COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HEARING

STATE CAPITOL
MAIN BUILDING
HOUSE FLOOR
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2022

PRESENTATION FROM INDEPENDENT FISCAL OFFICE

BEFORE:

HONORABLE STANLEY SAYLOR, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE MATT BRADFORD, MINORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE LYNDA SCHLEGEL-CULVER

HONORABLE TORREN ECKER

HONORABLE JONATHAN FRITZ

HONORABLE KEITH GREINER

HONORABLE DOYLE HEFFLEY

HONORABLE JOHNATHAN HERSHEY

HONORABLE LEE JAMES

HONORABLE JOHN LAWRENCE

HONORABLE ZACH MAKO

HONORABLE NATALIE MIHALEK

HONORABLE TIM O'NEAL

HONORABLE CLINT OWLETT

HONORABLE CHRIS QUINN

HONORABLE GREG ROTHMAN

HONORABLE LOUIS SCHMITT

HONORABLE MEGHAN SCHROEDER

HONORABLE JAMES STRUZZI

HONORABLE JESSE TOPPER

HONORABLE RYAN WARNER

HONORABLE JEFF WHEELAND

HONORABLE DAVE ZIMMERMAN

JEAN DAVIS REPORTING

POST OFFICE BOX 125 • HERSHEY, PA 17033

Phone (717) 503-6568

1	BEFORE (cont.'d):
2	HONORABLE AMEN BROWN HONORABLE DONNA BULLOCK
3	HONORABLE MORGAN CEPHAS HONORABLE AUSTIN DAVIS
4	HONORABLE ELIZABETH FIEDLER HONORABLE MANUEL GUZMAN
5	HONORABLE PATTY KIM
6	HONORABKE EMILY KINKEAD HONORABLE STEPHEN KINSEY
7	HONORABLE LEANNE KRUEGER HONORABLE KYLE MULLINS
	HONORABLE BENJAMIN SANCHEZ HONORABLE PETER SCHWEYER
8	HONORABLE JOE WEBSTER
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	<u>-2</u>

1	ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
2	DAVID DONLEY, REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RITCHIE LaFAVER, REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
3	ANNE BALOGA, DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TARA TREES, DEMOCRATIC CHIEF COUNSEL
4	HONORABLE MIKE PEIFER HONORABLE KEVIN BOYLE
5	HONORABLE GARY DAY HONORABLE CRAIG STAATS
6	HONORABLE NAPOLEON NELSON HONORABLE DARISHA PARKER
7	HONORABLE STEVE SAMUELSON
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER NOTARY PUBLIC
13	ROTART TOBLIC
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	2

1	I N D E X TESTIFIERS	
2	TESTIFIERS	
3	NAME	PAGE
4	MATTHEW KNITTEL, DIRECTOR INDEPENDENT FISCAL OFFICE	6
5	BRENDA WARBURTON, DEPUTY DIRECTOR	36
6	INDEPENDENT FISCAL OFFICE	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF INFORMATION	
14		
15	PAGE LINE	
16	13 6-7	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	* * *
3	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: We'll call the
4	Appropriations Hearing for the Independent Fiscal Office to
5	order.
6	I'll ask everybody to take their seats and get
7	ready for the first question to start.
8	Director Knittel and Brenda, would you mind
9	standing and raising your right hand?
L O	
L1	(Witnesses sworn en masse.)
L2	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Thank you.
L3	With that, we will start off with our first
L 4	questioner, which is Representative Culver.
L5	REPRESENTATIVE SCHLEGEL-CULVER: Good morning.
L 6	Thank you for being here today. I just want to
L7	start off by talking about some of the demographics in the
L8	report. When I came to the House, my goodness, at the
L 9	beginning of it was six terms ago, I sat on the Aging
20	Committee for many years. And the Penn State Data Center
21	would come in each session and give us basically the data
22	within our districts and then an overall view of the
23	Commonwealth.
24	I noticed over the time period of 2010 through
25	2020, your office highlighted the change in demographic

challenges currently facing this Commonwealth and the impact that these will have on both expenditures and revenues in future budgets, which is why we are here today, to talk about this budget and future budgets.

So the data in the package shows that for the period of 2010 through 2020, the working population age 20 to 64 declined by approximately 60,000, while the population 65 and older has increased by 528,000.

But what is most noticeable in the data provided is the growth in the baby boomers alone age 65 to 79. Over that same time period it was 519,000. But the school-age population, zero to 19, which is basically, I think, the foundation in the structure for where the Commonwealth goes, declined by 168,000.

