1	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA						
3	* * * * DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES * * * *						
4							
5	House Appropriations Committee						
6	Main Capitol Building						
7	Main Capitor Building Majority Caucus, Room 140 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania						
8	narrisburg, rennsyrvania						
9	Wednesday, February 28, 2018						
10	000						
11	MATORINA COMMINDER MEMBERC PRECEND.						
12	MAJORITY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:						
13	Honorable Stanley Saylor, Majority Chairman Honorable Karen Boback Honorable Sheryl Delozier						
14	Honorable Sheryl Delozier Honorable George Dunbar Honorable Garth Everett						
15	Honorable Keith Greiner Honorable Marcia Hahn						
16	Honorable Doyle Heffley Honorable Susan Helm						
17	Honorable Lee James Honorable Warren Kampf						
18	Honorable Wallen Kampi Honorable Fred Keller Honorable Duane Milne						
19	Honorable Jason Ortitay						
20	Honorable Michael Peifer Honorable Marguerite Quinn						
21	Honorable Brad Roae Honorable James Santora						
22	Honorable Curtis Sonney						
23							
24	1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404						
25	717.764.7801						

```
1
      MINORITY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
2
      Honorable Joseph Markosek, Minority Chairman
 3
      Honorable Kevin Boyle
      Honorable Tim Briggs
      Honorable Donna Bullock
 4
      Honorable Maria Donatucci
 5
      Honorable Marty Flynn
      Honorable Patty Kim
 6
      Honorable Stephen Kinsey
      Honorable Leanne Krueger-Braneky
      Honorable Michael O'Brien
7
      Honorable Mark Rozzi
      Honorable Peter Schweyer
8
 9
10
      NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
11
      Honorable Steve Barrar
      Honorable Cris Dush
12
      Honorable Harold English
      Honorable Eli Evankovich
13
      Honorable Adam Harris
      Honorable Francis Ryan
14
      Honorable Tommy Sankey
      Honorable Judy Ward
15
      Honorable Matthew Bradford
16
      Honorable Bryan Barbin
      Honorable Frank Burns
      Honorable Dom Costa
17
      Honorable Paul Costa
18
      Honorable William Kortz
      Honorable Brian Sims
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:
2	
3	David Donley Majority Executive Director
4	Ritchie LaFaver
5	Majority Deputy Executive Director
6	Miriam Fox
7	Minority Executive Director
8	Tara Trees, Esquire
9	Minority Chief Counsel
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Key Reporters———————————————————————————————————

1	INDEX OF TESTIFIERS					
2	DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES					
3						
4	Curt Topper Secretary					
5	Secretary					
6	Beverly Hudson Deputy Secretary for Administration					
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14		DEOLEGE				· Nm
15		KEQUEST	FOR PRO	DUCTION O	E DOCUME	P. D. J.
16	PAGE	LINE	PAGE	LINE	PAGE	LINE
17	30	17-25	31	14-17	34	13-24
18	35	4-15	39	17-19	45	1
19	61	10-13	73	8-20		
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

LKey Reporters-

1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Anyway, 2 wanted to say this morning, we have Secretary Topper with us today, and Deputy Secretary of 3 Administration, Bev Hudson. If you would both rise 4 and raise your right hand and be sworn in. 5 6 (Testifiers were sworn en masse by 7 Chairman Saylor). MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Very good. 8 9 I wanted to recognize, we've been joined 10 by other members who -- in and out today. 11 other members will be joining us that are not on 12 the committee. We have Representative Sims here. 13 We have Representative Ryan, Representative O'Neil, 14 Representative Sankey and Representative Dush who are in presence today. I will announce others as 15 16 they walk in as well. 17 So, with that, Chairman Markosek, any 18 comment? 19 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you. 20 Thank you, Chairman. 21 Just a welcome, Secretary, Deputy 22 Secretary. We're anxious to hear what you have to 23 say today. I'll have a question later, but for 24 now, just welcome and glad you're here. 25 SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you.

1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Very good. 2 We'll start off with our first questioner of today is Representative Marquerite Quinn. 3 REPRESENTATIVE OUINN: Here we go. 4 5 SECRETARY TOPPER: Good morning. 6 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: We both have our 7 tissue supplier, our Kleenex supply, uh? SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you so much. 8 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: It is the season. 10 I really wish DGS would do something about 11 eradicating the germs around here. Until you 12 figure that out, we'll just go on to some other 13 easier topics, okay? 14 SECRETARY TOPPER: I thought I had a big job already. 15 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: We're gonna start 16 17 with one of the biggest topics we've all been 18 reading about, and some of us with surprise. 19 been in the General Assembly now in my 6th term. To be honest with you, I was not aware of and nor 20 21 do I yet have a real clarification on the employee 22 liability self-insurance program. It came to light 23 this year, and I hope it's not going to be coming to light with anything else we have yet to read 24 25 about, but let me start with a basic question.

What agencies does this cover? How wide of an umbrella does it have over state government?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure. So, the employee liability self-insurance program is part of our bureau of risk and insurance management at the Department of General Services.

The Commonwealth is self-insured and -So ELSIP is one program within the larger program
that the Department manages to handle all potential
types of insured loss.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Slip and fall, rock falling from a building, and anything else we've read about; those type -- anything like that?

SECRETARY TOPPER: That's correct. Any loss due to lightening strikes, property losses.

The majority of claims that come through the bureau actually have to do with things like the PennDOT traffic line paint on citizens' vehicles, that sort

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Which are much more interesting to deal with.

Our PASSHE system was here last week in front of us. Because they are universities owned by the Commonwealth, are they part of this system?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes, they are.

of thing.

2.1

1 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: When the reports 2 came out about some payouts, did they include payouts from those university systems? 3 SECRETARY TOPPER: I believe they did, 4 5 yes. How does the 6 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: 7 employee liability self-insurance program work and who pays into it? I looked at some of my pay stubs 8 and I don't see a line where I'm paying into it, 10 where I see my Social Security and other normal 11 things on a paycheck. 12 SECRETARY TOPPER: I don't believe you 13 would -- any state employee would see an individual 14 charge at the paycheck level. However, the agencies under the Governor's jurisdiction, the 15 16 House and Senate, PASSHE, all of the organizations 17 that are covered under ELSIP are billed by the 18 Department of General Services. 19 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Like my 20 automobile insurance, if I had a claim or my 21 homeowners; if there's claims against an agency 22 paying into this, does their assessment go up the following year? 23 24 SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes, it does.

REPRESENTATIVE OUINN: I don't recall

```
1
      ever seeing notice of that on any of these
 2
      different agency budget lines, but that's for those
      agencies and not for you.
 3
                 How much of the annual revenues and
 4
      expenses of that program?
 5
 6
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: ELSIP specifically or
 7
      BRIM overall?
                 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: ELSIP, or what
 8
 9
      overall?
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: BRIM, the Bureau of
10
11
      Risk and Insurance Management, so --
12
                 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: ELSIP
13
      specifically. That's a mouthful.
14
                  (Paper handed to Secretary Topper).
15
                 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: She's good.
16
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: Yeah. So the total
17
      billing for the ELSIP program was $5.75 million
18
      last year.
19
                 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: And the payouts
20
      last year?
21
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: There were a total of
22
      -- total claims of 7 million -- Oh, I'm sorry. For
      ELSIP, 3 million. Roughly $3 million.
23
24
                 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Does the money
25
      from a previous year that's not paid out roll over
```

to, you know, increase the pot going forward? And if so, what is your total number of -- what are you sitting on in terms of dollars for potential risk?

(Secretary Topper and Ms. Hudson confer privately).

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: You can get back to me with that. I have this little green clock sitting in front of me that I need to ask --

You mentioned any sorts of liability.

What point of responsibility does the bureau have to say, um, this is -- we're paying this out, but there's a red flag here that needs to be reported somewhere that maybe a state employee, be it through a driver's record or egregious behavior on the job towards another employee or someone else, when does that come up? We're not paying for this guy or gal. They're getting reported and they're getting their boot -- butt kicked to where it should be.

SECRETARY TOPPER: So, all payments that are made out of ELSIP have been preceded by a process involving a formal claim that is made, and involves agency legal counsel, involves agency HR, and involves frequently either the Attorney General or EEOC. We are at the back end of a long process

that results in a settlement.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: While I still have green, let me go to the front end of that process. Very often when I go to a public restroom or something, I will see signs, if you feel abused at home or anything, call this hotline. I don't ever remember seeing that in a ladies' room or in a cafeteria or anything in the Capitol or in another state.

What access to this information does a staff person, who may be fearful for their job, know that there's an avenue of recourse without them having to, you know, go through levels of embarrassment; maybe not being believed and potential feeling abused within the system as they're trying to report it?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Right.

Representative, I think since the onset of the "Me Too" movement and well before, Governor Wolf has been absolutely dedicated to improving the way we handle claims like sexual harassment claims.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I'm trying to get to before the claims happen in terms of people knowing that out in the workplace that that is just unacceptable behavior.

1 SECRETARY TOPPER: Absolutely, 2 Representative. The entire cabinet has gone 3 through mandatory training. Every Commonwealth employee has been required to go through mandatory 4 training so that it is clear to every Commonwealth 5 6 employee what their avenues of recourse are --7 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you. That's what I wanted to hear. 8 9 SECRETARY TOPPER: -- and they should be 10 going to. And we've been very aggressive about 11 that. 12 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you very 13 much. 14 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: 15 Representative Markosek. 16 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Thank you, 17 Chairman. 18 You know, safety is a big concern; not 19 only here in Pennsylvania, but everywhere, of course. Can you just give me a little status 20 2.1 report on how the Capitol Police, which I believe 22 come under DGS, and our police forces that we have 23 here at the Capitol, the House police, security and also the Senate, can you tell me about how all 24 25 those entities work together or work with you, and

what is the collaboration and maybe just a status report? Is there some things that we can do a little better or things that you need some help with to make all three entities perform to the best of their ability?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to always talk about the Capitol Police force.

I'm immensely proud of the work that they do. In fact, I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge that just last week, they were first on the scene and they saved a life in the lobby of the North Office Building.

We had a contractor go down with a severe heart attack virtually at our security check point in the North Office Building. The two Capitol police officers who were on the scene immediately administered CPR. We had an AED device right there, and we were able to bring this gentleman back to life.

It's a real credit, and it really underscores the value of having qualified, well-trained first responders, and fully-fledged police officers operating as our security force here in the Capitol. We have so much to be proud

of.

Broadly speaking, you asked about our level of coordination with the House and Senate.

My sense of it is, is that, it has never been better. I think we've established a solid rapport between Capitol Police facilities and all four caucuses. We have better coordination.

We've been able to work together on the new badge access system as part of the Capitol project that's improving our Capitol security systems here. We are in regular communications, and I think it's a good story. I think we have better coordination than we've had.

The Capitol -- I mean, this amazing facility that we all get to work in every day, you know, like any public facility, it could always be more safe. It could always be made more secure. But, making it more secure involves more than just coordination and collaboration. It also involves potential greater investment.

And so, we're certainly open to having a conversation going forward about whether those additional investments are worthwhile to harden the facility to a greater degree.

But, as of right now, I believe that the

level of security is adequate to the threat. We routinely re-evaluate what the safety situation looks like. Honestly, I couldn't be prouder of the work that they're doing.

with you that things are so much better today than they had been years and years ago. When I started here, anybody off the street could walk in. You know, there's 600 rooms here in the Capitol. They could walk in almost any of those 600 rooms and steal a purse, do whatever they wanted to do.

