## COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## HOUSE LABOR AND INDUSTRY COMMITTEE HEARING

## STATE CAPITOL RYAN OFFICE BUILDING ROOM 205 HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2020

IN RE: UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFIT MODERNIZATION

## **BEFORE:**

HONORABLE JIM COX, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE PATRICK HARKINS, MINORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE CRIS DUSH

HONORABLE TORREN ECKER

HONORABLE BARBARA GLEIM

HONORABLE JAMES GREGORY

HONORABLE DAWN KEEFER

HONORABLE KATE KLUNK

HONORABLE DAVID MALONEY

HONORABLE LORI MIZGORSKI

HONORABLE ERIC NELSON

HONORABLE DAVID ROWE

HONORABLE PAUL SCHEMEL

HONORABLE MARIA DONATUCCI

HONORABLE LEANNE KRUEGER

HONORABLE JEANNE McNEILL

HONORABLE DAN MILLER

HONORABLE GERALD MULLERY

HONORABLE ED NEILSON

HONORABLE ADAM RAVENSTAHL

HONORABLE PAM SNYDER

JEAN DAVIS REPORTING

POST OFFICE BOX 125 • HERSHEY, PA 17033

Phone (717) 503-6568

1	COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:
2	JOHN SCARPATO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, REPUBLICAN CAUCUS JONAS RICCI, RESEARCH ANALYST, REPUBLICAN CAUCUS
3	JENNIFER DODGE, LEGISLATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT II, REPUBLICAN CAUCUS
4	THE OBLICATION CAOCOD
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER
12	NOTARY PUBLIC
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX	
2	TESTIFIERS	
3	NAME	PAGE
4	GEOFF MOOMAW, PRESIDENT,	8
5	INTERSTATE TAX SERVICES	·
6	JULIA SIMON-MISHEL, SUPERVISING ATTORNEY, PHILADELPHIA LEGAL ASSISTANCE	11
7	W. GERALD OLEKSIAK, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY	15
9	DAVID NAISBY, CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY	22
10	WILLIAM TRUSKY, DEPUTY SECRETARY, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAMS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY	23
12		
13	ROBERT O'BRIEN, EXECUTIVE DEPUTY SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY	25
14	PAUL TOOMEY, PRESIDENT, GEOGRAPHIC SOLUTIONS, INC.	45
15	deciding solutions, the.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	1	

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	* * *
3	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Good morning.
4	I'd like to call this meeting to order. Those
5	who are here, I'd like to have you join me in rising and
6	saying the Pledge of Allegiance.
7	
8	(Pledge of Allegiance.)
9	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: I'd like to welcome
10	everyone to this hearing of the House Labor & Industry
11	Committee. I would like to start off by saying this meeting
12	is being recorded, so I would ask that all members and
13	guests please silence their cell phones and their electronic
14	devices.
15	I'm going to ask the members who are here to
16	introduce themselves briefly, very, very briefly.
17	REPRESENTATIVE DUSH: Representative Cris Dush,
18	Jefferson and Indiana Counties.
19	REPRESENTATIVE MIZGORSKI: Representative Lori
20	Mizgorski, Allegheny County, the 30th District.
21	REPRESENTATIVE ROWE: Representative David Rowe,
22	the 85th Legislative District, parts of Union and Snyder
23	Counties.
24	REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: Good morning.
25	Representative Dave Maloney, Southeast Berks County, the

1	130th.
2	REPRESENTATIVE GLEIM: Hello, Representative Barb
3	Gleim, Cumberland County, the 199th District.
4	MINORITY CHAIRMAN HARKINS: Good morning. Pat
5	Harkins. I represent the 1st District in Erie.
6	REPRESENTATIVE NELSON: Good morning.
7	Representative Eric Nelson, Westmoreland County.
8	REPRESENTATIVE MULLERY: Jerry Mullery, 119,
9	Luzerne County.
10	REPRESENTATIVE SNYDER: Pam Snyder, District 50,
11	Greene, Fayette, and Washington Counties.
12	REPRESENTATIVE KLUNK: Representative Kate Klunk,
13	169th District, York County.
14	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: And we also have some
15	members joining us online. I don't know what the best way
16	to do that is.
17	REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Representative Neilson,
18	Philadelphia County.
19	How's that, Chairman?
20	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Works for me,
21	Mr. Neilson.
22	REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: Representative Leanne
23	Krueger is here from Delaware County.
24	REPRESENTATIVE GREGORY: Representative Gregory
25	from Blair County is here.

5

Г

1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: All right. That seems to 2 be the extent of those joining us. We do welcome everyone.

Just a little background on this hearing. We called this hearing to discuss the critical benefit modernization problem project that's been ongoing for the unemployment compensation system.

Throughout the Pandemic and the unprecedented spike in unemployment claims, I and other members of this Committee have expressed concern and questioned whether this project could still be implemented on time in October as originally planned.

In fact, we had weekly calls. I and the Minority Chairman and the two Chairmen from the Senate had weekly calls with the Department of Labor & Industry, the Secretary, and some others. We were repeatedly on an almost weekly basis assured that the project was going ahead as planned; that there were no issues; that they were working through things; and that they fully expected things to go live in early October.

However, in late August, we learned that the Advisory Committee that had been established to monitor the project actually had voted to recommend a delay. And it was because they believed that there were too many critical tasks that had yet to be completed.

After all those reassuring phone calls, it was

1.3

upsetting to hear that even repeatedly being told we were on time, we're all ready, that now the project was not going to be on track to go live in October.

1.3

The Advisory Committee was established because this Committee wanted oversight of the project given the troubled history of the project. We greatly appreciated the work of the Advisory Committee. We appreciate the fact that they raised the alarm.

We've been getting a different story for the past few months and so now we thought we'd hold a hearing to find out more of what the Advisory Committee had been hearing.

The inability to implement a functional modern benefit delivery system for Pennsylvania's UC System is a longstanding problem. It goes back to the Rendell Administration. Everyone wants this project to happen and everyone wants it to work for the people of Pennsylvania.

Today we're going to hear from those Committee's appointees to the Benefit Modernization Advisory Committee and then we're going to hear from the Department of Labor & Industry to discuss their plans for moving forward. We're also going to hear from Geographic Solutions, the project vendor, to answer questions more about the technical specifics.

Joining us first we have Geoff Moomaw. Geoff is the President of the Interstate Tax Services and he serves

2 Advisory Committee. We're just going to jump in. 3 Geoff, we're ready to hear your testimony. Thank you for joining us. 4 MR. GEOFF MOOMAW: I won't read my formal 5 6 testimony. I'll give you the highlights as I go through. 7 Chairman Cox, Chairman Harkins, members, thank 8 you for the opportunity to talk about the Ben Mod Committee and whether we should go live on October 5th. 9 10 We had our last meeting back on August 25th. 11 that time, we were given a project update, which is 12 customary whenever we have our meetings. The first part of 13 the project update is we were told that we were in trending 14 red status, given other information as well. 15 When that part of the meeting was over, of 16 course, it's open floor to discuss. My question right away, 17 as has been customary, was a little different. I asked, 18 were we red, were we Amber, or were we glowing red? The 19 answer was glowing red. It's not what I was expecting to 20 hear since we were about six weeks away. 21 Later in the meeting we were advised that 22 training for the staff for the service centers wasn't going 23 to start until September 14th, just this past Monday.

as the House appointee for the Benefit Modernization

1

24

25

Prior to that meeting in August, we, as members,

gave them only three weeks of training with the system.

were given an opportunity and we sent questions to those within the Department some things we thought should be brought up. This idea of whether to go live or not was one of the questions brought up.

1.3

When I went into that meeting, my personal thought was we should go live. We had been working on this. Let's go. That's what we're here for. But I did have an open mind and wanted to hear what was occurring. When we were notified that the project was glowing red, my preference for going live in October started to waver.

I asked the Department what it thought its chances were of the project being yellow on October 5th. A fellow Committee member interjected, shouldn't it be green on October 5th? Good point was my thought right away.