Looking into the future, so over the next four-ish years, 2020 to 2025, this picture doesn't seem to be getting any better. That seems to be the going trend for us as a Commonwealth. The population age zero to 64 is anticipated to decline by 254,000, while the population age 65 years and older is anticipated to grow by 322,000.

Given our challenging age demographics, would you say that the anticipated long-term growth, revenue growth, will be able to meet the anticipated long-term expenditure growth within the Commonwealth?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Yes. If I could, referring to

page 7 in the hearing packet where we have our demographic projections. And I do think that we are looking at a challenging picture going forward for the next five years.

As you noted, our working age cohort is actually contracting. And on top of that, we have the lowest labor force participation rate that we've had since 1984. So these effects are compounding one other. And, of course, with fewer people working, you have slower economic growth. So on the revenue side, there's definitely challenges due to both factors.

And then as you noted, due to the retirement of the baby boomers, we are having very strong growth over the five years, 2.7 percent per annum, in the retirees.

And I would also point out for those age 80 and above where a lot of the costs demands are for long-term living, they are going by 3.5 percent per annum, which for a demographic growth is extremely strong. That's from 25 to 30. So, yes, challenges on both sides of the budget.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHLEGEL-CULVER: You know, like I said, when I got here I was on the Aging Committee. And they were trying to prepare us for what they termed the Silver Tsunami. I believe we are there and we'll continue to see the effects of that as we go into the next few years.

So what would you advise us as policymakers to keep in mind, one, about our current tax structure; two,

about expanding and creating new service initiatives given these demographic challenges? Because the concern is, if we don't have the population to enter the workforce to generate the revenues that we need, how do we pay for them? And if you know anything about our aging population, your needs don't decrease as you age. They certainly increase. And we are already not meeting that need.

So what do you have for us? What advice do you have for us as policymakers?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: So this trend has been long developing. And I think people understand where we are right now, that there's a lot of significant challenges. As policymakers, I think we, you, need to do what we can in order to attract residents into the Commonwealth.

And there's a number of ways that could be done, higher education institutions. But what we've seen in terms of the overall demographic picture from Pennsylvania is that the birth and death rates are about the same so there was no organic growth. About the same number of folks are coming into the state and leaving the state domestically. And that just leaves international migration if we want any additional growth.

So that's the picture over the next five to ten years, challenging, but I think if we could attract residents and retain college students who are from out of

state, that will help to address this issue.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHLEGEL-CULVER: I just want to point out one of the things I had heard in the report that you would think with the advances in medicine and the advances in technology, that the upcoming generations would be healthier, but the reports are showing that they are actually not. And the cost of health care for them and the cost of services will be more than any generation preceding them. So I think it's important for us to have this data. But I think it's also important that we need to really start to buckle down and address them.

So thank you very much.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Our next questioner is Representative Lee James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Director Knittel and staff, good afternoon.

Thank you for coming in today. I want to compliment you.

You may be the only organization here that's truly

nonpartisan in this whole building.

I do have two quick questions. Number 1, I was looking at the brief budget numbers here. And I see for '21-'22 your budget was flat-lined from the year before and proposed to be flat-lined again but you're going to come up about \$400,000 short. How do you propose to make that up?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Yes. In our budget material we have an operating deficit of about \$400,000. And we have a flat-line appropriation. Currently the way we are addressing that is through unused appropriations from prior years. We have about \$4.3 million of unused appropriations from prior years and we're using them currently.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: There you go.

Thank you very much.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the labor force and some of the data and graphs and so forth that you have presented.

In the budget presentation here earlier today, I believe it was in there that it was said that there was approximately 350,000 jobs that were lost permanently in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania over the two-year COVID program, which brings our employment levels down to 2007 level and labor participation all the way back to 1984.

I'm not so sure that statement or those statistics are critical. What's critical, I think, is what are we going to do tomorrow? I wonder if you could comment today on your expectations and projections for our labor force and labor participation as we go into the new year?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. So as you noted in the packet, we do have some data here on pages 3 and 4 about the labor force and participation. Going forward, we are

projecting 80,000 jobs to be added in the current year. We added 115,000 last year. We do think that the labor force participation, which is at the lowest level since 1984, we do anticipate that will turn around a bit here but still remain low going forward.

So I characterize that as the jobs outlook as not as good as last year where we picked up 115,000 jobs. But ordinarily, we would add about forty to fifty thousand jobs in a non-COVID year. So a little bit above normal, but still not where we need to go.

We are down permanently about three hundred to three hundred fifty thousand jobs.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: It may be unanswerable.

