COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BUDGET HEARING

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

STATE CAPITOL
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
ROOM 140, MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2018 1:00 P.M.

BEFORE:

HONORABLE STANLEY SAYLOR, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE JOSEPH MARKOSEK, MINORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE KAREN BOBACK

HONORABLE JIM CHRISTIANA

HONORABLE SHERYL DELOZIER

HONORABLE GEORGE DUNBAR

HONORABLE KEITH GREINER

HONORABLE SETH GROVE

HONORABLE DOYLE HEFFLEY

HONORABLE SUE HELM

HONORABLE LEE JAMES

HONORABLE WARREN KAMPF

HONORABLE FRED KELLER

HONORABLE JASON ORTITAY

HONORABLE MIKE PEIFER

HONORABLE MARGUERITE QUINN

HONORABLE BRAD ROAE

HONORABLE JAMIE SANTORA

HONORABLE CURT SONNEY

HONORABLE KEVIN BOYLE

HONORABLE TIM BRIGGS

HONORABLE DONNA BULLOCK

HONORABLE MARY JO DALEY

HONORABLE MARIA DONATUCCI

HONORABLE MARTY FLYNN

Pennsylvania House of Representatives Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

BEFORE: (Continued)

HONORABLE PATTY KIM

HONORABLE STEPHEN KINSEY

HONORABLE LEANNE KRUEGER-BRANEKY

HONORABLE MIKE O'BRIEN

HONORABLE PETER SCHWEYER

NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS

HONORABLE FRANK RYAN

HONORABLE CRIS DUSH

HONORABLE KURT MASSER

HONORABLE ELI EVANKOVICH

HONORABLE JAKE WHEATLEY

HONORABLE STEVEN SAMUELSON

COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:

DAVID DONLEY

REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RITCHIE LAFAVER

REPUBLICAN DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MIRIAM FOX

DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

TARA TREES

DEMOCRATIC CHIEF COUNSEL

1	INDEX
2	TESTIFIERS
3	* * *
4	
5	NAME PAGE
6	C. DANIEL HASSELL SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
7	AMY GILL
8	DEPUTY SECRETARY FOR TAX POLICY14
9	CHRISTIN HEIDINGSFELDER DEPUTY SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION
10	DREW SVITKO
11	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF PA LOTTERY10
12	
13	
14	SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY
15	* * *
16	(See submitted written testimony and handouts online.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

2.0

21

22

23

24

2.5

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: We have Representative Kurt Masser here, who is the Republican Caucus Administrator. I wanted to recognize him as being here, as well, before we start.

We had this morning every member introduce themselves. We're not going to do that again. But anyway, Secretary Hassell, I want to welcome you to our hearings today. I'm going to ask before we get any further along, if you and anybody else that's going to present testimony, if you would rise and raise your right hand.

Do you swear and affirm that the testimony that you're about to give is true to the best of your knowledge, information and belief; if so, say I do.

19 SECRETARY HASSELL: I do.

DEPUTY SECRETARY HEIDINGSFELDER: I do.

DEPUTY SECRETARY GILL: I do.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: I do.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Thank you very

much.

Chairman Markosek, any opening comments?

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, Chairman.

1.3

2.5

Just really an introduction to say welcome. We're very much looking forward to what you have to say. Obviously, the revenue of the Commonwealth is pretty important at budget time, particularly.

So we're anxious to hear steps that you're taking to make your office more efficient and to make sure that the taxpayers are getting the best service that they can for the tax money that they do pay. Also, I'm looking forward to hearing what the lottery -- some of the new programs that the lottery, perhaps, has for us and is planning to do.

Lottery is very, very important. I've said it all along that we cannot afford to have our lottery system not provide the revenue that we're used to having from that because we have a number of dedicated programs that depend on lottery funds and I don't see the legislature ever cutting those programs if we don't have the funds because they, for the most part, are senior citizen-oriented funds.

So it's very, very important that the lottery remain healthy and continue to be healthy

1 and to grow. So I'm especially interested to hear 2 what we're doing in that area. So with that, Chairman, thank you. 3 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Very good. 4 5 Again, I welcome the Secretary. And of 6 course, Drew, it's great to see you here because I'm 7 looking forward to you keeping to raise a lot of 8 money in the lottery to help pay for Joe's retirement and mine at some point, for our senior benefits. But seriously, I'm excited about seeing 10 11 the new lottery pop up and the creativity that's 12 coming about. 1.3 It's amazing that an old guy like me, the kind of things you can do with computers today. 14 So 15 I'm excited and I think members, and I think the 16 public, will be excited when you start unveiling the 17 games. So with that, we're going to start off with 18 Representative Kampf for the start of questioning. 19 Representative Kampf. 2.0 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Sorry, 21 Mr. Secretary, over here. Chester and Montgomery 22 Counties. 23 SECRETARY HASSELL: Good afternoon. 24 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Good afternoon.

So my questions for you involves an announcement

2.5

```
that the Governor's Office made about some sort of
1
2
     $200 million arrangement with Municipal Real Estate
 3
     Funding, LLC. This was, I guess, as a result of an
     RFP that was issued, which somehow, in some way,
 4
     related to the Farm Show.
5
 6
                My first question to you is, did you have
7
     any discussions with the Governor's Office of the
8
     budget about this agreement that we now have, before
     it was made?
                SECRETARY HASSELL: The answer to that is
10
11
          That's not something I'm closely familiar with.
12
     It's not something that affects our Department, but
1.3
     I am aware that it's a part of the funding in the
     budget this year.
14
15
                REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Okay. I take it,
16
     then, the same answer for, did you have any
17
     discussions with the Department of General Services
18
     or the Farm Show Administration or the Department of
19
     Ag about this agreement before it was made?
2.0
                SECRETARY HASSELL:
21
                REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Do you know
22
     whether it's just a loan or a lease-leaseback?
23
                SECRETARY HASSELL: I understood it to be
24
     a lease-leaseback arrangement.
2.5
                REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF:
                                        Okay. So I
```

reviewed it, this document, the financial agreement. 1 2 I didn't see any details in it about leasing, typical leasing arrangements with the Farm Show. 3 Does the entity that gave us the money or 4 agreed to give us \$200 million, do they get any 5 6 rights with respect to our Farm Show? 7 SECRETARY HASSELL: As I said, I'm not 8 familiar with the details of this arrangement. REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Do you know 10 whether the Farm Show itself played any role in the 11 negotiations of these terms? 12 SECRETARY HASSELL: I do not. 1.3 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Were you told of any legal authority that the Governor was relying on 14 15 in entering into this agreement? SECRETARY HASSELL: I am not familiar 16 17 enough with it, sir, to answer that question. REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: There was an 18 19 indication in the bills that were passed surrounding 2.0 the closing of the budget this fall. Actually, I 21 think a clear statement that \$300 million would be 22 transferred from special funds -- we got some 23 information that \$175 million of this \$200 million 24 that I was just speaking of was transferred to the

2.5

General Fund.

```
Out of what special fund did that come?
1
2
                SECRETARY HASSELL: I'm sorry. I don't
     know the answer to that.
3
 4
                REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Is there a special
5
     fund that you're aware of related to the
     lease-leaseback of the Farm Show?
 6
7
                SECRETARY HASSELL: I do not.
8
                REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Okay. Thank you,
     Mr. Secretary. Thank you very much.
9
10
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative
11
     Daley.
                REPRESENTATIVE DALEY:
12
                                        Thanks,
     Mr. Chairman.
13
                I had a couple of questions that are
14
15
     related to the lottery. My first -- I hope this is
     a quick answer, but I'm going to ask both of them at
16
     the same time.
17
18
                So the first question is, how do, with
19
     the iLottery and that type of game, how do you
2.0
     screen or know that kids, young kids, are not using
21
     or playing these games? Because I don't think any
22
     of us want to see the kids supporting programs, even
23
     if they're for seniors and their grandparents, but
24
     that's not a good thing.
2.5
                And then the second thing is, if you
```

could just talk about the profit margin because back in 2014, we lowered the statutory profit requirement to 25 percent. I just want to see, how does that profit margin mandate compare to other State lotteries and how does the profit margin impact the lottery's ability to maximize revenues for senior programs?

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: And I'm going to turn to Drew Switko, the Executive Director of the lottery, for those answers.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Thank you.

On iLottery, age control, so obviously, we're not experts in Internet business, but we are fastly educating ourselves. But we partner with experts. And so we will be employing industry best solutions for age control.

One of those solutions is really common to all Internet business, and it's a thing called KYC, Know Your Customer. And it's a mechanism. It's a series of identification pieces that all Internet businesses use to make sure that the person making the purchase is the person who they say they are.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Like those robot CAPTCHA-type of things?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: That's one 1 2 example, yep. REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: 3 Okav. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: As well as 4 5 personal identification. It might be a driver's 6 license number or the last four digits of the 7 Social Security number. Those kinds of things all 8 pieced together lead to a verification. REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Okay. 10 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Now, that 11 said, we won't be in a position to control what 12 happens to an account. So in the home, it is still 1.3 other people's -- adults' responsibilities to protect those accounts, just like they would protect 14 15 any online banking accounts or other, you know, Amazon accounts, those kinds of things. 16 17 It still requires somebody to make sure that it doesn't fall in the hands of people who 18 19 shouldn't be using it. 2.0 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thank you. 21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: And as far as 22 profit margin goes -- glad you asked -- I mean, 23 profit margin is a concern because there's 24 legislation -- it's a concern for us because there's

legislation that requires us to generate 25 percent

2.5

profit right now.

1.3

2.0

2.5

We're well over that. We're, I think at this time, over -- just over 27 percent. We'll probably finish the fiscal year in the mid-to-low 26 percent. But some of that, a lot of it, is out of our control. And sometimes the luck of the draw will pull that down.

As I've said before when we've talked about it, that's going to be something we continue to come back to because that margin requirement forces us to manage to a percentage and not necessarily to do what is best for generating more money for older Pennsylvanians.

So while we are north of 26 percent now, as sales grow and we launch new products like our monitor games solution, that's going to require us to take another look at that. Profit margin, that profit margin mandate will act as an artificial barrier to additional profit growth for the lottery, just because we have to manage to a percentage instead of managing to, you know, just generate more dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: How do other States manage their profit margins?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: So we're one

```
of only a handful of States that have a margin
1
2
     requirement. None of the other top five, top 10
     lotteries have it. It's not something that -- it's
3
 4
     not an industry best practice.
                REPRESENTATIVE DALEY:
                                        Okay.
5
                                               Thank you.
                EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Thank you.
 6
7
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR:
8
     Representative Roae.
                REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Thank you,
     Mr. Chairman.
10
11
                Thank you, folks, for being here to
12
     testify. My question is, as far as your employee
13
     complement, I have some confusing numbers here. I
     want to make sure I'm looking at the right thing.
14
15
     Is your current complement 1,730 or is it 1,746?
     Because we've got information that indicates both.
16
17
                SECRETARY HASSELL: Currently, we're at
18
     1,334.
19
                REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Now, what's your
20
     current authorized complement?
21
                SECRETARY HASSELL: This is -- I'm
22
     referring to the General Fund total.
23
                REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Okay. For all of
24
     the funds.
2.5
                SECRETARY HASSELL: For all the funds,
```

yes, 1730 in total.

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Now, of that, the Governor is basically saying he wants to keep it the same at 1,746, but that's actually an increase, right?

If you're at 30 now -- if the Governor is saying he wants to keep the complement the same at 1,746, that's actually an increase of 16 positions, right?

DEPUTY SECRETARY GILL: There were some positions added in the current fiscal year for lottery, for the expansion of lottery. So those were added probably after the data that you're looking at in the current year. So then next year it would be stable.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Okay. And then for all of the funds, the total right now, the numbers I'm looking at here -- actually, the Governor's numbers -- if there's 1,634 filled positions and you're authorized for 1,730 positions.

And then the new authorization level for the new budget year would be 1,746. That's 112 positions more than you had on New Year's Eve, on December 31st, 2017.

So how come you need 112 more people, you

know, today than you -- well, not today, but effective July 1st -- when the new fiscal year starts?

1.3

2.5

How come you need 112 more people than you did on New Year's Eve?

SECRETARY HASSELL: Sir, the complement level is such that we're always going to have people coming and going. Just in any group of 1700 people, there are people who are retiring or moving on in one way or another, and it takes a little bit of time to fill positions.

And that means that the complement is never going to be 100 percent filled, no matter what. We need to have that room to recruit and attract qualified people into those positions, so that we're not constantly falling behind.

As Christen already indicated, we have asked for some additional positions for the lottery because of the new programs that are being rolled out currently. They need additional staff in order to recruit retailers and service those retailers with the new games.