As the meeting continued, I personally was persuaded that not going live might be a necessary evil. Why am I now in favor of delaying the release of the new system? Consider the following:

Was six weeks enough time to take the project from glowing red to green? My personal answer is no.

Was the employee and employer community aware of this new system? The answer is no. That's just not my answer. That's a fact. There's been no engagement to the employer community whatsoever. I believe the same for the employee community. I get e-mails from the Department. I

haven't received anything about this project.

1.3

Was the new benefit system going to be tested by claimants and employers outside of the Department? The answer has been no. And that has been an issue that's been raised by us Committee members. The next speaker, Ms. Simon-Mishel, and I have both brought that up, that we thought there should be testing outside the Department.

Were the employees of the service centers provided with ample time to train on the new system while handling the current load? I do not believe so.

Could the Department, the employees, and the employer community risk engaging a new benefit system that had the potential to be less than perfect? I realize the word perfect is extreme. But you be the claimant trying to file for benefits for a system that's not working. You all know what's going on. I don't believe we're ready for that.

Is the Department and the General Assembly prepared to deal with the public and the media if the new system fails to meet expectations? I'll let you determine that.

Thus, my opinion became it was time to delay.

Please keep in mind my firm, we represent 1,800 employers in every county in Pennsylvania. I myself have been doing this for 34 years, my firm since 1943. What the Department is experiencing is beyond belief. It's nothing that has ever

occurred.

1.3

My opinion about delaying it is not a reflection on the Department or its personnel. It's we have a system that I'm afraid is not going to be ready and we've experienced that since March, that we don't need to make things more complicated for us.

So I believe we need to delay so we can ensure that we have what we're here for, a system that will serve the employees and employers of Pennsylvania so the unemployment compensation system works properly and efficiently.

I thank you for your time. I'll be here for questions when you deem appropriate.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you.

Next joining us we have Julia Simon-Mishel.

She's a supervising attorney with the Philadelphia Legal

Assistance. And Julia is joining us remotely.

Julia, when you're ready.

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: Good morning, Chairman, and thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning.

As you mentioned, I'm the supervising attorney of the Unemployment Unit at Philadelphia Legal Assistance. We have been representing over 1,000 claimants since the COVID-19 Pandemic began . I am also one of the committee members on the UC Benefit Modernization Advisory Committee.

While I've looked forward to the benefits of the new system, I strongly urge the Department to delay implementation of the modernization project. However, I must stress that this should not reflect on the Department, as I believe the Department has done everything within its power to deliver this project.

COVID-19 has created unforeseen challenges that have severely impacted our ability to go live. My recommendation was based primarily on four reasons.

First, introducing the new system at this time in the middle of a Pandemic will cause massive upheaval at a time of extraordinary unemployment when it is already nearly impossibile for workers and employers to get through to the Agency on the phones. And Pennsylvania workers are already struggling to pay their rent and bills.

I know your offices have felt the effects of the unemployment crisis. If the system were to go live, the amount of questions and issues presented to your office will certainly increase.

Furthermore, workers have been experiencing significant confusion between the different unemployment programs currently available. Introducing a new system will only exacerbate those problems.

As my counterpart Geoff Moomaw mentioned, the Pandemic has also severely limited any effort by the

Department to engage end users, workers and employers, in testing the new system. User testing is vital to understanding how users will navigate the system and what challenges they may face.

I spent the past two years leading a national research project on state unemployment modernization projects. And the No. 1 recommendation in their upcoming report is that these projects must place customers at the center of the design and testing of the product.

Third, COVID-19 has limited the ability for outreach and community education on the project and has cut off much in-person access to resources like CareerLinks and libraries. It will be vital that workers have access to computers as many will struggle to navigate the new system on their phone.

The Department's original plan called for increased support to workers through staffing at CareerLink offices, a plan I very much agreed with. But that will be nearly impossibile in the current moment with our social distancing requirement.

And finally, unfortunately, I am just not confident at the moment in the ability of our vendor to have this project ready for implementation and, more importantly, their ability to quickly address problems post go live. The experience of my clients with the Pandemic unemployment

assisted system, which was designed and hosted by Geographic Solutions has raised significant concerns. Not a single one of my clients has had a smooth experience with that system. Importantly, the operation of the PUA system has been violating the constitutional rights of many workers across the state and GSI's response to these issues has been slow to nonexistent, which makes me very concerned about their ability to handle any problems that arise in the system after it is implemented.

For these reasons, I recommend that the project be delayed. I'm happy to take questions about these reasons and any other issues related to the modernization project.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you for your testimony.

Next joining us for comments is the Secretary of
Labor & Industry, Jerry Oleksiak. Joining him will be Bill
Trusky, Deputy Secretary for Unemployment Compensation
Systems; Bob O'Brien, Executive Deputy Secretary; and David
Naisby, Chief Information Officer.

I believe we also have an individual, a gentleman by the name of Paul Toomey. He's the President of Geographic Solutions, the vendor who is handling the new system and creating the new system.

So you will be hearing from Secretary Oleksiak,

and the other individuals that I mentioned will be providing information as needed. They will be available for questions from the members of the Committee as well is my understanding.

At this time, Secretary Oleksiak, are you with us?

1.3

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: I am here, Mr. Chairman, and I'm ready to proceed if you are.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: All right. Begin when you are ready.

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: Thank you.

Good morning, Chairman Cox, Chairman Harkins, and members of the Labor & Industry Committee. I appreciate the opportunity to update you on the significant progress that the Department of Labor & Industry has made on moving away from our decades-old reliance on an antiquated mainframe system that's been the technological lynchpin to the administration of the Commonwealth's unemployment compensation system.

This new initiative is referred to as the Benefits Modernization Project, or Ben Mod. As you know, L&I's first modernization effort to implement an enterprise UC system was unsuccessful. Because that matter is now in litigation, we cannot comment further on the issue.

In 2016, L&I put out a new request for proposals

for UC benefits modernization. In 2017, Geographic Solutions, Incorporated, GSI, was selected as the vendor with the best value for the contracts. And work on Ben Mod launched in August of that year, with an initial go-live date of April 2019.

In December of 2017, the Benefits Modernization Advisory Committee was created under Act 60 to monitor, assess, and counsel all stakeholders on Ben Mod's implementation. Last year we determined that GSI's initial schedule for April of 2019 was too ambitious. And with the support of the Ben Mod Advisory Committee, we made the decision with GSI to push back the go-live date to October of 2020.

Of course, at the time we did not and could not anticipate the global Pandemic and its unprecedented operational and administrative effects on the Commonwealth's UC system. We have kept you updated throughout the Pandemic and we know you are familiar with many of those challenges but they bear repeating.

Since March of 2020, L&I has responded to the most significant unemployment crisis since the Great Depression. And today Pennsylvania's unemployment rate remains in double digits. The Pandemic has put tremendous strain on our staff's capacity to process claims. And this has continued even as we have found additional staffing

support. In fact, since mid-March we have more than doubled the staffing levels for the UC service centers.

This has drastically improved our ability to respond to e-mails, phone calls, and chats. But ultimately it is a math problem. A person can only write so many e-mails or answer so many complex calls in a single day.

While we were relocating, increasing, and training staff, we simultaneously implemented complex legislation as part of the Federal CARES Act. This included the Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation Program, Pandemic Unemployment Assistance, and the Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation System.

While all these legislative pieces have diverted staff time and resources away from Ben Mod, PUA has remained by far the most challenging and labor intensive as we work with GSI, our Ben Mod vendor, to implement a standalone system, deliver system functionality, and as well combat a sophisticated nationwide fraud scheme, one that affected states across the country, as well as Pennsylvania.

Most recently we have had to divert staff and vendor resources to implement another entirely new IT system for the President's Lost Wages Assistance Program that provides only six weeks of reduced benefits to qualifying Pennsylvanians. We started making LWA payments to claimants about two weeks ago and just about one month after the

program was announced.