In fact, I was amazed--And this was many, many years ago--how the access to this place was so open, which is good for transparency and all that stuff, but even then I wondered -- Then 9/11 came along, and that's 15 years ago or so, and things really changed around here. You know, we see the sniffing dogs, and the garage is now gated and all the many doors are gated, and you have the security and the main entrances to the Capitol Building.

But having said that, it's still a huge, huge building, and you have other buildings besides this one that come under your purview. You know, we've had a couple incidents. Not too long ago somebody broke in. Your folks did a good job of

2.1

corralling that person pretty quickly.

But, nevertheless -- And I know all this costs money. I can only imagine what we've spent since 9/11 just upgrading the security here at this building.

But, can you talk a little bit about anything specifically that you might be doing to upgrade security even more?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure, Mr. Chairman.

I mentioned the Capitol project. It's a multiphase project that has upgraded the access system, which is now 99 percent complete. We're in the process of upgrading the parking equipment and the barriers which you mentioned. That's 75 percent complete.

We are installing new bollards and granite work at Third and State. We are 50 percent complete with the IMCS, which is the Incident

Management Center, which I believe a number of you may have toured, and I would invite you all to come and see the security center firsthand. It really gives you a sense of just how comprehensive our coverage of the facility is from a video-monitoring standpoint.

The one instance you mentioned where the vandal was able to break in last year, we were all

on him in about 11 minutes at 2 o'clock in the morning. In a facility this large, to have been able to detect him that quickly and to have apprehended him that fast, I think is a credit to just how good our systems are.

We have also taken steps with card assess here for the Capitol Complex. You'll know that there are double doors which, historically, you could badge into one door, and then the second door on the inside would have been opened. Now you need a badge to get through both doors. That helps us reduce on the piggy-backing issue with folks who are unauthorized or unbadged being able to enter the building. We have locked down a few doors and made them exit only.

I think we're doing -- we're doing what we can within the budget constraints that we have to ensure that the facility is safe.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Okay. And I appreciate that. I mean, it's a -- it's a huge, huge, huge and expensive job, too. You know, perhaps, we're never going to be 100 percent. We'd like to think we're 100 percent safe. But, I mean, we can walk down the street and have something happen to us, too.

2.1

But I think you've done a great job of really enhancing security. In the time I've been here, not just you, but previous folks, there's a huge difference in security today than the way it was, but I think we can always do better. So I would just leave you with that, and we'll try to help you to the best that we can.

SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Mr. Topper, I have a quick question. I shouldn't say question, but a comment.

I think -- Yes, I think both the House and Senate security as well as the Capitol Police have done an amazing job. One of the things I think that we have to in the House and Senate, as well as the Governor's office and yourself, need to remind employees as they come in not to let people piggy-back.

I was just at South Eastern Middle
School to speak to 7th graders, you have to go
through two double locked doors. I know parents
are very much in recognition of not somebody behind
them to walk in.

I think we need to remind our employees, because I have seen it. All are quilty parties

here. Not everybody does it. I know when I walk in, I look to see if somebody behind me has a badge or not.

I think that's something, we have to have a constant reminder. I think we take a lot for granted around here sometimes. Everybody coming into the Capitol has a badge or an employee. We don't know each other. But I do think that's something we have to keep reminding employees is that, their security depends on them.

Also being alert is the President and Homeland Security and FBI, and everybody else warns people to put a call in if you have anything. We also have to be observant here at the Capitol to protect the employees here. We have a lot of school students, and people who come in to see their beautiful Capitol.

So, I just think that's one of the things we probably need to do as a -- on a constant reminder to our employees, the Governor's office, the House, and the Senate as well employees.

SECRETARY TOPPER: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a pending meeting in the next couple of weeks involving House and Senate leadership, Capitol Police, myself and my executive

2.1

1 team. I'm looking forward to that meeting and to that dialogue, and then determining what else we 2 3 can do. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Appreciate 4 5 that, Mr. Secretary. 6 With that, we'll move to Representative 7 Peifer. REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: 8 Thank you, 9 Chairman. Thank you, Secretary, for being here. 10 I'd like to talk a little bit about the 11 Farm Show finance project. I know last fall you 12 issued an RFP for this project. We had heard that 13 the Governor was interested in doing a lease/ 14 lease-back of the Farm Show Complex. This wasn't new to anyone. It had been in his budget 15 16 proposals. 17 Could you tell me how many bids you 18 actually received for this project? 19 SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes, sir. We've received four bids. 20 21 REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Okay. So you 22 received four bids based upon the lease and 23 lease-back of the Farm Show; is that correct? SECRETARY TOPPER: That's correct. We 24 25 issued a request for a proposal consistent with the

1 Commonwealth's procurement code and regulations, 2 and we received four competitive proposals. REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Okay. So, when 3 I look at the RFP itself, very clearly in the title it talks about this lease slash lease-back of the Farm Show Complex, specifically named. Under the 6 project description, again it talks about the lease/lease-back of the Farm Show Complex. 8 But somewhere -- You know, we just 10 received payment, correct? Can you explain, we 11 just received \$200 million in January for this 12 overall proposal, correct? That's correct. 13 SECRETARY TOPPER: 14 REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Okav. 15 Somewhere, I guess my question is, how did the RFP 16 morph itself into what we have as a financing 17 agreement? 18 I'm trying to look through this 19 financing agreement and read some of the terms of the financing agreement. I don't see the 20 2.1 lease/lease-back of the Farm Show Complex. 22 not called a lease/lease-back agreement. It's 23 called a financing agreement. 24 So, could you explain how we morphed --25 this whole process morphed itself from one set of

terms to a separate set of terms?

2.1

SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, the contract -- the final contract emerged as a result of the contract negotiations that typically follow any request for proposal process. So, between OGC, my Office of Chief Counsel, and the prospective winning bidder, we arrived at a contract that was agreeable to all parties.

REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Do you think,
maybe, if you had an RFP out for the financing
agreement, there might have been other entities
willing to propose or put a bid in for the
financing agreement, because I see two separate and
distinct documents. I was just wondering if you've
ever considered putting out the financing agreement
to bid?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Perhaps. I don't think that there was any confusion in the marketplace over whether the Commonwealth was -- was looking to establish what is in effect a financing agreement. It was referred to as a lease/lease-back model from day one, but I really don't think there was any confusion based on the numerous communications that I know my team had with participants in the market.

1 REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: So you still 2 feel confident -- Even though it doesn't say that in this financing agreement, you still feel 3 confident that it is a lease/lease-back transaction? 5 SECRETARY TOPPER: I feel confident that 6 7 the final agreement was entered into in a manner that's consistent with the requirements of the 8 procurement code in the original RFP? 10 REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Some of the --11 Let's go on to the actual financing agreement as 12 it's called. Page 4, paragraph C, talks about DGS 13 and the Secretary of Budget reasonably believe that 14 sufficient funds can be appropriated to DGS by the 15 General Assembly to make all payments owed during 16 the term. 17 You know, is that consistent with other 18 debt that we issue at the state level? 19 SECRETARY TOPPER: That's consistent 20 with -- with all -- with all contract obligations; 21 virtually all contract obligations that the 22 Commonwealth enters into within the context of 23 Commonwealth procurement and contracts. It is a standard term in Commonwealth 24

contracts that our obligations are subject to

appropriations --

REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: So even though we received \$200 million, we received an amortization schedule that details a 29-year-payment term totaling, I think, cash payments of \$375 million--I have that somewhere--it just seems odd that we would just say we reasonably believe we can make payments.

But you're saying that's pretty common?

SECRETARY TOPPER: I'm saying that all

of our obligations -- all of our payment

obligations within the context of contracts, or

virtually all of them, are contingent upon

appropriations from the General Assembly.

REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Okay. Next page, on page 5 -- item 5 in the middle, talks about security of this transaction. In the middle it says: Semi-annual payments are not secured by a pledge of the Commonwealth.

So, I would think in a lease/lease-back of the Farm Show Complex, that we are using the actual complex as some type of security on the \$200 million that we received. But it clearly says on this paragraph that they are not pledged by -- they're not secured by a pledge. Is that true?

1 SECRETARY TOPPER: That is true. 2 REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Okay. So what 3 happens if the General Assembly is not reasonable and they're not able to make payments on the 4 \$200 million, what happens then? I mean --5 6 SECRETARY TOPPER: I suppose, then, we 7 would be in default. REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: But we would 8 still own the Farm Show Complex? 10 SECRETARY TOPPER: That is correct. 11 REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Okav. 12 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Are you done? 13 REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: One more 14 question, Mr. Chairman. 15 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: 16 REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: The credit 17 rating agencies, how do they see this transaction? 18 Do they see this, as far as we know, again, general 19 obligation bonds rank? Where does this fit in their ranking or -- of our Commonwealth as far as 20 2.1 our ratings go? 22 SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, that 23 might be a better question directed towards the Budget Secretary. I not do not have any direct 24 25 dealings with the credit agencies.

1 REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Okay. Thank 2 you, Chairman. 3 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: 4 Representative Kinsey. My apologies, Representative Kinsey. 5 6 Just one quick -- I wanted to note that Representative Ward has joined us as well. She's 7 not a member of the committee, but is here to 8 9 observe as well. 10 Representative Kinsey. Thank you. 11 REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Good morning. 12 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Deputy 13 Secretary. 14 My question is going to center around 15 the diversity and contract issuance. Governor Wolf 16 had issued an Executive Order 2015-11 to expand and improve contract opportunities. My understanding 17 18 is that part of this executive order had tasked DGS 19 to expand its diversity bureau and to focus on 20 training, outreach and implement meaningful 21 performance-based metrics, as well as establish a 22 mentor protege program to help grow, sustain 23 participating businesses. Can you briefly elaborate on this work 2.4 25 and identify the specific outlay of this program;

how the Commonwealth has improved in terms of diversity contracting?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure. Thank you for your question, Representative.

I'm really proud of the record we've established here over the course of the last three years when it comes to diversity and inclusion.

When the Administration arrived, measured as a matter of payments, the Commonwealth -- the level of participation by small businesses overall, and particularly my minority and women-owned businesses was in sharp decline. It had declined every year in the prior Administration.

I'm proud to be able to say that we've at least turned the corner, and we've leveled that decline off and started it back in the right direction. However, we have tremendous work to do.

You know, currently, our overall level of small business participation in Commonwealth contracts, measured as a matter of payments, sits at about 8 and a half percent. That's all in small businesses and small diverse businesses. Small diverse businesses, which are a subset of that number, currently sits at just over 5 percent.

We can do better. The Commonwealth --

If we look to our neighbors to the south and to the north, Maryland and New York, they routinely see levels of participation three to four times the level of participation that Pennsylvania has historically achieved when it comes to participation by small and minority-owned businesses.

We have taken pretty significant steps here for the last three years in order to help stem the tide, or trim the corner, and get very serious about how we do this. The first thing we did was, we got -- we moved to an imperially met valid measure based on payments. This was a number that was, unfortunately, had been politicized over the course of successful administrations. The numbers were a little bit cooked.

We've now established an empirical basis that I hope will be sustained through success of administrations.

The second thing we did was, we put in place compliance measures, firm subcontract requirements, so that, when prime contractors make commitments to subcontractors in the course of our procurement process, they -- we have teeth in the contract and in the subcontract that enable us to

hold them accountable for those commitments.