So I think those things together make up the complement that we're asking for.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Okay. So you know,

in this era of where a lot of employers, you know, they try to do, you know, more with less, a lot of companies, you know, tax-paying companies that fund Pennsylvania's government, they don't necessarily fill every single position they want.

2.5

But do you think by the end of the year you really need the 1,746 positions, even though at the end of the year, you only had 1,634?

Are you comfortable telling taxpayers they need to pay for 112 more positions than they did last year?

SECRETARY HASSELL: The complement over the last several years has been in decline. The Department has been shrinking over a period of years. And it's the rollout of new technology that allows us to do that and continue to get the work done without having all of those positions.

As I said, you have to have some room in the complement in order to recruit and retain people as positions become vacant and we're able to fill them. So we have to have some room within our complement window to operate.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Okay. Well, 112 people, that seems like a lot of wiggle room, but thank you.

1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative 2 Kinsey. REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: 3 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. 4 SECRETARY HASSELL: Good afternoon. 5 REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: I want to focus 6 7 on working families for a second. The Governor 8 proposed -- in fact, his proposal to address the structural balance protects working families and the 10 middle class by avoiding broad-based tax increases, 11 such as personal income tax, as well as sales tax. 12 Can you describe the types of entities 13 that could possibly be impacted by the Governor's revenue proposal? 14 15 SECRETARY HASSELL: Sure. REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: And then I want 16 17 to jump to a second question, and that is -- well, can you just sort of give some information in 18 19 regards to -- some insight into how the new personal 20 income tax withholding requirements affect 21 businesses and their reporting requirements and what 22 your Department is doing to reach out to those 23 businesses, as well? 24 So I want to talk about taxes from a 2.5 personal perspective and then also from a business

perspective.

1.3

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: Okay. So let me start with the severance tax proposal. As you know, the Governor has proposed a severance tax on numerous occasions. He continues to believe that this is the right way to raise revenue for the Commonwealth because it's a very large industry and Pennsylvania is now the second State in the nation for production of natural gas.

The proposal would have a cents-per-thousand-cubic-feet-structure that would rise as the market price rises. It starts at 2.4 cents per thousand cubic feet for prices that are under \$3.00 per MCF.

It would be a structure that's similar to what is in place now for the impact fee. It would be administered in roughly the same way, through the Public Utility Commission. A second piece of the Governor's proposal is a reform of the corporate net income tax. And this is something that he has also asked for on several occasions.

The proposal is designed to make the system fairer and better. Currently, Pennsylvania is at the bottom of lots of companies' lists for expansion because of the 9.99 percent rate. And the

Governor's plan, as he has proposed in the past, is to bring that rate down so that it's less of an obstacle to business expansion, and at the same time broaden the base with combined reporting to preserve revenues.

1.3

2.0

2.5

So to your question about the -- I think you were referring to the 1099 withholding proposal; is that right?

The proposal was designed to affect non-residents of Pennsylvania, primarily. For people who have sources of income within Pennsylvania, but who may not live in Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania entity is required to withhold income tax on the money that's paid for non-business income.

Typically, what we would think of is a 1099-misc income, non-employee compensation, and also lease payments for businesses where there is a non-resident owner.

REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Okay. Great.

And I think the other part of my question is, what kind of outreach is your Department doing to inform businesses of these requirements?

And do you have the -- I guess, earlier someone talked about your staffing ratio. So the

outreach is part of my question, but also the capacity to do outreach.

1.3

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: The Department has been releasing materials, technical guidance and been doing outreach through the professional associations, the PACPA --

REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Okay.

SECRETARY HASSELL: -- and other tax preparers to let them know what the law requires. We are working with them to answer a lot of questions and to help them help their clients to get into compliance.

For the withholding piece of this, the feedback that we have gotten is that the withholding requirements that were effective January 1st came at them very late in the process because the budget wasn't passed until the end of October. And lots of people were saying to us that they needed more time to implement those changes.

And so the Department made an announcement that we would withhold on implementing any enforcement of the withholding requirements until at least July 1st. So we are working with people, helping them to make the changes they need and to go forward from there.

```
REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Great.
1
                                                 Thank
2
     you, Mr. Secretary.
 3
                Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 4
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative
5
     Boback.
 6
                REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Secretary
7
     Hassell, I'm up here.
8
                My questions are specific to the Federal
     Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. I think there's a little
9
     redundancy. And if there is, just clarify, if you
10
11
     would, please.
12
                SECRETARY HASSELL: Certainly. Well,
13
     I've seen and read the reports that many other
     States will be realizing increases in personal
14
     income tax revenue due to the State income tax base
15
16
     being linked to the expanded Federal tax base.
17
                REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: So just for
18
     clarification purposes, is the Pennsylvania personal
19
     income tax base in any way linked to the Federal
2.0
     personal income tax base?
21
                SECRETARY HASSELL: Thank you for that
22
     question.
                The answer is that, for the most part,
23
     the Pennsylvania personal income tax is not
     connected to the Federal system. So there isn't --
24
2.5
     there are not many places where there is a direct
```

linkage to the Federal changes. There are a few exceptions to that.

1.3

2.0

2.5

For example, in the Federal bill, they made changes to expand the use of 529 plans to private schools and some things like that. Our law does refer directly to those 529 provisions and so that expanded usage of 529 plans will flow through and affect personal income taxpayers in Pennsylvania, as well.

But again, that should be a relatively modest impact.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you for that. I do have a follow-up, if you will.

We heard from the IFO earlier this morning that incorporated into their estimates are increased revenues resulting from the Federal Act.

Do you have any idea how much additional revenue you could estimate from the Federal Tax Act?

In other words, what kind of amount and breakdown of the total tax revenue would we receive here in Pennsylvania by each tax type?

And if you don't have that answer, you could get it back to us, if you would.

SECRETARY HASSELL: For purposes of this fiscal year, we have not made changes due to the

Federal Act. What we've learned by looking at the bill here is that the primary impact is in the corporate tax and there are aspects of the Federal bill that should increase our base. And there are other aspects that will reduce our base.

1.3

2.0

2.5

There are both positives and negatives.

One potential negative from the Federal bill is that the corporate taxpayers may have made changes in their system to delay recognition of income and accelerate expenses in tax year 2017, which would reduce the amount of income that they're reporting last year.

And that would be a major negative. We don't know the extent to which that's happened. We probably won't know until those returns are filed this year, so that will balance out some of the other positives.

So at the moment, we're treating it as having no impact, but it's something we need to watch clearly to see what changes companies are making and what they're reporting.

REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: So we'll see you again next year at this time and then we'll find out, right?

Thank you, Secretary Hassell.

SECRETARY HASSELL: 1 Yes. 2 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 4 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Bullock. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Thank you, 7 Mr. Chairman. SECRETARY HASSELL: Good afternoon. 8 REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Good afternoon, 9 10 Secretary. 11 I'm going to ask two or three sort of 12 short-answer questions and then follow up with a 1.3 longer question, so I'll ask those questions first. First, what is the percentage of taxes or revenues 14 15 generated from Philadelphia, specifically, if you can give me that; and then, if you know, from a 16 17 larger sort of southeast region? 18 And the other question I have is, each 19 year I ask about diversity in our hiring and by our State with the belief that our work force should 2.0 21 reflect our Commonwealth. So if you can, share any 22 updates and changes in your work force and any 23 efforts to diversify that work force. 24 I'll let you answer those and then I'll 2.5 ask my follow-up question.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Let me speak generally to the first question. There are some revenue sources where we can tell where the money is paid from, and we publish on our website some tables showing where sales tax is paid from, where personal income tax is paid from, you know, for those kinds of things. There are other revenue sources in which we don't know and there's no way to know, for instance, corporate tax. We don't know where companies are operating.

1.3

2.0

2.5

They may be filing a return from their accountant's office in Chicago. We have no way to know what they're doing in Pennsylvania. So I'd be happy to provide the information we have available at the county level.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: I appreciate that.

SECRETARY HASSELL: And for the other issue, I will be happy to get you the information you're asking for.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Great. So my other question is in regards to cyber security. In recent years, we've seen a number of public, very public incidents in which cyber security breaches occurred, and as we move towards a system, we're

encouraging folks to pay their taxes online, do a lot of reporting online and now, actually, participate in the iLottery online.

1.3

2.0

2.5

What steps are you taking to protect
Pennsylvania working families in their
confidentiality and their privacy?

question. The confidentiality of taxpayer data is very important to us, and it's something we put a lot of effort into. So our IT people have spent a lot of time hardening our systems to encrypt the data that's stored in our systems, to encrypt data that's being transferred from one place to another, getting our mobile devices locked down so that they can't be accessed and protecting all of the Department's websites to make sure that bad actors are not able to hack into our systems.

Clearly, it would be a very, very bad thing for the Department's systems to be hacked.

And it's something that we put a lot of effort into protecting against. But beyond that, we're also working with the tax prep industry in general. It's just as important for accountants, tax preparers, individuals even, to be aware of what they need to do to protect their own computers.

So we've had some publicity news conference-type events in putting out guidance for individuals, saying how important it is for you as a taxpayer to protect your own identity, to protect your own computer from being hacked, for things as simple as making sure that your antivirus software is up to date, that you have a firewall, that you don't click on links that come to you in e-mails from people that you don't know, all those kind of basic things that we've heard about.

1.3

2.0

2.5

It's critically important that everyone in the system, since we're all linked together now, that everyone in the system take those same precautions in order to protect our data.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I have no further questions.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative
Ouinn.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you.

Over here, Mr. Secretary. Thank you for coming.

I commend the previous speaker for her line of questioning. And with that being said, I'm going to continue on it. You're absolutely right, there are bad actors out there and they're out to

get our data. I'm delighted to hear that you're well ahead in terms of encryption and things like that.

1.3

2.5

Can you speak to how many hits or attempted hacks your, for lack of a better word, cyber filters have been able to detect?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I don't know the exact number, but having talked to our IT people, I believe that government websites in general, ours included, are subject to many, many thousands of hacking attempts every day.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Every day?

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: It's the type of stuff I lay up in bed and can't sleep over, worried about things like this.

Could you please speak to the protocols you've put in place, if you have, to a follow-up?

For example, you've detected a breach, is there written policy to say in X many days, we will notify the constituents?

And if that happens, is there something in place already to say, and we will be offering continued monitoring of their credit reports for a year?

What have we done to parity what's happening in the public -- in the private sector?

SECRETARY HASSELL: Sure. Well, first and foremost, we will follow the statute. There has been legislation on this and we will follow the law that requires notification.

1.3

2.0

2.5

I can tell you about the one event that we had several years ago that taught us a valuable lesson about data breaches. And that is we had an event where we had a team of auditors in the field. Their car was broken into and their laptops were stolen from the car.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Oh, yeah.

SECRETARY HASSELL: And we were unable to confirm that all of the rules had been followed in terms of locking down their laptops. So in an abundance of caution, we treated that as a breach and there was information on hundreds of people in the auditor's laptop.

So we went through a process of gathering that data, literally from backups of the laptop since we didn't have it at hand. We had a team of people working on that, long hours, in order to assemble all of the data, and then put out a press release.

We sent out notices to all of the affected individuals, and we paid for credit monitoring services for a year for all of those people.

1.3

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay. That's good to hear.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: You can understand, then, when I look at the second line of your budget with regard to budget and process modernization, why I have a concern that in the last couple of years there's been a 28 percent reduction in funds for that, and this proposed budget has a 6 percent, so 22 and then -- well, roughly 6, not exact math, but you've got the picture.

It seems to me, with the increased demands and, you know, even the instance that you just spelled out about the hours and hours of man hours to do that, I feel, out of so many of these pages, that's something, if anything, that we ought to be beefing up and not reducing.

Do you feel you have adequate dollars for the cyber security demands that are on your agency?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I do. And let me

25 explain more about that line item. That is money

1 that will pay for the next phase of our 2 modernization of our systems. We are -- we have been pursuing an RFP for the last 12 months to 3 4 procure a new system that will include personal 5 income tax. 6 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Right. 7 SECRETARY HASSELL: And we are just about 8 done with that procurement. It's now in the final stages of the signature process. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: May I interrupt? 11 SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes. 12 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Just because I 13 have a feeling one of my colleagues might get into that. 14 15 SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes. 16 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: So if that is for the modernization, and I understand there's been 17 18 well over \$500 million spent towards that, in many 19 years combined, where would I look to see what is a 2.0 line item or a collection of line items with regard to cyber security? 21 22 SECRETARY HASSELL: I don't think that 23 there is a separate line item in our budget for 24 that, but let me just, just to complete the

thought -- the new system that we're purchasing for

2.5

personal income tax, I think, will provide much better security than the homegrown 30-year-old system that we're operating now. So I think that will be a major step forward in terms of securing taxpayer data.

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Question, you are still on or at least a portion of what happens in Revenue on the homegrown, the COBOL System in 30 years?