All this amounts to what industry experts refer to as unplanned scope, putting additional resource constraints on our core Ben Mod staff and the vendor, GSI. Rest assured our UC staff have done their best to continue to move Ben Mod forward while processing a historic number of claims and building from scratch and implementing four completely new Federal programs.

So where are we today with Ben Mod? In January of 2020, we initiated User Acceptance Testing, or UAT. UAT is an important milestone in the implementation of any new IT system. Initially, we launched UAT with over 70 testers, but because of that Pandemic, more than half were reallocated to support the dramatic increase in claims volume, which left about 20 testers to continue UAT. Thus far we have successfully executed over 9,600 tests in UAT and 1,300 tests with converted data.

Additionally, our monthly data conversions have continued on schedule and our staff has begun training on the new system. We are proud of the achievements we've made so far on Ben Mod during this Pandemic against incredible odds. However, we also know that for the system to be absolutely ready to go live, we must complete our due diligence and take into account the critical tasks yet outstanding, the anticipated impact on claimants and this

new historically high unemployment environment.

Well before this House hearing was scheduled for today, our project manager vendor set up what is commonly referred to in the IT industry as the Go/No-Go Meeting.

That's actually scheduled for Monday, September 21st. This meeting will convene L&I and OIT, the Office of Information Technology, leadership to decide whether L&I can and will launch the system on October 5th.

At this Go/No-Go Meeting we will consider input from our various key stakeholders, including members of the Legislature and the Ben Mod Advisory Committee. We will raise important questions, whether we will have hardware properly configured to account for the increased claims we have absorbed during the Pandemic, the status of interface and load testing, training of UC staff, the quality of converted data to be available for testing, among other critical components.

We recognize that after much deliberation the Ben Mod Advisory Committee in early September made the recommendation to postpone the October Ben Mod go-live date. Among their concerns was UC's ability to continue to process and pay out the unprecedented number of new and continuing claims through the transition between old and new systems while we are in this Pandemic.

We are doing our best to make sure every eligible

claimant receives their benefits during this unemployment crisis. As of September 10th, we have paid or deemed ineligible about 97 percent of all claims received between March 15th and August 10th. But we are also mindful of the very human impact that implementing a new system would have in the midst of one of the worst employment crises in Pennsylvania's history.

We are weighing all these considerations as we prepare for the Go/No-Go Meeting. We are working with our system integrator, GSI, and project management team to make sure they give us a realistic and accurate assessment of the project schedule. We are daily consulting with stakeholders and staff to gather their input into our decision-making.

Make no mistake, our commitment to Ben Mod is unwavering. For years our staff have been patiently awaiting a move away from a time- and labor-intensive mainframe environment. Our stakeholders have long been ready for change and we owe it to Pennsylvanians to ensure their years-long investment in modernizing the UC system bears fruit at the level of functionality they expect in the 21st Century.

So thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak to you today. As you mentioned, I'm here, along with Executive Deputy Secretary Bob O'Brien; our UC Deputy Secretary Bill Trusky; and our Chief Information Officer,

1 Dave Naisby. We will be happy to take questions when you 2 are ready. 3 Thank you. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. 4 I would like to add that a few additional members 5 6 have joined us. We are joined by Representative Torren 7 Ecker, Representative Dawn Keefer, and online, 8 Representative Ravenstahl has joined us. 9 Anyone else that I've missed here in the room? 10 Anyone else joining us online that I've missed? 11 Representative Miller, I don't think we heard 12 that he was online initially as well. So I'd like to 1.3 welcome all those additional members who have joined us. 14 At this time, I'm going to open it up for 15 questions. I have one of my own, but I wanted to remind all 16 of the members both here and online that it's my 17 understanding that each of the testifiers are still 18 available online for questions. 19 In the past we've done a panel-style discussion and so we will continue that. We do have Mr. Moomaw in the 20 21 room currently. And my understanding is that everyone else 22 is still online joining us virtually.

Department, we also have Bill Trusky, Bob O'Brien, and Dave Naisby, as well as Paul Toomey from Geographic Solutions,

And in addition to Secretary Oleksiak from the

23

24

25

1 the vendor.

So I appreciate them joining us and being willing to answer questions.

So I'd like to start with a question of my own and then we'll move to various members.

So with any new system, transferring the old data to the new data, the old system to the new system, obviously that has to meet the requirements of the law. And so my question is, or my initial question is, when the new system goes live, is there going to be access to data for all of the data in the Legacy system?

Like, is there anything that's going to be lost to your knowledge or will they have access to every bit of information that is currently in the Legacy system?

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to ask Dave Naisby to respond to that.

Dave.

MR. DAVID NAISBY: Sure.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Secretary.

So as we work through the process towards modernization, all of our Legacy data will be converted into our new modernized platform. We will then further retain all of the historical data as required by State and Federal law for reference but also for auditing purposes. So no

data throughout this process will be lost. It will be available to our workers within the Department. And most of that data will be made available to our claimants who are filing.

I think, if I'm hearing, the root question is, will claimants have to enter duplicate information that the Agency already has on retention? And the answer to that question is no. All data will be made available.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. And so you've answered the question about existing claimants or claimants who are currently in the system and ongoing claimants, if you will. Does the same hold true for individuals who have been in the system? Let's say they had a claim that was opened in 2007 and it was finally closed somewhere in 2009. Is that type of Legacy data going to be retained and made accessible as needed?

MR. DAVID NAISBY: That's correct.

Go ahead, Bill.

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: No. Going back to 2007 to 2009, that won't be available. And just to clarify, we're going back three years with data, Mr. Chairman. So unless there's an issue, an overpayment with that claim from 2009, that will transfer over but the claim information from 2007 will not transfer over.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. And just making

sure I understand, the generic data, if you will, will go back three years for claims. What is the longest period of time? You mentioned overpayments as something. What is the longest period of time that the data will be kept?

1.3

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: That stays on the books forever.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: And is that overpayment where -- just for the benefit of our viewers and others who might not be familiar with this, that's an overpayment where an individual perhaps received a duplicate check or a duplicate payment to their account, sometimes, you know, their own fault, other times there was a mistake made, but there was an overpayment made.

If the Department has information about that, that will be retained so that the Department can seek repayment of the overpayment?

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: Mr. Chairman, it will only be fault overpayments that will transfer over that go back, you know, indefinitely. Non-fault overpayments are actually removed from a person's account after three years.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. And so what about the issue -- we've had individuals -- just during this recent Pandemic and all the unemployment and PUA structure, we've had individuals who have begun repayment. I've been made aware of it. In the past there's been some issues

where individuals have overpaid, if you will, in those repayments, if that makes sense or, you know, incorrect liens were put on individuals' properties, etc.

How will that be addressed? Because that is their property that needs to be returned to them in the form of a financial remedy. Is there going to be a Legacy system that can account for those types of situations?

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: I'm not exactly sure what you're saying. I mean, we'll only put a lien on someone if it's a fault overpayment. So I haven't been aware or made aware that we have issues with that. I mean, that would -- obviously, if it's a fault overpayment, as I said previously, that would transfer over. The lien would remain.

So if this is something you want to discuss off-line, I'd be happy to do so because it's the first I've heard of those types of issues.

MR. ROBERT O'BRIEN: Chairman, this is Bob
O'Brien. I also think we would need to touch base with the
UC Tax Office with their computer system to see what UC tax
is retain ing also.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. The reason -- one of the reasons I asked this question is, it wasn't too long ago we had a -- I think it was a tax amnesty type of approach that was put out there. And it was basically if

you owe back taxes, etc., you can repay those. And what we saw was the Department had records that went back for decades. And they had records of taxes that were due but they did not have records of taxes that were paid attached to those very same things.

So I specifically received a notice. I have done one probate in my entire legal career. That one probate I kept records of but it was 15 years ago. And the Department sent me a notice saying that tax needs to be paid. I had records showing that it had been paid, an inheritance tax, on my client's behalf. And the Department had no record of it. I had to prove that.