2.1

A third thing we've done, working with the Governor's advisory council for diversity and inclusion, is establish an agency liaison program and begin to set agency-level goals and start a senior-level dialogue between DGS, the Governor's office, members of the advisory council and agency leadership around identifying the places where we can do better; what contract should we target; how can we do a better job of driving more small business participation. That just got underway within the last year, and I think we're starting to make some headway with it.

And finally, last year we contracted for the state's first comprehensive disparity study, which includes all of the goods and services that are purchased under the purview of DGS and the other agencies, and PennDOT and PennDOT construction. So, it's the first comprehensive disparity study that the Commonwealth has ever done.

The purpose of the disparity study is to establish an empirical basis. It's a measure of the availability of small and minority and women-owned businesses, diverse businesses to do

1 Commonwealth work; and, historically, the level of 2 -- the percentage of the contracts they've actually been able to win, their level of participation. 3 When we have those things empirically established, it creates a baseline and an opportunity for us to 5 put in place legally defensible policies and 6 programs to help drive the numbers up. 7 REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: 8 Mr. Secretary, I know that my time is almost up. 10 Just so we're clear, when we talk about 11 small business participation and diversity, are we 12 looking at -- you have it broken down. We have 13 folks of color, as well as women, folks with disability and also individuals with the LGBT. 14 Do we have those broken down in those categories as 15 16 well, and others? 17 SECRETARY TOPPER: We do. I can provide 18 you with -- I don't have the participation, but 19 I'll be happy to provide it for you. 20 REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: If you could 21 send it in, I would just like to see that, and also 22 see the growth from previous years up to where we 23 are now. 24 SECRETARY TOPPER: I'll be pleased to

share that information.

```
1
                 REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Thank you very
 2
      much, Mr. Secretary.
                 Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.
 3
                  (Chairman Saylor spoke to Representative
 4
 5
      Kinsey).
 6
                 REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: He's given me
 7
      additional time, and I appreciate that.
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: Sorry for the
 8
      filibuster. It wasn't intentional.
                 REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: No, that's fine.
10
11
                 I think just the important part that I'm
      going to ask for again is -- Again, I listed four
12
13
      categories of diversity: Folks of color, women,
14
      people with disability as well as LGBT. If there's
15
      any other category that your department captures,
16
      I'd like to receive that as well.
17
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: Veterans.
18
                 REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Thank you very
19
      much. Thank you very much.
20
                 Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.
21
                 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR:
22
      Representative Sonney.
23
                 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY:
                                          Thank you, Mr.
      Chairman.
24
                 Mr. Secretary, thank you for being here.
25
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: Good morning.
```

1	REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Good morning.
2	I'd like to follow up a little bit more on the Farm
3	Show and the lease/lease-back agreement that turned
4	into a financial agreement.
5	So you were, obviously, the lead agency
6	on this, correct?
7	SECRETARY TOPPER: We did execute the
8	agreement, yes.
9	REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: And you also
10	executed the RFP?
11	SECRETARY TOPPER: That's correct.
12	REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: You just
13	testified that four people or four entities
14	responded to that RFP?
15	SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes, sir.
16	REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Did any of those
17	entities respond believing that it was a true
18	lease/lease-back?
19	SECRETARY TOPPER: I believe all four
20	entities responded based on the language that was
21	in the RFP. I'm not sure
22	REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: It says in the
23	RFP that it is a lease/lease-back.
24	SECRETARY TOPPER: Correct. I guess
25	what I'm struggling with is your characterization

of true lease/lease-back versus false lease/ 1 2 lease-back. I'm not sure what that means. REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Mr. Secretary, I 3 quess at some point in time this changed from what, 5 in all appearances, was a lease/lease-back proposal to a financing proposal. And so, I'm curious as to 6 why your agency remained a lead agency in finalizing this agreement. 8 In other words, did your agency have 10 anything to do with securitizing money using the 11 tobacco settlement money? 12 SECRETARY TOPPER: No, sir. 13 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: So it's not 14 common practice for your agency to do financing, other than specifically for, you know, your 15 16 projects or anything under your purview? 17 SECRETARY TOPPER: That's correct. 18 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: So why did you 19 not turn this over to a different agency when it became clear that it was morphing into a financing 20 and not a lease/lease-back? 21 22 SECRETARY TOPPER: The Department was 23 working extensively with the Office of Budget and the Department of Agriculture. Because DGS issued 24

the RFP, it made sense for DGS to be the

1 contracting agency. It's that simple. 2 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: When I read 3 through the agreement, then the amortization schedule, which is paid over 29 years, correct? 4 SECRETARY TOPPER: Correct. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: And we have 7 semi-annual payments for the debt, correct? SECRETARY TOPPER: That's correct. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: If we were to 10 pay this debt off early, do we then end on the 11 interest payments, or are the interest payments 12 guaranteed? 13 SECRETARY TOPPER: I don't know the 14 answer to that, Representative, off the top of my 15 head, but I'll be happy to provide it for you. 16 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: It would seem 17 odd to me that you don't know that answer when you 18 are the one that initiated that contract. I know 19 if I go to borrow money from somebody, I'd like to know all the terms of that agreement, and what my 20 21 ability is to end that agreement. And you don't --22 you don't know that? 23 SECRETARY TOPPER: I'll be pleased to 24 provide the answer to you. 25 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Thank you.

1	Would you be able to provide the copies of those					
2	four proposals that came back for the lease/					
3	lease-back?					
4	SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, I					
5	don't know to what extent those proposals are					
6	required to be maintained as confidential, but I'll					
7	be pleased to provide whatever information we're					
8	able to provide.					
9	REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Thank you.					
LO	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.					
L1	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Mr.					
12	Secretary, I would appreciate you sending those to					
L3	Chairman Markosek and myself. The proposals that					
L 4	were submitted, as well as any other documents at					
L5	that point, since they've been requested?					
L 6	SECRETARY TOPPER: Absolutely.					
L7	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: With that,					
L8	Representative Bullock.					
L 9	REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Thank you, Mr.					
20	Chairman.					
21	Good morning, Secretary, how are you?					
22	SECRETARY TOPPER: Good morning.					
23	REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: I was reading					
24	through the materials and noted that we have been					
25	working on an energy savings energy reduction					

plan for the Commonwealth buildings.

2.1

Similarly, the City of Philadelphia actually has a Philadelphia municipal energy master plan that has committed itself to reducing carbon pollution -- or reducing its own energy use and cleaning their energy supply. In that plan they set benchmarks, by which they plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions for their built environment by 2030 by 50 percent. They plan to reduce their overall built environment energy use and generate more than -- well, generate a hundred percent of their electricity from renewable sources.

Have we set similar benchmarks for the Commonwealth and for our buildings and our energy use here as well?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you for the question, Representative.

We're in the process of actually rolling out building by building sort of a public awareness campaign to make certain that visitors and employees, folks coming and going from our buildings are aware of what the actual energy consumption looks like in the buildings they are visiting, and also what that energy consumption

looks like in comparison with key benchmarks.

2.1

I'm really pleased to be able to share with you that, overall, the building fleet is

16 percent more efficient than the CBECS average, which is the Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey for the northeast region, which is the benchmark that we typically use.

You asked about green energy. At the start of the Administration, the Commonwealth's green energy purchase had been reduced by the prior Administration to zero. I'm pleased to say that three years in, we are now back up to 30 percent of the Commonwealth's energy purchase is coming from renewable sources.

We would absolutely like to see that number continue to grow. We are working within the constraints that we have in terms of current contracts and budgets to try to continue to make it grow. But I'm quite proud that in three years, we have been able to grow it back from zero to 30.

That 30 percent equates to 160,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide, or, you know, sufficient actually to -- sufficient power for 22,000 average American homes. It's quite a significant amount of electricity.

I could go on and on. It's quite a comprehensive process. We've made significant investments under the GESA program within the last three years. You know, the building we're in now has LED lighting virtually everywhere you look. As you know, LED is about 9 to 10 times more efficient than the prior electric lighting; also involves considerable less maintenance, so we're excited about that.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Are you able at this point to report any specific savings; whether it's this building or --

For example, I know the Philadelphia

Museum of Art had a 3-million-dollar-a-year

electric bill that we were able to cut with the

savings that we're working on, right?

have come from two sources. The first is, we got much more aggressive and much smarter about how we were engaging the market in order to buy electricity. So we've been aggregating the buy across all Commonwealth facilities; working with Penn State -- a team at Penn State to get the strategy right and going long. You know, the net of it is -- I'll have to get the exact numbers, but

1 it was several million dollars a year in savings. 2 Our average cost per kilowatt hour across the Commonwealth is now right around \$0.05, 3 which is competitive with every commercial 4 benchmark I can find. We expanded that this year 5 6 to the COSTARS program and began buying energy on behalf of 28 municipalities in the Commonwealth. And they, in turn, with our help, have -- over the 8 next four years will save about \$1.8 million over 10 their current rates simply by participating; 11 working together with us on the buy. 12 That's where our focus has been; there, 13 and also reinvesting in systems like LED lighting, 14 HVAC systems; when we do upgrades to our buildings; 15 finding ways to manage them in a more efficient 16 way. 17 There's a lot of more detail here than 18 we have time for, but I'd be pleased to provide it 19 to you. 20 REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: I appreciate 2.1 that, Mr. Secretary. 22 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I have no 23 further questions. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: 24 25 Representative Delozier.

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, over here. We're moving around on you. Sorry about that. I actually -- I know a couple questions have been asked about the lease-back. I have some issues on authority, so I just want to get a couple questions out to you.

This agreement was the DGS, the Commonwealth, and the municipal real estate -- municipal real estate, which, from all intents and purposes, from what I can tell, that was kind of developed simply for this deal. They hadn't been in existence prior to that for the January 30, 200 million.

The Governor has made a number of proposals. It seems that when he doesn't get it passed through the legislature, he just does it on his own, even though the legislative process is supposed to be a part of it. Yesterday we heard from Department of Corrections. They didn't get probation and parole in the corrections merger, so he just did it on his own.

This seems to be kind of the same scenario, in the sense that he proposed it; it didn't get passed by 253, majority in the

```
1
      legislature, so he's doing it on his own.
                                                  I quess
      health and human services will be next since he
 2
      proposed that this year if it doesn't go through --
 3
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative,
 4
      that's not correct.
 5
 6
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER:
                                            What's not
      correct?
 7
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: It was not proposed
 8
 9
      as part of the last budget.
10
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER:
                                            What was not
11
      proposed?
12
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: The lease/lease-back.
13
      There was ample discussion on it. There was --
14
      There were hearings on it.
15
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Right.
16
      had conversation about the fact of doing it. He
17
      did not get the votes in order to have it happen
18
      here in the legislature, correct?
19
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: It was never the
      position of the Administration that the General
20
21
      Assembly was required to be a party to the deal.
22
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Oh.
                                                 So the
23
      General Assembly has no oversight of budget?
      that the thought of what the Governor thought?
24
25
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: No. It's quite clear
```

that the Commonwealth -- that DGS, the Office of the Budget, the Governor has ample authority to enter into contracts.

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Yes. But the -- You're dealing with the Farm Show, so my question with authority comes into play with this particular entity. I mean, I've been around government a long time with the Governor's office, Lieutenant Governor's Banking, Office of Administration. I've never seen a contract like this. Has there ever been one done like this before?

SECRETARY TOPPER: This is the first of its kind. Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: That's what I thought.

