other point that I was going to make, I guess, was the issue about whether, if you had your druthers, you would have chosen not to have occupied buildings in your CRIZ that are currently being used. And it sounds like, although I get the bit about underutilization, that your life would have certainly been made a lot easier if you had dealt with vacant brownfield sites and so forth exclusively and could build up from that.

But I also want to mention as an example for the

1 Members, I think your idea of having the developer have 2 some skin in the game and also be responsible for the start-off of these projects is a good thing. All 3 4 developers come in with the best of intentions and have 5 bright ideas that how great it's all going to be, and 6 having been in business myself, some of my wonderful ideas 7 didn't turn out. And so if it is on the authority and the 8 9 authority loses that money and becomes impaired, that's not 10 a great thing. If you reduce your exposure and share the 11 risk with the guy who's actually doing the project, I think 12 that's very sound and good policy. MAYOR GRAY: Well, we don't share the risk. 13 14

takes the risk --

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: That's --

MAYOR GRAY: -- or she takes the risk really --

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: You put a little energy

18 into it at least.

> MAYOR GRAY: The other thing, there has been some talk from time to time about a cap. We expected threequarters to a million-and-a-quarter. You know, to have a predictability that you can do that --

> > REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: Right.

MAYOR GRAY: -- you know, if you're concerned --

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: Yes.

25

15

16

17

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 MAYOR GRAY: -- that would be one way to do it. REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: We do not have the 2 3 Department of Revenue or the Department of Community and 4 Economic Development testifying here today, but I know 5 they're interested. 6 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Just to 7 clarify, they were invited. Yes. MR. PATTERSON: If I could add one thing to 8 9 Representative Ross's comment, the State can actually 10 obtain new revenue within the CRIZ. So if we have a 11 successful development, we only pass through the revenue required to pay the debt service. So if they are 12 13 generating revenue that exceeds that, depending on their 14 ability to generate private sector financing and equity, 15 there is the potential over the long run for revenue to 16 also be provided to the State. 17 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: I admire your optimism --MR. PATTERSON: Thank you. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: -- based on your prior 20 experience. 21 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Thank you. 2.2 MR. PATTERSON: Economic developer. COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: 23 24 Representative Rothman. 25 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Thank you, Mayor.

1 Just a couple of questions in clarification, you mentioned the hotel tax going to the State. Does Lancaster 2 3 County not collect the hotel tax? How is it done 4 differently in Lancaster than it is in Cumberland? 5 MAYOR GRAY: The county does have a hotel tax. 6 Hotel tax is appropriated to tourism development. 7 hotel tax we're speaking of is only the State hotel tax. If you look in the November DCED document, it was listed as 8 9 an attributable tax, and then that policy was changed. And 10 that's why you hear from us asking for that to be added 11 back in. And you'll hear from one project developer on our 12 side who was anticipating that hotel tax revenue. So it's 13 just the State hotel tax that's --14 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: How much is the State 15 hotel tax? 16 MAYOR GRAY: Six percent hotel occupancy tax. 17 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: One percent? 18 MAYOR GRAY: Six percent. 19 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Six percent. And how 20 much is the Lancaster County hotel tax? 21 MAYOR GRAY: Five percent. 2.2 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: And that money --23 MAYOR GRAY: Yes. It's distributed --24 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: -- goes to the county --25 MAYOR GRAY: -- between the tourism development

1 entity and used to pay bonds on the convention center and 2 hotel project. 3 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: So does any go back to the City of Lancaster? 4 5 MAYOR GRAY: It does not. REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Okay. Earned income 6 7 tax, does the city have an earned income tax? MAYOR GRAY: So I'm glad you mentioned that. 8 We 9 have two revenue streams under the CRIZ program for 10 Lancaster. We have the local services tax, the \$52 tax, 11 and we have the earned income tax. In our case, in every 12 case it's only for those employees who live in the city and 13 work in the CRIZ. So it's not a general earned income tax 14 that's available to us. 15 I wanted to mention that because the \$2,870 we 16 got from the State, the city's local increment was \$126,000 17 from two revenue streams as opposed to \$2,800 from seven State revenue streams. And that goes to the issue of cross 18 19 collateralization. 20 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: And then just a point, 21 and correct me if I'm wrong, but the Lancaster School 2.2 District is within the City of Lancaster? 23 MAYOR GRAY: Penn Lancaster Township. 24 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Penn Lancaster Township.

25

So what percentage?

1 MR. PATTERSON: We don't receive any of that percentage because they cross municipal boundaries. 2 3 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: But according to the most recent budget number I saw, the State of Pennsylvania, 4 Lancaster School District receives about \$58 million from 5 6 the State of Pennsylvania? 7 MAYOR GRAY: I can't answer that question. 8 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Well, so I just take exception to the comment that the city is subsidizing the 9 10 State revenue sources when the State's receiving maybe 11 \$126,000. Yet we're contributing \$58 million to your 12 school districts. 13 MAYOR GRAY: Well, first of all, the school 14 district and the city are two completely separate entities, 15 and the school district covers a broader area --16 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Mayor, you mentioned the 17 school mill tax being 12 mills. 18 MAYOR GRAY: That's right. 19 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: What would it be if you 20 didn't receive the \$58 million from --21 MAYOR GRAY: No, no, the city tax is 12 mills. 2.2 The school tax is in the 20s. 23 MR. PATTERSON: Twenty-five. 24 MAYOR GRAY: Twenty-five. So what I'm saying is

they very often agree to reduce property taxes with us on

25

projects if they do a TIF or something along those lines or

LERTA covers the entire city.