And so if you're not going to keep the Legacy records in those types of scenarios, we're going to have some problems. And it has come to my attention that there's an overpayment issue out there, that there's an overpayment issue where individuals -- and this goes back for a period of time in the early 2000s where an overpayment was made, an individual is being asked to repay it.

And it is my understanding that a fair number of claimants were actually asked to pay too much due to miscalculated interest or other things like that. And it numbered in the millions of dollars. Over 10 million is the lowest end and over 30 million is the highest end I've heard on this particular issue.

My question is, how are we going to make sure those individuals receive that payment? If we're getting rid of all Legacy information except for three years, these outstanding amounts that are still due to the individuals who overpaid when they repaid, how is that going to be rectified?

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: We're not getting rid of those overpayments, Mr. Chairman. We will have that information. Again, we'll retain fault overpayments and the lien information that go -- or the lien that goes along with that. We will have access in read-only mode of those liens in the Legacy system. So that is not going away.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. So you're pretty confident that if mistakes come to light from ten years ago on an overpayment issue, if someone says, hey, wait a minute. I paid, I repaid too much, you're pretty confident that your records will be able to adequately reflect that and you'll be able to research those without too much headache?

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: That's the intention, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. I'm concerned about the accessibility. I know anytime -- I mean, even when we have system upgrades here in the House of Representatives, we have system upgrades and there's

1 information lost. And my concern is that we just -- we have 2 to have access to that and it has to be something that's not 3 just stored somewhere. It has to be accessible when needed. That would be my concern. 4 I'll move on to other questions. 5 6 MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: Mr. Chairman, we're on the 7 same page there. 8 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Thank you. Chairman Harkins, do you have a question or two? 9 10 MINORITY CHAIRMAN HARKINS: Thank you, Chairman 11 Cox. 12 I want to thank all of today's panelists for 13 taking the time to be here. I know that you all have a lot 14 on your plates dealing with the tremendous number of 15 employment claims related to the COVID-19 Pandemic. 16 I understand that nobody wants to further delay 17 the implementation of the employment benefit modernization 18 However, at the end of the day, it's our job to 19 ensure that the Department does what's best for our 20 constituents and everyone utilizing the UC system. 21 I echo the Ben Mod Advisory Committee's concerns 22 about implementing these changes at a time of high 23 unemployment. 24 With that said, Geoff, I appreciate your

testimony. Do you believe that the Ben Mod project is in

25

the red because of the Department's failure or could you expound a little bit on where you were going with that?

1.3

MR. GEOFF MOOMAW: I don't believe it's the Department Department's failure. I don't believe it's the Department personnel. What was dropped in their lap because of the Pandemic, as you heard the Secretary describe, they had to take people out of testing. I believe his number was over half of the number of people that were testing the system were taken out in order to process claims. That had to be done. We had to process claims.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN HARKINS: Right.

MR. GEOFF MOOMAW: The rules and the programs from Washington and the U.S. Department of Labor changed constantly. And suddenly what the Department had dropped in their lap, create PUA, Pandemic Unemployment Assistance, for people that aren't even in the system, it was for self-employed individuals, gig workers.

Those people have no wage history in the

Department's database. So suddenly now the Department has

to figure out a way to implement a new program. And as they
said, it took away.

So I truly believe -- and I'm speaking for myself now -- why I think there has to be a delay. It's all Pandemic related in how the Department has been pulled in 18 different directions to satisfy the requirements from

1 Washington and the changing rules and programs we have.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN HARKINS: I appreciate that.

And I vividly remember that Saturday morning when we had the rollout of the PUA and the 9 o'clock calls that we received. My house became a sub-satellite of the Department of Labor. And I think it still is.

Just yesterday, some of the calls that we're dealing with, it's -- I worked for UPS for 25 years. I was a driver. I said this would be like implementing a new software system at the height of the Christmas delivery season. We're all talking about the postal service and UPS and everything.

In my mind it's just incomprehensible we would even attempt something like this at this point. And with that said, you mentioned the project trending yellow or red in your testimony.

Can you give a little more detail about what you mean by those terms and what benchmarks would constitute the project being in a yellow or green phase?

MR. GEOFF MOOMAW: I don't think I can address the benchmarks. I, as a committee member, have relied on the Department and the benchmarks there with GSI. I rely on them giving us the project update. Red, yellow, green, I just think of a traffic light. The red says it all to me.

When that phrase goaling red came out, that set

off my personal signals and gave me doubt. Yellow, again, it's a traffic light, folks. Okay. Proceed with caution. Try to get through that intersection without getting caught. That can be a little dangerous analogy. Again, if you're the claimant, the employee trying to use a new system, is it working or not? Green to me simply means we've met all the benchmarks. We've met all the testing. The Department and GSI are confident. It's a go.

Will there probably still be hiccups? I can't imagine that there wouldn't. What new program is implemented without headaches? I used that word perfect in my testimony and I emphasized, you know, that's a hard word or hard expectation to meet. There will be hiccups.

But until the folks that are dealing with it know they've met all the benchmarks, have done all the testing, and they are confident to say green, I personally think we have to pause. I don't know how long the pause would be.

Again, as a committee member, I would have to rely on the updates we got.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN HARKINS: I appreciate your intake and your insight on that.

MR. GEOFF MOOMAW: Sure.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN HARKINS: I think that's a cumbersome task.

MR. GEOFF MOOMAW: Yes.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN HARKINS: And I hope going forward with the implementation, whenever we do it, that we have the flexibility to change this system, too, when it's up and running so that if we see an employer X, Y, Z when they have layoffs, massive layoffs, if they would occur, when they would occur, that we can realign or redo some things with this quickly so we're not in these kinds of positions.

Julia, if you wanted to respond to that question also.

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: Certainly. So what
Mr. Moomaw testified to was status, what is provided to us
by the Department. But most recently when it was reported,
it was told to us there were still some outstanding
development issues, some interface issues, we were still
working on data conversion. You know, obviously there's
just an unbelievable amount of data that needs to be
converted, especially current data.

And, you know, they were working on progress with single sign-on across the state. And there were still questions about key functionality, especially testing, in what we call a non-monetary, which is pretty much the vast majority of claim issues that people have.

As the Secretary said, they had to deploy people away from testing temporarily.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN HARKINS: Right.

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: So there have been issues somewhat throughout the project when it comes to meeting benchmarks. And as you all know, the Department has had to hold back on certain payment dates to the vendor because deliverables had not been met. But the vast majority of issues leading to the current status are based on COVID-19 and the effects of the Pandemic.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN HARKINS: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Next we have a question from Representative Klunk.

REPRESENTATIVE KLUNK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you to the panelists for joining us here today. My question goes to the interplay with the U.S. Department of Labor and their oversight and input on this particular project.

So the U.S. Department of Labor actually requires a report to be filed with their Department, from the State L&I Department, six months prior to the rollout of a new benefit system.

So my question is, was that report submitted?

When was it submitted? Were there any changes to that report to the U.S. Department of Labor in light of everything that's going on with the Pandemic and the changes that are taking place right now? And has the U.S.

Department of Labor provided any feedback to us here in Pennsylvania about the rollout of Ben Mod and what they would like to see, you know, moving forward, whether they recommended that we hold, that we do the pause right now, or, you know, maybe proceed with caution, with yellow? What have we heard back from them? I know that they also have, you know, some checklists to determine readiness of a new system when it's rolled out, when it deals with functionality and, you know, testing, customer service, and all of those things.

My question goes to the Department. What's the status of that report to the U.S. Department of Labor? Have we updated it? What's the feedback that we're getting from them?

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: Representative Klunk, I can answer that. We submitted that report June 2nd. It was timely. We have not heard back from the Department of Labor. We don't have any feedback, recent feedback, from them. We're in regular contact. You know, if the regional office asks us for something, we readily give it to them. However, since June 2nd, we have not been contacted by the Department of Labor regarding the modernization project.