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Are you able to tell me if there's 50 percent of migration to a newer system or is it still 100 percent based on COBOL?

Secretary HASSELL: The major business tax systems have been converted over the last few years. The ones that are still outstanding are -- the big one being personal income tax, but also property tax rent rebate, the inheritance tax, realty transfer tax, some of the smaller pieces, as well, and motor fuels. Those are all things that will be converted under this new contract that I just mentioned.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: How many years do you anticipate that to take?

```
1
                SECRETARY HASSELL: It's a four-year
2
     contract, I believe.
 3
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: That has already
 4
     commenced?
5
                SECRETARY HASSELL: As I mentioned, it's
 6
     still to be approved by the Attorney General, but I
7
     think that's the last step in the process, then
8
     we'll be ready to go.
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you very
10
     much.
11
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Okay.
12
     good.
1.3
                Representative Donatucci.
                REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI:
14
                                            Thank you,
15
     Mr. Chairman. And thank you for being here today.
16
                Medical marijuana is being implemented in
17
     Pennsylvania through six dispensaries.
                                              There are
18
     3,000 residents and there is also uncertainty in the
19
     Federal government surrounding the program because
20
     the U.S. Attorney in the west said that he would
21
     prosecute. And when he was pressed, would you
22
     prosecute for medical marijuana, he hasn't given an
23
     answer.
                In the Middle District, it was said that
24
2.5
     they would honor the medical marijuana. We're still
```

waiting for an answer in the east. Because of all of this uncertainty, is it affecting the Department's ability to plan for a tax collection in that market?

1.3

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: No, it has not affected anything that we're doing at this point.

To my knowledge, the process continues to roll out with the growers being licensed and the dispensaries being licensed. And our role in it is to be ready to collect the tax once they begin operation, which I believe should be soon. And we are ready.

I have heard those same kinds of news reports, but I don't know more about that than you do.

REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI: Okay. Thank you.

And also, if I may, the Gaming Act lifted the ban on keno. So what are your plans in implementing keno in Pennsylvania?

Where will it be?

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes. Maybe Drew can speak more about this. As a general matter, the lottery has been recruiting retailers who will sign up for both keno and the virtual sports games that will be on monitors in bars and taverns and things

```
1
     like that and setting some aggressive goals for
2
     recruiting those retailers and getting all of them
     ready to sell those products by the first of May.
3
                Do you want to add anything to that?
 4
5
                EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Yeah, that's
6
             So May 1 is our goal to launch keno.
7
     will meet that goal. We have hundreds of new
8
     retailers recruited already to sell those new games.
                Again, as the Secretary mentioned, we're
10
     focusing on bars and taverns, social clubs, places
11
     where adults hang out and may benefit from some
12
     additional entertainment. But we have a goal of
13
     recruiting, bringing 3500 new retailers into our
14
     retailer mix.
15
                We have 9200 retailers right now.
16
     over the next couple of years, we'll have an
     additional 3,000-3,500.
17
18
                REPRESENTATIVE DONATUCCI:
                                            Thank you.
19
                Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative
21
     Peifer.
22
                REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER:
                                         Thank you,
23
     Chairman.
24
                Thank you, Secretary, for being here
2.5
     today.
```

We were talking about IT a little bit.

And I know back in 2008, when I was first elected,
we had many ideas that we wanted to run through
Revenue, but because the system was so old and
because we hadn't upgraded your system in such a
long time -- it was an old COBOL system. I know
Secretary Meuser was here and talked about some of
the concerns and a major upgrade has happened in
those 10 years, but at one point, I don't even think
we could add a special line or a check-off box for
charity because the system wouldn't allow it.

1.3

2.0

2.5

So I guess my question is this, back in 2008, we were able to pass Act 32, which consolidated the local tax collectors from, I think, a number of over 500 collectors to a number of 69 across the State. And that debate was on the floor. I know it was an interesting discussion. We felt there were insufficiencies with people sending money different places, employers' money kind of lost throughout the Commonwealth. And that's really been successful.

I think we did get a report from the Legislative Bureau on Finance that, you know, \$173 million through this Act was collected, an increase in earned income tax collections. So there were

definitely efficiencies there.

1.3

2.0

2.5

One of the amendments that day, when we passed Act 32, was the ability for all of the revenue from the local earned income tax to come to Revenue here in Harrisburg, just like our State revenues do. At that time, one of the reasons why that amendment failed, and I think it was a very close vote, it probably failed by single digits, was because Revenue said, look, you know, we don't have the system, the technology, to be able to collect this.

Earlier this month, 10 years later, we did pass a resolution in the Finance Committee asking Revenue, the IFO and DCED to look at this concept of the collection of the local earned income tax at the State level. I guess my question is, with your upgrades of your IT departments, do you feel that you could be capable of collecting these revenues and distributing them back to our schools and municipal governments?

SECRETARY HASSELL: The short answer to your question is, we have learned about the resolution that you spoke of, and we're happy to participate in a study to see what the pros and cons of taking that step would be and what the cost would

be. And I'm happy to participate in that study.

modernization with a new off-the-shelf income tax system, the company that does this, which is

Fast Enterprises, is used for income tax collection in many jurisdictions across the country. And there are other places where States use that software for local income tax collection. So it has been done with this system that we are acquiring. It probably is the time to look at this again and see how this would work and, you know, what the Revenue Department could do in response to that request.

REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Okay. Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative
Daley.

17 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Thanks,

18 Mr. Chairman.

2.5

Hello again. I wanted to go back to doing more with less. So over the past several years, I think, the complement for your Department has gone down by about 250 staff members. And that would be from 2015-'16. So I just wanted to -- I went and looked at those numbers.

So the question that I had about your

answer to earlier questions on the numbers, are you saying that if somebody leaves the Department or is planning to leave the Department, possibly retire, whatever, and you're going to replace them, there might be overlap of a person in the position for a period of time just for training purposes?

1.3

2.5

Does the Department actually have that luxury that you can pass information along that way to new employees?

Is that -- I was just curious about that.

SECRETARY HASSELL: So let me expand upon
the point that I made earlier. It's that the
process to fill a position, once a person leaves,
takes a certain amount of time.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Right.

SECRETARY HASSELL: If we were in a position where every time someone retired or quit that the position immediately disappeared, then the Department would begin to shrink its staff very rapidly over a period of time. We have to have some room within the complement in which to recruit people into those same jobs in order to just stay where we are and not continue to lose staff.

But you were exactly right, that the Department has downsized over -- you mentioned

250 -- over a period of years, especially as things have been modernized and technology was put into place. There are a lot of manual labor-type jobs that have been eliminated. That has allowed us to continue to get the job done, even with a smaller complement.

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Can you evaluate your own Department on the level of customer service that you are able to provide with the lower number of people?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I have to say that I would like to be doing much better with customer service than we are today. It is a fact that the number of people that we have available in our call center is down significantly. I don't recall the numbers, but it means that people are aware that —there are frequently busy signals when you call the Department.

That's something we're looking at and laying some plans in order to deal with that issue because providing customer service is part of tax administration. And it's something I would like to do better with.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Okay. Thank you. And then one last piece. With the different new tax

1 types that were implemented recently, do you have 2 sufficient resources to enact those and to get them going smoothly, and also with potential new tax 3 revenues that could possibly be passed this year? 4 SECRETARY HASSELL: We do. I think that 5 we're okay where we are today. We are always 6 looking for innovative ideas and ways to do things 7 better in order to be more efficient in what we do. 8 And as some of these things have been passed in 10 legislation, some of the IT projects that we have 11 had, we have had to put on hold temporarily in order 12 to make resources available to put in place some of 1.3 the new changes, but nevertheless, I think that the work is getting done and we have the resources that 14 15 we need. 16 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: So your budget for 17 this year reflects an adequate funding to get the 18 job done if any of these new taxes are implemented? SECRETARY HASSELL: 19 Yes. 2.0 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Or to continue 21 with implementing the ones that you had from last 22 vear? 23 SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes. 24 REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Okay. Thank you. 2.5 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative

Christiana. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 4 Good afternoon, Secretary. Mr. Secretary, over here -- to your 5 right. 6 7 SECRETARY HASSELL: Sorry. REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Thank you. 8 SECRETARY HASSELL: I apologize. 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: No, no, no. 11 It's okay. 12 In his budget address, the Governor stated that this budget could be funded, quote, 13 14 without any tax increases on Pennsylvania families, 15 but as you mentioned, just three short paragraphs after that, the Governor proposes another severance 16 tax. 17 The Governor even admits in that section 18 19 that the severance tax will be paid by the people, 2.0 the consumers of that natural gas. Would you agree 21 with the Governor that a severance tax is ultimately 22 paid by the consumer of natural gas? 23 SECRETARY HASSELL: The way I understand 24 it is that natural resources that are mined from a 2.5 State and exported carry the tax burden with them.

It's something that is already happening for States that produce natural gas or oil or any of the other kinds of things.

2.5

And we are paying other States severance taxes currently because we are consumers of those products and so --

REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: We're consumers of other states' natural gas?

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Okay. So you would admit -- what you're saying, though, makes sense to me, that ultimately the consumer of the product, of the natural resources pays the taxes associated with that. I think that's what the Governor was saying. That sounds like what you would say, and what I would agree with.

But the consumers of the natural gas are also Pennsylvania families, correct?

SECRETARY HASSELL: My understanding is that the great majority of the natural gas that's produced here is exported.

REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Okay. So then, you would agree that whether the Governor's number of 20 percent is accurate, 20 percent is consumed within Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania families

using natural gas would be paying a severance tax that they're currently not paying, which would ultimately be an increase on Pennsylvania families, correct?

1.3

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: I think that the Governor's statements have been about avoiding broad-based tax increases, sales tax, income tax in this budget.

with you, Mr. Secretary, but he said without any tax increases in his budget. So while I would agree with you that he didn't say -- he could have said without a broad-based tax increase, but what he's saying is that this budget could be balanced without any tax increase on Pennsylvania families.

And what you and I seem to agree on is that some of the natural gas consumed in Pennsylvania would bear the burden of a severance tax, therefore, can we just say that Pennsylvania families will pay higher taxes to fund this budget if this budget relies on severance tax revenue?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I think that, again, the great majority of that revenue will come from out-of-state consumers and that the impact on Pennsylvania families should be minimal.

1 REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Okay. Can we 2 talk about the amount of revenue anticipated from 3 the Governor's severance tax proposal? 4 How much revenue do you anticipate coming into the Treasury in budget year 2018-'19 from the 5 6 Governor's severance tax proposal? 7 SECRETARY HASSELL: I believe the 8 estimate is for \$248 million next year. REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: And is that 10 exclusively from unconventional drilling or would 11 that include conventional drilling, as well? SECRETARY HASSELL: It's on the same 12 13 wells that the impact fee is imposed on, so it's unconventional. 14 15 REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: unconventional? 16 17 SECRETARY HASSELL: Yep. 18 REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Okay. 19 can you maybe just address how after the Supreme 2.0 Court's recent decision on the casinos that this 21 would not violate the uniformity requirement for 22 taxes? 23 SECRETARY HASSELL: Well, I'm not a 24 Justice of the Supreme Court, but the impact fee has 2.5 stood the test of time, at this point. And this

proposal is structured in the same way and should have the same effect.

REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: But the impact fee would not necessarily -- a fee does not violate the Uniformity Clause about taxes, correct?

So the fact that we call it a fee versus calling a severance tax a tax could violate the Uniformity Clause if you look at the casino industry and what the Supreme Court has recently said about treating those within an industry differently.

SECRETARY HASSELL: For those legal issues that have to do with the Uniformity Clause, the question that would go to Court would be, is there a rational basis to distinguish one class from another class?

And so in this case, the question would be, is there a rational basis to distinguish these unconventional wells from other types of wells?

I think you can, you know, the legislature has decided that there is a rational distinction between those two types of things.

REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Do you think that there's a rational distinction between these two?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I do.

1.3

```
1
                REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIANA: Okav.
2
     you, Mr. Chairman.
 3
                Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
 4
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative
5
     Schweyer.
 6
                REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER:
                                          Thank you,
7
     Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to ask a
8
     question here. I'd like to talk a little bit,
     switch over to tobacco taxes. It's something that I
10
     really am sort of concerned about.
11
                I think the last number is that we
12
     generated about $450 million a year, give or take,
     based on taxes levied on tobacco products.
13
14
                Is that about your number?
15
                Am I way off base there or --
                SECRETARY HASSELL: I think it's higher
16
17
     than that. Hang on a second.
18
                SECRETARY HASSELL: So last fiscal year
19
     through June, there was collection of
2.0
     $1,261,000,000.00 just in cigarette tax.
21
                REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: And the
22
     $450 million was the increase in the taxes.
23
     believe that's the correct number.
                SECRETARY HASSELL: That may be right.
24
2.5
                REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: But the overall
```

number of folks that are using and consuming tobacco-based products seems to be shrinking every year.