But do you have any clue as to where those jobs went, those

350,000?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: So if we look across sectors, they are particular sectors, such as restaurants or leisure. We lost a lot of temp jobs. We lost a lot of residential nursing care facilities. We think, again, due to efficiencies in the economic and different ways of spending patterns that the jobs won't be coming back, for example, also for remote working.

The temp agencies, we lost about 30,000 jobs there; building maintenance services, lost jobs there. So it's pretty widespread. The only sectors that picked up

1 jobs have to do with transportation or warehousing or 2 delivery, such as FedEx and UPS. So we don't see these 3 trends reversing. 4 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. 5 I yield back my time. 6 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Bullock 7 is our next questioner. 8 REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. 9 10 We've talked a lot about -- or we've been talking 11 about the larger economic trends for the state as a whole, 12 how industries have been lost or we may not see come back. 13 But we also know that different parts of the state and 14 different groups experience the economy differently. 15 For example, in 2020 I believe Pennsylvania had 16 the highest black unemployment rate in the country. One in 17 five black Pennsylvanians were out of work. If we look 18 deeper, how does the recovery look for different demographic 19 subgroups, such as communities of color, different age 20 groups, low income, middle class, and higher income 21 communities in Pennsylvania? 22 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: So regarding the labor market 23 recovery -- and I, again, think it will be partial.

where we were prior to COVID to the 2019 levels. And the

think it will take about four or five years to get back to

24

25

job losses were broad-based, but they were particularly concentrated in certain industries, as we noted.

Going forward, as you noted, for the black unemployment rate, it still remains higher than it is for other groups. We haven't looked at that issue specifically. If it's helpful, we can take a look at that and provide that information.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: That would be helpful.

And do you know of any other demographics or areas of the economy which certain groups, whether it be age group or other demographics, that they're either hit differently, harsher or faster or quicker, how those economic trends impact those communities? Can you share that with us today or share with us at a later point?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure.

We have some additional detail. This wasn't part of the hearing packet. But as part of our midyear update, we did look at the impact on age groups. And the contraction was strong across all age groups. There's been a lot of articles about early retirements. And certainly that occurred in Pennsylvania.

But if you look across the younger groups, I'm looking here, 19 to 24 and 25 to 34, the ratio of employment to population for both of these groups fell by 5 or 6 percentage points. So it's not just older folks who are

1 retiring early. It was across the board for all age groups.

And I would say in Pennsylvania, at least, the data that we're seeing, it did hit younger age groups more so than older age groups.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Great. That's very helpful.

Moving on to another subject -- and I think you touched on this briefly with the previous questions -- when we are looking at the different industries that may be leaving or coming during the last few years, what are your thoughts on those trends and how can we address them going forward?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Yes. So I turned to refer to page 3 in the packet where we were looking at the trends since COVID, since 2019. And clearly, the gains are in anything to do with warehousing storage or transportation jobs. We have some gains in real estate, some retail gains.

But going forward, I think, due to the demographics that we're seeing in here in the state, the real growth industry will be health care. And as people are aging out in their home, home health care workers, the number of employees in the nursing home and residential care are down 30,000.

So this tells us -- and we have a report on performance-based budgeting that shows that the percentage

of older Pennsylvanians in nursing homes is declining every
year. So health care and high tech is where we think the
growth will be going forward.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: So given that statement, for Pennsylvania to move forward, what investments would you recommend in the future of work in Pennsylvania? I'm hearing health care. What are the ways that we can support the future of work for the Commonwealth?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: So I think certainly support for higher education is beneficial. Right now one of our main concerns is getting folks back into the labor force. Employers have offered stipends to pay for college or perhaps child care to get parents back into the workforce. They are both beneficial.

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Thank you very much.

I have no further questions.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Our next questioner is Representative Natalie Mihalek.

REPRESENTATIVE MIHALEK: Thank you for being here with us today and for the budget materials that you shared.

I wanted to follow up on my colleague's questions regarding domestic migration. I noticed in the materials that it provided information for mostly Mid-Atlantic states. And generally speaking, the Mid-Atlantic states are doing well on overall tax burdens.

Just yesterday the Wall Street Journal noted that ten states with the most domestic migration growth had an average state and local tax burden of 7.7 percent. The ten states with the worst domestic migration figures had an average state and local tax burden of 9.9 percent.

So when you're considering our population loss in these trends, what role do you think our tax burden is playing and how can we move forward in that as policymakers? I know that you've told my colleague that we should focus on policies that can attract residents into the state and retain students. But are there any specific policies with regard to tax reforms that you can comment on?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Yes. And in the packet, I would refer to page 13 where we compare the Pennsylvania tax burden to other states, to Mid-Atlantic states and some peer states, we're relatively high for some, relatively lower for others. But overall I would characterize us in the middle of the pack.