REPRESENTATIVE KLUNK: Thank you.

Have you done any follow-ups with them? I know that they're clearly probably just as busy as you guys are

when it comes to what's going on in the world. But have you 1 2 pushed them to get any feedback? I do think that it would 3 be important to get their feedback. They see these all across the United States and have implemented -- assisted 4 5 states in implementing all across the United States. I 6 think it would be important to have their input as well. 7 MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: I respectfully disagree. 8 That's generally not their role. We do talk to the national 9 organization we belong to, NUI, on a regular basis about our 10 project. We are in regular contact with them with regards 11 to other states' projects and their status. The Department 12 of Labor is generally in a gathering information role with 13 regards to these projects. 14 Again, when they do ask us for information, we do 15 respond appropriately. And again, as I stated before, after 16 sending that report June 2nd, we have not heard back. 17 REPRESENTATIVE KLUNK: Thank you. 18 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you, Representative 19 Klunk. 20 Thank you, Mr. Trusky. 21 Next we have a question from Representative 22 Gleim. 23 REPRESENTATIVE GLEIM: Thank you for everybody 24 being here today.

After hearing all the testimony and reading some

25

of the studies and everything, I believe that L&I needs to have a plan with GSI to complete the necessary tasks and implement the project no matter whether you go live on the date or not. I would just like to remind everybody that the money that's been spent so far and that we're going to be spending from here on out comes from the taxpayers and we need to use those funds with fidelity. I don't recommend a pause but a new go-live date with a plan.

I feel that time is of the essence. Seasonal workers are going to be laying -- you know, getting laid off here pretty soon, probably starting in November. And they are going to be filing for unemployment.

And so we're going to have a new whole set of people coming onboard. I believe that the CareerLinks can handle training up to 25 people at a time. So if there's a plan to roll out the training that we could possibly do it.

So my question really is, what is L&I's plan to get the final steps completed to go live with the new system? And what is the new project timeline? And also I would like to request a copy of the contract between L&I and GSI if the Committee could obtain that. I would love to read it.

Thank you.

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: I'll begin and then I'll defer to our tech people.

There is a plan. We have had a plan throughout this whole process. We meet regularly internally. We meet regularly virtually with the vendor, with our project managers. We have used a plan that we have as our guide. We have adjusted it when we needed to, primarily based on new systems that we had to create through the Pandemic and, you know, other issues that would come up as they would in any development. But we do have a plan.

And one of the things that we have really focused on more and more in the past few months is, with a laser-like focus, what do we need to do? What part in the plan do we need to adjust? What do we need to change? What do we need to put on hold?

So we are doing that constantly internally and with the vendor. I'm going to defer to Dave and Bill. And Paul Toomey from GSI wants to add to that.

Dave.

MR. DAVID NAISBY: Sure. Thank you, Secretary.

For the Committee, I know that Julia, Geoff's secretary, has hit on a couple of the obstacles that were presented to us, curve balls, if you will, throughout the Pandemic. And while they're not excuses, they are, in fact, just that. They are obstacles.

When we take a look at the staffing reallocations that had to take place, the buildups in order to support

remote workers -- and I'm not just talking about laptops and PCs, but the technical connectivity, more importantly secure connectivity into our back-end systems, building for videoconferences. So there's a tremendous build-out. And I think probably all areas of industry were affected by things, such as supply chain orders. Oftentimes we are waiting weeks if not months for new hardware.

When we take a look at those impacts, all right, at a user level and then we try and tie them into the construction of a system, we're in a position where we are seeing unemployment going up at a dramatic rate, higher than the 2008 Recession, some have argued, and greater than that of the Great Depression.

That being said, we had to shift resources, as the Secretary indicated, but more importantly we had to allocate new technical resources, hardware, to support Legacy systems. Well, of course -- and we could not have forecasted in 2017 when we published a request for proposals the amount of load and the amount of users that this system would require.

So to answer the question in terms of how do we get there, well, we had to close all these gaps. We had to position people to be successful. We had to ensure we had adequate hardware. We had to ensure that our networks were hardened to be able to support these loads. And more

importantly, probably the most important thing that the Secretary drives home daily, is the security integrity of these systems, ensuring that our data is secure and ensuring that our users information is, in fact, protected, that we have that all together.

Here's the great news. We have been able to get caught up on those technical needs. The infrastructure has been built out. And now we're in a position where we have to now continue the integration.

And as I mentioned before, when we talked about the CARES Act, we talked about PUA, we talked about Lost Wage Assistance, these are now new programs that, again, were not part of the original project schedule that Jerry talked about.

Now we have to account for that new data, data that was not historically part of our data set, those that were previously ineligible for unemployment. Now we have to complete the additional data conversion. We have additional interfaces and obviously all those take time.

So when we talk about the project schedule, yes, the Secretary is absolutely correct. We have done a very good job of doing our best to stick to that schedule, yielding to the obstacles and accounting for those new obstacles.

Going forward -- and let me go back to the heart

of the question, what was that time frame? Well, that time frame needs to be determined based on where we're at and what existing obstacles still remain and some of those new integration components, the interfaces, this new data that needs to be converted, the new hardware that has been received and has been built and needs to be configured.

So that's why we're working both internally with the Office of Administration, the Agency, and ultimately not just GSI as our partner, but over 70 interfaces that we have with other State and Federal agencies. So collectively we're working hard to determine what that new date will be as a team.

REPRESENTATIVE GLEIM: Okay. Thank you.

I would be really interested to know what the new date is. If it's not going to be October 5th, is it going to be December 5th? Like, I understand all the things that you just said. It sounds like a lot.

All I'm asking is, what is the plan? What is the new go-live date if it's not October 5th ? And what is the plan between October 5th and the new date? And then I also wanted to know if we could get a copy of the contract.

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: The current contract, that's public record so certainly we could provide that. And as far as a new go-live date, if we're not doing October, that's the purpose of our meeting next week, to gather all

that information, see where we are, see what's left based on the plan that we have now and what do we need to do. What can we do given all the plates that we are spinning to continue to provide the service we need to provide to our claimants and knowing that we're going to be hopefully -- well, not hopefully. We will have improved service to claimants, but we have to balance all the obstacles that Dave mentioned along the way.

One of the things that has been forefront in my mind, as Dave mentioned, is not just the security and stability of the system, but what's in the best interest of the claimants. They are the people that -- I testified before and I said it at every opportunity, we are very aware that there are real people at the end of the process. These are people in great need who are struggling. We need to do all we can to help them meet those needs given the constraints that we have from all the things we've just talked about.

So that's always driving us. What's going to be in the best interest of the claimants? And how can we get there given what we are confronting? So we will be spending some serious time reviewing all this when we decide on if and when what date we are going to choose if it's not October 5th.

We will certainly alert the stakeholders, the

Advisory Committee, the Labor & Industry Committee. It will be part of our conversation with our Chairs, the Labor Committee Chairs, all next week.

This has been right up there with the Pandemic.

This has been an issue that we have been addressing daily

and will continue to address.

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: And, Representative, the Committee has recommended that it be involved in any determination of metrics that will -- if that will inform the decision about a new go-live date, both internal metrics in terms of where the project is at but also external metrics in terms of what is happening with the Pandemic and these unprecedented levels of unemployment and, of course, as I mentioned previously, some of the restrictions on movement that we're still experiencing because of the Pandemic.

So the Committee has appointments, both the Senate and the House Labor & Industry Committees. And we believe that that would be the appropriate place to have that discussion as well.

I'd just like to point out you mentioned the funding for the project. And the Committee has submitted three annual reports to the Legislature on the project, most recently on June 30th of this year. And in every report, we've been incredibly supportive of the Department's use and

handling of the funding for this project. They remained on budget. These challenges have held again the vendor to the deliverables required under the contract. And that is actually incredibly impressive given that the vast majority of these projects across the country have significant issues with the budget for the project.

So that is one thing the Committee would like to

So that is one thing the Committee would like to express. And we have expressed that. We believe that has been handled very well by the Department.