1.3

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes. So it sounds like this might be really good healthcare policy or public health policy, in terms of a fiscal strategy for the Commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Continuing to rely on the shrinking base seems like either it's something that we're going to have to either, A, encourage more people to smoke, which seems stupid, or continue to increase the taxes on the consumer of this one to continue to get that billion-plus a year of annual revenue, correct.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yeah, I would agree with you that to some extent those two things are our intention, right?

It's in the public's best interest to reduce the amount of people who are smoking cigarettes, but if we're successful at that, there will be less tax revenue.

So eventually moving away from this as a way to fund a significant part of our General Fund may be an appropriate way to move forward for the Commonwealth, from both a getting rid of that

cognitive dissidence between what is the right public policy versus the right fiscal policy.

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: But also, as people do continue to move away from tobacco-based products, using that. I'm worried about the volatility, I guess, is the point I'm trying to get at, the other half of the point, the volatility in that tax.

It's not going to be -- do you have any objections about the stability of that moving forward?

Are you worried about the stability of that income that's generated?

SECRETARY HASSELL: It's not that it's unstable. It's that it reliably goes down year after year for exactly the reason you stated. And in fact, one of the problems in this fiscal year's revenue was exactly that, the implementation of the dollar per pack increase in cigarette tax had a larger impact reducing tax revenue there than the estimate allowed for.

We knew that the cigarette tax, at the base, would shrink with a higher rate, but it did so even more than we had anticipated. So I think it is something that deserved some study and is a source

of concern, to the extent that we have revenue sources that are not only not stable, but are actually shrinking over time. That's going to be a fiscal problem.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Switching gears a little bit. Again, I'm looking long term on a number of these issues, but staying with the general realm of tobacco-based funding. At our tobacco settlement, we borrowed a significant amount of money from it, paid off -- and we're taking money for future revenues.

Could we describe a little bit about what the long-term impact is going to be on the ability to those tobacco cessation programs in out years as a result of us using one-time funding to balance a budget last year?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I think I would recommend that this be a conversation with the Budget Secretary for the support of those spending programs going forward over time. That's probably not something I can address.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHWEYER: Fair enough. I'll save that for that day.

Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.5

1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative 2 Dunbar.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.5

Welcome, Secretary. I'll follow up on where Representative Schweyer was going, as far as we're talking about revenues. I think it is something that we do need to discuss, that we saw the after effects of overzealous revenue estimates in the past. I'm sure none of us want to go back down that road again.

With that being said, as I look at the Governor's revenue projections in some of the out years, most specifically CNIT in '18-'19, a little bit over \$3 billion, \$3.074 billion. And then in '19-'20, it jumps up to \$4.007 billion, which is almost a billion dollar increase, a 31 percent increase, doing quick math.

I understand that in our questions we were told that the majority of that increase is coming from implementation of combined reporting and a number that you provided us was \$903 million, which to me, makes me a little bit nervous because I go back to the same conversation I had with Secretary McNulty two years ago.

And I asked her, what is the revenue projection, net of any rate changes, for combined reporting?

1.3

2.0

2.5

She told me \$507 million. This morning,

I asked IFO the same question and they told me 300

million. So I'm curious to where we get to \$900

million. If you could -- and fortunately, it's a

couple years out, so if you can elaborate a little

bit how you got to that number, I'd appreciate that.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Sure. You're probably aware that the Department has been asked to analyze combined reporting proposals many times over the years, and we spent a lot of time on it, going back to the '80s. And so we have developed a methodology that starts with tax return data from a combined reporting state and matches those returns up with Pennsylvania returns to see how the base would be different than the base that we have today, if we were to implement combined reporting.

And so that's the source of information for a lot of these kinds of --

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: So you can attribute any type of change in the last two years -- because it was Secretary McNulty that gave me the \$500 million number.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Well, let me just add to that that the estimates are very sensitive to what you do with net operating loss carryovers. And some proposals that we have looked at over time have proposed including an uncapped on a well going forward. This proposal keeps in place current law, which is a 40 percent limit on NOL usage. And those — and I don't know the specific numbers. Maybe Amy Gill to my right can speak to that, but those issues are very important in determining what the number is.

2.0

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Just for my own good, if someone could provide me just an analysis of where we were two years ago and where we are today. And I understand the Nextel case has transpired since then, but --

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: But at least if I can understand a little bit better, I'd feel comfortable about that.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Changing gears a little bit. We talked a little bit about the tax cut, the Jobs Act and what happened in Federal government and what we have and haven't done here in

Pennsylvania. And no, I'm not going to bonus depreciation. I'll let someone else take care of that.

1.3

2.0

2.5

But part of the tax cut in the Jobs Act was the elimination of unreimbursed employee business expenses on the Federal level. So there's no longer going to be a deduction for that at the Federal level.

Has there been any consideration and discussion between you and the Administration about doing that at the Pennsylvania level, as you talk about new and innovative revenue sources?

I call it a tax increase, but has there been any discussion about eliminating that in Pennsylvania?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I'm not aware of any kind of discussion about that. That is one of those issues that would not impact our system directly, unless, as you said, that were adopted specifically. But it is something we could get back to you on.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Okay. And lastly, last year, maybe it was early this year or late last year, there was a news release about a glitch in a computer system that held back some refunds, about \$15 million of refunds. And I had

several calls of practitioners, most of them were sales tax refunds that were through the Board of Appeals.

1.3

2.0

2.5

Is that what everything was tied up -- was it appellate-type refunds that were held up?

What exactly happened there?

I also heard that it was Treasury.

Can you enlighten us a little bit so we don't go down the same road.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes. So last fall there was a problem discovered in the communications between our business access system and Treasury's. Those two systems are in daily communication, literally, because there are so many refunds requested by our Department.

We issue 1.6 million refunds a year so a tremendous number. Treasury let us know that they were having to reject some of our refund requests because the name wasn't formatted correctly. Like a long company name would get truncated, literally.

And we needed to make changes in order to simply get the name formatted correctly. That took a little bit of time. There were, as I recall, something like 700 refunds affected. And it was resolved in January, I believe, by resolving that

1 miscommunication between the two agencies. 2 that's probably what you're hearing about. REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Okay. Thank you. 3 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative 4 Briggs. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Thank you, 7 Chairman. I just wanted to ask a couple of 8 questions about the lottery, so I'll direct them to Drew. It's amazing the innovation and the way 10 you're able to keep costs low with all the programs 11 that the lottery handles. I had a question 12 regarding the RFP process for the instant tickets and related services. 1.3 My understanding -- that's being drafted 14 15 as we speak, I quess? SECRETARY HASSELL: 16 Correct. 17 REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: My understanding 18 is that two distinct services are going to be 19 included in one RFP. One is related to warehousing 2.0 and distribution and delivery services, and the 21 other is the printing of the tickets. 22 Has there been any conversation or can 23 you explain to me why it's -- it seems like one 24 entity would have to have dual specialties to

provide the best service for the lottery.

2.5

Is there a reason why it's in one contract?

1.3

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yeah. So we -- so you're talking about the Instant Tickets, the scratch-off tickets. Right, there are some -- there are two, essentially, parts of that contract, the distribution, as you said, and the warehousing and then the actual printing and design of those tickets.

We generally -- and most lotteries bundle it as one because the efficiency of our business and the efficiency of the distribution of that product depends so heavily upon data and the people that -- and that also feeds into the design of the product.

So in other words, if we -- when we're designing a game, we have to sort of right size it for the market and that's really -- that's determined not only by demand, but also by factors like distribution. And so our approach has been, in most, if not all of the top 10 lotteries that I'm aware of, to bundle it as one because of the reliance upon data and how important it is for us to make sure that when we're designing products, that we're considering the supply chain as part of that whole product design process.

REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Is the one winner of the contract -- are they guaranteed all of the printing services, are you aware?

1.3

2.5

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: So we haven't released the contract yet. But generally speaking -- I'll speak even to our existing contract -- we have the ability to contract with not just one supplier, but have other, you know, a certain percentage of the contract can be still -- a percentage of the ticket, I should say can be printed by a third party or another major supplier so that's a practice that we've used in our contracts for as far back as I can remember, 20 years. I expect it to be the case going forward, as well.

We always want the best overall solution, but the ability to go out and get something if the next greatest thing happens next week.

REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: I mean, that's the point I was trying to get to and I'm glad you go there regarding the innovation. A number of the lotteries in the country allow 50 to 30 percent of secondary vendors for printing various things as they come up. My understanding is Pennsylvania uses 10 percent.

1 If there's any way to figure out if 2 that's the right number or to try to make that -- if the lottery deems fair, I think it's the minimum is 3 90 percent for the primary vendor. If they're doing 4 a great job, I guess they could do it all. 5 6 But you know, if something does come up, it would be great to be able to take advantage of 7 8 that, so thank you very much. Thank you, Chairman. 10 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative 11 Helm. 12 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 Secretary Hassell. 14 15 SECRETARY HASSELL: Ηi. REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Hi. I'd like to 16 17 talk about the Property Tax Rent Rebate Program. 18 The estimated amount of the property tax rent rebates to be paid in 2018-'19 is \$262.8 million, 19 which is a decrease of \$1.9 million from 2017-'18. 2.0 21 Please explain the decline in the amount 22 of rebates under the Property Tax Rebate Program in 23 light of the anticipated growing senior population 24 in the Commonwealth. 2.5 And do you anticipate a growing demand

for this program as more of the baby boomers are becoming age eligible for the program?

1.3

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes, thank you for that. The history of the program is that whenever the parameters remain the same for a period of time, then the numbers begin to go down gradually. And I think it's just because the -- as incomes of seniors rise, then fewer people are going to qualify under those income parameters.

And you're right that the number of seniors is rising and is going to continue to rise, but that doesn't seem to be offsetting the bracket creep, essentially, of people whose incomes are rising.

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: I get a lot of questions about that, so I have another question to talk about a letter that was sent December 1, 2017 to all legislators. Outlined is a new process for legislative offices to contact the Department of Revenue regarding constituent inquiries.

And part of this process includes having the constituents sign a waiver for the Department to discuss account specifics with the member's office staff. I just was wondering, why was this change made and under what circumstances must a waiver be

obtained from the constituents?

1.3

2.5

As an example, people many times contact our office to simply see if, you know, to find out about their Property Tax Rent Rebate. I just wondered, in this case, will I need to have them sign the waiver?

SECRETARY HASSELL: Sure. So there was a conversation earlier about the security of taxpayer data, and it is something we take very seriously.

We put that process in place to protect seniors in PTRR, but taxpayers in general. And it's simply a process that allows us to make sure that the information we're releasing to a member's office is something they authorized, that they're okay with it.

It is similar to a process that's in place in other States, as well as with the IRS. So I know from my own personal experience of dealing with the IRS on my mother's behalf, they -- the Congressman's office would not deal with her issue until there was a waiver in hand that they could give to the IRS, so it's a fairly common type of process.

But specifically on PTRR, we have said that if it's just a status inquiry to ask, you know,

```
1
     what's the status currently on a rebate claim we'll
2
     do that without the waiver in hand. But if you want
     to pursue it further and ask, well, if it was
 3
     denied, why was it denied, what was the income
 4
     reported, what's the issue, then I think we're going
5
     to have to have the waiver in hand.
 6
7
                Again, it's to protect the individual
     from unauthorized use of their information.
8
                REPRESENTATIVE HELM: I know the office
10
     staff was concerned to listen to your answer there.
                What about the cost, is there a cost to
11
12
     implement this?
                 SECRETARY HASSELL: I don't believe so.
1.3
                REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Okay. Another
14
15
     question, which you didn't answer earlier, but the
16
     Farm Show. I was really interested to hear your
17
     answer.
18
                Since you couldn't answer, who can we
19
     contact?
2.0
                Who can give us those answers?
21
                 SECRETARY HASSELL: I would think that
22
     the Department of General Services has been involved
23
     in that and also the Budget Office.
24
                REPRESENTATIVE HELM: All right. Thank
2.5
     you.
```

SECRETARY HASSELL: 1 Yes. 2 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Kim. 3 REPRESENTATIVE KIM: Good afternoon. 4 SECRETARY HASSELL: Good afternoon. 5 REPRESENTATIVE KIM: My question is that 6 7 I believe you have a program for compulsive 8 gamblers. It's a small program where if you believe you have a gambling problem, you can sign yourself 10 up and essentially be banned from certain places. 11 I was wondering, now that the iSports is 12 coming up, is there that same kind of process for Internet users? 1.3 SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes, I believe that 14 15 there is a self exclusion component to this. 16 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Absolutely. 17 The R.I. lottery program will have all the social 18 responsibility controls that you would expect. 19 are following industry standard. There's an 2.0 industry certification in Internet gaming, and we're 21 following that as our lead as we design the program 22 and all of the controls that will be in place. 23 Players will have the ability to not only 24 self exclude, and they can self exclude for, you 2.5 know, maybe take a year off or maybe take forever

off, but there will be other daily spend limits, amount of time, these are all configurable by the user. In their account setup, they'll be able to have a lot of controls and put a lot of controls in place if they're concerned that they would not be able to use it responsibly.