So the ability for -- Since this is the Farm Show that we're talking about, even though it seems that the Farm Show is not really involved, my question comes to the fact that my understanding -- and Secretary Redding was here and said that agriculture hasn't been involved in this contract whatsoever. They're not a signatory looking at the signatures that are on it.

My understanding with the Farm Show, and

2.1

1 I asked one of the board members, Farm Show Commission exists in statute, and their 2 jurisdiction is the oversight of the Farm Show. 3 Why are they not involved with this contract? 5 SECRETARY TOPPER: Historically, my 6 understanding is, the Commission has never been involved in Capitol projects associated with the Farm Show or other decisions that have been made 8 historically related to the facility itself. 10 Commission, as I understand it, has been 11 predominately focused on the Farm Show -- on the 12 Farm Show event. 13 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Well, I would 14 think if you're going to put the Farm Show in hock, 15 that they would have something to do with the fact 16 that you're using them as the -- you're using them 17 as the reason for the loan, correct? SECRETARY TOPPER: I don't believe we've 18 19 put the Farm Show in hock. 20 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: You're getting a mortgage out on 200 million -- you're getting 2.1 22 \$200 million for the Farm Show, correct? 23 SECRETARY TOPPER: There is no security 24 interest in the Farm Show conveyed as --25 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Right, which

1 might be more of an issue. 2 Okay. The other one I saw was not on 3 this contract was the Commission of Public Grounds and Buildings. My understanding, in statute, that 4 they are responsible for all assets for executive 5 6 agencies, but yet, they are not a part of this. Where would they normally -- Wouldn't they normally 7 be part of the contract like this; with DGS I mean? 8 SECRETARY TOPPER: Our determination 10 with council was that this transaction did not 11 constitute a lease that would have been required to 12 go through the Board of Commissioners of Public 13 Grounds and Buildings. 14 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Okay. What is 15 the definition of ones that do not go through that 16 entity, then? 17 SECRETARY TOPPER: I'd be happy to get 18 for you the --19 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: I didn't know 20 there was a differentiation. 21 SECRETARY TOPPER: T --22 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: So there's 23 some that do and some that don't? SECRETARY TOPPER: That's correct. 24 25 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: And you're not

1 clear on which ones don't? That's the information 2 you can get us? SECRETARY TOPPER: I'd be pleased to. 3 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: 4 Okav. 5 appreciate that. 6 One of the questions we also had deals with -- a lot of the whereases that are in the 7 contract talk about a lot of the stipulations where 8 you have the authority to go in and make contracts 10 and everything else. 11 When this particular contract went into 12 place and everything else, one of the questions 13 that I -- In reading it, I was a little just kind 14 of confused to the fact that, \$200 million in cash is going into the General Fund, correct? 15 16 SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes, ma'am. 17 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: So all 18 200-million is going in. And the ability for us to 19 turn that around, that money would be used for DGS, or was it going to other entities? 20 21 SECRETARY TOPPER: The 200 million is deposited in the General Fund. It's to be used to 22 23 provide sufficient funding to pay DGS's operational expenses, agricultural extension service payments, 24

a food purchase program costs, and other

agricultural operation costs in fiscal year '17-18.

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Okay. That's something I will just have to follow up on mainly because the ag secretary didn't believe that any of the dollars were coming back to agriculture. So, we just have a conflict there. I just need to figure out exactly where those dollars are going and what they're actually paying for so we know which line items there are going to help in the budget in and of itself for '17-18.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I appreciate it. I just have a lot of, I guess, concerns as to the fact that, A, this is the first of its kind, kind of contract. I'm just a little nervous that the Governor seems to be kind of going out on his own when he doesn't seem to get what he wants from the legislature, and checks and balances are there for a reason. I think that many of them have been skipped recently. So, thank you very much.

 $\label{eq:majority} \mbox{MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: With that,} \\ \mbox{Representative Kampf.}$

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, following on what

Representative Delozier says, I've looked at this

finance agreement. And my sense is that, we put

2.1

into the budget documents, and the Governor signed it, that 300 million was supposed to come out of special funds; money that was already in the special funds. The Administration didn't want to do that, so they used you to issue debt, and that's what this finance agreement is. Plain and simple, it's debt.

They gave it this entity that was created for this. I'm sure it's folks who have lots of money. They agreed to give us 200 million; and, in turn, by signing this contract, you attempted to bind us to pay back, I think it's about 394 million.

So my questions are really, first, about debt. Is this the first time you have ever signed a contract to issue debt?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, this is the first time I've signed a contract of this nature. It's the first time the Commonwealth has executed a contract of this nature.

REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: And my understanding is, generally speaking, the Commonwealth, a legal entity has to have legal authority in order to do these things.

So, with respect to debt, the

1 Constitution of Pennsylvania says that debt is defined as anything that -- where we issue and have 2 outstanding obligations, and it includes 3 obligations of its agencies or authorities to the extent they are to be repaid from revenues of the 6 Commonwealth. Would you agree that this financing agreement falls into that definition? 8 SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure. 10 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Okay. 11 are now in agreement that it is debt under the 12 Constitution's definition, I don't know if you're 13 aware, but there are several limitations on debt in that same Constitution. You're allowed -- We are 14 15 allowed to issue debt for tax anticipation notes. 16 Is this a tax anticipation note? 17 Representative, we're SECRETARY TOPPER: 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Is it a tax 20 anticipation tax note? Yes or no, or I don't know. 2.1 SECRETARY TOPPER: I don't know. 22 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: All right. Is it 23 debt to -- and you can do this to unlimited 24 amounts, to suppress insurrection, rehabilitate 25 areas affected by man-made diasters, or was it

```
1
      approved by the electorate, this financing
      agreement?
 2
 3
                  (Pause).
                 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Yes, no, or I
 4
      don't know?
 5
                  SECRETARY TOPPER: No, that seems to be.
 6
 7
                 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: No, okay.
                 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: These are
 8
 9
      questions --
10
                 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: So the other
11
      reason --
12
                 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Excuse me,
13
      Representative.
14
                 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: I'm sorry.
15
      asking the questions.
16
                 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: I know.
17
                 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Can we stop the
18
      clock for a moment, please?
19
                 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: Chairman's
20
      license here that we --
21
                 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Please stop your
22
      clock.
23
                 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: There are
      questions that would be more apropos for the
24
25
      Secretary of the Budget. The Secretary has said
```

1 he's not an expert in this, so --2 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: He signed this agreement by attempting to bind the Commonwealth of 3 Pennsylvania, and I believe I'm entitled to ask 4 these questions. 5 6 So there's another possible debt under 7 the Constitution, and that is for Capitol projects. Is this debt related to a Capitol project? 8 SECRETARY TOPPER: No, sir. 10 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Do we pledge in 11 this agreement the full faith and credit of the 12 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania? 13 SECRETARY TOPPER: No, sir. 14 Sir, I'm advised that, according to the Attorney General, this is not constitutional debt. 15 16 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Right. So, let's 17 go to another question on authority as opposed to debt. 18 19 So you -- This agreement that you signed has a bunch of whereas clauses. We've already 20 2.1 established that it doesn't really have anything to 22 do with the Farm Show, despite the RFP that you 23 issued. So the Farm Show Commission didn't approve 24 it, even though the statute says they approve

leases. This Board of Leasing, whatever it's

1 called, that you sometimes use for your work didn't 2 approve this. 3 But, you say there are multiple acts, I quess the administrative code, that allow for this. 4 So I've got some questions about that. The whereas 5 6 clause indicates that you're allowed to, under the administrative code, sign contracts for the carrying-on of your operations. Is signing a 8 financing agreement part of carrying-on your 10 operations? 11 SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, it 12 seems to me your questions are -- are --13 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: I just want to 14 I just want to know, if signing a financing agreement is part of your operations? 15 16 SECRETARY TOPPER: I'd like to be able 17 to ask (sic) your question. 18 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: And I asked it, 19 and I still haven't heard under the administrative code or some other law or rule related to DGS, 20 whether signing a financing agreement is 2.1 22 essentially a promise to pay back money with 23 interest is part of your operations; your department's operations. Yes or no? 24

25

SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, my

1	Department signs contracts every day.
2	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: I asked about a
3	financing agreement; this financing agreement.
4	SECRETARY TOPPER: The answer is yes.
5	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Okay. So is
6	generating revenue and issuing debt part of DGS's
7	mission?
8	(Pause).
9	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Yes, no, or I
10	don't know?
11	SECRETARY TOPPER: The Department
12	generates revenue from a number of sources, so yes.
13	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: All right. So
14	you indicated that you are following the
15	administrative code. This financing agreement has
16	some other whereas clauses. It says under this
17	Section 2401, you're allowed to accept grants and
18	aid, gifts. This is in the agreement you signed:
19	Grants and aid, gifts, donations, legacies or
20	usages of money extended by individuals.
21	Is this document one of those items?
22	SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes.
23	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Is it a gift?
24	SECRETARY TOPPER: No.
25	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Is it a donation?

1 SECRETARY TOPPER: It's a usage of 2 money. REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: It's a usage of 3 money. So usage of money is, if somebody gives me \$200 million, and I agree to pay them 394 back --5 394 million back, that's a usage of money, sir? Do 6 you have any citation for the usage of money being that kind of an instrument? 8 SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, if 10 it's your intent to question the legality of the 11 contract, you're certainly free to do that. 12 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: That's actually what I'm actually doing, and you signed it, sir. 13 14 SECRETARY TOPPER: T did. 15 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: And there is an 16 obligation under the budgeting and the law of the 17 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that when things are 18 passed and signed by the Governor, like the code 19 bills were, that he's supposed to follow the law. 20 This does not appear to me to be 21 transferring money out of special funds as was 22 instructed in that code. 23 REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Mr. Chairman, the red light's been going on and off, on and off. 24 25 This is -- This is getting a little bit excessive.

1 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: My last question then, let's say you wanted to sign --2 3 REPRESENTATIVE BRIGGS: Mr. Chairman. REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: -- a financing 4 agreement for \$1.5 billion. Would you be allowed 5 to do that? 6 7 SECRETARY TOPPER: I'm not interested in hypotheticals. 8 9 (Pause). 10 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative --11 12 REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Never in my 13 wildest dreams did I think we would get to the 14 point where you were signing a finance agreement, 15 so I think --16 SECRETARY TOPPER: The contract that I 17 signed was thoroughly reviewed by the Office of 18 Attorney General; thoroughly reviewed by the Office 19 of Chief Counsel; thoroughly reviewed by the -- by the Department's counsel. It was approved in terms 20 2.1 of form and legality, and I felt 100 percent 22 comfortable signing it. Otherwise, I would not 23 have signed it, sir. 2.4 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: With that, we 25 need to move on to the next member.

1	REPRESENTATIVE KAMPF: Yes,
2	Mr. Chairman.
3	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR:
4	Representative Dunbar.
5	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: I always love
6	following you, Warren.
7	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
8	I guess we'll stick with the Farm Show.
9	I guess it's not the Farm Show anymore, but the
10	financing agreement. And on page 8 of the finance
11	agreement, there is a number 12, fees, commission
12	expenses. It lists that there's language that
13	allows DGS that says DGS shall pay all expenses
14	and the issuance of this debt not to exceed
15	\$2.3 million in costs.
16	Were those costs incurred?
17	SECRETARY TOPPER: I'm sorry. Which
18	costs?
19	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: \$2.3 million of
20	fees, commissions and expenses related to the
21	interim financing or permit financing agreement.
22	SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes, sir, those were
23	included.