I would say anything as far as economic growth that can attract newer firms into the Commonwealth, start-up firms, anything that's export-based industries, that you're exporting out and bringing the monies in. We now have a new dynamic from remote working. So if we can attract remote workers into the Commonwealth, any policies that we can do for that is a positive.

Just on the domestic migration issue, I would like to note a positive. The latest data that we have suggests that the inflows and outflows from Pennsylvania are now about even. It used to be that about ten to twenty thousand residents were leaving the state. The most recent data suggests that it is now roughly even.

REPRESENTATIVE MIHALEK: And that data indicated that -- because I think the big question is, where is everybody going? And they're going to Florida, Texas, Arizona, North Carolina, South Carolina, Idaho, Utah. And many of those states that I just mentioned -- in fact, I think all but Texas -- are in the top 15 for having the lowest CNIT.

I wanted to shift very quickly to dynamic modeling. I think this can be helpful for the Legislature in developing tax policies moving forward. Act 77 of 2021 included a provision requiring the IFO to utilize dynamic modeling in certain situations, specifically if there's a fiscal impact expected in excess of \$50 million.

Could you just provide a brief description of what dynamic modeling is? I think it's a term that's thrown around a lot. Just for the benefit and the sake of the hearing today.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. Well, I compare dynamic modeling to static modeling. Static assumes no behavioral

responses, macro-economic responses in the overall economy. So that it does not allow the state economy to grow or contract. It does take into account consumer behaviors or taxpayer behavior. But the overall economy cannot grow or shrink.

Dynamic modeling allows the economy to grow or shrink in response to various policies, whether it be spending or taxes. So it's probably more accurate for a larger proposals way to estimate the impact for the economy.

REPRESENTATIVE MIHALEK: And the IFO had just purchased a model in order to perform this dynamic modeling required by Act 70. Could you just specifically comment on what exactly was purchased and how it's been utilized so far?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. Prior to this purchase we had a model called IMPLAN, which is an input/output model. The model that we just purchased is known as REMI. It's used by at least a dozen other states for dynamic estimation. The capabilities of REMI are very broad and widespread.

Right now, what we are doing with the model is to populate it with Pennsylvania-specific data. So there's a lot of data inputs. And we're also calibrating it. So what we intend to do as soon as we calibrate it is to run some simulations. And what we plan right now is to simulate a 1

1 and 2 percentage point increase in the corporate income tax 2 rate and the personal income tax rate to see what the 3 dynamic effect is from there. 4 REPRESENTATIVE MIHALEK: So when you're performing those dynamics, it's under the request of a 5 6 specific list of officers. Could you say who those officers 7 are? 8 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. There are 14 requesting 9 There's the Speaker and the President Pro 10 There are the Majority and Minority Leaders of the 11 House and the Senate, the four Chairs of the Appropriations 12 Committees and the four Chairs of the Standing Committees to 13 which the bills are referred. 14 REPRESENTATIVE MIHALEK: And when a request like 15 that is made, does it trigger an automatic public 16 notification of the results? 17 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Any material or analysis that 18 we do with regards to REMI or any other proposals, we do 19 post to our website. We send it to the requester three days 20 ahead of time, offer to meet with them. And then we post it 21 to our website and it's publicly available. 22 REPRESENTATIVE MIHALEK: Thank you so much. 23 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. 24 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Our next questioner is

Representative Kruger.

25

Thank you. 2 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative, do you 3 have your tent? REPRESENTATIVE KRUGER: I do not. 4 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Okay. Thank you. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE KRUGER: Thank you so much for 7 joining us here today for this first official day of House 8 Appropriations Budget Hearings. 9 I want to dive in a bit to the numbers because in 10 the previous hearing this morning, some of my colleagues 11 pointed out the difference between the projections from the 12 Administration, specifically the Department of Revenue, and 1.3 what we are seeing through the Independent Fiscal Office. 14 I want to note that for this year, your forecast 15 is 364 million higher than the Department of Revenue's 16 projections but both of you are off. We are currently 17 looking at year-to-date revenues of 26.148 billion, which is 18 \$2.2 billion higher than what you had initially projected. 19 And I understand that doing these projections, 20 it's a moving target, right? And as we heard from a 21 previous speaker, there's different kinds of economic modeling that get us to the projections so that we can 22 23 budget accordingly just like we would at our own homes. 24 So my first question for you is this: Are you

REPRESENTATIVE KRUGER:

1

25

surprised by how strong revenues have been so far this

fiscal year? And what do you attribute the difference
between your projection and the revenues to date?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: And you are speaking just for this current fiscal year?