1.3

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: I would like to add an addendum to the request for the contract. Is it safe to assume that any change orders, Mr. Secretary, will be included in the copy of the contract that our Committee receives?

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: We will do that, Mr. Chairman, absolutely.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Okay. Thank you.

At this time we have a question from Representative Nelson.

REPRESENTATIVE NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Extremely disappointing, you know, the failure for the go-live date. I think, you know, emotionally the hundreds of thousands of people that were really staking hopes on October, you know, I think everyone shares in that disappointment. It's good to have the bad news that we

won't be able to roll this out. But I think what the citizens really need, which, I think, Mr. Secretary, you are saying that the meeting next week will help to identify, you know, a forecasted -- because we bumped it back about six months once already. I do appreciate the information shared that the project is running on budget.

Because of the supplementals and the change orders associated with the Pandemic and additional programs related, has the Department been able to use any of those CARES dollars to help? I'm imagine the change orders in the project are considerable and the discussions about security and implementations and fraud that we've learned through this process. Have you been able to receive additional financial resources from, you know, some of those CARES Act dollars? Because it does seem to be changes related to the Pandemic that are impacting the citizens.

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: I can address that.

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: Bill.

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: Thanks, Secretary.

Representative Nelson, yes, we've been able to draw down CARES Act dollars for all of the Federal programs, PUA, you know, extended Federal benefits, etc. Right now, earlier this week, we submitted a grant application to receive money to fight fraud. So, yes, the Department of Labor has been very generous with providing us funds for the

Federal programs that they've asked us to implement.

REPRESENTATIVE NELSON: Great. And when you were talking about the security and the PUA situations with, you know, unemployment, prisoners getting unemployment, some of the, you know, things that were embarrassing for everybody — but criminals are out there and they're looking to take advantage of those vulnerabilities.

Mr. Toomey, can you touch on, will all of the current crossmatches be utilized in this new system or will the changeover create potential new windows for manipulation, you know, by that criminal element once again?

MR. PAUL TOOMEY: All of the fraud detection measures that have been put in place will also be available when Ben Mod goes live. So all of those capabilities that were added to the PUA system will transfer over to the new Ben Mod system as well.

REPRESENTATIVE NELSON: Okay. And the last portion of -- it was great to hear, you know, the citizens of Pennsylvania are, you know, being kept in the forefront of the mind. The employees within Labor & Industry that have to be working within the system, it appeared like that training hasn't started yet but a response to an earlier answer said, hey, the system for the most part is done.

When will our employees begin to start to train on the system if it is somewhat complete and we're rolling

through these data shifts and obstacles along those lines?

When are the employees going to begin to receive training on this new system?

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: Again, I'm going to defer to Bill. But the training has begun. But I'll defer to Bill for more specifics.

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: Yeah. Training,
Representative Nelson, began this week. We will continue to
train. You know, if we decide to delay implementation, we
have a plan to do refresher training for our employees.

We also have a plan for stakeholder outreach which would include your staff as well and familiarize them with the system. So we do have a plan regardless if we delay implementation or not.

REPRESENTATIVE NELSON: Thank you.

And just to clarify, Mr. Secretary, the meeting next week, part of the goal of that meeting is to establish this new rollout date or a new target date. Did I understand that correctly?

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: We may have one, we may not.

We're going to review where we stand. First of all, can we?

Is it at all possible to do the October date? Secondly, if it turns out that it's not, what do we need to do? What time frame can we reasonably assume?

But then we're going to -- we'll be working in

more detail with the vendor, you know, with the Committee to establish that date. So I'm not going to guarantee that we'll meet on Monday or Tuesday and then have a date for you. But we will. As soon as we have a date, as soon as we have a decision about October 5th, and then as soon as we have a date, we will let the Committee know for sure.

We're as disappointed as anyone that, you know, we may not make the October 5th date. But as Mr. Naisby has detailed pretty thoroughly, there are reasons that we aren't going to get there.

Again, as many of you know, I was a classroom teacher for many years. I used to talk to my students all the time. There's a difference between a reason and an excuse. These are reasons that we are not able to do this, reasons that frankly are beyond our control or the control of any of us on this call.

We want to get this. Our staff wants to have it done. They are anxious to get away from the old system. So we want to do it. But again, we want to do it right and we want to do it in the best interest of the claimants.

REPRESENTATIVE NELSON: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you.

Next we have a question from Representative Keefer.

REPRESENTATIVE KEEFER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, kind of on the same line as

Representative Nelson but more on the education side. So

given that there hasn't been a decision to delay the

implementation, the October 5th date, I assume that L&I has

been moving forward as if it were going to go live.

But my concern is that I haven't seen any public education, like any public awareness kind of campaign that's been going out. So even if everything goes perfectly with this and we don't have any glitches, you're still going to have that learning curve, right?

I think of just getting a new version of the same phone, the learning curve we have. What have you done as far as the education piece to date? Like, have you reached out to claimants just informing them that there's a new system and maybe possible templates? Do you have resources for that? Has there been any -- I would assume that that's part of the plan already but I haven't seen anything. Can you go into any of that?

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: Sure. I'm going to ask
Deputy Secretary Trusky to speak to that, please.

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: Sure.

Representative Keefer, we do have a plan. We have a stakeholder outreach group. Is it something we're a little behind in right now? Yes. I mean, as everybody is

aware, we have quite a bit going on. But we will have desk guides, videos, etc. And, you know, if we do delay implementation, it does give us more time to do that external outreach. So there is a plan in place.

We've had many internal meetings regarding it.

Again, it's on the list of things to do. Again, if we do

delay, it will give us more time to educate the public in a

much better manner.

REPRESENTATIVE KEEFER: Okay. And that was my concern. I'm just assuming that there will be a delay because I just don't feel like -- I mean, this is a beast. This piece of it all by itself, this education piece, I'm just even thinking my staff alone, educating them on it so that they can communicate with the constituents as they call in about how it works and where they need to go, where to find things, that part of it as well.

I would just think that if that October 5th is our date, we would have already been engaged in this part of it just because it would -- I think it would swamp you, it would crush you guys and all of your staff who are going to try navigating all this in the midst of a Pandemic and all of the unprecedented number of claims that you have.

MR. WILLIAM TRUSKY: Yeah, we appreciate that. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE KEEFER: So when you get that

timeline -- I mean, when you meet on Monday, might there be a possibility of a timeline as far as that public education awareness? There is some apprehension on that level as far as it coming out and then not having any understanding of how to use it or how to tell people how to use the system.

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: It is obviously something we will be discussing that is already in place. We will modify it as necessary. But again, I'm not going to guarantee that Monday afternoon or Tuesday morning we're going to have a detailed plan for you. But know that as Deputy Trusky said, it's something that we are very aware of and we have in place and we will let folks know as we move forward, particularly the Committee.

And Julia is a very strong advocate for the folks who are in the system. And we will make sure that everybody is aware of the training opportunities that we will have.

REPRESENTATIVE KEEFER: Okay. And just an advanced timeline on it. I'm just, you know, thinking we would need at least two or three weeks of that just to kind of get everybody hearing about it so that they know it's even coming.

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE KEEFER: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: Thank you.

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: And, Representative, if I could just add, the Committee has seen and has spoken with the Department many times over the last year about their community outreach and education plan. It's something that we feel very strongly about.

And there has been a plan in place but, of course, it has been impacted by COVID-19. We strongly agree that significant training outreach and materials is going to be incredibly important to the successful implementation of this project.

As your offices have seen, people trying to navigate the systems now are struggling, especially in the new PUA system, which has the same core functionality and the same look in many ways as the new benefit modernization system.

So I've personally spoken with hundreds of clients who have struggled to kind of figure out how to navigate that technology. So the ability for legal services, labor to train, and do community outreach on this project with the Department and, of course, with your offices, it's going to be incredibly important.

The same with Mr. Moomaw and the employer side.

That is going to be a concern of his as well that employers are notified and provided with that training.