24	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: And how were
25	they paid? Or were they borrowed?

1	SECRETARY TOPPER: It's rolled into the
2	cost of the transaction.
3	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: So the borrowing
4	then was 200 plus; is that correct?
5	SECRETARY TOPPER: I believe that's
6	correct.
7	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: So, as far as
8	our budgets are concerned, the repayment of this,
9	the interest expense is part of your budget going
10	forward now?
11	SECRETARY TOPPER: It will be, yes.
12	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: So that would be
13	part of the budget As far as what we're looking
14	at for '18-19, will I be able to see that somewhere
15	in our actual budget or
16	SECRETARY TOPPER: I believe the first
17	required payments will be in '19-20.
18	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Okay. So, in
19	'19-20, we should start seeing an increase in your
20	budget based upon incurred interest?
21	SECRETARY TOPPER: That's correct.
22	REPRESENTATIVE DUNBAR: Okay. Thank.
23	You.
24	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR:
25	Representative Boback.

1 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you, Mr. 2 Chairman. Good morning, Mr. Secretary. 3 SECRETARY TOPPER: Good morning. 4 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: 5 A few weeks ago, Governor Wolf created a new executive level office 6 called the Office of Performance Through Excellence. Are you able to explain what the 8 duties of this new office will be? 10 Did DOS -- excuse me -- DGS previously handled the tasks that this office is going to 11 12 handle, and how many people would the office 13 (pause) whether it be employed and at what cost? SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure. 14 Thank you for 15 the question. 16 The Office of Performance Through 17 Excellence was created recently to take the efforts 18 that were previously being administered and 19 organized through the GO-TIME office within the 20 Office of Administration, and to elevate them to 2.1 make them a direct report to the Governor, and to 22 accelerate our efforts here on performance 23 management across the enterprise and on our implementation of lean principles, which is 24

basically an approach to management that was

1 developed first by the Toyota Corporation -- by 2 Toyota called the Toyota Production System. best practices on how to administer business 3 processes and drive out waste and make it more efficient. 5 6 The Governor felt it was important to 7 elevate both of those tasks, performance management which is to say the application of metrics to our 8 business operations, and the application of lean 10 which is intended to help drive efficiencies in the 11 attainment of those metrics. 12 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you. And 13 about how many people will the office employ at 14 what approximate annual cost? 15 SECRETARY TOPPER: I don't have the cost 16 in front of me. But, my understanding is that, the 17 new office effectively subsumes the personnel and 18 the budget that were already within the GO-TIME 19 office within the Office of Administration. 20 don't anticipate it's a net increase. 21 REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you, Mr. 22 Secretary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR:

Representative Roae.

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Thank you, Mr.

1 Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Secretary, for your 2 3 testimony today. My question is about the \$5 million 4 Capitol fire protection line item in the budget. 5 6 The Harrisburg Fire Department budget, according to the city budget, is \$8.3 million. And then, in our state budget we have a \$5 million line item for 8 Capitol fire protection. That's seemingly paid to 10 the city of Harrisburg. That would cover about 60 percent of the budget for the Harrisburg Fire 11 12 Department. 13 Do you know, are approximately 14 60 percent of the calls that the Harrisburg Fire 15 Department responds to, are they to the Capitol 16 Building in the Capitol Complex? 17 SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, that 18 seems unlikely to me. I --19 REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: It does to me, 20 too. That's why I'm asking. 21 I mean, they respond to -- the 22 Harrisburg Fire Department responds to about 3,400 23 calls a year. So, 60 percent of that would be over 2,000 calls a year. So every nine calls the 24

Harrisburg Fire Department has, five or six of them

would be to this building and the other buildings in the Capitol Complex.

Do you think that's close to what's happening, or is that probably not the situation?

SECRETARY TOPPER: I understand the line of questioning, Representative. I believe that it's best to consider that \$5 million line item as a payment in lieu of taxes.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Well, okay. Let's talk about it from that perspective. This

Harrisburg city budget says they're going to collect \$17.4 million of property taxes for all the properties in Harrisburg. So, we're giving them 5 million.

Is this building -- about over a fourth. Is this building about 28 percent of the total assessed property value in the entire City of Harrisburg when you look at all the houses and colleges and hospitals, and county government buildings, and businesses, and retail shopping centers, its factories? Is this building we're in right now about a fourth of the total assessed value of the entire city?

SECRETARY TOPPER: I honestly don't know, Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: It doesn't -- it doesn't seem very likely. So if it's payment in lieu of taxes, it seems like it should be something proportional.

Maybe by square miles, the City of
Harrisburg is 12 square miles. 60 percent of that
is seven square miles. Do you know, does the state
government own seven square miles out of the 12
square miles in the city of Harrisburg?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, I'm told I can provide to you an answer to your prior question relative to assessed values. I'll be happy to provide that.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Okay. Thank you.

And then, a couple of questions for the Department. Would the Department support using that \$5 million throughout the state? In my legislative district, we have a Department of Agriculture office. We have a PASSHE college. We have a Department of Corrections prison.

Would the Department support spreading that \$5 million for fire protection to the fire departments in all communities throughout the Commonwealth where the state owns property, or does your Department support keeping all 5 million of it

2.4

1 in the City of Harrisburg? SECRETARY TOPPER: The Department 2 supports the budget as proposed. 3 REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Okav. I will be 4 asking for some follow-up questions that we don't 5 6 have time to do today. My second question regards the vehicles that are provided to legislators through DGS. When 8 a legislator -- When a state House member has a 10 vehicle that's leased or bought, or whatever the 11 arrangement is through the state, does the 12 Department of General Services order annual driving 13 records of those legislators? 14 SECRETARY TOPPER: I'm told we do not. 15 REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Oh. Does DGS 16 require legislators to report accidents when it's 17 in a state-leased or state-owned vehicle? 18 SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes, we do. 19 REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: If a legislator does not report the vehicle, is the vehicle revoked 20 from that legislator? 2.1 22 SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes, it is. 23 REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Okay. And then, 24 do you know approximately how many vehicle state 25 House members have that are through leased

```
1
      agreements with DGS?
                 SECRETARY TOPPER: There are currently
 2
 3
      35.
                 REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Okay. Then one
 4
      final question: If a legislator has too many
 5
 6
      tickets or accidents, or anything like that, does
 7
      DGS revoke the car if they were not involved in an
      accident?
 8
 9
                  SECRETARY TOPPER: We have the ability
10
      to do that, yes.
11
                 REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: How often does
12
      that happen? Like, when's the last time you
13
      revoked the driving privileges from somebody
14
      because of too many tickets or things like that?
15
                  SECRETARY TOPPER: Three weeks ago.
                 REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Okay. Thank you,
16
17
      sir.
18
                 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR:
                                            I want to
19
      announce that we've been joined by Representative
      Hal English as well. He's not a member of the
20
2.1
      committee, but he's observing as well.
22
                 With that, we'll move to Representative
23
      Helm.
24
                 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Thank you, Mr.
      Chairman.
25
```

Secretary Topper, up here. Several years ago I had a bill to give DGS the authority to sell the Harrisburg State Hospital grounds. And then later we did an amendment to bring in the Dauphin County Redevelopment Authority.

I haven't heard lately -- What's the update on that? Can you inform me what's going on?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure, Representative.

We have been actively engaged in negotiations with

the Redevelopment Authority over the course of the last six months or so. I anticipate we'll have a deal closed within the next month or two. I think we're getting closer.

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: When you say closed, tell me more about what you mean by closed? SECRETARY TOPPER: So, the -- the intent is to convey the property in its entirety to the Redevelopment Authority, so that they, in turn, can determine the best disposition for it.

What we're working through now are the terms. So, for example, the portion of the proceeds that would come back to the Commonwealth, you know, upon the ultimate disposition of the property is an important consideration.

We also still have, as I sit here, I

1 think how many? (Question directed to Ms. Hudson). 2 SECRETARY TOPPER: We also still have 3 roughly 800 Commonwealth employees on the property. And so, what we're doing is negotiating the timing 4 of the conveyance and taking into account the 5 6 transition of those -- of those remaining employees 7 off of the property and into downtown locations. REPRESENTATIVE HELM: That's what I was 8 wondering, how long they would be there, because 10 that was part of the Harrisburg Strong Plan to move 11 on with those employees leaving and going into 12 Harrisburg. 13 SECRETARY TOPPER: That's right. So 14 far, we have already successfully transitioned, how 15 many? (Ouestion directed to Ms. Hudson). 16 SECRETARY TOPPER: It's significant. 17 believe it's a couple thousand employees into 18 downtown locations; primarily, into Strawberry 19 Square. 20 Okay. Thank you. I'm sorry, 751. So 2.1 751 so far; 800 remaining. 22 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: All right. 23 how much do you anticipate the Commonwealth will save in annual carrying costs once this is all 24 25 sold?

1 SECRETARY TOPPER: The annual carrying cost of the property is approximately \$5 million. 2 So I'm anxious to --3 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: 4 So the sooner the better, right? 5 6 SECRETARY TOPPER: That's correct. 7 REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Recently, the Susquehanna Township members of the school board 8 came to see me. They would love to have a part of 10 this parcel to build a new school. And I know we 11 have some good parcels. We also have some parcels 12 that have asbestos all through the buildings, which 13 those parcels have a negative value. 14 What is the possibility of Susquehanna 15 Township obtaining some of this ground to build a 16 school? 17 SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, as 18 I'm sure you can imagine, I am anxious to get the 19 current deal that we are negotiating completed so 20 that we can get the property on a schedule to, 2.1 ultimately, have it off the Commonwealth's books. 22 I would certainly be happy to engage 23 with the township, but I would think it would need to be, at this point, a three-party kind of 24

conversation involving the state, the Redevelopment

Authority and the school district.

And, ultimately, I would be hesitant to add new complications that would potentially slow down our progress here. So, I think it may be worth an offline conversation. I would certainly encourage a conversation between the RDA and the school district. But I'm not in a position to be able to judge the likelihood of success there sitting here.

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: All right. We will work on that. I know some of the problems with some of the parcels.

How many other state-owned properties are unused and surplus? While you're looking for that, like, what's the annual carrying costs for these properties?

SECRETARY TOPPER: I actually had it here.

So, we currently have 18 properties; five, of which, are under agreement of sale; 13, of which, we're currently prepping for sale. The ones we are prepping for sale have all in about a -- a carrying cost of about \$4 million a year.

REPRESENTATIVE HELM: Since it seems to take us so long to do this, do you have any

1 suggestions for legislative changes you can recommend to speed up the process for future 2 3 properties? SECRETARY TOPPER: I do. 4 We have provided language to both State Government 5 6 Committee Chairmen and staffs with a package that we're calling real estate modernization. In there, there are a number of steps that I think would make 8 it easier for us to dispose of properties faster. 10 Frankly, it's the involvement of the 11 General Assembly that tends to slow this process 12 down. 13 All right. REPRESENTATIVE HELM: We'll 14 listen to your comments, but I do want to talk to 15 you about the Susquehanna school because I 16 graduated from that school. That's a long time 17 ago. They need a new property, and they're 18 actually increasing their student population where 19 a lot of schools are decreasing. 20 So, thank you very much. 21 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: 22 Representative Everett. 23 REPRESENTATIVE EVERETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2.4 25 Secretary Topper, I want to just briefly talk about the Separations Act. Could you just, for the committee and for those who may not be familiar, can you explain what the Separations Act is?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure.