The tax revenue that's produced by development does not inure to the city. It doesn't inure to the school district either.

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: And that specific property, but the properties around it, I mean, the idea of economic development is it lifts all the property values, which then would benefit the city --

MAYOR GRAY: Well --

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: -- and it creates jobs, which then --

MAYOR GRAY: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: -- with the income tax, which the city --

MAYOR GRAY: One Democratic candidate wants the single payer, too, and then 20 or 30 years from now when that might get realistic, it doesn't -- one development, we don't see property taxes go up. How often are the reassessments? We see our property values going down, and in the CRIZ district, too, as larger property owners continue to appeal and contest valuations. So, you know, if you're counting on that to fund local government, it doesn't happen. It doesn't. I can tell you I've been Mayor for 11 years, and the only way we've increased tax

```
1
       revenue is by increasing taxes really. Wouldn't you say
 2
       that's fair, Randy?
                 MR. PATTERSON: So property values haven't gone
 3
       up after these projects are done.
 4
 5
                 MAYOR GRAY: It might have gone up if you'd done
 6
       a pre-assessment --
 7
                 MR. PATTERSON: Well, no, there's a common-level
       ratio that's supposed to take into --
 8
 9
                MAYOR GRAY: We could tell you --
10
                 MR. PATTERSON: -- account --
11
                MAYOR GRAY: -- in the analysis of our budget
12
       this year, if we would not have had assessment appeals, we
13
       would have seen about a 5 percent increase in assessed
14
      values within the City of Lancaster. We actually only saw
15
       a 1.4 percent increase because of assessment appeals that
16
       are occurring now as a result of the length of time --
17
                 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Last year?
                 MAYOR GRAY: Last year.
18
19
                 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: But how about in the
20
       last 11 years?
21
                 MAYOR GRAY: If you track that from the time
2.2
      we're in office, we would see the same thing.
23
                 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN:
                                          Thank you.
24
                 COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: All right.
       Seeing no other questions, we'll just say thank you very
25
```

much for your testimony.

2 MAYOR GRAY: Thank you.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: We wish you the best and look forward working with you in the future.

MAYOR GRAY: Thank you very much.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Okay. Next up, we have the Borough of Tamaqua. Micah Gursky is the Tamaqua CRIZ Coordinator and Tamaqua Borough Councilman. Welcome. The microphone is yours.

MR. GURSKY: Thank you, and good morning. I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify and comment regarding the City Revitalization and Improvement Zone.

The Borough of Tamaqua in Schuylkill County was designated as a pilot CRIZ in December of 2014. I worked closely with the Tamaqua Borough Council, the CRIZ Authority, the business community to develop and implement the CRIZ in Tamaqua. I do this as a volunteer councilman as Tamaqua is a small community that does not have fulltime or even part-time economic development professionals.

Tamaqua is demographically similar to a lot of the coal-region communities in Pennsylvania that have seen a decline in coal, rail, textile industries over the past 80 years. I'm not going to go into a lot of detail about the history. I'm sure you're all familiar with it.

If you look at the census data, you'll see that

we have similar poverty levels, income levels, and unemployment as other small but densely populated little towns in Pennsylvania's Appalachian counties. You can drive through our business district and see signs of decades of disinvestment and decay, but you'll also see signs of growth and vitality and revitalization.

For many years, Tamaqua has aggressively pursued opportunities to promote businesses and job development through programs like the Keystone Opportunity Zone, the Keystone Opportunity Expansion Zone, Main Street, and now CRIZ. Tamaqua applied for the CRIZ designation twice: once in 2013 and we did not receive designation, and then again in 2014. We received a letter on December 31, 2014, designating Tamaqua as a pilot CRIZ. This designation is one year behind the Bethlehem and Lancaster CRIZ designations.

We are grateful and very appreciative that the Legislature and the administration created this opportunity to demonstrate how the economic development tool, which was really designed for cities, can also be used for smaller community that face big-city problems. We take very seriously the responsibility of being the pilot CRIZ, and we hope that our work and experience opens this and other opportunities to smaller communities and helps the fellow CRIZ cities.

You've heard this morning how a CRIZ functions so I won't repeat a lot of that. But it is important to note that different communities will use CRIZ in different ways depending on their unique economic development strategy. You'll see that Tamaqua's CRIZ looks and operates very differently than the Lancaster and Bethlehem zones. Tamaqua's CRIZ consists 297 parcels of land totaling 128.48 acres. This is just below the 130-acre cap. Within those acres in 2014 there were 198 businesses.

There is a map included that shows the zone, and as you can see, Tamaqua's CRIZ includes almost our entire downtown business district, much of our large-tract highway commercial land, and a large part of our 900-parcel local historic district.

For many years, Tamaqua has explicitly worked to redevelop our traditional downtown and productively reuse the amazing architectural inventory we inherited from our forefathers. The zone also includes property that has been devastated by acid mine drainage that our community would like to repurpose to create jobs.

But I have to tell you that in my town the most common reaction to the CRIZ has been, wow, I can't believe there's actually that many businesses in Tamaqua. There is even more surprise when they find out that the total reported CRIZ taxes coming out of those 120 acres in 2014

was \$2,010,119.50. Keep in mind, of the 198 businesses in the zone, we only received reports from 120, or a little over 60 percent.

Although we were hoping for a much higher response rate, Tamaqua's CRIZ got a 60 percent reporting rate without having any paid staff working on the CRIZ. Kevin Steigerwalt, our Borough Manager; and Christine Zamudio in our borough office and I worked together with the business community -- in particular the Tamaqua Area Chamber of Commerce -- to talk about the CRIZ and to talk about why it's important to report.