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE KIM: Thank you for that answer. And in, let's say the past two years, have you seen a number of users going up or has it stayed the same in terms of people signing up?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: So we don't have that program yet. The casinos have --

REPRESENTATIVE KIM: Oh, no. In terms of the program.

Yeah, the casinos.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Right. The casinos have a self exclusion program. The lottery doesn't yet. It will be coming as part of our iLottery solution. But responsible gaming is something that we're awfully concerned about and committed to and absolutely committed to working with professionals.

So we're not problem gambling experts, but we partner with problem gambling experts, like our partners at DDAP, as well as the Pennsylvania

```
1
     Council on Compulsive Gambling. We have a
2
     longstanding sponsorship and partnership with them.
     And we sponsor, we help sponsor the 1-800-GAMBLER
 3
     hotline, as well.
 4
 5
                REPRESENTATIVE KIM: Okay. That's good
 6
     to hear.
7
                 I know from the information that we
8
     received that Instant Games is going up and doing
     well. You know, representing an impoverished area,
10
     I get a little protective over my folks.
11
                Do you have any profile as to who they
12
     are?
1.3
                And do you keep track of who they are in
     terms of the Instant Games?
14
15
                EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Obviously, we
     don't track consumers.
16
17
                REPRESENTATIVE KIM:
                                      Right.
                EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO:
18
                                             We do
19
     surveys. And we know from that, and this is
20
     counterintuitive, but we know from that that by and
21
     large, at the end of the year, the people that play
22
     Pennsylvania lottery are the average Pennsylvanians.
23
     We see two differences, actually, in our data and
24
     that is that the household income is slightly above
2.5
     statewide average and education rankings are --
```

ratings are slightly higher than average.

1.3

2.5

I know that's counterintuitive from what people think, but if we're talking about, you know, people who played the lottery over the course of the year, and it's, you know, it's six or seven million adult Pennsylvanians play the lottery every year. So it's a wide range of people, but we don't, to your question, don't track it by individual.

REPRESENTATIVE KIM: Okay. I appreciate your answers. That's all I have.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you,
Representative. Over here on your right, at the good-looking table.

You started down the road of iGaming for a brief period to talk about keno. I wonder if you could expand upon that a little bit and explain to me exactly what virtual sports gaming might look like.

And then, among those 3,000 new vendors, which you will have, what sort of establishments will benefit from that and how will they benefit by providing that service?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Sure. So

I'll start with the last one, the type of
establishment. So our monitor games -- and that's
the product category we're talking about. We're
talking about keno and virtual sports, our monitor
games. And they're called that because in these
age-controlled social environments like bars and
taverns, that tends to be where they're most
successful.

1.3

2.5

That's what we hope to get lots of, and are, so far, successful in that, but in those locations, there are monitors up on the wall, so a big screen TV. And you watch -- essentially, you watch the drawing on that big screen TV.

So that's why they're called monitor games. So monitor games like keno and virtual sports will be played in, again, mostly social environments, where adults tend to hang out.

There will be -- you will see it in some more traditional lottery locations. You may see some grocery stores have a cafe attached to them if they have a license to, you know, promote on-premise consumption of alcohol. So it may be in places like that. But all retailers, all 9200 other retailers, will also be able to sell those products, but they

won't have a monitor.

1.3

2.5

So while you can buy monitor games -- you will be able to buy as of May 1st monitor games in maybe a convenience store. It may not make sense for us to go through the expense of having the monitors on the wall in those locations, so we're really focused more on the social environments, but all 9200 retailers will be able to sell those products.

So virtual sports you asked about. Yeah, virtual sports, it's a really exciting product.

What does it look like? Think about -- I will take a step back. These are products that are designed to attract a new audience, right.

It's the most responsible thing we can do long-term, is grow the business by reaching new players in new ways, by delivering a relevant and engaging, entertaining content to an increasing breadth of lottery players, all over the age of 18, but these products are designed to attract younger people.

So if you think about what a lot of younger people grew up doing -- I'm talking about 25-year-olds, right, grew up playing video games and that's a big source of entertainment and continues

to be. I have a 23-year-old son who still plays video games occasionally.

1.3

2.0

2.5

But those games are -- those virtual sports games will look like the highest quality sports sort of video games that you can imagine.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Are they interactive?

so they're not interactive. It is -- in essence, I mean, the way they work is, you are watching a lottery drawing. It just looks like you're watching a football game or a snippet of the football game. The drawings themselves will be actually conducted through a random number generator, just like we do for our midday draws and have done for many years.

And then those machines just animate the drawing results to look like a football game. It's complex stuff, but it's really neat, really engaging, entertaining content. We're excited to launch it. We're going to be, I think, the first U.S. lottery to launch it in brick-and-mortar retail stores.

We're excited about it because we think it really proves our relevance as an entertainment source to a whole new generation of lottery players.

1 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Our target 2 beneficiaries are, then, typically older 3 Pennsylvanians. 4 What is your feeling about the long-term stability of the lottery system that we have now? 5 6 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: So I think 7 Act 42, which gave us the ability to sell iLottery 8 and monitor games, was a fantastic step toward stable, long-term growth of profits for older 10 Pennsylvanians. It's again -- we've never been told 11 that we don't need more money, so we have to keep 12 generating more money. And if we have to do that by 13 just asking existing players to spend more, that doesn't make business sense. 14 15 It's not good government. It's not good 16 policy. It's not sustainable. So by growing in 17 these new ways, I think is a great thing. It's 18 absolutely something that is going to continue to 19 grow well into the future. 2.0 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you. 21 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Okav. 22 Representative Keller. 23 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you, Mr. 24 Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, and the rest of

2.5

```
1
     your team for being here today. I'd like to go back
     to the refunds that we had an issue with because of
2
     the truncated names.
3
 4
                Was that a problem with the system at
     Revenue or was that a problem with the system at
5
 6
     Treasury?
7
                SECRETARY HASSELL: I think --
                REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Who changed?
8
                Who changed their system, I guess, would
9
10
     be the --
11
                SECRETARY HASSELL: My understanding is
12
     that there were changes on both sides, honestly.
1.3
     The Treasurer made a change and they started looking
     more closely at business tax refunds than they had
14
15
     in the past. And as we were making adjustments to
     accommodate that, allowing them to reject one refund
16
     request at a time instead of a whole batch of
17
18
     thousands of them, then that triggered some of these
19
     other problems.
2.0
                REPRESENTATIVE KELLER:
                                         I quess I --
21
     because what you told us earlier was there was a
22
     problem because the names were truncated.
23
                SECRETARY HASSELL:
                                     Yes.
24
                REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Who truncated the
2.5
     names?
```

1 SECRETARY HASSELL: Our system. 2 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay. And we didn't think that we should test that? 3 SECRETARY HASSELL: It was not something 4 that was picked up in our testing. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: So we -- okay. 7 I find that -- I mean, if our stated mission and 8 goal is to fairly, efficiently and accurately administer tax laws and other revenue programs of 10 the Commonwealth and the testimony that you gave us, 11 I think we probably failed. 12 SECRETARY HASSELL: On this particular 13 issue, it should not have occurred. I would agree. REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I quess that 14 15 gives me much concern over other areas, which I'm 16 going to go back to one here. It mentions as part 17 of the Governor's GO-TIME Initiatives, the 18 Department saved taxpayers \$29.3 million in the last 19 fiscal year. 2.0 Due to issues with fraudulent and erroneous tax refunds -- have we corrected --21 22 mean, have we corrected the things that we would be 23 making errors on with tax refunds? 24 SECRETARY HASSELL: We're talking about 2.5 errors on tax returns that come to us. And we have

established a new unit in the Department, the Fraud Investigation Unit, whose job it is to watch out for fraudulent requests for refunds from the Commonwealth because, as we've talked about here already today, there are many people out there who seem to be looking for ways to break our system and to get money from the Commonwealth when they're not --

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Are we sure that we don't have any errors in that system that pick up law-abiding citizens like we had in the ones that didn't get their refunds?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I'm sure that nothing is 100 percent. And the system that we have in place to detect fraudulent refunds has multiple components to it. We're working with software that flags certain refunds as being suspicious and worthy of follow up.

And we have individuals who then look at them more closely and often a letter is sent to the home address of the individual asking them to verify that it's their return and to verify the information on the return. So those identity verification letters have been ramped up dramatically in order to make sure that we're not dealing with someone who

has stolen someone's identity in order to defraud the Commonwealth of a refund.

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: So we're confident that law-abiding taxpayers won't have the same issue that the 700 returns experienced this past year?

SECRETARY HASSELL: As I said, nothing is ever 100 percent, but we're working very hard to make sure that we do what we do efficiently and accurately.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay. Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative

Greiner.

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Thank you,} $$\operatorname{Mr. Chairman.}$$

Good afternoon, Secretary Hassell. I have a question, which I had asked this morning also, about the Federal bonus depreciation and the Corporation Tax Bulletin 2017-02. The Federal Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 provided the schedule for bonus depreciation over several years, initially permitting a 100 percent bonus depreciation for property placed in service after September 27th of 2017.

I know you're aware of this, but on

December 22nd, 2016, your Department issued a Corporation Tax Bulletin, the 2017-02, addressing disallowance and recovery of the 100 percent depreciation.

1.3

2.0

2.5

And on background, I said this morning, I've worked in public accounting for over 20 years and worked with a lot of companies and we try to create jobs in this State. I'm actually concerned about the message that was sent to the business community in issuance of this bulletin.

And I need to ask, in your opinion, is it sound tax policy to completely allow depreciation over the usable life of business property as the business -- as your Bulletin prescribes? Until the property is sold or otherwise disposed -- we're talking about this for life exchange, now we're talking about this for actual purchases. And are you aware of any other State that has taken this position?

SECRETARY HASSELL: To address the last question first, I don't think so. But let me back up a little bit. We're working with the statute that was adopted in 2002 in order to decouple Pennsylvania corporate tax from the first version of bonus depreciation that was enacted by the Federal

government.

1.3

2.5

That initial Federal law allowed a 30 percent bonus and it was the agreement of the General Assembly and the Governor at the time to not allow that to flow through into our tax. The problem that has occurred since then is that the formula that's in that decoupling statute was designed for 30 percent and it doesn't work that well when the rate is something other than 30 percent.

Because for a number of years there has been in Federal law a bonus of 50 percent. We still have had this statute that says, well, you had back the 50 percent bonus, but we're going to allow you to recover that by scaling up the remaining appreciation by 30 percent. So the formula that's in the statute doesn't work that well with a bonus that's other than 30 percent. And we were faced with a difficult choice. The Federal bill that adopted 100 percent bonus depreciation passed at the end of December.

And we needed to provide some quick guidance for what taxpayers were supposed to do as they began to fill out their returns early in January. And it is not within our ability as an

agency, it's not within our ability to fix this formula that's in the statute.

1.3

2.5

What the Bulletin does is simply follow the literal letter of the law, which gives you the result that you described. And I'm not going to say that that's the correct policy result, but --

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Let -- yeah,
because I know I'm probably running out of time
here. Let me just follow up on that. I mean, the
reality is that whatever we do is going to end up
being revenue neutral anyway. Now, maybe you are
dealing with the time value of money, but the
reality is, it is going to be revenue neutral over
time for the State, correct, with the --

SECRETARY HASSELL: Eventually.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Exactly.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes, over a 20-year period. Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Well, let me ask

you -- let me just follow up because I do want to

emphasize that point, but let me follow up. We have

a bill that just came out of the House Committee.

It was unanimous out of the Finance Committee,

HB 2017, that brings in where we're allowed to still

depreciate an asset, not necessarily take the 100

percent.

1.3

2.0

2.5

I don't know whether you've looked at the language in that bill. And I wanted to know whether you've -- first of all, have you done an analysis on that bill and would the Department and Administration support that language in that bill at this point?

SECRETARY HASSELL: We have looked at that bill. There was an amendment in Committee recently that I think corrected some of the issues that we had with it. I think the language works as it is. My only comment on it is that our standard answer on any tax legislation that has a fiscal impact is that it should be considered in the context of balancing the budget and that's the same answer that we have on this.

It's that what we have done is to buy time for the General Assembly to act to consider what to do on this score so that it can be fixed in the statute where it belongs.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Appreciate your answer. Appreciate the time.

Thank you.