The Separations Act of 1913 requires that the Commonwealth and other public entities, when we contract for construction, that we engage four prime contractors separately, effectively acting as our own GC. So, that would be a general construction contract as a prime, and then one each for mechanical, electrical, and plumbing and HVAC.

REPRESENTATIVE EVERETT: It's my understanding that in testimony last year in the Senate, you opined that you thought the Commonwealth could save a hundred million dollars or so if -- if the Commonwealth had the ability to maybe bid both ways or -- and compare the costs. Is that still your opinion?

SECRETARY TOPPER: In the year since, we have been taking a pretty hard look at both the potential administrative cost savings and the potential impact on total costs associated with construction, if we had -- if we had other alternatives. We're continuing to do that

analysis.

I think from an administrative cost standpoint, there's little question that it would be less costly. But, in terms of total costs, I think we're still evaluating data that we have been able to receive from constituencies on both sides of the issue.

Presently, the Administration's position on the Separations Act hasn't changed. We're continuing to look at it. I don't believe at this point that a -- that a straight repeal of the Separations Act, without an ample description of what we would replace it with administratively is a tenable position.

working on legislation with all the stakeholders in your office. At this point, I think that the proposition that I would put forward would be that the Commonwealth and all the different municipal entities would have the option of bidding it the way we do it now, or bidding it to just do one prime, and just give them the flexibility to do it the way they feel, in their situation, would be the best cost savings for them.

Prior to coming to the legislature, I

was the solicitor for a number of school districts, municipalities and authorities, and they are unanimous in the desire to have that flexibility.

Is that -- I don't see how that compromises anybody. If you still want to do it the way we do it now, you can still do it that way. If you want to put your bid out in another way, it would give you the flexibility to do that.

Is that something you think that you could support?

SECRETARY TOPPER: I would prefer to conduct a further study that we need to do in order to understand exactly what the impact is on total costs. But, broadly speaking, I do tend to favor greater -- a greater amount of flexibility in terms of how we do our contracting. I can't -- I think we need to see the details of what's being proposed before we can take an official position.

REPRESENTATIVE EVERETT: Okay. I'll get that -- We're reworking the legislation right now and putting the fine details on it. We'll get it to your office to review again.

And I'd just like to point out to the committee that's not -- that aren't familiar with the Separations Act. Forty-seven other states have

1 moved away from the Separations Act. We're one of three left in the country that still do it. What 2 year was it, 1911, 1913? 3 SECRETARY TOPPER: 1913. 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE EVERETT: Yeah, that 6 still do it the 1913 way. I'm convinced and all the state associations that represent municipalities and authorities are convinced that 8 they can save money with this flexibility. And 10 we're going to advance that cause with the help of 11 the Chairmen and the state government, and we'll move that forward. 12 13 Thank you for your time. Appreciate it. 14 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: 15 Representative James. 16 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr. 17 Chairman. Good morning. 18 SECRETARY TOPPER: Good morning. 19 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: I would like to devote a couple moments of time to discuss an act 20 21 which was passed in 2012. For the benefit of the 22 audience, it's called the Indigenous Mineral 23 Resources Development Act. The essence of the act is, that it 2.4 25 enabled your Department to consider leasing

1 properties owned by the Commonwealth or the state 2 system of higher education, and really enable us to, perhaps, benefit from the natural resources 3 beneath our feet. 4 I wonder if any action has been taken in 5 6 that area? And if so, are the revenues for the benefit of the Commonwealth? SECRETARY TOPPER: Representative, I do 8 not believe there's been any recent activity 10 pursuant to the act through the Department. 11 I'll be happy to follow up with any detail. 12 least I'm not familiar with any over the course of 13 the last couple of years. Would you 14 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: speculate that that's because the public is unaware 15 16 of the passage of the act, or they don't perceive 17 it to be of value or --18 SECRETARY TOPPER: Quite honestly, I'd 19 rather get better informed before I speculate. 20 I'll be pleased to dig into it and find out. I 2.1 don't know if things have been proposed and have 22 been rejected for some reason, or if we just had an 23 absence of proposals. 24 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Final 25 comment. I live in Venango County; represent

1 Venango County. We have at least two major 2 institutions there, Polk Center and Clarion University campus of Clarion University, both of 3 which have considerable lands, and very possibly could benefit by gas well drilling, oil drilling, 5 things of that nature. 6 7 So, I would ask you to do exactly what you just said you would. And thank you --8 SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure. 10 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: -- for your time. 11 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 12 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: I wanted to 13 announce that we've been joined by Representative 14 Evankovich as well, who's not on the committee, but here observing the hearing. 15 16 Representative Greiner. 17 REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Thank you, Mr. 18 Chairman. 19 Good morning, Mr. Secretary. I'm going to talk briefly about the COSTARS program. 20 2.1 background, I was a township supervisor and I know 22 a lot of municipalities used this, and local 23 governments and not-for-profits to their benefit. I know the cooperative purchasing 24 25 program offers -- offers these benefits to the

government and nonprofits to allow them to piggy-back on our state contracts. But there have been some concerns that have been raised.

There's been some feedback that some local governments are actually spending more on goods and services under COSTARS contracts than they would if they would have actually bid the contracts out themselves. I think they're assuming, you know, we have the best deal, and that's not always the case.

What I wanted to know is, are there any mechanisms in place to ensure the COSTARS contracts are not costing the local governments more money than they could bid locally? That's the first question.

The second question would be: Is the COSTARS program working equally well for supply service and construction contracts, you know, across the board?

And number 3: If not, would it be best to alter the COSTARS program so that it only applies to maybe those procurements where it's working the best?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure. Thanks for the questions. Let me see if I can remember them all.

2.1

2.4

First, with respect to goods, services and construction, the COSTARS program does not apply to construction. They're only goods and services contracts currently in the COSTARS program.

With respect to savings and potential savings, the vast majority of the contracts that are available to municipalities and nonprofits through the COSTARS program are multiple-award contracts, which is to say, for any good or service that you might want to go to the contract for, you have multiple entities from whom you could purchase that service.

A best practice that we recommend that everyone follow is that, although they're not required to do a formal public bid, they should absolutely seek competitive quotes from the various options that they have on each contract in order to ensure that they're getting the best price they can, because these contracts are in definite delivery and definite quantity.

So, the pricing that the suppliers provide to us at the time they win the contracts is provided in the absence of any information about what the volume of the purchase might ultimately

2.1

look like. So once a municipality has a specific purchase, it's much easiest for a supplier to potentially provide a further discount, knowing what the likely revenue is that they're going to generate.

So, it's really a best practice. We can't vouch every day all day for every price that's on every one of those contracts. It wouldn't be possible.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Yeah,
understood. And it's been a while since I've been
a township supervisor. But I will say, I remember
there was a case where I think we wanted to go
through the program, and we found out that one of
the local dealerships was gonna be able to provide
a truck for less money, which came as a surprise to
me at the time.

That's all I have right now. I do just wanna ask one last comment. I know a lot of my colleagues hit on this. With my background as a CPA, I will tell you that I do have -- And this will be more discussion. I do have grave concerns about what ended up being a finance agreement and not a -- not a lease-back. And having done tax work, you know, often we've said, if it doesn't

pass the smell test, it doesn't.

2.1

I think what's even more troublesome to me is, I feel that the legislature here is -- we're getting our power usurped; meaning, I think if we're gonna do a financing decision or we need to provide that funding as one of my colleagues suggested, the Governor was to use these supplemental -- the funds that were in the restricted accounts or the off -- off General Fund accounts.

I think that -- I think we're going to have to look at this, because I'm very worried. I don't know what's next; whether it's gonna be the East Wing of the Capitol or the Capitol Building itself. I'm just saying, with my professional background, I struggle very much with that transaction. I wanted to go on the record publicly to let you know.

I know you've been asked a lot of questions. So, I thank you for coming today. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Thank you. Representative Hahn.

REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 Good morning, Mr. Secretary. I'm on 2 this side. Over here. 3 SECRETARY TOPPER: I'm sorry. REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: That's all right. 4 Thank you. 5 6 I just wanted to follow up on some 7 things you had said earlier about these small business opportunities. If I missed any of this 8 earlier, I apologize. 10 Have veterans always been in that group, 11 or were they just added recently? 12 SECRETARY TOPPER: Veterans were added 13 in 2012. 14 REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: And how are they 15 made aware that they're part of this and that and 16 it exists? Is there advertisement how to -- other 17 than we put it on our website or whatever? I mean, 18 does DGS do anything? 19 SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure. Part of our 20 diversity and inclusion and small business 21 opportunities team is devoted to doing some 22 outreach. 23 Honestly, we don't have sufficient staff to be able to engage in a full on-marketing kind of 2.4 25 approach, but we do try to get out in the

community. We've done a number of events sponsored by members of the House and Senate in local communities, and we'd be pleased to do it in your district. We're doing everything we can to expand the number of veterans and other qualified businesses so we can grow that database.

REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: What are some of the opportunities that they might have? Not just veterans, but any of them. So what is the opportunity for them when they get into the program?

SECRETARY TOPPER: In any given year, the Commonwealth spends in the neighborhood of \$4 billion on various goods and services through contracts. There are -- Really, it runs the gamut.

So, what I would encourage any business that you're talking to to do would be, to go to our website to register as a small business. If they qualify as a small diverse business, to start the process of getting certified so that we can engage with them directly and help them find opportunities.

REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: Is there any criteria as to what qualifies as the owner?

So, I had some complaints in my office a

2.1

couple years ago where people were trying to start a small business were having problems. And they said, well, there's this husband and wife, and it's the husband's business, but the wife is on paper as the president, but doesn't go into the business; doesn't really do anything with the business. She has another full-time job, but they qualified.

Does any of that get looked at to see if --

SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you. It does get looked at quite extensively. We rely on, I think, five or six independent certification entities, such as the Women's Business Enterprise Council, the Minority Business Enterprise Council, the federal government FedBiz program, all of whom do certifications; all of whom take into account what the ownership structure of these businesses look like, and all of whom have operations that we'll investigate when there are allegations made about a firm not being who they say they are.

REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: Have any applications been rejected or businesses taken out of the program because they're found that the owners --

SECRETARY TOPPER: Not recently.

1 REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: All right. 2 you. 3 SECRETARY TOPPER: You're very welcome. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: 4 Representative Bradford. 5 6 Before I do that, Representative 7 Bradford and Representative Metcalfe are here as oversight committees as Chairman Metcalfe and 8 Chairman Bradford. 10 CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: Thank you, 11 Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Secretary. 12 I want to circle back, if I could, and 13 talk about how we wound up with the encumbrance of 14 the Farm Show Complex. I realize sometimes context 15 is very important. And I realize you were put into 16 the difficult position of playing bond council for 17 the Commonwealth. 18 I think anyone who's ever been involved 19 in those types of transactions would tell you the tremendous detail that go into it. But I think 20 21 sometimes it's better to step back from 30,000 feet 22 and kind of set the table for how we wound up in 23 this situation. I say we, because I think everyone in the General Assembly has ownership. 2.4

I can't help but think that when we

passed a 32-billion-dollar general appropriation budget on June 30th of last year, we authorized spending, and we did that with absolutely no way to fund it, and we waited four months. The Governor governed, and he tried to govern when the legislature failed to do so. And I think when the arsonist yells fire, and we go back and place incriminations on individual secretaries for the failure of the legislature, I think we do a disservice to the Commonwealth. But I think we also fail to take responsibility for the failures of this body to enact a revenue plan.