REPRESENTATIVE KRUGER: For the current fiscal year that we're in, yes.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Correct. Yes.

So I can say first, yes, we were surprised by the strength of the revenues. We think there are various issues driving that, some of them technical. I put the first reason as more of the stimulus monies are being spent than we had assumed. The surveys about a year ago showed that one-third of the monies, the economic impact payments, were being spent. The latest surveys that we are seeing now suggest it's closer to two-thirds.

I know there was discussion about durable goods purchases before. And that is very notable in Pennsylvania. That share has gone up about 3 percentage points versus historical levels. Every percentage point is adding \$200 million on to sales and use tax revenues. So we're thinking that will revert partially next year.

The final thing I would note, very unusual year because of the massive Federal stimulus that came into the state economy. I suspect, but we don't have the data, that the economic multipliers were larger than they normally are

due to the massive infusions. So I think those are all driving it.

In regards to the second question, yes, we are about 306 million higher than the Department of Revenue. We think there's a bit of an extra kick that's still out there. The Federal Reserve data on checking account balances show that they're still very flush through the third quarter. So we still think there's some extra stimulus monies to be spent. And we are expecting a strong final payment in personal income tax due to the very significant gains in the stock market. And we know that dividend payments were strong as well.

REPRESENTATIVE KRUGER: Thank you.

Thank you for clarifying that.

So just as a followup, which of those revenue sources do you think have the potential to continue to grow next fiscal year? I heard a lot of it could be due to the Federal dollars which will at some point be spent and then be gone. What will continue next year?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: So for next year, if there's any upside to the forecast, I would look at withholding wage growth. So the wage growth that we're seeing is very strong. And if the labor force participation rate doesn't increase, we think the strong wage growth could continue. So there's a potential upside there depending on labor force

1	participation.
2	REPRESENTATIVE KRUGER: I appreciate that.
3	And can you just expand on that a little bit?
4	What is possible if we continue with this kind of wage
5	growth?
6	DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Speaking for IFO, we had a 5.1
7	percent wage growth. Again, that's coming off a very strong
8	year last year where the wage growth was about 8.3 or 8.4
9	percent of course coming off a weak year. So it's possible
10	that could be a percentage point or 1 and a half percentage
11	points higher, again depending on the labor force
12	participation.
13	REPRESENTATIVE KRUGER: So 1 and a half to 2
14	percent above the 5.1 percent?
15	DIRECTOR KNITTEL: I would say perhaps 1 to 1.5.
16	That's plausible.
17	REPRESENTATIVE KRUGER: And how would that
18	translate to revenues?
19	DIRECTOR KNITTEL: That I don't have in front of
20	me, the computation, a few hundred million. But I don't
21	have the exact figure.
22	REPRESENTATIVE KRUGER: Okay. Thank you very
23	much. I appreciate you joining us today.
24	DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Thank you.
25	REPRESENTATIVE KRUGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Mr. Knittel, just a

clarification. There has been a lot of discussion about

forecast. Am I correct the forecast that you gave in last

year's was not inclusive of the Federal stimulus dollars

that came into the state after that forecast? Am I correct?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: That is correct.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Thank you.

Next is Representative Lou Schmitt.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHMITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, folks. Thanks for coming over.

I want to switch gears on you a little bit. One of the responsibilities of the IFO is to respond to requests of the members of the General Assembly to provide economic revenue or fiscal analysis to the extent that staff resources are available.

We always see when a piece of legislation comes out, the IFO says it's going to have this impact. It's going to have that impact. How do I -- as a member of the General Assembly, how do I initiate that process to request an analysis from the IFO on a piece of my legislation?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. Any member of the