We expect that response rate to increase this year as the businesses who did not submit their tax information just this week received a letter from the Department of Revenue stating that a \$1,000 fine has been assessed to their business for failing to report in 2015. The letter will further state that the penalty will be waived if the business submits the 2016 report.

For all the cities and legislators that are chomping at the bit to become a CRIZ, remember that it takes courage to stick up for the Department of Revenue when they send those not-so-nice letters to your businesses and they get a letter saying that a \$1,000 penalty will be assessed if they don't complete the report each year.

Get ready for the calls because they will come.

I get them at my home. And I they ask what is this CRIZ and why am I getting a \$1,000 penalty? Tamaqua tried to get ahead of this by sending letters to our CRIZ businesses telling them about the possibility or actually the certainty of the penalty and encouraging them to do their CRIZ report because it helps the community not just because it helps them avoid a \$1,000 fine.

Even though we are a year behind, Tamaqua's CRIZ has experienced some of the same issues as Lancaster and Bethlehem. The most important issue, as you've heard this morning, is the possibility that the tax increment will actually be negative, and there may be little or no funding in the CRIZ program to finance the improvements.

Our businesses have found it impossible to use the CRIZ to finance their projects alone because there is a real possibility that the taxes year over year may be less. That uncertainty makes it impossible to finance based on the total anticipated CRIZ increment. No bank or authority can finance based on an increment that may not be there.

In Tamaqua, we've had some smaller developments in our CRIZ choose to forgo the possibility of CRIZ funding because the project is too small to make the application and the development agreement process worthwhile. These developments are still proceeding, which is a good thing. They're just proceeding without CRIZ. We also had a

developer choose to forgo CRIZ because of the prevailing wage reporting requirements.

2.2

With the uncertainty of CRIZ revenues, it was not worthwhile adding the extra requirement to a smaller project. We actually have several developments that are occurring that will not use CRIZ financing but will certainly add to the incremental new taxes in CRIZ.

I agree with Lancaster's recommendation and Bethlehem's recommendation that a baseline be set for each property or some other mechanism be in place to set a hard floor on the increment. The idea that the tax increment would go negative is a major deterrent to financing. Of course, I think Lancaster and Bethlehem would agree that the most powerful change would be to create a more NIZ-like scenario where all or part of the baseline can be used to finance the improvements in the zone. Changing the way the increment is calculated would greatly help our CRIZ businesses count on the CRIZ funding when it comes time to put together a financing package.

I am confident that the Tamaqua CRIZ will create investments that add jobs and tax base to our community. But unlike the NIZ, it will not happen overnight, and I would encourage any new CRIZ communities to take the long view on this 30-year program. What is happening in Allentown's NIZ will not happen with the current CRIZ

structure.

2.2

What people like about the CRIZ in Tamaqua is that there is a chance of getting some of the locally generated taxes to come back to our community. What is not particularly liked is the uncertainty whether there will be a net gain in CRIZ taxes. Tamaqua could not expect to be able to use the entire \$2 million annual baseline to finance developments as though we were a NIZ, although if we could, there is no doubt in my mind that we would see the same type of rapid investment in downtown Tamaqua.

Personally, I like the CRIZ program philosophy because it helps keep locally generated taxes local. For the conservative, it's a "mother hen" program where whoever helps make the bread helps eat the bread. And it only works if businesses actually succeed in hiring more people, paying more wages, earning more, and making more sales. There's only money in the CRIZ pot if the CRIZ businesses are paying more taxes.

Over the next 28 years of the Tamaqua CRIZ program, I'm looking forward to businesses actually rooting for each other to do better so the funds can finance more developments in the CRIZ.

I would like to comment a little bit about the administration of the CRIZ in Tamaqua. As you know, there's no funding for administration, for the operation of

the Authority, or even solicitor fees. In Tamaqua, we did not add administrative overhead to run our CRIZ other than a small retainer to the CRIZ authority solicitor. There is no incremental new staff to administer our program. We rely on volunteers and some existing borough staff. We are very pleased that, given our limited outlay of expenses, Tamaqua's CRIZ had a 60 percent reporting rate in year one.

Our CRIZ developments will be relatively small—we won't be building any arenas—compared to some of the other CRIZ and NIZ developments, but we're still excited for them. A small parking area to benefit a neighborhood store, a new medical office, a new retail store, and repurposing that acid mine drainage site for commercial development may not sound like a lot, but in a small community like Tamaqua, it will make a big impact. If there are changes to how the CRIZ baseline is calculated, it will open the possibility of a lot more reinvestment of those tax dollars.

From an administrative perspective, I do have to comment that the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue staff that work with Tamaqua on our CRIZ are excellent. I do this as a volunteer, and our Borough Manager and Borough staff are not economic development practitioners. We work hard, and we know our local businesses, but whenever we have a question, the Department of Revenue and DCED staff

have been very helpful.

2.2

Oh, we still do all of the administrative work, and it is a lot of work, but it helps to have a responsive and professional CRIZ representative when we have questions about our list of businesses or our baseline calculations. As the CRIZ expands to include more cities, I hope that staff support from the departments continue.

I would like to conclude that, as expected, at this point we have noticed few differences between implementing CRIZ in a small community compared to a city. The paperwork, the legwork, the outreach, the support and establishment and operation of the CRIZ authority are all the same. The preparation of the business list and the calculation of the local baselines are all the same. The only significant difference is that, as a small community with a likewise small budget, we don't have the ability to assign this work to economic development staff or consultants.