The simple reality is, we now go back and talk about how debt instruments were structured, but it was this body that decided that it was going to securitize funds. Why get dollars tomorrow when you can get pennies today. And to do everything possible to avoid doing reoccurring revenue; things like severance tax and stuff that gets us far afield from the discussion with the Department of General Services. But, again, that's my point.

Asking the Secretary of the Department of General Services about budget issues is absurd if we're not going to take any ownership of our

2.1

failure as a legislature to timely pass a revenue package.

For four months, the Governor was handed a mess. And now, almost a year later, to go back with these incriminations and claim there's gambling in this facility. Well, yeah, they were borrowing. And you know what? There was also gambling in this facility, because that's all we did in last year's budget to crash land it. And that was a decision of the leadership of the General Assembly. And again, to now put that at the feet of the Secretary, I just find a willful suspension of disbelief.

Borrowing for operating expenses is absorbed, and this legislation needs to take ownership of it and stop trying to pass the buck onto individual Secretaries. It is shameful.

Now, I have a couple issues that I want to address specifically, and I hate to be so parochial, because they all come from my part of the Commonwealth, but they are with tremendous importance.

One of them is the Phoenix project in Montgomery County. That was a debacle coming back from the days when the first PLA was removed from

that project, and it's gone kind of haywire since.

Where are we with the Phoenix and where are we with
pursuing Walsh Scherri for a complete and utter
inability to deliver?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you for the question, Representative.

So, we are close. As you know, the SCI-Phoenix project was to have been completed originally by the 20th of November 2015. Since that day, and as of this month, you know, Walsh Scherri, the contractor, has been accumulating liquidated damages in the amount of \$35,000 a day, and now totalling more than \$28 million.

I can say definitively that, when this project is ultimately concluded, the Commonwealth will not incur additional costs. We have not made payments to Walsh Scherri in the main since the amount of liquidated damages began to exceed the amount of money that was left in the project.

We're continuing to work with them using the tools that we have available to try to hold them accountable and to try to get the job done.

We are now at a point where we have certificates of occupancy either completed or pending for roughly half of the facility. We are working on a schedule

2.1

that has us completing those certificates of occupancy within the next month or two.

I'm being intentionally vague, in part, because there are security concerns associated with moving into the new facility. I've been advised that I shouldn't talk specifically about when we're gonna be transitioning.

But, I fully anticipate we will finally have the project done within the next few months, and we'll be able to transition into the new facility with the Department of Corrections here by the end of the fiscal year.

CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: Two issues, again, parochial and really quick answers because the Chairman has given me his indulgence.

The Department of Revenue, and this is pretty parochial in my district, getting a lease.

This has drug on for longer than either of us would like. I know I speak to your legislative assistant more than you would like.

Can we get that resolved in a timely manner once and for all, because I would love to stop fielding those phone calls from our landlord who's looking to make some improvements through a transfer, and I think that would be good for a

community that could use a shot in the arm and, obviously, looks for the Commonwealth to be a good partner.

And I would go on and say, that same community deals with the Norristown State Hospital. If you can give me a quick update on that, and then I'll turn it over to the Chairman because I don't want to take advantage of his generosity. Thank you.

SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you.

Steven brought the lease to my attention again this morning. I'll be pleased to get involved directly with the Department of Revenue on behalf -- on your behalf and on behalf of the landlord, and we'll see if we can get it shaken loose.

CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: And the state.

SECRETARY TOPPER: And the state

hospital. I've lost the question. Forgive me.

CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: I was so inspired by the talk of Susquehanna Township's efforts.

Obviously, Norristown has tremendous issues and concerns about the property and transition to, hopefully, a better future for everyone involved.

I would just hope you give me a quick update on

2.1

that.

SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure. Mr. Chairman, as you know, we've been working very actively with you, with DHS and with members of the local community. We've done a couple of things.

One is, we've taken a lesson from the success we had in Harrisburg, and we have funded and are currently competing for a study similar to the one we did in Harrisburg to look for -- with a third-party planner to help us understand what the best disposition for the property ought to be.

The process in Harrisburg was very successful because it involved a lot of community involvement; a lot of public meetings, and we plan to do the same in Norristown.

In the meantime, I'm aware -- I know my staff has been working with DHS staff and members of the local community to look at different options for subdividing the property and different -- different schedules for potentially conveying portions of it sooner rather than later. I'm pleased with the progress that they're making.

I think we'd be better to have an offline conversation to talk about the details.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: I wanted to

mention, we've been joined by Representative

Barbin, and we were joined by Representative

Barrar. Representative Barrar chairs the Veterans

Affairs Committee. He has stepped out, but he was
here as well observing.

With that, we will move to Chairman Metcalfe.

CHAIRMAN METCALFE: Good afternoon -SECRETARY TOPPER: Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN METCALFE: -- almost. Still morning. I thought after Representative Bradford's questions, we would have been into the afternoon, but we weren't yet. Good we have a timer.

Back to the Farm Show grounds, I had some other questions, but I think the importance of the issue that occurred here around the Farm Show grounds, and then, ultimately, the money that you have borrowed and that we're going to pay back that was initially put out as an RFP, but then was changed then to the financing agreement.

So when the RFP was put out for the lease/lease-back, four companies had responded to that RFP, and one of those companies was the company that ultimately signed this financing agreement?

1 SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes, sir. So, do you believe 2 CHAIRMAN METCALFE: 3 the RFP is the same as the financing agreement? SECRETARY TOPPER: I do. 4 CHAIRMAN METCALFE: So, do the other 5 6 three parties that bid on the RFP -- through the 7 RFP process, do you believe that they would be under the same understanding that it's the same 8 thing, the financing agreement? 10 SECRETARY TOPPER: I do. 11 CHAIRMAN METCALFE: It's just that -- I 12 think for all of us that have been concerned about the direction this was going, I think there's a lot 13 14 of us that don't believe it's the same thing, of 15 course, and --16 Have you had any indication that any of 17 the other three parties that they're all okay with 18 the way this process played out, or are any of them 19 aggrieved to the point that they might actually be following up with some action in addition to what's 20 21 already been taken to try and intervene in what's 22 occurring? 23 SECRETARY TOPPER: We have had no 24 protests. 25 CHAIRMAN METCALFE: So you had mentioned earlier that the Attorney General had signed off on this, and I have the document here that was issued by his office. Actually, this was from the General Counsel's office.

So, did the Attorney General sign off on the contract itself in full and its entirety? And did he, in addition to that, sign off on you executing this agreement; that DGS has not been involved in executing in the past in the way of financing agreements?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Yes, sir. The contract followed the normal contract signature process in the Commonwealth, which involves the Office of Attorney General.

CHAIRMAN METCALFE: But, as far as a contract, I mean, it's still a financing agreement which is outside of the norm for what you're normally signing and what he's approving through those processes; is that correct? You said this was the first time anything -- that this type of an agreement had been executed by DGS.

SECRETARY TOPPER: I believe that's correct, yes.

CHAIRMAN METCALFE: So in the -- in the financing agreement memo that I have that is dated

2.1

January 29th from the Governor's Office of Chief Counsel, it says towards the end of it: To the extent applicable to the referenced document, no approval or opinion is offered as to the fiscal authority of the agency to commit funds not yet appropriated.

But within the agreement -- but within

-- Then I have the memo also from the Office of the

Attorney General which gives the same line is there

also: To the extent applicable to the referenced

contract, no approval or opinion is offered as to

fiscal authority of the agency to commit funds not

yet appropriated.

So, in the agreement -- financing agreement, were you not committing funds for that \$2-plus million that was being paid in fees and such that were part of the agreement? Isn't that committing funds? And if it --

I mean, either way, it seems like the little disclaimers that seem to be in Attorney General's memo and the Chief Counsel's memo, both seemed like they've got their own disclaimers in here that would lead you to believe that they really didn't approve the document in full; the proposal.

2.1

1 SECRETARY TOPPER: Mr. Chairman, I'm 2 told that that language is the standard cover memo that they put on every contract. 3 CHAIRMAN METCALFE: 4 The language in the memos from the Chief Counsel and the Attorney 5 General's office? 6 7 SECRETARY TOPPER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN METCALFE: So they have a 8 standard disclaimer for any contract they're 10 reviewing that might lead you to believe that they 11 didn't really, fully approve the entirety of the 12 document that they're claiming that they've 13 approved? 14 SECRETARY TOPPER: As I tended -- As I 15 testified earlier, virtually all the Commonwealth's 16 expenditures are sub -- and long-term contract 17 obligations are subject to appropriations from the 18 General Assembly. That is -- That's pretty 19 standard. 20 CHAIRMAN METCALFE: I would think they 2.1 are subject to the appropriations from the General 22 Assembly, which is what concerns me that, in number 23 12 of the financial agreement, the fees,

commissions and expenses, DGS shall pay all

expenses incident to the issuance of the

24

1 certificates of participation, not to exceed \$2.375 million. 2 3 Did the General Assembly approve that money to be spent; to be appropriated? 4 SECRETARY TOPPER: The payments aren't 5 scheduled until -- until fiscal year '19-20. 6 7 CHAIRMAN METCALFE: So you're expecting that we're still going to have to approve an 8 appropriation to pay that \$2.375 million? 10 SECRETARY TOPPER: Just as we would for 11 every other loan -- for every other multi-year 12 financial obligation that every agency in the 13 Commonwealth enters into through contract. 14 CHAIRMAN METCALFE: But you said this is 15 the first time your agency has ever executed a document like this. 16 17 SECRETARY TOPPER: It's the first time 18 this agency has executed a document with this 19 intent. We execute contracts on a daily basis. 20 CHAIRMAN METCALFE: But not to -- Not to 2.1 borrow \$200 million and pay back almost \$400 million. 22 23 SECRETARY TOPPER: All of the contracts 24 that the agency executes involve financial 25 obligations that are subject to appropriations.

CHAIRMAN METCALFE: So the interest on the \$200 million that you, for the first time ever, assigned the financial agreement on as a Department, you have a real sweetheart deal here, because you borrowed \$200 million, and we get to pay back 177 and a half plus million; along with paying another 2 to 2 and a half million dollars in fees and service fees.

For the average person out there, it's looking like you're paying back close to 400 million to borrow 200. It's really around \$380 million that we're paying back to borrow \$200 million. I think that the General Assembly really needs to work with our legal team to thoroughly vet this before we would ever give a dime to an appropriations that's going to pay what's been entered into through this financing agreement for the first time ever.

I would strongly advise you not to consider entering any more financial agreements like this until the General Assembly has vetted this one and determine whether or not this was a proper use of your Department's resources to actually do something like this for the very first time and commit the Commonwealth, that we've been

2.1

told from one of your advisors isn't a constitutional debt issuance; but that you're committing us to paying back debt, almost \$200 million in addition to \$180 million, in addition to 200 million that you're borrowing for the first time ever through this type of an agreement.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: We have a request by Representative Quinn for another question or round, so we will start the second round. Representative Quinn, I did want to recognize before you start that we have been joined by Dom Costa.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I appreciate you being through here. I'm going to go back to a kinder gentler subject, the Employee Liability Self-Insurance Program.

And in bringing that back up, I recognize this falls under -- that a lot of this is not something that's new to you or your Administration. It's just come to -- come under our purview; you know, realization that there's

been payouts on this.