SECRETARY HASSELL: All right.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative

```
1
     Grove.
2
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Good afternoon.
                SECRETARY HASSELL: Good afternoon.
 3
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                        Thanks for joining
 4
     us. First, you sent over a sheet of IT budgeting
5
 6
     stuff.
7
                Do you have that there with you?
                It was sent over --
8
                SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes, I understand
9
10
     that that came from the Budget Office.
                                              There was a
11
     response from the Budget Office to your questions on
12
     this. I don't think we've seen what was sent yet.
13
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay.
                                               Well,
     there's -- line one of this is general government
14
15
     operations personnel. Our understanding is your
     personnel budget for your IT employees, '17-'18,
16
     listed as $20.2 million, '18-'19 listed as $175,000.
17
18
     So obviously, a large drop in cost for IT personnel.
19
                Getting rid of them, are they shifted
2.0
     somewhere else?
21
                SECRETARY HASSELL: They are -- they are
22
     part of the Governor's initiative to centralize IT
23
     and HR resources --
24
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                        Okay.
2.5
                SECRETARY HASSELL: -- under the Office
```

```
1
     of Administration, so they're no longer in our
2
     budget.
 3
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                        So my
 4
     understanding with discussions from Secretary
5
     Minnich of OA is while the employees will be under
 6
     OA, they're getting charged back to you; is that
7
     still accurate?
                SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes.
8
                                           Yes.
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: So should your GGO
9
10
     reflect that cost or should OA's if they're getting
11
     charged back?
12
                SECRETARY HASSELL: As I understand it,
13
     the mechanism -- the formula for charging those
     costs back to agencies is still being resolved.
14
15
     It's been a subject of study and we haven't landed
     on a final formula at this point. So we don't know
16
17
     exactly what those numbers will be.
18
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay.
                                               But if we
19
     get OA's budget, it should reflect the total cost of
20
     personnel, basically what your documents are
21
     showing, those costs have been shifted over to OA's
22
     budget?
23
                DEPUTY SECRETARY GILL:
                                         Correct.
24
                SECRETARY HASSELL: Correct.
2.5
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                        Correct, okay.
```

That answers that question.

1.3

2.0

2.5

Could you give a breakdown, past seven years to make it a good bipartisan breakdown, of your head count for IT personnel compared to your staff augmentation?

I believe there should be a staff augmentation contract utilized.

Can you give us a breakdown of the temporary augmentation staff versus your actual employee head count, past seven years?

SECRETARY HASSELL: Sure.

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: That would be helpful. Thank you. \\$

I asked this earlier with the IFO. They did a -- and this goes back to last year's budget. They did a mid-year update published January 25th, 2017. They assumed revenues would continue to fall short of estimate over the next five months after January. The fiscal year would be short of estimates, \$716.4 million.

When the Governor presented his executive budget two weeks later on February 7th, he anticipated revenues would end the fiscal year short by \$374.7 million. Basically, the assumption is we'll get more revenue in the next five months to

not have such a huge deficit.

1.3

2.5

Ultimately, June 30th 2017, when the fiscal year ended, collections were short by \$1.1 billion. Now, what was Revenue seeing that the IFO wasn't to get that analysis done?

SECRETARY HASSELL: And I'm sorry, specifically, you're asking about the change in the Revenue estimate from the time of the budget to year-end?

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Yeah. So basically in 2017, January 25th, IFO said, for the rest of the fiscal year, '16-'17 budget, revenues would continue to decline. The Department of Revenue, in their analysis built into the Governor's budget said, we're going to see an uptick in revenue for the remainder of the fiscal year, so it won't be quite that bad. You know, two different entities analyzing it.

What was Revenue seeing differently than the IFO during that time frame?

SECRETARY HASSELL: We would have been looking at the revenue forecast -- excuse me, the economic forecasts that were available to us at the time. As you know, the Commonwealth contracts with IHS to provide economic data and forecasts and the

1 last fiscal year, the actual economic results came 2 in much lower than what had been forecast by IHS. 3 We can go through those numbers, if you like, but that's essentially the story. 4 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. Do you --5 IFO just sent this out, I think maybe December time 6 7 frame. They actually do a self analysis of their 8 revenue estimates. They kind of mark how wrong -do you do an internal look at your error rates on 9 10 your revenue estimates? 11 SECRETARY HASSELL: Not in a formal way, 12 but we always look back after the fact in order to 13 evaluate, what did we get right, what did we get 14 wrong, look for ways to improve our process and 15 learn, basically, lessons learned after the fact. 16 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Thank you. 17 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Delozier. 19 2.0 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Thank you, 21 Mr. Chairman. I just had a real quick question. 22 We had talked a little bit about the Rent 23 Rebate Program, and I was doing a little bit of 24 research because my recollection was that one of the 2.5 issues when I have folks calling in is that they are

```
1
     on Social Security and they get a little bit of a
2
     bump, not much, but just enough to throw them over.
                We had a moratorium out there on the fact
 3
 4
     if their increase for Social Security was not to be
     counted --
5
 6
                 SECRETARY HASSELL:
                                     Yes.
7
                REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: -- in order for
8
     them to qualify for -- my understanding is that has
     ended.
9
                 SECRETARY HASSELL:
10
                                     Yes.
11
                REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: And so my
12
     direct question is, how many in 2017 will be bumped
     off of Rent Rebate because of that?
1.3
                 SECRETARY HASSELL: We could take a look
14
15
     at that. I don't have those numbers in front of me,
16
     but yes.
17
                REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: And that is the
18
     ability for -- do you have any costs as to -- and I
19
     quess the numbers that are going to be bumped off
20
     will tell us how many folks are going to lose out on
21
     that opportunity. Because I know my folks depend on
22
     that heavily and that's one of the biggest calls I
23
     get in my office as to --
24
                SECRETARY HASSELL: Sure.
2.5
                REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: -- when is the
```

```
1
     form coming out?
2
                When can I apply?
                When is my check coming?
 3
                 SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes.
 4
                REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: So that is a
 5
6
     big call that I get. So I would be very interested
7
     to see what that difference is, because I think it
8
     was a big benefit to a lot of our seniors that are
     right on that edge and only a couple of bucks knocks
10
     them off and they lose a lot of money from that
11
     program.
12
                 SECRETARY HASSELL: Sure. We can take a
     look at that.
13
                REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Okay.
14
                                                   I'd
15
     appreciate it.
                Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
16
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: All right.
17
                The next we will move to are Chairmen of
18
19
     the Committees. We have Representative Hennessey,
2.0
     who is Chairman of Aging.
21
                REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY:
                                            Thank you,
22
     Mr. Chairman.
23
                SECRETARY HASSELL: Good afternoon.
24
                REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Good
     afternoon, Secretary Hassell and panel members.
2.5
```

I'm going to direct my questions

primarily to Drew because the Department of Aging

doesn't draw on the State General Fund. We get 80

percent of our money from the lottery, roughly, and

about 20 percent from the Older Americans Act,

Federal funding, various titles.

1.3

2.0

2.5

So the importance of the lottery is magnified in my view. And I just wanted to talk to you, Drew. We meet periodically through the year and you keep me up to date, and I appreciate the fact that you do keep me up to date on both the operation of the lottery and the health of the Lottery Fund.

With regard to the operations, you've talked about the implementation schedule and how we're rolling it out in the spring and summer. It sounds like that's proceeding at a pace and that's healthy. Tell me about the difference between Powerball and Mega Millions.

Months ago, it seems to me, that

Powerball had the odds against winning, so to speak,

adjusted upwards to a point where Powerball was

really riskier in a sense than to pay the Mega

Millions.

I understand that the State Commission

```
1
     has changed that and that Mega Millions is now
2
     slightly harder to win than Powerball; is that
     accurate?
3
                Can you give me any numbers, if you have
 4
     them at the top of your head?
5
 6
                EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Yeah.
7
     it's about, I think, about 292 million to 1 to win
8
     the jackpot.
                REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: For Powerball?
10
                EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Right, for
11
     Powerball.
12
                Mega is slightly more than that. I don't
     have that -- 295, 296 maybe. You know, the --
13
                REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: But that
14
15
     adjustment is already -- that's happened. That's
     the laws or the status of the games as we play them
16
17
     today.
18
                EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Correct.
19
     Yeah, that change has happened and it's really just
20
     those games, people play them to win a life-changing
21
     humongous prize.
22
                REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY:
                                            Right.
23
                EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: So they are
24
     tweaked occasionally to respond to supply and demand
2.5
     issues, or demand only, and generate bigger
```

jackpots. And that's really what that change was designed to do.

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. Now, moving to the health of the lottery, you've heard a number of people ask you about the fact that we have faced -- we are an aging population here in Pennsylvania. By the year 2020, two years from now, our Secretary of Aging, Teresa Osborne, tells us that 20 percent of our population will be over the age of 60. With that, we would expect draws on our existing programs, the Lottery Funds for our senior population.

Tell us about the health of the lottery and the long-term ability of the lottery to sustain the funding for those programs. And if we are in trouble, tell us about that. So tell us what we have to do.

management of the Lottery Fund, as you know, is not managed by the lottery. We're more the majority of the input of that, that fund. You know, the revenue generating side, and I'm pleased to say again, the new programs that we have in place coupled with the hard work of the 9200 retails we already have.

So we are better prepared for the future

than we've ever been. The iLottery Program and monitor games are going to help us broaden our reach in retailers and types of businesses selling our product, broaden our reach in the people who are playing the games and attracted to the games. And therefore stabilizing that revenue stream for many years to come.

1.3

2.0

2.5

That said, you know, ours is a -- you know, we're selling a product that people don't need. This is an entertainment product and we have to keep in mind that we are always competing for top of mind awareness, competing for -- against many other things. Anything else you can do with that extra dollar in your pocket is essentially competition for the lottery.

So we will always -- we have been and will continue to be looking for new opportunities to generate money well into the future, small opportunities, big opportunities, all opportunities.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. But the takeaway from your testimony is the Pennsylvania lottery is a healthy product and it is positioned well for sustaining the kind of programs that our seniors depend on here in Pennsylvania, even given the expected increase in senior population.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: That's correct. Our collective -- our lottery is one of the top performing lotteries in the nation -- REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY:

Congratulations.

1.3

2.5

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: -- one of the most profitable, and one of the most efficient and is positioned to continue to be that well into the future, as long as we keep, you know, getting the support that we've been enjoying and being able to respond to changing market conditions and demands of retail and demands of players. As long as we continue to be able to, you know, think and act like a business in that regard, we're going to continue to grow.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. One final follow-up.

Can you provide the Appropriations

Committee with a listing of the various senior programs that are funded through the lottery?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SVITKO: Absolutely.

And I would encourage you to check out our website at palottery.com. There's a great Who Benefits section that has an interactive map that describes by county all the different amounts that go to each,

prizes that are paid to that county and all the different funding for the benefit programs by county, but we can also supply that in writing, as well.

1.3

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: And if I could jump in there. I apologize, Mr. Chairman, but just to add a little bit of additional information. The Governor's budget, taking a count of the new games that have been added to the mix, as well as making changes in the programs that are funded, does get us to the point where we can reestablish a reserve in the Lottery Fund of \$75 million a few years out and I think that indicates some confidence that we're getting back to stable funding for those programs.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, Drew. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: I'm going to interrupt the proceedings just quickly here.

Chairman Markosek had to go to a very important meeting, and I have to leave for another important meeting, as well. We're turning it over to our Vice-Chairmen, Representative Briggs and Representative Dunbar.

But before I do leave, Mr. Secretary --

they get big pay for this -- but before I do leave, one of the concerns I've had, and you didn't get to see it because I guess the Budget Office was supposed to share it with all of the secretaries before coming in here, was the IT report and how much money has been spent on IT.

2.0

2.5

Based upon the report the Budget

Secretary gave me, that in the last 10 years at the

Department of Revenue, we've spent \$528 million

dollars on IT. And we're requesting \$46.5 million

this coming year.

I really think the concern I have, and you're just one Department, that's a lot of money to not be able to do the things that we need to be able to do in the Department of Revenue. And again, it goes over multiple registrations. I'm not pointing it out to you, Mr. Secretary, or to this Governor.

My concern is just there are so many demands for money in our budget. People have needs, whether it's children with autism, it's the education system. It just seems to me that whatever we're doing with IT in this State, when we're spending a half a million dollars just in one Department, I can't imagine. I'm waiting to see what the DHS is spending on IT.

It really bothers me that, are we getting our bang for our buck that we're getting?

1.3

2.5

When we ask for a program, are we really getting something that's going to last into the future or is it something we're going out on a contract on every year to update something that should be easily done by our own personnel without any cost to it since we have IT personnel on board?