General Assembly can reach out to my office either through

our contact box, or you can contact myself or Brenda

directly. You can tell us what you're interested in. We

will meet either with you or with your staff and we will

1 discuss what the capabilities are. In general, our office 2 policy is that if we have the resources and we have data, 3 that we will undertake the analysis. 4 And again, once we undertake it, we will transmit 5 our results to the member and then three days following that we will post it to our public website. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE SCHMITT: Are you folks able to do 8 an analysis for all of the requests received? I think you 9 just mentioned that you don't do an analysis maybe for 10 substantive reasons. 11 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: In my ten years we had to turn 12 down two or three requests. Most of that was due to lack of 1.3 data. So if we don't have data to analyze, generally we 14 don't have any value to add and we would not undertake the 15 request. 16 REPRESENTATIVE SCHMITT: Does your office 17 prioritize requests that it receives in a certain manner? 18 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Only on a first-come, 19 first-serve basis. 20 REPRESENTATIVE SCHMITT: Thank you very much. 21 appreciate that. 22 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 23 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Next is Representative 24 Kinkead. 25 REPRESENTATIVE KINKEAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for joining us today. I just have a 1 2 quick question about labor force participation, particularly 3 in regards to the prime age male participation in the workforce. One of the things that we have seen in the 4 5 pandemic -- well, we were seeing before the pandemic was a 6 dramatic drop in 25- to 34-year-old men actually 7 participating in the workforce. We've seen an even more 8 precipitous drop since the pandemic. 9 Do you believe that one of the ways that we could 10 potentially alleviate that is by actually investing more 11 money to fully fund access to child care because we are

seeing more men choosing to be stay-at-home parents because of the need and the pandemic?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Yes. I have seen the same trend that you alluded to for working-age men in that age I would say regardless of the age or gender, child care is an important component of folks rejoining the labor force and would only be a positive.

> REPRESENTATIVE KINKEAD: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Our next questioner is Representative Owlett.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Director, for being here. I appreciate you taking the time and your hard work in putting these numbers together for us.

Looking back we really had no idea that -- like the Chairman talked a little bit about not knowing how much money would be coming from the Federal Government. Are you anticipating any money coming from the Federal Government in 2022, this year?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: No, not any additional amounts. The only thing I believe -- the program that's ongoing is the enhanced SNAP benefits. Those are still, I think, through March. They could be extended further. But that's all we have built-in right now.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: We talked quite a bit about the spike in sales tax from durable goods. I just want to drill down a little bit more on that. What has been the economic impact of that? We've seen an increase. Talk a little bit about the numbers on that.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. I think it's been very dramatic. So there are two things happening here. One is just a shift over towards goods. The second item, if you look at Pennsylvania, durable goods inflation is really what's driving the overall growth in the CPI. So not only did you have greater demand for these goods but the prices were going up rapidly.

As I noted prior, the share of money spent on taxable items, durable goods, has increased by 3 percentage

points. And each percentage point is worth about \$200 million. So that shift after COVID hit we think was worth about \$600 million in extra sales tax collections.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: So when we look forward, moving forward in drafting a budget that's reasonable and, you know, responsible, the numbers really are different from what you're projecting and what Revenue is projecting.

And the '22-'23 Budget, we're looking at about -I mean, yours are about 3.2 percent lower, which is like a
billion dollars. I mean, it's a lot of money. So here we
are as policymakers. We have to make a decision on revenue
numbers and how to plan for the future.

If we went with this, with the Governor's Budget, and the numbers come back that we're -- you know, given the demographics that you're talking about and the challenges we're facing here as a state, where is that going to leave us as a state in our budget going into next year if we went with the Governor's proposal and your numbers? What does that do for us?

about the differential here, because I know there's been some discussion, we are a billion dollars lower than the Administration for next year. We are not forecasting a recession or a sales tax recession. What is happening here is a partial reversion back to normality. There has been

\$120 billion of Federal stimulus injected into the state.

There are these technical issues that we talked about about purchasing durable goods that we don't think can be maintained. It will revert back.

And for basically those two reasons we have a slight contraction of 3 percent in sales tax revenues. So we've taken all these into account in our models. But the \$120 billion of Federal stimulus is just massive and it's no longer there.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: I'll go back.

I mean, over the course of, you know, five or six years, I mean, what the Governor is projecting is, you know, a 4.2 percent growth and the IFO is at 1.8. I mean, those are big numbers. I mean, I want to be responsible because, I mean, that's quite a -- that would be quite a tax increase that we'd have to come up with and money we'd have to find for next year's budget if we had to come up with, you know, \$700 million, \$800 million next year.

That's where we're at. I think the biggest questions that we're going to have to face as policymakers is, you know, do we really think that people are going to spend money they don't have? You said it today. The money has -- a lot of it's been spent.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Um-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: And the Federal

1 Government is likely not going to be coming with additional 2 funds. So we have some really big decisions to make. 3 just want people to realize that, you know, the numbers that you're projecting are different than Revenue's and it would 4 put us in a hole if we went with the Governor's numbers 5 6 instead of yours. 7 So thank you for being here. And thank you for 8 crunching the numbers. 9 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Thank you. 10 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: 11 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Our next questioner is 12 Representative Guzman. 13 REPRESENTATIVE GUZMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 14 And thank you so much for your time this afternoon. 15 We heard earlier on in this hearing about 16 population loss. Isn't it true that the Hispanic Latino 17 community here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has an 18 increased population about over 45 percent? 19 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: I know it's been very strong. 20 I don't have the exact figure. But it has been robust. 21 REPRESENTATIVE GUZMAN: Yes. And so the Latino 22 community is the strongest performing demographic within the 23 Commonwealth over the last census -- to the census, would 24 you agree with that, or at least one of the best performing

25

subgroups?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: That sounds correct to me, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE GUZMAN: Correct. And so perhaps maybe this body should be more in tune to the needs of the Latino community.