When I asked about how many agencies, and we learned that all the agencies are in this self-insurance program, I didn't ask, if an employee left employment from the Commonwealth, and if there's a complaint brought about that employee for the time they were with the Commonwealth, does that still come, or now that the employee is gone, are they on their own with their own attorney's fees and their own dollars out of their own pocket for any potential settlement?

Is there a Statute of Limitation that applies here?

SECRETARY TOPPER: We would have to evaluate it on a case-by-case basis.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: So there's a discretionary component?

SECRETARY TOPPER: There is.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you.

You said you bring in -- the payments come in as revenue to that fund, about \$5.75 million a year. Last year it was about \$3 million in claims. I'm gonna even go with the year that has no claims at all and say we bring in 5.75 million.

However, there could be a year with an awful lot of claims, and we've seen it sadly in the last few years where Penn State has had -- it surpassed the hundred-million-dollar mark. Is there a backup insurance plan on this, like a reinsurance plan, or is the backup insurance the taxpayers of Pennsylvania?

SECRETARY TOPPER: So, the maximum claim that can be paid is \$250,000 through the ELSIP program. Anything over that would have to be paid by the agency. So, we're confident in the solvency of the fund based on the -- based on the process and the building model that's in place.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Are the agencies told or do they have to keep a separate account for any claim that would come in over two hundred fifty? Because, if you have someone who's been maltreating, to put it very nicely, that's not typically an isolated event. So that's not a 250-million-dollar claim against one perpetrator. That's per claim if there were a couple men or women who cried foul and had a case, that at your discretion or whomever's discretion would be paid out.

SECRETARY TOPPER: The agencies are

aware of the 250,000-dollar limit. And I can't speak to what specifically they're doing from a budgetary perspective in order to --

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: If I were to look to where they would be keeping this in a budget, where would it be?

SECRETARY TOPPER: I --

 $\label{eq:condition} \mbox{REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: That's a question} \\ \mbox{I'll ask for another person.}$

SECRETARY TOPPER: I would suspect somewhere in their operating budgets.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: So, to my question about any reinsurance program, it goes back to the agency, which is funded by the General Fund or the taxpayers and all that.

What amount do your actuaries say should be the amount -- we see -- I wish I was playing in a hypothetical world here, but we're not. We've seen hundreds -- we've seen millions and millions of dollars payout. And if this Employee Liability Self-Insurance Program covers all state agencies, yet, brings in only \$5.75 million a year of revenue, I get concerned that a bad actor could not only deplete that 5.75, but could go to any one of the agencies, under which he's employed right now,

and you know where I'm going. I don't even have to articulate it.

SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure. The fund is evaluated annually by an actuary.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Outside actuary or in-house?

SECRETARY TOPPER: Outside actuary. And they look at a 10-year claims history. And based on that 10-year claims history, they establish the rates. So we -- We're comfortable that the fund is sufficient. Based on the claims history, the fund is adequately funded.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: My concern, and you mentioned it a couple hours ago when we started, was with the recognition and the involvement of the "Me Too" movement, that claim history might be blown out of the water with people understanding that they have a valid claim as they find their voice.

SECRETARY TOPPER: I would only just point out that, of that \$3 million in claims, it was only a very small portion that could be characterized as part of the "Me Too" movement.

ELSIP covers a wide array of claims from wrongful termination to --

1 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: You did make that 2 clear, and I appreciate that. I'm just concerned that, as we have from, you know, any walk of life 3 right now, especially, you know, Hollywood or anything else, there will be a rush -- an 5 6 understanding to say, damn it, all this behavior is not acceptable. I have grounds for a claim. And I just want to make sure the people of Pennsylvania 8 will not be on the hook, ultimately, for all of 10 this. And if we need to explore a reinsurance 11 program to back this up, then we should be doing 12 so. 13 Thank you. 14 SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you. 15 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: 16 Representative Kim. 17 REPRESENTATIVE KIM: Secretary, over 18 here. Good afternoon. 19 SECRETARY TOPPER: Good afternoon. 20 REPRESENTATIVE KIM: Thanks for being 2.1 here. I just wanted to clean up some 22 misinformation about the City of Harrisburg, so if 23 you'll just indulge me for a little bit. The City of Harrisburg has a \$26 million public safety 24

budget and about half of that is for fire.

states owns about 40 buildings in the City of
Harrisburg, and the fire department has to have the
potential and be ready with trained personnel and
functioning equipment to be able to combat anything
that happens, whether it be fire or gas leaks.

The city's population doubles during the workweek, during work hours, because of all the state workers that come into the city, which we're happy to host, but we have to have a fire department. If the Keystone Building, if this Capitol Building and Strawberry Square with the Attorney General's office starts to go on fire, and we're not ready, we would have a whole different conversation right now, and we'd say, why aren't we funding the fire department more with more than \$5 million. You can't win with this, Secretary.

I appreciate the \$5 million. It's so helpful, and I think it's money well spent for the safety of the state workers here in Harrisburg.

The second thing is not a question.

It's just more of a -- I'm part of the Capitol

Preservation Committee. I just would exhort that

you will work with DGS and that committee to make

sure that we preserve this Capitol Building. When

something breaks down, that we don't just slob on

2.1

1 concrete, you know, because it's, you know, financially cheaper to do that; that we preserve 2 this Capitol Building because it's a gem and a 3 beautiful building to do that. 4 SECRETARY TOPPER: Count on it. 5 I'm 6 honored to also serve on that committee with you. It really is a highlight of getting to do this job. You can absolutely count on my commitment. 8 I'm really pleased that we just are 10 beginning design work on the Forum. And we'll be 11 working hand in hand with the CPC as design begins, 12 and we make progress here to finally conduct the 13 renovation that's necessary on the Forum Building 14 and end more than two decades of vacancy in that --15 in that building, so we'll get more efficient. 16 We'll have more of our employees on state-owned 17 property instead of leased property, and we will 18 effectively preserve more of the gem that is this 19 complex. So I couldn't be more excited about it. 20 REPRESENTATIVE KIM: Thank you for your 2.1 work, Secretary. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. 22 23 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: 24 Representative Heffley. 25 REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. Just a brief question because of the conversation that's been going on today.

I obviously want to make sure that our state buildings are safe here in Harrisburg, and God forbid, that if something happens, the fire department will be able to respond. So we give \$5 million to the fire department in Harrisburg.

Is there an audit that is done? Does the Auditor General audit to make sure that \$5 million goes directly to the fire department? Is there a way that we pursue it just to ensure that it is going to the fire department? We want to make sure they have the resources that are needed.

SECRETARY TOPPER: We provide the money pursuant to an invoice from the city. I'm not aware of any --

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Is there a way that --

SECRETARY TOPPER: -- audit.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Is there a way we could request back from the city proof of an audit to say this \$5 million went to the fire department? I would hate that we're giving this money -- I believe that every intention -- but just

to kind of clear the air to ensure that \$5 million 1 2 is going to the fire department. I mean, we appropriate money. We're 3 going to have this much money is going to schools, 4 this much is going to go here. If we say, we're 5 6 going to give you this money for the fire department, are we making sure it is going to the fire department. Is there a way you can ask them 8 to just verify that? 10 SECRETARY TOPPER: We could certainly 11 make the request. My agency is not an -- is not an 12 agency that performs that sort of audit. 13 REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: So if you would 14 request the Auditor General's office or somebody, would that be the appropriate agency to do that 15 16 type of audit? 17 SECRETARY TOPPER: T --18 REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: I mean, I don't 19 think it would be -- it would be a big ask to say, 20

okay, just show us the receipt for the money that went to the fire department. I mean, I think that's a reasonable request.

> SECRETARY TOPPER: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: We do it all the time. We get grants for fire departments in

2.1

22

23

24

the 122nd District and all across the state, and they need to show exactly -- they need to do audit reports so they can even apply for those grants. I would just ask that we have something in place like that.

SECRETARY TOPPER: I'd be happy to look into it, Representative. I think the mechanism is such that we receive an invoice for services; we pay the invoice.

So, what the city does ultimately with the proceeds, and whether or not that's subject to audit from a Commonwealth perspective, is a question I have to look into.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: I would just want to make sure that the money is going into that; that they're gonna have the equipment and the resources that they need that we're kind of providing that funding for, if we needed it. I mean, I don't think it's an unreasonable request.

Like, with the fire grant program that's out there now, all the volunteer organizations and those fire departments, they need to complete all their paperwork and turn it in before they can even apply for that money the next year. That would be my comment.

2.1

1 Thank you for your time. SECRETARY TOPPER: 2 Sure. 3 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Markosek. 4 MINORITY CHAIRMAN MARKOSEK: 5 Thank you. 6 And just to say thank you -- And you in many ways have a thankless job. I mentioned when I started 7 early in the -- made comments earlier about the 8 safety of not only state employees, but all 10 Pennsylvanians. 11 And I know, just echoing a little bit of Representative Kim's -- talking about the 12 13 Harrisburg Fire Department, that's part of safety 14 too. So we're all involved in trying to make 15 everything as safe as possible, and give our 16 police, EMS responders, the best resources that we 17 can to make every Pennsylvanian and every Capitol 18 employee, state employee; people that come in and 19 out of Harrisburg in all state buildings as safe as 20 possible.

Again, you know, we're here to help you.

It's a task that is enormous, and we're not going

to solve it all in a short period of time. But I

appreciate you coming today and answering the

questions to the best of your ability. Thank you.

21

22

23

24

SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Mr.

Secretary, my closing comment really is, you know,
Representative Bradford brought up about the

5 legislature. The real point of this whole thing

6 when it comes down to this agreement is, this is

7 not about debt or gaming. This is about the role

8 of the legislature and the Governor and the rule of

9 law. I believe, and I think many members believe,

10 that the Governor willfully subverted the

11 legislative process to make that \$200 million loan.

12 It is a loan. It is pure and simple a loan. It is

13 not a lease.

1

2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

I think that, at some point, if the Governor--And this is any Governor--decides that they just want to go out and borrow \$200 million or a billion dollars, because that's what this is--This is an agreement--that's not the legislative process. That's not our Constitution here in Pennsylvania.

There is constitutional and there's law written on this. And I believe just because the Governor doesn't like the outcome of the legislative process, subverting that is not the appropriate way to do it and to have a good-working

relationship with the General Assembly. 1 The General Assembly was very clear that 2 the funds that were to be transferred were the 3 existing funds in the Special Fund account; not to 4 take out a loan to supplement 200 million of it. 5 So, with that, I thank you for coming, 6 7 and I appreciate both of you, Deputy Secretary, as 8 well being here and answering the questions. If you would get the information that's requested to 10 us, and then we'll submit some additional questions 11 possibly as well as other documentation we may 12 want. 13 With that, we will reconvene at 1:15 14 today with the Liquor Control Board. With that, 15 this hearing is adjourned. 16 SECRETARY TOPPER: Thank you. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

LKey Reporters

24

1 CERTIFICATE 2 I, Karen J. Meister, Reporter, Notary 3 Public, duly commissioned and qualified in and for 4 5 the County of York, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and 6 7 accurate transcript, to the best of my ability, of 8 a public hearing taken from a videotape recording 9 and reduced to computer printout under my 10 supervision. 11 This certification does not apply to any 12 reproduction of the same by any means unless under 13 my direct control and/or supervision. 14 15 16 17 Karen J. Meister Reporter, Notary Public 18 19 20 21 22 23 2.4

Key Reporters