REPRESENTATIVE KEEFER: Sure.

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: We will definitely be keeping our eyes on and working with the Department on that plan.

REPRESENTATIVE KEEFER: So that's great, Julia.

So can you tell me, the plan that you have in place now, what do you see as a timeline? I'm not asking for dates.

But the period of time that it will take you that you foresee that you're going to need for that, you know, public awareness campaign/education campaign? Is it two weeks? three weeks? Like, what are you looking at for the plan that you currently have in place?

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: I think I have to look back with the Department and the programmatic staff on what they had planned. There's a balance that always has to be kept between giving people advanced notice but not creating unnecessary anxiety too early on about any sort of switchover.

You know, I think personally we would want probably at least six weeks to start getting information out there, develop our own training materials in addition to what the Department has, and work with the community partners, getting information out there, especially to the most vulnerable populations. Here in Pennsylvania people in rural areas, people without a lot of access to technology is

1 going to take some time. We just want to make sure that we 2 are sufficiently prepared for that. 3 REPRESENTATIVE KEEFER: And none of that has started yet, correct? 4 5 MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: It has not. 6 REPRESENTATIVE KEEFER: Okay. Thank you. 7 MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: At least not from what 8 the Committee has been aware of. 9 REPRESENTATIVE KEEFER: Okay. Thank you. 10 MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: Sure. 11 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you. 12 Representative Krueger is joining us virtually 1.3 and has a question. 14 And I would like to remind members that we are 15 closing in on the last 15 minutes of the hearing. We do 16 have a number of people still wanting to ask questions, so 17 if you would be mindful of that. 18 Thank you. 19 REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 20 My question is for Mr. Toomey and GSI. 21 Like so many members of the Legislature, my 22 office has spent time helping hundreds of constituents 23 navigate issues with the PUA system that you built. I have 24 to say now that most of the folks who received their UC

benefits have been served. The people who call my office

25

who are most frustrated and angry are people who are having issues with the PUA system. And it's taking you weeks, if not months, to draft some of the programming issues that the Department has identified that cause significant delays with the payment of benefits.

For example, it took weeks for GSI to fix the back-week issues. We had a lot of folks calling our offices in the meantime. So can you explain first what caused that delay? And are we expecting similar service levels for this new system that you're building?

MR. PAUL TOOMEY: Yes. On the back-week issue, originally there was -- we had to make a change to support Pennsylvania's implementation of backdating of weeks, which was contrary to the system. So it's a pretty intricate and complicated action to take. So it took a little time for us to put that in place. I believe that is now in place and is fully functioning with the system. So that would have affected people, to have that backdating issue, that wanted to go back further than the system was permitting.

Obviously with backdating, that's an issue that we have to be careful of. It's very subject obviously to potential fraud where somebody is going to look to get backdated several weeks. So we had to put a lot of things in the system to try and make sure that wasn't the subject of fraud.

So some of these things, you know, do take time 1 2 to put in to modify the system. 3 REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: And what kind of assurances can you give us that your next project won't have 4 5 the same kind of issues that are causing a bad consumer 6 experience? MR. PAUL TOOMEY: Well, as you are probably aware 7 8 with the PUA system, that was a system essentially that went 9 from zero to an implemented system. And I think it was two 10 to three weeks we were taking PUA claims. Whereas, 11 obviously with the Ben Mod project, we will have a lot more 12 time, a lot more testing. 13 PUA's big emphasis obviously was to get people to 14 be able to apply as soon as possible and to get them paid as 15 quickly as possible. So on that, that's probably a year and 16 a half worth of work that we did in three weeks. 17 inevitably there's going to be issues. 18 Obviously, with Ben Mod we have had much more 19 time. It's been, you know, a lot more time for testing, 20 etc. 21 REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: Okay. 22 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 23 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you. 24 Next we have a question from Representative Dave 25 Maloney.

1 REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A lot of good stuff here. A lot of questions were asked that I think many of us wanted to know. But I just want to go to a couple things quickly from listening to testimony.

Julia, I guess my first question would be to you.

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: You triggered an interest of mine when you said that there was constitutional rights as sort of a hurdle to get over. Can you speak to that?

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: Sure, Representative.

For that I'm referring to the issues that we've experienced with the PUA system, which I do agree was built rather quickly. But for example, there are thousands of people cut off from benefits in the PUA system without any notice about why they're cut off or what they can do to get back on benefits.

I'm sure your offices have heard and received plenty of phone calls about those issues. Those are due process issues with a notice and opportunity to be heard.

The Department has made entries to GSI about fixing that, about getting determinations out, especially considering that they have already been built in many ways for the benefit modernization project. But that has not yet

happened. So people have left without any ideas as to why their benefits are cut off.

1.3

And so that's an example of some of the concerns we have about, you know, again, the ability of the vendor to address any issues like that that could possibly happen after go live for the project. And we are in communication with the Department trying to address a lot of those issues now.

REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: So you're referring to the fact that they are not getting their benefits as the constitutional issue?

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: No. The constitutional issue is they're not provided with any notice about why their benefits have been stopped or any predetermination, investigation, prior to stopping those benefits and no opportunity to be heard because there is no determination ever issued that tells them why their benefits have been turned off and would give them appeal rights. So that's a due process issue.

REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: Okay. That's very important to emphasize and to explain a little bit better. I appreciate that.

MS. JULIA SIMON-MISHEL: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: So, Mr. Secretary, I was wondering if you could give us a quick update on what we

know as the total investment, going back to monies lost, including up to date with what has been invested, as was mentioned earlier, with the taxpayers' money?

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: Well, I can tell you that on the Ben Mod system, we are on budget. The way the contract is designed, there's only payment upon deliverables, when we are satisfied with the quality of those deliverables. So with the Ben Mod system, we are right where we need to be as far as the budget goes.

REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: And what is that total?

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: I don't have that offhand.

I don't know if Dave or Bill would have that. When we provide you copies of the contract, we will have that.

MR. DAVID NAISBY: Yes.

Secretary and Chairman, to date we have paid for deliverables just over \$8.6 million and we have outstanding receivables totaling \$8.9 million. And those will not be paid until the system is delivered and accepted by the Agency.

REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: So you're saying that there was a total contract of say 17-plus million dollars?

MR. DAVID NAISBY: Seventeen million five hundred sixty-four thousand for the base contract. That is for the system. That does not include the out years for annual maintenance. But, yes, the answer is 17.56 million total.

We have paid 8.6, outstanding 8.9. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: Okay. So I guess the 3 total that we'll be getting at some point will be what the contract total usage is plus all the extras, if we will, for 4 5 I think the question that was already asked earlier so what that will -- whatever those numbers would be would be added 6 7 to that, correct? 8 SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: With the change orders 9 you're referring to, yes. 10 REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: Okay. And then we can 11 add -- what was the investment that was lost prior to that? 12 SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: That's something that is 13 part of the litigation that we referenced earlier and we 14 really are not able to discuss that. 15 REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: We knew it was north of 16 163 or something, correct? 17 SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: I'm not going to comment on 18 the litigation, Representative. I understand your concerns. 19 But I'm not -- we just are not at liberty to talk about 20

that.

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: Well, I realize the litigation part, but the number I think was public record.

I appreciate you referring to a math problem as I did earlier in a different hearing. So I quess my last question would really be, what is the figure that we're

using or you're holding on to now as who is left to be satisfied with claims?

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: I don't know if we can point to one particular figure. We do have the 97 percent figure of claims that have been resolved between March 15th and -- what did I say? -- August, early August, mid August. And that August date, we keep adding to that. So the longer we work on these claims, the closer we'll get to where we are now.

Last I saw that number, that was about 50,000 claims. Again, that's in the traditional UC system. The reason those claims are held up is varied reasons. It could be, you know, mistakes that have been made on the application. It could be waiting for information from out of state. It could be the disputes between the employer and employee. It could be we're getting something about reasonable assurance, whether or not people who work in the school systems have reasonable assurance that they will go back to work.