Moving on though, in your packet you discuss the types of industries with the largest impact to employment by the COVID-19 pandemic both positively and negatively.

Can you talk about the sectors that took a hit, which ones have shown strength, and the outlook for those sectors?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. You refer to page 3 of our packet handout where we had the gains and losses. And on the loss side, again, we were looking at the leisure and hospitality sector. We're looking at temp workers where we have contraction. We're looking at accommodations such as hotels, amusements, and gamings. Those have been the very noticeable contractions. I also noted nursing and residential care. Less folks are going into nursing homes and they're choosing to age out at their home.

We expect that those job losses are generally permanent, that they wouldn't be recouped. On the positive side, again, these are due to warehousing and storage, couriers and messengers.

I should note that the data you see here and that

we're discussing, it doesn't include self-employed individuals. It doesn't include, you know, Grubhub or DoorDash or things such as that. We suspect there's been a lot of growth there but we don't have the data to quantify it.

REPRESENTATIVE GUZMAN: Great.

1.3

And then my final question, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back after this.

Last week we had a committee meeting with the Chancellor of PASSHE schools where, you know, we talked about the difficulties that PASSHE is currently having in light of declining student enrollment both from demographic factors and because of the cost of attendance, of course.

So we know that we -- in the General Assembly we know we need to do more on the cost front side by supporting the system's budget request. But can you give us an update on the demographic sides and how those trends are looking for different age brackets?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Yes. So for our demographic projections, and we included it, but I'm going to look specifically at the age group from 18 to 22. That number for 2021 is 828,000. By the time we get to 2025, we have a contraction of 44,000 down to 784,000. And then heading out to 2030, we have another further contraction of 22,000

1 individuals in that age group. So very stark.

REPRESENTATIVE GUZMAN: Indeed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative Guzman,
I would say that I've actually met with the Latino community
in Lancaster recently and look forward to having that
discussion with you on your ideas with the Latino community
because I agree with you. We need to be focused on how we
can help and better the community as its growth is here.
You are absolutely right. Our Latino population has soared.
I don't know what those exact numbers are but I look forward
to discussion with you.

REPRESENTATIVE GUZMAN: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: With this we'll move to Representative Greiner.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you both for coming today. This is a question to Director Knittel.

We have been focusing, as my one colleague said here, we want to be responsible when we put the budget together and look at the revenue side. But I'm concerned about the expenditure side, too. And in particular, the Department of Human Services, which is one of the biggest, if not the biggest, agency we had to deal with here in the Commonwealth.

Your five-year economic forecast, five-year economic and budget outlook on page 30 shows DHS expenditure is growing by \$611 million, \$611 million for the year '23-'24. I just want to point that out.

The Governor's Budget proposes a General Fund total increase for all departments and agencies of only -- of about \$119 million for years '22 and '23. I want to kind of let everybody hear what I just said, what you said for DHS and what the Governor is saying for all agencies.

Looking forward through '26-'27 over a four-year period, your projections assume DHS expenditures increase by about \$2.2 billion. However, the Governor anticipates total General Funding expenditures for all departments -- for all departments and agencies only to be increasing by about \$1.7 billion over that period.

Do you believe that the Governor's proposed expenditure growth through '26-'27 is realistic in light of the numbers that you have presented?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. I can refer to our five-year forecast that we put out in November. Over the budget horizon through '26-'27, we have average growth and expenditures of 3 percent per annum. Historically, it's been about 3.4 percent per annum. In the Executive budget the average growth over that time period from the budget year through '26-'27 is 0.9 percent.

So there is a difference of opinion about how expenditures will be growing.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Correct. I mean, like I said, I'm a CPA. I'm looking at this and the math is really fuzzy looking at the Governor's budget moving forward into future years. I'm having a hard time getting my hands around it. I mean, you don't have to be an accountant to try to figure out that something is not right with these projections moving forward with inflation. It's about 7 percent right now. I'm just making that comment.