I would be remiss if I did not thank my counterparts in Bethlehem and Lancaster who have helped Tamaqua by sharing the results of their hard work. We have certainly benefited from being able to model the forms, the actions, the programs that Lancaster and Bethlehem have used. Tamaqua had the benefit of being one year behind and being the third CRIZ through the door, and the help we

received by modeling Lancaster and Bethlehem is greatly appreciated.

As with any program, there is a learning curve and a need to make changes that achieve the goal of the program. I listed some suggested changes, and I'll go through them guickly.

I recommend that we allow an existing municipal authority to be used instead of the requirement to establish a new CRIZ Authority. In Tamaqua we have a borough authority that was established under the Municipality Authorities Act that has brought economic development powers. We would have preferred to not have to establish a whole new municipal entity. We're a small town, but we have enough municipal entities.

And so we actually just reused the same municipal authority members and had to create a separate legal entity. So I don't see any reason why we couldn't reuse a municipal authority that has those powers.

Change the local match from a requirement that it be private funds to non-State funds to allow for municipal projects where the match is municipal funding.

Number three, set the increment baseline at \$1 million, which incidentally happens to be 50 percent of the Tamaqua's baseline. That's where I came up with that number. And then anything above that baseline could be

used to finance CRIZ projects. This limits the State's exposure to revenue loss but allows the CRIZ zones to be more like a NIZ in that there is some certainty that there would be an increment.

The next is to reduce the penalty for not filing the CRIZ documentation from \$1,000 to \$500 and/or allow those non-filing penalties to be used by the local authority for administration of the CRIZ. Five hundred dollars will get the attention of a business in Tamaqua just as much as \$1,000 will.

Number five, include in the CRIZ all liquor sales taxes, malt beverage tax, and the 6 percent sales tax on liquor that businesses in the CRIZ buy for resale in the CRIZ, regardless of where they buy them. Just to elaborate on that a little bit, if you have a restaurant that buys from a distributor or a bar that buys from a distributor that's outside the CRIZ, when they do their reporting, they have to separate out where they bought the liquor. It's not so much of a revenue-generating issue as it'll make it a little bit easier for those businesses to report all of their liquor purchases that they have in the zone.

And then finally, allow the rollover of any excess CRIZ funds, which I guess I'm being optimistic that there would be excess CRIZ funds, but it certainly would help with some of the issues that you've heard about today

and certainly that we anticipate with just trying to smooth the predictability of the available CRIZ financing each year.

So I want to thank you again for the opportunity to discuss the CRIZ project and recommend changes, and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Thank you very much. You certainly are sort of a unique experiment in this process, and it's good to have you here and kind of get an update on how things are going.

Chairman Ross?

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: And again, thank you for the energy you've put into this. Having spent a little time with these programs, this is not simple stuff. And I was a township supervisor myself, and the amount of care and detail you've gone into to get prepared to actually handle this and the time associated with setting up the zone, setting up the administration, organizing the authority — and by the way, I'm quite comfortable with the idea of using an existing authority as long as you amend your articles of incorporation to properly adjust for the additional responsibilities and meet the other legal requirements that might go into that. But I see no problem with that.

And I'm also comfortable with the idea of the

- 1 issue of trying to break the parcels down separately.
- 2 Based on the concerns that Lancaster has had with their
- 3 program, do you have any second thoughts about using
- 4 existing occupied parcels in the CRIZ instead of relying on
- 5 this from a simplicity point of view, from a clarity point
- of view on currently vacant or unoccupied, unused parcels?
- 7 MR. GURSKY: No. The way the CRIZ is structured
- 8 now --
- 9 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: I know how it's structured,
- 10 but I'm just -- you know, you've heard what trouble they
- have and you're already having that trouble, too.
- MR. GURSKY: We are having that trouble, but it's
- a 30-year program, and I think over the course of that 30
- 14 years, being able to cross collateralize will long term be
- 15 | a benefit. Certainly for those trying to get a project
- done right now, it's more difficult. But we've had a lot
- of -- we've had several developments happen that don't use
- 18 CRIZ financing that will add to the increment.
- But with the way the CRIZ is structured now, I
- 20 | would make the zone the same way. Obviously, if it was a
- 21 change where it was parcel by parcel, then yes, we would
- 22 have done the CRIZ map differently.
- 23 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: And language is important.
- 24 And for the Members of the Committee, I want to make sure
- everybody understands what you're talking about when you're

talking about using the baseline.

The baseline are taxes that were currently flowing into the Commonwealth's treasury before the CRIZ was created. So if we take some of those Commonwealth funds and redirect them back to you, that is comparable to creating a new grant program. So it, again, reduces the amount of money in the general fund and purposefully sends it to your municipality.

We had the testimony earlier that people are not quite sure why this shouldn't be used in any municipality, and again, I'll pretend I'm the Department of Revenue right now. They may have some significant concerns if we have several thousand CRIZs, particularly if they were taking the baseline, i.e., the money that is currently flowing into the treasury and redirecting it, it could become a rather devastating hit on the treasury.

And if we don't, as people have suggested -- if we have caps instead, we limit the amount that we're using in this kind of a program, then we have the question of why this place and not that place. And again, I don't think I've yet heard a real criteria that anybody is using as to why Tamaqua and not one of your neighboring communities that might have some of the same problems that you have and some of the same challenges.

But thank you very much for the work you're doing

on this.

MR. GURSKY: And I would agree with that. It's been very revealing. There's no way for Tamaqua to know how much taxes we're sending to Harrisburg, and I'd be remiss if I came here and didn't ask for our businesses to get their taxes back.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Thank you.

Representative Topper?

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for appearing. I know working on borough council is not the easiest thing in the world to do.