So there's a multitude of reasons why some of those claims aren't able to go cleanly through the system .

REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: I understand that. I appreciate that.

SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: As far as claims, I don't have a number available. I don't know if Dave or Bill has

1 that. 2 REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: But the number that you 3 are using is 3 percent left over? SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: From the traditional 4 5 unemployment claims in that window of time, yes. 6 REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: And that includes even 7 those that receive or doesn't include even those that may 8 have received one check or two checks and then now are still 9 waiting? 10 SECRETARY OLEKSIAK: One of the issues that we 11 have had is that, you know, there are people who have not 12 replied. So I'm not sure if that's in that system or in that number or not. 13 14 REPRESENTATIVE MALONEY: All right. 15 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 16 I will refrain from any more. Thank you. 17 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: And for a very quick 18 question and then we'll have concluding comments from 19 Representative Harkins and myself. 20 Representative Dush. 21 REPRESENTATIVE DUSH: Yes. Paul, you said you 22 got 18 months' worth of work done in three weeks on the PUA 23 system. Why was not the same amount of effort done to 24 making sure that we were on time for the first deadline

before extending to the October of this year and also

25

getting us to this point where we could be operational on the October 5th?

MR. PAUL TOOMEY: So you're referring to -you're talking about with Ben Mod obviously. That involves
-- obviously, it's a lot more complicated. So for example,
there are 74 Legacy interfaces. That obviously had to
increase now with the Pandemic and the different programs
being introduced.

We have been putting in a lot of effort obviously into both systems. I think we've done well over 1,000 different changes from the system to the Pennsylvania system. So we have been putting full effort into the Ben Mod system as we did in the PUA system. Ben Mod, there's just a lot more to it in terms of different programs that it handles.

entered which is from multiple different systems of Legacy data that is in different kinds of shape and repair. So that that alone is a big difference between the PUA system where essentially there was no major data conversion. So Ben Mod is a lot bigger project, a lot more complicated, a lot more involved.

REPRESENTATIVE DUSH: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Chairman Harkins.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN HARKINS: Thank you, Chairman

Cox.

I wasn't going to speak again but with all this talk about PUA, again I go back to that Saturday morning when the rollout came and I can't get those images out of my mind as hard as I try.

It's been a nightmare. I know I speak for many members on both sides of the aisle because many of them have called me. Many of them have seen me and reiterated this point to me. This piece of the puzzle is, was, and still is a complete nightmare.

We received little to no help or guidance or assistance with any of that. And we still can't get questions answered. With it being a Federal issue, I have contacted Congress people, I have contacted U.S. Senate offices. I've even contacted people outside of Pennsylvania. No one seems to have the answers that we need to help our constituents and the consumers.

I would hope that going forward this would change and very quickly with the money being spent. The Federal Government dropped the ball with PUA and we are all stuck because of that. And it is the consumer in the end who will suffer. Changes need to be made.

I intend to keep hammering away at my Federal counterparts. I've even had contact from CNN and some of the other major news networks about some of the things where

we overlap with other states.

I'm 20 minutes from the New York State line and 20 minutes from the Ohio State line. I have major employers in my district who have people who live in Ripley, New York, and work in my district in Erie, Pennsylvania, who can't get answers. They are caught in a bubble. They are caught in a situation where you just feel hopeless with them. It's something that needs to change and it's very frustrating.

I want people to know that we are working on it bipartisan. We are all frustrated with it and we all want to see a change and we're going to make sure that we get a change.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN COX: Thank you, Representative Harkins.

I think it's fair to state that everyone wants this project to go forward. But we also would agree that it needs to be right. It needs to be complete when it goes live. I have a number of concerns, a number of problems. I addressed one at the beginning.

The lack of transparency here, the trending yellow comment that was made in some of the testimony for most of the past year. And then suddenly in June the trending red and then the glowing red, as Mr. Moomaw pointed out, that didn't happen overnight.

There was a transparency issue here. I and the other Chairmen from the House and Senate, we were on calls. We were repeatedly told this project is on time. It was not. And it was clearly not something that they just discovered within the last few weeks. Nobody here wants a disaster. We don't want to see the same headache that we've seen with the PUA system and with the overload of the UC system.

My rhetorical question is, if L&I goes against the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, we're going to have serious delays, confusion, technical issues that are going to be unable to be addressed. And the people of Pennsylvania who rely on this working, they are going to be the ones that suffer. And that's who this Committee speaks for. They are the ones who are already trying to get back pay, trying to get what was owed to them back in earlier months under the existing system. So things are already a mess.

Our district offices have basically become -- one of the individuals talked about it being a satellite office. We all have satellite offices. Every single district office that's open to the public and taking calls has become a satellite office and they probably have one semi-expert on UC in their office. Our offices have been open throughout the State.

Mr. Secretary, I would ask that you push the Governor and that you make things happen where your employees get back into their offices. I notice that you and the IT gentleman were both in your homes and that the other two individuals who testified were seemingly in their State government offices.

I would suggest that all employees who are able to physically come back to work that you make it happen. They get back to work. We've been back at work. We've been working hard for the people of Pennsylvania. It's time to bring the employees of the Department of Labor back in so they can function at the highest level. There's no reason at this point why that can't happen. It needs to happen.

I'll wrap up my comments quickly. I'll further state that I don't understand how the next four days is going to make a difference. We've heard recommendations. We've heard input. I don't see what the next four days are going to change and why a decision can't be made. Maybe it's a technical voting issue. I don't know.

To me, your response today should have been, we are not going to be able to go live on October 5th.

Representative Keefer pointed out a little bit of a deadline or a timeline as far as the educational side of the rollout. You need six weeks for an effective rollout. That hasn't even begun. We are three weeks away. That

should have been started on some level.

I'm not sure why we would want to even subject other families to this if it's not ready. Families rely on this. Families who go back to work only to find out now that their restaurant is forced to operate under the Governor's restrictions and has to shut down or has to lay them off.

Layoffs are still happening. Hours are still being cut. Businesses are finding that they just can't stay open. We can't wait to make this decision. In my mind, and I believe in the minds of several others on this Committee, the decision should have already been made and steps should already be taken.

This is a big responsibility. The Department needs to do everything in its power, absolutely everything in its power, to push GSI to get this job done.

Representative Gleim asked for a new timeline.

I'm going to repeat that request. We need a new timeline.

The Advisory Committee needs to be heavily involved in this.

If new metrics are needed, if existing metrics need to be modified, we need that to happen.

Government is elected by the people to serve them. A lot of what we are able to do was able to be performed from your living room tables, dining room tables, wherever we were working from. But the vast majority of the

workforce has now been able to go back to work and function at its fullest level.

It's time for government workers, Labor &

Industry employees in particular, to get back in the office
so that they can function at the highest level so that we
can remove those who are waiting.

We've heard 3 percent. I call that -- I have questions about that. We still have people that received one week and they never received anything after that. I'm continuing to get calls in my office and I know other members are as well. We have got to get those employees back in. The Department needs to bring them back in.

If I could go so far as to demand that, I would.

I'm going to look into how that might be able to be done but it needs to happen. Perhaps we need legislation to nudge things along. But they need to be back in their offices so that they can help the people of Pennsylvania who have paid into the system and who deserve to be able to put food on their table and pay their rent and their mortgages.

At this time, I'm going to conclude this. I appreciate all the testifiers joining us. I appreciate the input, the information provided, and we certainly will have more questions. We will likely follow up with some written questions to the Department and potentially others if that's okay.

11	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
<ul> <li>5</li> <li>6</li> <li>7</li> <li>8</li> </ul>	
6	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
11	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
14 15 16 17 18	
15 16 17 18 19	
16 17 18 19	
17 18 19	
18 19	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
69	

1	I hereby certify that the proceedings and
2	evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes
3	taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a
4	correct transcript of the same.
5	
6	
7	
8	Jean M. Davis
9	Notary Public
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

**-**70