So I'm not asking you to respond,
necessarily, it's just a statement for me. If you
want to respond, you're welcome to, but I have a
real concern. Like I said, it's not about this
Administration. Both Democratic and Republican
Administrations have spent a lot of money on IT in
every department. And just in your Department
alone, \$500 million is a lot of money.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yeah, I agree with you, Mr. Chairman. And I think that that is a key concern of this Governor, and he has put some things in place in order to make sure that we get every value that we can out of every dollar that's spent on IT. And that's part of the reason for the consolidation initiative, to make sure that we're combining, overlapping resources across different agencies.

And I think that Sharon Minnich will be able to speak in more detail about this, but I think it's absolutely the correct question to ask and something we should be working together on.

1.3

2.5

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Very good. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: And with that, the next questioner is Representative Wheatley.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, and all of the Department folks that you brought with you.

responsible for implementation and that you try to keep your influences around policy to a minimum, but earlier today we heard from the IFO about the demographic trends and some challenges that we could potentially face if we don't do something to change them and that is, we're seeing some issues with the 20-to-64-year-olds, as well as with citizens having children in the Commonwealth and those numbers versus what our population over 65 is, is very concerning as we move out into the future years.

So in your analysis of the State revenue

streams, do you believe our structure, our current makeup of taxes, are structurally fair and are they helpful to us to try to really attract, maintain and grow that future work force and that future family support?

1.3

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: That's a great question. And I probably don't have a comprehensive answer to that, but I mean, I think it's something that we should be looking at as we think about the future and thinking about what's the right way to fund government in a way that's efficient, attracts jobs and doesn't burden our citizens.

In this budget, the Governor is again talking about reforming the corporate tax to bring the rate down and spread the base out in a way that should make the Commonwealth more competitive among other States so that we're not sticking out there at the top or the bottom of all the lists with the 9.99 percent rate.

That certainly is a step in the right direction. But your question, I know, goes well beyond that. And I think it's something that's worth study, to come up with that kind of comprehensive plan.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Second

question, with the new changes to the Federal tax law, which reduces the rate for the C Corps, do you foresee a shift or do you anticipate a shift of pass-throughs in PA opting to restructure to become more of a corporate tax payer?

1.3

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: You know, I don't have statistics on that. Of course, I think that's a work in progress, but that's what I understand, that a lot of businesses looking at the Federal tax changes are restructuring and changing the way they do business in order to intelligently take advantage of the new Federal system.

We will see, once returns start to come in, where we are on that. But that might be a significant shift in our business population.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And do you think that would positively or negatively impact our revenue?

SECRETARY HASSELL: To the extent that there are more corporations, then you would expect more corporations' tax.

REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: And then finally, this is a question -- I'm just trying to figure this out.

Do you think we would be better off --

again, going to your own thought -- would we be better off expanding our bases and maybe even lowering our tax rates?

2.5

And if so, do you think it would generate revenue or lose revenue, specifically, as we are talking about trying to target our tax structure to really help families, help that 20-to-64 age group?

And do you think it would be beneficial for us to consider, just consider, possibly doing something with future retirement income or expanding the sales tax base?

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yeah, I think that it would be a good thing to look at the sales tax base and think about whether all of the exemptions that are there make sense. And again, this isn't in the context of an overall reform. You know, the sort of classical tax reform study/proposals that lots of States look at are, again, how do you broaden the base and lower the rate because that spreads the burden out. It makes it less difficult for individuals who are subject to tax to actually pay what they owe.

So if there's an opportunity to do that kind of study and to design a better, fairer tax system, then I'd be happy to participate in that.

1 REPRESENTATIVE WHEATLEY: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you.

And continuing with our parade of Chairmen will be Chairman Samuelson.

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: Thank you,} % Representative Dunbar.% % The properties of the pr$

Most of my questions have to do with the Property Tax Rent Rebate. My local office is very involved in that Program. We do about a thousand of those every year. So far this year, we've completed 159, including the 53 I brought down today since the last time I was here just a few days ago.

First, I want to thank you. The Department processes a half a million of these every year. It seems like the average person, the seniors in Pennsylvania, get \$250 million. So the average person is getting about \$500.00.

And the employees of the Department are very helpful when we have questions. I also appreciate that you took up one of my suggestions from previous years that the booklets were distributed to the legislative offices and the public by January 31st this year. Previous years, there had been a delay, but we got them. We were up

and running before the end of January.

Thank you.

1.3

2.0

2.5

A couple of suggestions. I brought last year's book and this year's book. Last year, the chart, which encapsulates the whole program in a very readable format, was on page one. This year, they stuck the chart inside. I think it's better to have it right out front, so the public can see it.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: One more suggestion. Last year on the chart, they clearly said that you only have to count half of your Social Security income. That was an important reform that we did 18 years ago, dramatically increased the number of people who are eligible. This year's chart omits that fact.

So I wonder, I know the books are all printed, but maybe on the website you could update that to clearly say that you only count half of your Social Security income. I know it's in the text of the booklet, but to put it right out front, that would be helpful.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Okay. We'll look at that.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: One more

suggestion. We have -- in my community, we help seniors. We help low income individuals, people with disabilities. The booklet says that, if you're a renter, this is available to homeowners or renters. The booklet say if you are a renter, that could be an apartment, that could be a boarding home. That could be -- it lists a whole bunch of categories.

1.3

2.5

I have run into some issues over the last year. My constituents who are low income, who live in boarding homes, they almost never get the rebate the first time. They get a follow-up letter from the Department, an additional level of scrutiny that's not given to the homeowners and apartment dwellers who apply for this program.

So I wonder if somebody could follow up with this or ask about this internally in the Department of what is that additional level of scrutiny. As I said, almost every single person who's renting a room in a boarding house who has applied through my office has received a follow-up letter before they can get the rebate.

And I hope some don't give up when they get that letter saying you can't get it, you know. So I just want you to take a look at that.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Sure. Okay.

1.3

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: My main point is what you said earlier about bracket creep. It has been 11 years since we increased the income limits for this program. January 2007, we raised the income limits to \$35,000 net income for homeowners, dramatic increase. We doubled the number of people who were eligible.

And that \$35,000 is after you only count half of your Social Security income. So people even above \$35,000 can qualify, but as that number has stayed the same for 11 years, as people's incomes have gone up, the number of people receiving this rebate has gone down.

And I saw some statistics you put in the budget book that we were talking about a 10-percent decrease. If we go back just six short years ago, there were approximately 600,000 people getting the Property Tax Rent Rebate. Now, we're in the ballpark of 540,000.

So every year there's a small Social
Security increase or people have other income
increases, they could be in danger of being priced
out of this program. So I think it's long overdue
for the House of Representatives and the General

Assembly to go back and increase the income limits on this program.

1.3

2.0

2.5

I know former Representative

Phyllis Mundy, Chair of the Finance Committee, she had an amendment one time that would raise it up in the \$45,000-\$50,000 range. We have not raised this program since January of 2007, and it's about time.

I do want to follow up on what

Representative Delozier said about the moratorium,

if you get a small Social Security increase that

could price you out of the program. We're starting

to see that this year because we're comparing 2017

incomes with 2016 incomes and there was a

three-tenths of a percent increase.

So there are people moving out of the program because we no longer have that moratorium. That problem is going to grow dramatically a year from now because in the future when we're comparing 2018-2017, there's a two percent increase in Social Security. There are going to be tens of thousands of people who are going to lose this benefit if we don't address that Social Security cost of living issue.

And I think the better way to address it is just an across-the-board increase in this

program. So I wanted to make a few points about the Property Tax Rent Rebate Program. I know it depends on the lottery. And Drew was talking about the lottery. I saw the income. The sales have gone up this year.

1.3

2.5

There was a dip in sales last year. It's a very successful program. We've had a billion dollars in profit six years in a row. That's extraordinary, but after last year's dip, I noticed it went up 4.9 percent in the current year.

My question for Drew is, what can you attribute that 4.9 percent increase to in comparing the first half of this year to the first half of the previous year?

this case, it was jackpots. All right. So I said before, huge jackpots from Powerball or Mega Millions are typically the difference between us having a good year and a great year. In this case, the first half of the fiscal year, we had a couple really big jackpots and we didn't have those over the same period last year.

So on a year-to-year basis, we're up. We also launched a new project category Fast Play.

Fast Play has generated over a hundred million

```
1
     dollars in its first full year, which is
2
     dramatically more than we projected. It's doing
     very well. That's a new type of game for us.
3
                And scratch-offs continue to grow, as
 4
     well as a few other products, but you know, it's
5
 6
     fighting for entertainment dollars at 9200 retailers
7
     all across the Commonwealth. So that success is due
     to the work in 9200 retailers and 238 dedicated
8
     professionals who love their jobs back at lottery.
                                            Thank you,
10
                REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON:
11
            Thank you, Secretary Hassell.
12
                SECRETARY HASSELL: You're welcome.
13
                REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you,
     Mr. Chairman. And we will go for a brief second
14
15
     round of questions.
16
                We'll start with Representative Quinn.
17
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thanks. By brief,
18
     I still get my five minutes, right?
19
                Okay. Don't even answer. You're
2.0
     clicking the clock.
21
                Mr. Secretary, I have introduced HB 1511.
22
     There's a counterpart, and what this does is
23
     clarifies the Tax Code on the collection of hotel
24
     occupancy taxes and the online travel companies.
2.5
                It's my understanding that the online
```

travel companies currently remit the State sales tax and the local hotel occupancy tax based on the rate that they negotiated with the hotel, not the rate that they contract between the end user, the person putting their head on the pillow and themselves, correct?

1.3

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes, that's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay. Could you please let me know if the online travel companies require -- do we require them differently to state on the receipts the amount of state taxes and local taxes paid as well as the additional fees, markups?

Do we have them break out in any way to their end user that, you know, State taxes are being paid here, yet the taxes are going on the \$100 for example, not the \$160 that they're paying for the room?

SECRETARY HASSELL: My understanding of this is there are basically two transactions, right, there is, let's say, I'm going to Expedia and reserving a room and I will have a receipt from Expedia indicating what I paid. And it probably doesn't tell me what they're paying, what Expedia is paying the hotel.

When I get to the hotel, they're probably

going to give me a separate receipt that indicates what the room charge was and it will disclose the taxes that they charge as part of the process.

1.3

2.0

2.5

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Right.

SECRETARY HASSELL: So because the law says that hotel tax is due from a hotel operator, Expedia doesn't operate any hotels.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Do you agree that they should be paying, remitting to the State and to the local taxing authority the full amount on the rate that they had the room occupied for as opposed to the negotiated rate with the hotel entity?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I think that would be a good change. All I'm saying is that in our current statute, the fee that Expedia is charging me isn't part of the tax base. I think that's clear.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: This is a concern for me, not just for the lost revenue there and the competition that it puts up against our brick-and-mortar facilities that have been paying this for years, but we have a whole new-ish industry throughout Pennsylvania now and predominantly in certain pocket areas, like the Poconos.

I can look down at the other end of the table with the AirBnBs and the other places where

people are actually renting out their home. 1 SECRETARY HASSELL: 2 Sure. REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I have been made 3 4 aware that an agreement has been brokered, for lack 5 of a better word, between AirBnB and I'm not sure if 6 it's the State or is it a city of the first class whereby there are taxes being paid, but I can't find 7 details. 8 SECRETARY HASSELL: The agreement is with 10 our Department. 11 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I cannot find 12 details of that agreement. 1.3 Are they out there and I'm lacking, or can you provide something to me? 14 15 Because it's not just the AirBnBs. 16 are one. That's like saying Kleenex when there are 17 so many other brands that offer the like product of renting an individual's residence. 18 19 SECRETARY HASSELL: I'm sure we can get 20 you some information about that. You're correct 21 that there are other online companies that do 22 similar things, maybe not exactly the same. But the 23 agreement that we have currently is with AirBnB. 24 They have been collecting hotel taxes in

2.5

Pennsylvania for some time.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: So presently, and I'm a realtor by background; I know we have a couple in this Committee, but presently, if you are involved in a transaction with real property, either leasing a home to someone for three months or three years or a transaction of a sale of a property, you need to be a brokered -- real estate licensed realtor to accept those dollars to hold them in escrow before you're releasing them.

1.3

2.5

Is that the case with the AirBnB?

Because these companies -- and again, I don't mean to pick on or advertise for one company, but these companies are holding hundreds of thousands of dollars. If I book today for my Fourth of July vacation, they would be holding those dollars prior to remitting them to the -- is that something that falls under your purview, you as the Secretary of Revenue?