But some of your recommended changes, the one that caught my eye was number two. You said, "Change the local match from a requirement that it be private funds to non-State funds to allow municipal projects where the match is municipal funding." Do you mean a project done by, for instance, the borough or done within the borough? Could you explain that --

MR. GURSKY: Sure. If the project was going to be financed by the borough for a municipal parking lot, for example, and I'm not an attorney, but the way I read the statute, it says that there has to be a 1:5 local match. So that means for every \$6 in the project, \$1 has to be local. But I think it specifically says "private match."

1 And so I take that to mean not municipal money.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Right.

MR. GURSKY: So --

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Well, and I would think that kind of the design of the program was for the private funds to be used. You know, matching tax dollars with other tax dollars, I don't know that that was the vision whenever the program was created. But thank you.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: And Christine has a question.

MS. GOLDBECK: Micah, one of the legislative proposals -- I believe it's Representative Julie Harhart's -- proposes to expand CRIZ by allowing the multi-municipal approach. And I'm just curious, you being not as big as Lancaster and as big as Bethlehem, how do you view that proposal in terms of being able to open up to Coaldale or other neighbors of yours to expand that out?

MR. GURSKY: I don't see a problem with it. It adds to the level of complexity because now you'll have an inter-municipal authority. You're going to be dealing with two municipal governments. But there's no difference between an inter-municipal authority and a single municipality authority as far as implementing the program. It just adds that level of complexity of trying to create your CRIZ zone and implement it. I don't see any reason

why it would adversely impact how you would use the program.

But, you know, which municipalities get in and which don't, Representative Ross, you know, I don't have a recommendation on how you select those.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Excellent.

Seeing no other questions, we just want to say thank you for your testimony, and we look forward to working with you in the future.

Okay. Coming up next from the Pew Charitable
Trusts, we have Jeff Chapman, Director of Economic
Development. Jeff, the microphone is yours.

MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to come up here on this beautiful day and speak with you.

I direct a project at the Pew Charitable Trusts.

We work with State policymakers such as yourself to help set up processes and policies that allow you to have better evidence as you go about making decisions on economic development incentives.

I'm going to talk about sort of four broad tools that could be helpful in answering some of the questions that have been arising this morning. The first one is the importance of setting clear goals and metrics for your programs. The second one is putting in place regular and rigorous evaluation, then using that evidence to drive

improvements in policy. And then finally, thinking about CRIZ in the context of Pennsylvania full incentive and economic development portfolio.

So when I think about goals, I always think about a quote from the Nebraska legislative auditor who, she was reviewing their major economic development incentives there, and she said by the standards, meaning by the goals that are in legislation by what's spelled out -- "by these standards, any activity could be deemed a success and any cost would be acceptable." And I think that's a situation that a lot of lawmakers find themselves in where the goals of the programs are not very clearly spelled out.

The CRIZ law states that zones "will provide economic development and job creation within a city." As somebody who has economic development in my title, I can tell you that's a very vague term and can mean lots of different things. And as we've been talking about this morning, job creation in a city is not something that I think you're fully satisfied that you have an answer about what that means. Does it count if the jobs came from a neighboring city or from another city in Pennsylvania? Those types of questions, I think, are worth asking.

And you've heard a lot of really interesting proposals from the cities and borough this morning about how to improve the program. And I think having some

In particular, this idea of revenue neutrality keeps coming
up or what does this do to local and State budgets. And
that's not part of that goal. That's not part of, you

know, sort of the official thinking around the program.

clarity around those goals would help you evaluate those.

6 And I think sort of clarifying that before going forward

7 would be very helpful.

So generally, setting effective metrics includes asking and answering much more specific questions. So just as an example, is it important that new jobs would go to the existing residents of the zone or the city? Maryland asked this question in their enterprise zone, and they found that while there were new businesses moving into these zones and they were hiring new workers, people in the zones didn't have the education and the skills to take those new jobs and so they weren't able to benefit from that.

So the evaluation recommended thinking through ways of coordinating the program with the State workforce training programs in order to try to make sure that the program more closely benefits the targeted population.

That may or may not be a goal of the CRIZ, but those are the types of things I think are worth thinking about.

The second thing is evaluation. The CRIZ law, to its credit, requires both auditing and reporting. These

are essential components of ensuring that you have a well-run and efficient program, but they don't provide you information on what your return on investment is and how you can increase that or improve that.

2.2

So putting in place regular and rigorous studies on the outcomes of CRIZ, according to the goals that you establish, will give you the information you need to shape the policy in ways that will obtain the best possible results for taxpayers and the economy.

Evaluating these types of programs can be extremely difficult, but there's a lot of new work coming out of States that are answering some of these questions. For example, a recent report from Indiana of their TIF program addressed some of the same questions I think you even struggled with in evaluating the CRIZ program. And they came up with a very interesting result. They found that their TIF program was succeeding on one possible goal — increasing property values in the area — but that it wasn't creating jobs. And so the next step for the evaluators and for lawmakers in Indiana is to think about how can the program be improved so it can be more successful at job creation.

I'm sure the last thing you want is another set of reports that nobody pays attention to, so we always recommend explicitly linking evaluations of economic

development incentives to the policymaking process.

Usually, this is done by requiring that a key committee will hold a hearing when a new evaluation report comes out.

The most effective evaluations aren't just thumbs up or thumbs down; the program worked, the program didn't; get rid of it, keep it, but they actually offer concrete opportunities for improvement. For example, a review of Louisiana's Enterprise Zone program found that because of the way the program was structured, many of the jobs created in the zones were likely coming at the expense of existing Louisiana jobs, negating a lot of the positive benefit they thought they were getting. So they were able to amend the program in very concrete ways to direct more of the incentives to those sectors in which the net benefit for the State and local area would be the greatest. So that type of evaluation I think will be very helpful as you consider expanding or amending CRIZ.

But just looking at CRIZ by itself is of limited use because Pennsylvania has a number of programs with complementary and sometimes conflicting goals. Some of those have been mentioned here this morning. When you consider each program just by itself, I think you can miss out on a lot of opportunities. When you consider them as a portfolio, you can assure that the lessons learned in one program will be applied in others and that money is

1 invested in the most effective effort.

Since 2012, 17 States plus D.C. have passed laws that will require regular evaluation of their economic development incentives or to improve existing processes.

This is an idea that Pennsylvania may want to consider, and we'd be happy to help provide you with more information on best practices that we found in our research and our technical assistance with State lawmakers across the country. Thank you.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Thank you very much.

Chairman Ross?

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: I see a couple of pieces of paper in front of you if you wouldn't mind, since we don't have a stenographer with us today, if you wouldn't mind --

MR. CHAPMAN: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: -- providing copies to the Committee. That would be helpful.

And just as an aside, when I became Chairman of the Commerce Committee previously, previous Chairman, one of the things we did is we sat down and counted up all of the economic development programs that we could identify in Pennsylvania, and we got up to about 110.

MR. CHAPMAN: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: And you won't be shocked to

hear that a fair number of them were somewhat duplicative. And I used to refer to it as kind of like going through the Grand Canyon or something where you saw the KC layer and then you would go up and see the Thornburg layer, and then you would work your way up through to the various different administrations and each layer was laid on top of the previous layer and they pile up rather dramatically. And a number of our Governors have actually tried to suggest that we go about trying to rationalize and synthesize and shed some that are excessive.

2.2

Several of the testifiers today have mentioned that they've used the TIF and they've used the KOZ and the KOEZ and all the various different things. And even with a relatively small place like Tamaqua to have six or seven or eight different of these programs all in and operating and working in a relatively small geographic area tends to boggle the mind at some level.

But I think the criteria that you've suggested is useful and, you know, some of the things that I've been thinking about, I think, are along those lines, too. So hopefully, we can take that into consideration as we move forward. And thank you for coming today.

MR. CHAPMAN: Thanks. And Pennsylvania is certainly not alone in that situation. I think all States are facing that.

One of the things we recommend is that States don't try to tackle the entire thing at once. It's too much, right? A lot of States have put in place a process where every three to five years all the programs will get evaluated, and I think that can be very helpful.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: I was all for tackling at once.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: That is the aggressive nature of Chairman Ross.

Seeing no other questions, I just want to say thank you very much for your testimony --

MR. CHAPMAN: Yes.

2.2

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: -- and for being here today.

And last on our list of testifiers today is Mr. John Meeder, business owner and developer at Meeder Development Corporation. Welcome.

MR. CHAPMAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Committee Members.

My name is John Meeder of Meeder Development

Corporation from Lancaster City. My company has been

developing real estate in Lancaster City and County for 30

years. I'm here today to talk about the possible impact of

CRIZ in Lancaster and what needs to happen to CRIZ to make

a major difference in Lancaster and other PA cities for

years to come.

2.2

Right now, there are three major changes that need to be addressed to make CRIZ a force for development:

- 1) Insure the inclusion of the hotel occupancy tax in the legislation.
- 2) Fix the annual increment calculation against the baseline.
- 3) Make sure CRIZ revenue can be underwritten as a dependable cash stream for banks and investors.

The program is currently ineffective in aiding any development, and here's a developer's perspective on the program.

Background: You know, there's been a resurgence of interest in Lancaster and other small cities in PA.

There are advantages to being in the city that has a vibrant economy and is attractive to businesses, to residents, and tourists. Lancaster, as well as other third-class cities in Pennsylvania have taken an enormous hit over the past 60 years with many of them losing up to 45 percent of the population and a comparable amount of business and manufacturing. Pennsylvania did not have a Katrina. We had a slow, consistent decline tied directly to this loss.

In order to encourage businesses to locate in downtown Lancaster, I must find solutions to the costs of upper level development, code compliance, functional obsolescence, lack of convenient parking, and high real estate taxes. These factors cause potential tenants and businesses to turn and walk away from urban opportunities. It's just easier to move to the suburbs or develop in a cornfield.

A developer or business must utilize every tool available to get to occupancy costs competitive with suburban properties. Urban development typically does not happen without subsidy. The majority of my projects in Lancaster have had anywhere between 7 and 13 sources of funds. CRIZ can be a major funding help in funding development.

The occupancy tax and the Hotel Lancaster: In 2013, the former Brunswick Hotel was an eyesore and an embarrassment to Lancaster City. It was a public nuisance and also was the scene of police calls and a fatal shooting just prior to our taking over the hotel. The hotel had fallen on hard times with no incentive for anyone to invest in the property. To make matters worse, the property had absentee ownership and very poor management. My partners and I decided to see what could be done with the property after reviewing the opportunity of CRIZ financing.

The hotel property was a centerpiece of Lancaster City's initial application to the State to receive the CRIZ program designation. The CRIZ program offered the opportunity to have the newly generated taxes underwrite a portion of the debt and lessen the risk to undertake the project.

We moved forward with the project with the approval of the Lancaster CRIZ Authority, and the CRIZ Authority had our projections reviewed by the Department of Revenue. With the support of the Community First Fund and with those approvals in place, we settled on the property in December of 2014.