SECRETARY HASSELL: Well, let me take a stab at that. I mean, that sounds like a consumer protection issue to me.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: The reason I'm bringing it up here is I'm trying to identify a mechanism by which the State gets those dollars that I believe we should be entitled to for the same

```
1
     function of someone coming in, you know, for a
2
     vacation or business, whatever it is, and renting a
     room and then not paying the sales tax nor the local
3
     dollars that typically go to tourism.
 4
5
                SECRETARY HASSELL: Right. So for the
 6
     companies other than AirBnB, since they're doing tax
7
     collection for us, there are lots of other --
8
     there's VRBO, for example.
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Are they under the
10
     same agreement that AirBnB would be?
11
                SECRETARY HASSELL: No, I don't.
12
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: VRBO?
13
                Are they under an agreement with us
14
     for --
15
                REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Representative?
                SECRETARY HASSELL: I'm not aware of one.
16
17
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN:
                                        Oh, sorry.
18
                SECRETARY HASSELL: All I wanted to say
19
     is that the Department has been gathering data from
2.0
     these websites and reaching out directly to the
21
     property owner to say if you are advertising your
22
     home or your facility for a rental, then you need to
23
     be remitting hotel tax to the State and local
24
     government.
                So I don't know those numbers off the top
2.5
```

1 of my head, but I'll be on them. 2 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I'm glad to hear 3 you are being proactive on that. Thank you. 4 SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes. We are reaching out to those homeowners and asking them to remit the 5 6 tax, and many have. 7 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: That's quite a 8 task. Thank you. 9 REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you. 10 We're going to move on to Representative 11 Grove. REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Thank you. Just a 12 13 follow-up on the revenue estimates. Is it possible to do, again, a lookback 14 15 of estimates, the error rates maybe over the past 16 four years to see specific tax and their error rates. If you could model that off of the IFO 17 18 report, which you can find online, it would be very 19 helpful. 2.0 SECRETARY HASSELL: Yes. 21 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: But at what point 22 during that time frame where revenues continue to 23 drop, do you sound the alarm on, we're spending 24 money, we don't have revenue to back it up.

Internally, how does that work within the

2.5

administration?

2.0

2.5

SECRETARY HASSELL: I -- excuse me, I meet frequently with the Budget Secretary and he's always very interested in knowing how things are going on the Revenue front, so it's a frequent topic of conversation. And obviously, we're producing reports that are public, but also internally, we're releasing all of that information.

And we talk frequently with the administration about how things are going and whether we're seeing worrisome friends.

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right. At any point of that time, was there -- you know, as you're getting closer to the June deadline, obviously, there's May -- April and May are good revenue months.

At what point does that trigger maybe a more structured discussion, more eminent destruction -- or not destruction, discussion -- on moving money into budgetary reserve?

I mean, did those discussions happen during that time frame?

SECRETARY HASSELL: So this would have been, roughly, a year ago --

REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Yeah.

```
SECRETARY HASSELL: -- during '16 and
1
2
     '17.
 3
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Obviously, you
     weren't the Secretary then, but --
 4
                SECRETARY HASSELL: That's correct.
5
 6
     was not.
7
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                        Yeah.
8
                SECRETARY HASSELL: But I certainly
     remember conversations with Budget where they were
9
10
     concerned about those trends and were talking about
11
     steps to take.
12
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE:
                                        Okay.
                SECRETARY HASSELL: And I don't remember
13
     the timing of the decisions that were made, but as I
14
15
     said, it's a frequent topic of conversation with
16
     Budget.
17
                REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. Obviously,
18
     you don't have the final decision to stop spending
19
     money, but I'm glad to hear that those discussions
20
     were happening. And I don't know at what level of
21
     alarm we're having at that point, but you know,
22
     unfortunately if you don't hit the mark on the
23
     revenues one year, the floor creeps out, we're
24
     facing dire straights financially.
2.5
                You know, there has to be some kind of
```

correction moving forward. Obviously, we don't want to be in the same position. I mean, we're blessed to see revenues trending nicely at this point.

2.5

Hopefully we're not in that position again, but going back, learning some lessons that had happened, try to prevent them in the future, I always thing that's a positive thing moving forward, so thank you.

SECRETARY HASSELL: I absolutely agree.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you,

Representative.

We'll go back to Chairman Samuelson, who promised he'll get his question out before the red light comes on.

MR. SAMUELSON: One follow-up question.

Mr. Secretary, on your testimony, page 4, you talk about the Automated Call Project. So when you apply for the Property Tax Rent Rebate, you used to get a letter saying it's been received. The last couple of years, instead, you get an automated phone call, a robo call from the revenue.

All of our offices, the Attorney General, all across Pennsylvania were concerned about identity theft. We're concerned about scams. We're concerned about scams that affect seniors, which are

prevalent on the phone, day and night.

1.3

2.5

So here's my -- I want somebody in the Department, you or your team, to take a look at this. We tell folks that if you get a call that says they're from the IRS, that's a scam. Don't answer it. Don't give them any information.

So the United States Department of Revenue, if they're calling you, that is not them. But then if the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue calls you, this is a legitimate phone call.

That's confusing for senior citizens.

Secondly, I had constituents tell me about that phone call. And when you get the automated robocall from Pennsylvania Department of Revenue, it says, if you want information about your rebate, type in your Social Security number.

We tell people at our forums, never give somebody your Social Security number if you're not the one who initiated the call. So I have a deep concern that the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue is having a robo call, which tells people to type your Social Security number in.

I know that your program is legitimate, but how is a citizen to distinguish that from all of the scammers that are calling people day and night.

```
1
     It's a real problem, and I have a real concern about
2
     this program.
 3
                SECRETARY HASSELL: I understand your
     question. I'd like the opportunity to go back and
 4
5
     have some more conversation about exactly that
 6
     issue.
7
                MR. SAMUELSON: Okay. And if they want
8
     to continue with this, maybe take out the part where
     you're asking people to give their Social Security
9
10
     number over the phone. Maybe a reminder phone call
11
     like, hey, we got your information, if you'd like to
12
     follow up, you contact us; not have the person punch
13
     their Social Security number in right away.
                Maybe that's a revision that could be
14
15
     made, or go back to the old-fashioned letters that
16
     people used to get in the mail. There was no
     problem with that.
17
18
                SECRETARY HASSELL:
                                     Right.
19
                REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: Thank you,
2.0
     Mr. Chairman.
21
                REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR:
                                         Thank you,
22
     Mr. Chairman. And there we found something we can
23
     agree on there.
24
                We'll move on to Representative Heffley.
2.5
                MR. HEFFLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
```

Thank you Mr. Secretary.

1.3

2.5

Just a follow-up on some of the questions with the online booking companies. Now, specific to like the AirBnB arrangement where you have an entity that's out-of-state and they are selling or using their platform for you to rent your room out for a night or whatever, you said you have an agreement with them, the Department of Revenue has an agreement with them to collect some of that sales tax.

Are you taxing their fees or are you just collecting the taxes that would be remitted by the person that's renting the room?

Are you taxing the profits or the fees that they're charging?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I believe it would be the amount that the individual is getting for the rental.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: But they're essentially operating --

SECRETARY HASSELL: I should verify that, just to make sure that I'm telling you the straight story, but I think that that's the case.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: You can get back to me because, obviously, they're operating -- and I

know that's Federal laws and there are some things we did in this past budget cycle to capture some of that online shopping.

1.3

2.0

2.5

And also, now you have an agreement with AirBnB. Do you share that information with the local taxing authorities at the county level?

One of the things that we're finding is that our county treasurers are having a very difficult time collecting the local hotel tax.

And if you are sharing that information, or if you're not, why wouldn't you share that information?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I know that there has been some data exchange because some of the counties were ahead of us on this, and we're doing a good job enforcing their local hotel tax and shared their data with us. I think it's gone both ways, but my understanding is that AirBnB is also collecting the local tax.

But again, I should verify those facts.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Yeah, from what I'm hearing is that if they are collecting it, we're not seeing it from our county treasurer that it's getting remitted.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: And also, are you currently working with other online -- not really the online travel companies, the Travelocity and stuff. They're doing things a little bit different. But these other platforms that are operating like bed and breakfasts where people can list their room in their house or half of their own property.

1.3

2.0

2.5

Are you in current negotiations with them to ensure that it's a level playing field for both our established bed and breakfast and hotels that are operating right now in the Commonwealth, with people that just want to rent their room out?

Is that an ongoing process?

SECRETARY HASSELL: I believe that AirBnB is the only one that's been willing to have the conversation so far.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: And is there anything that we're doing as a Commonwealth to capture that?

It just doesn't seem fair to me that we're looking at other revenue and yet we're having, you know, entities that are operating that are kind of cheating the system. And you know, it's not fair to those that are legitimately paying their taxes.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Sure. And we do want there to be a level playing field, so that everyone is treated equally. And if we can't get cooperation from the online company, then the only thing we can do is to approach the homeowner and say, you're renting rooms, you need to remit hotel tax. And so it needs to be one or the other.

1.3

2.0

2.5

For some of these companies, I think that they see it as part of the service that they can offer to their client, who are the homeowners, to do that, to take on the burden of the tax calculation for them, and it's part of the service that they offer.

And other companies don't see it that way. They just don't want to be involved or have that burden. They're essentially telling the homeowner, you're on your own. It's -- if the company is not located in Pennsylvania or it doesn't have a nexus whereby we can approach them and enforce compliance, then the only thing we can do is to approach the homeowner and ask them to comply.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: And I know that

-- I don't want to go over my time -- but I know how

many people are fearful. They want to make sure

they pay their taxes. They don't want the

Department of Revenue or anybody coming after them for anything. And that's the task that you have, to ensure that people are paying their taxes.

1.3

2.0

2.5

And I would just ask that we move on this matter to ensure that those folks and those entities that operate inside of our State are not cheating the system, and in a sense, you know, making it an unfair playing field for those businesses that want to rent.

SECRETARY HASSELL: And I agree with you.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And our final
question will come from Representative Santora.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTORA: Mr. Secretary, right here.

I really do believe we're falling into the realm of a real estate license. And there should be an escrow account set up in Pennsylvania for any funds that are coming in and being held by the company and then released to the homeowners. They're, in a sense, being involved in a rental agreement, property management agreement type of situation, almost as if they're operating illegally because of our real estate laws.

I own a real estate company. I have to

set up an escrow. I have to have a telephone inside the State of Pennsylvania. I have to have an office operating in Pennsylvania with a door and a sign and a conference room.

1.3

2.5

I feel that we're -- and I understand that side of it. I'll talk to the Department of State about it when they're here. But on the Revenue side, we're missing a lot of the boat. We're missing the fees and the revenue that would come in with that. So I think it's something we should be looking at and maybe collectively be with your Department and the Department of State. It's something we should be focused on.

SECRETARY HASSELL: Yeah, I'd be happy to participate in that conversation. Again, my concern is just that enforcement of those statutes, I don't think, rests with the Revenue Department, but if we can be part of the solution, I'd be happy to help.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTORA: Okay. And then to backup Representative Samuelson's point. I'm shocked that the scammers have not figured out that Pennsylvania does this and haven't barraged people because I get the calls from the IRS and people basically -- I can tell that they're from overseas that are doing these scams. And fortunately, for

me, I'll keep them on the phone and harass them for a while, but for some seniors, it's very intimidating, especially if they're going to tell them they're from the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue.

1.3

2.5

And if we're telling people, yes, this happens, that's got to be fixed. It's got to be fixed quickly because we're going to see a barrage of scams coming up. Luckily nobody is watching this so we can keep it secret for a little longer.

But my third and final point. Being someone that has voted for and supports the medical marijuana industry in Pennsylvania, are we set up to collect the income tax and everything else that goes along with that industry and are there going to be any issues with the Federal government because they don't recognize that as a legal industry?

And if they start -- they're going to start paying income tax to the Federal government on a regular basis, Social Security and everything else that goes along with a full-time employee and also part-time employees and we're collecting at the State.

Is that going to set any red flags up?

Are we prepared for that?

SECRETARY HASSELL: That's a great question. It is a concern. All I can tell you is that we haven't had issues with that yet, but we are at the beginning of the process.

And one question that we've talked about frequently is what if the company involved in medical marijuana can't get a bank because the bank refuses to take their money. So that would present us with the issue of having to accept cash for tax payments, which presents a whole host of difficult issues.

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE SANTORA: You can make them go get money orders. \\$

SECRETARY HASSELL: And again, so far that has not been an issue, but we're trying to be ready to deal with those kinds of issues. If somebody new does have to remit in cash, then we'll work with them and figure out how to do it.

REPRESENTATIVE SANTORA: Okay. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Thank you.

And with that, we are at a conclusion.

I wanted to thank Secretary Hassell.

Was this your first hearing -- your first one as Secretary?

2.5

```
SECRETARY HASSELL: My first one as
1
2
     Secretary, yes.
                 REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: You've been here
3
     many times before, but thank you for your time.
4
5
                 And thank you, Deputy Secretaries and
     Drew, for all being here.
6
7
                 We are back tomorrow morning at 10:00 for
8
     job creation in Pennsylvania. We're adjourned.
     Thank you.
10
                 SECRETARY HASSELL: Thank you.
11
                 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
2.1
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I hereby certify that the proceedings are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same. Tracy L. Markle, Court Reporter Notary Public