We have struggled for the past two years, and we are in limbo with regard to the project and the program, and here's what we face, the challenges for the Hotel Lancaster CRIZ project:

The Department of Revenue has ruled that the hotel occupancy tax is not a sales-and-use tax and therefore cannot be transmitted to the city as CRIZ funding, even though the Official DCED Guidelines included the hotel tax as a CRIZ attributable tax. Without this inclusion, our project will flounder as a partially developed hotel and will have a limited contribution to the city.

Number two, banks do not recognize CRIZ revenue

as a dependable source for debt repayment based on the current increment calculation used by the Department of Revenue. The potential: The Hotel Lancaster development is an important component to the success of downtown Lancaster. The additional rooms are needed to provide support for the \$170 million investment already made in the Lancaster County Convention Center.

2.2

More importantly, a second vibrant downtown hotel supports downtown retail, restaurants, and businesses.

After full development of the hotel, the Hotel Lancaster will generate over \$10 million of annual spending to support the hotel and downtown restaurants and retail.

The plan for the hotel is to invest approximately \$24 million to renovate the facility to become a hospitality anchor for Lancaster City. If CRIZ is viewed as a dependable source of revenue for debt repayment, this project can proceed. CRIZ is necessary for the full development of this project.

The baseline increment calculation risk: Any project wanting to use CRIZ is faced with the fact that even if you go through all the process and do everything asked of them, the CRIZ benefit may not flow to the project to cover development costs. This fact is due to the current method of how the annual increment is calculated by the Department of Revenue. The effect of DOR's methods

results in the inability to get financing.

2.2

Here are facts as we now know: Negative tax revenue from other businesses in the CRIZ zone can reduce or eliminate CRIZ revenue that is earned by our project. The current interpretation of calculating the tax increment eliminates any predictable CRIZ payment to the district or to the project. We need to have the CRIZ amended or corrective legislation retroactive to January 1, 2015, to restore the integrity of the program and to help with the future underwriting of development projects.

And number four, there is no confidence that CRIZ funds will flow because of a very discouraging history so far and because of the Department of Revenue's interpretation of how the increment is calculated.

Banks and investor underwriting (CRIZ flow dependability): The Hotel Lancaster requires full development, and the CRIZ is needed to supplement the conventional financing. Banks and investors rely on the project projections to see if the pro forma is reasonable and can justify the loan. Unfortunately, developers must obtain their own financing for CRIZ, utilizing the projected annual CRIZ funding to repay the initial borrowing. The banks can use the project projections for underwriting, but the bank will also need to underwrite the reliability of the CRIZ payments. If there are external

circumstances that could negatively impact that payment, the loan does not get funded, and the development does not happen. This is the crux of the problem with financing problems with CRIZ revenue.

Meeder Development also has attempted to use CRIZ on other projects and currently has another \$26 million development planned for Lancaster City. However, it is futile to attempt any project that requires CRIZ assistance until there is a legislative amendment curing the deficits of the program. A CRIZ-dependent project simply is not viable without legislative action.

And in summary, you know, when the program was first introduced, I saw it as way to facilitate major development in Lancaster and in other cities in Pennsylvania. It has the potential. Even with the many things that you need to work around with the program, it is still extremely valuable for Lancaster and will facilitate significant development over the next several years if put right by the Legislature. This development will ultimately provide additional long-term revenue to the State.

This testimony states the problems with the program, and now I urge you to take action to make CRIZ work the way it was intended.

Thank you.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Excellent.

1 Thank you very much. 2 Chairman Ross? 3 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: Thank you. And I'm 4 familiar with the building, I believe, that you were 5 talking about here, and my hat's off to you for taking that 6 project on. Downtown is a pretty critical spot in the 7 middle of town and really would make a difference if it was vibrant and operating properly. 8 9 MR. MEEDER: Thank you. 10 REPRESENTATIVE ROSS: And we've talked about 11 parcelization fairly extensively already so I think we 12 probably don't need to go over that part of your 13 recommendations. 14 One thing that occurred to me as you were 15 talking, the hotel occupancy tax walks like a sales-and-use 16 tax and quacks like a sales-and-use tax, and one fairly 17 elegant solution I was thinking about was to simply go into the code and rename it and instruct the Department of 18 19 Revenue to consider it as a sales-and-use tax. So just a 20 thought. 21

But otherwise, thank you for your work, and we'll see if can't help you somehow.

MR. MEEDER: Thank you very much.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS:

Representative Topper.

2.2

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I guess it shows how little I know about this issue that I've asked probably more questions in this hearing than I've asked in my entire time in the Legislature in these kind of hearings. But it's a subject that I'm not real familiar with. I'm trying to familiarize myself with it.

You said that one of the things in your proposals to fix it would be make sure CRIZ revenue can be underwritten as a dependable cash stream for banks and investors --

MR. MEEDER: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: -- which it can't be, and then later, the reason I assume is because it's not a dependable -- I mean, I'm trying to get my mind wrapped around if you're not getting the money up front, I mean, how can it ever be a real dependable cash stream for banks to look at?

MR. MEEDER: Thank you very much for that question. We've been wrestling with that. We had to wrestle with that one.

You know, the way that Lancaster put it together

-- and I understand where they are -- it'd be great if we

could come in and say, hey, we have a great project, can

you help fund our project with CRIZ revenues, float a bond

for us? Well, that's not the way it happens in Lancaster. They did one that they felt they needed to do for the convention center, but they're letting us up to our devices, which means that, okay, so we set out our projections, and within those projections, our revenue projections that generate taxes, okay? So you almost have dual projections going on here. One relates to the revenue and one relates to the tax revenue.

Okay. So we make that model and we say, okay, well, based on this model, we take that to our bank and we say, hey, based on this model, can you give me money up front based on this cash flow of CRIZ revenue? We've got the project revenue. I know we have conventional financing. But we also have a CRIZ element to our financing that they will underwrite based on that revenue. And, you know, with all the fun stuff that goes on with it, the fact that you have to wait for 11 months in the first place to get it, you know, so you have to figure out a way to escrow or bridge for that and create an even stream. You know, banks don't like to get just one payment a year.

So there's a lot of complications and figuring out how the heck you're going to get this done. But yes, it's a very valid question. And the CRIZ revenue, that's what we're struggling with. There's no assurance right

1 now.

2.2

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Because if the design was that whatever we get in taxes, that is the revenue that you'll get from CRIZ. I mean, it goes back to the first question I asked, which is are we looking at projected taxes, projected revenues --

MR. MEEDER: We have to -- yes.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: -- or are we looking at actual? And if we're looking at actual, I just don't see how that money could ever come in --

MR. MEEDER: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: -- up front.

MR. MEEDER: Somebody is taking a risk here. The developer is taking a risk and the banks are taking a risk based on the consistency or the potential, the projections of that revenue. And then those revenues have to come in order to satisfy, so they're taking the risk on this thing. It's paid on the actual but you project it.

You know, the same could be true with a hotel.

You can say, hey, we're going to do 60 percent, 65 percent occupancy and we're going to have a room rate of \$120, you know, a night and all that kind of stuff, but if nobody shows up, then the bank is SOL, you know. Nobody gets paid. The developer is out, the bank is out of luck, everybody is out of luck. The same is true with the CRIZ

1 revenue. You make the projections based on what your business is going to do, okay, and it's supposed to 2 3 generate a tax, and that's what you rely on to fund, you 4 know, the CRIZ loan, for a lack of a better term. Does 5 that help at all? 6 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: It does. And the other 7 group that would be out of luck would be the taxpayers because -- what I'm saying is if we changed it to where we 8 9 were giving the money up front, as we do in other programs, 10 that would be my concern would be that if things don't go 11 well, if those projections -- because sometimes projections 12 aren't met, that would be my main concern if that were --13 MR. MEEDER: Yes. 14 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: -- to happen. 15 MR. MEEDER: But that is not the case. You're 16 not giving the money up front. 17 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Right. 18 MR. MEEDER: The bank and the private sector is 19 taking the risk at least on the way that we have to work it 20 in Lancaster. I consider 21 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: All right. 22 myself properly education now, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: 23 24 Representative Greiner?

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER:

I'm glad my colleague

25

feels like he's properly educated because there's a lot thrown at this today. And I will say it was all very informative. I want to thank all the testifiers.

A couple things just stood out. I think I said early on I happen to just live east of the city, and, you know, it's kind of funny. I live out in Amish country, but a lot of what goes on down in the city affects me out in the suburbs. And I want to thank you for your efforts and certainly Mayor Gray's energy and Randy Patterson. I mean, they do an outstanding job. I do want to say that.

Two things: Chairman Ross, I think, hit on something. The hotel occupancy tax, to go into a project knowing that you think that's going to be part of, you know, the whole thing and then it's not, I mean, that needs to be addressed. Probably one thing that I get frustrated about State Government, having worked in private industry as a CPA for over 20 years is we don't seem to keep our word at all times, and I think that does need to be fixed in some fashion. I will share that. I just wanted to say that.

And then secondly, it is somewhat unique to Lancaster is that, as I said, where I come from -- and there was just a polling done in Lancaster about ag preservation, and I think it's like 95 percent of us support ag preservation, over 70 are going to pay

additional taxes to borrow money to preserve farms. I thought your testimony hit on something that I think could be unique to us, and it'd be nice if we can get, you know, this project -- you might have the ability to go out to East Lampeter Township and build a project while you're spending time trying to help the city out. And we have a gem in the city, and I think we're working real hard. I think, you know, it's been a special area. There's no question about it.

And all I'm saying is I think through all this and we're trying to figure out the cost and what needs to be done and is the State losing money, I do think there are some issues we need to address here. But the reality is, for us, people cherish the quality of life in Lancaster and the farmland we're at and to have a vibrant city with a lot of old warehouses and old homes. And if we can be able to come up with a solution that can do just that, that's why Lancaster is closing in as the fifth-largest county in Pennsylvania population-wise.

So just those couple things. I mean, I just wanted to kind of opine a little bit, but I do think it's a project that I think we need to continue to look at. And hopefully, we can get our hands around this and wish you continued success. And hopefully, we can come up with a solution with some of these ideas.

And like I said, all the testifiers, I thought, you know, to hear Tamaqua, too, like I said, I know that they have their challenges up in the coal regions, too. So thank you very much.

MR. MEEDER: You're welcome. Thank you.

COMMERCE MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HARRIS: And thank you for your testimony.

And just in conclusion, I'd like to thank all the testifiers. It's one thing to read about these programs on paper. It's another thing to actually come in and hear from the people that are trying to do this.

I hope the Members of both Committees found it very informative. I know I learned a lot in the last two hours about this program. It's new to me being new to this Committee, and I need to learn as much as I can because I will be flying on my own when my colleague to the left retires in half-a-year, unless we can miraculously talk him into running for yet another two-year term, which we already pulled that rabbit out of the hat once.

But I want to thank you all. I think it's been very informative. And we're going to now conclude the joint hearing. Thank you.

(The hearing concluded at 12:05 p.m.)

1	I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings
2	are a true and accurate transcription produced from audio
3	on the said proceedings and that this is a correct
4	transcript of the same.
5	
6	
7	Christy Snyder
8	Transcriptionist
9	Diaz Transcription Services