And you're probably not going to be able to answer this. But in my thoughts for the Governor -- for the Governor's Budget to even come close to coming true, that means we're going to have to probably cut programs in DHS to get to that spending level that he wants to or eliminate programs or changing requirements or -- I mean, I don't know.

All I'm saying is there's -- to me there's not a degree of realism going out the next four years in the Governor's Budget, at least in my thoughts. I mean, how would we get -- how do we get to that -- you know, it's like a half a percent growth or it's less than 1 percent growth, as you said. I think we looked at that, too, and reviewed that. Maybe you can shed some light on that.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Yes. The number we have

computed from the budget year through '26-'27 is 0.9 percent. The underlying detail or what the summations are, I can't comment on that. Let me check with Brenda to see if there was a specific policy on the expenditure side.

MS. WARBURTON: Not that I'm aware of. I think we're waiting to see more budget detail during the hearing process, especially for DHS.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: As my colleague to start this hearing said, you probably are the most nonpartisan agency here in the Commonwealth so I do appreciate you being upfront on how you came up with your projections moving forward for the next four years.

I mean, we, of course -- and we talked about the revenues and the projections now putting together the budget for the upcoming year. But we do have a responsibility to look at how this is going to impact these out years futurewise.

And I think you made another excellent point that we've discussed earlier that this Federal stimulus money has really created -- I want to say people are able to spend more money. But as far as projections, it's a burden trying to figure out where we're going to go in the future. And obviously, we have seen the inflation that's been derived by this money that's been, you know, put into the system.

I thank you for your time. Thank you for being

here.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Our next questioner is Representative Fritz.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: Much appreciated, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, Director Knittel.

Mr. Director, we have competing states across this nation and neighboring states, in particular, Ohio, that are seeing pronounced growth of business manufacturing and industry. Can you kindly share your thoughts on what gives them, what gives them, the advantage over our Keystone State? Mr. Director, is it incentives, regulatory environment, leadership, geographic proximity, workforce availability, tax environment, etc.? Please speak to that.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: We haven't examined that. We did look around at our peer states. And again, I'll refer to page 13 and the state and local tax burden about how we rank relative to other states in terms of tax.

I'll note for the overall tax structure, we have Pennsylvania being ranked 20th across all 50 states. Ohio is somewhat lower. They're ranked 26th in terms of state and local tax burden.

I suspect that, though we haven't looked at it, demographics is also a key element of that. Pennsylvania is

an older state. And that's causing slower economic growth here or contributing to it.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: So you're speaking in particular about tax burden. But really what I'm trying to find is the X factor, states that see this growth and expansion of their economy and wooing new people to their state. What are those reasons? What are the most compelling reasons that people are investing in business and moving to those states?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: I think it's probably a variety of factors. Certainly where they're seeing most of the growth now I would say is down south or out west is potentially weather-related. People are moving there for retirement or for other reasons.

The reason that Ohio is outcompeting

Pennsylvania, I can't point to a specific factor about
what's driving that.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: Okay. Well, how about can you share with us maybe -- again, you have a very unique vantage point and access to data. So that's why I'm trying to cull these answers from you. If you could speak to a few things that Pennsylvania is doing well, share with us your observation.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: I think there's a number of things that Pennsylvania is doing well. I know we have a

number of strengths. One of them is a diversified economy. I think every state weathered the COVID pandemic generally well. That was due to the Federal infusion of funds. If that had not occurred, I think Pennsylvania would have been better positioned to weather the storm due to the diversified economy, due to the fact that we have an export base, due to the fact that we have many institutions of higher education where we attract individuals into the state. So I think that's well done.

1.3

And I think we have a balanced tax portfolio when we compare to other states. We are not particularly vulnerable if the stock market goes up or down or people switch their spending.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: Okay. So I appreciate that response. And for what it's worth, I concur.

So let's do the flip side of the coin. What are three areas? And I really want to focus on the top three areas where Pennsylvania could do better in order to be more competitive.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Well, again, I would point to demographics, to anything we can do to either retain residents who are here or retain individuals who come into the state for, say, higher education. In particular, that younger demographic is very attractive.

Anything we can do to attract jobs, in particular

1	export-based jobs, that pull in monies into the economy.
2	And now with the new dynamic from remote working, anything
3	we can do to encourage remote workers to locate into the
4	state because, once again, they are pulling monies into the
5	state that can be spent here. So the dynamic is different.
6	REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: Okay. That was two items.
7	You got a third for us?
8	DIRECTOR KNITTEL: I'll have to defer on that.
9	Nothing is coming to mind.
10	REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ: Okay. I appreciate your
11	responses.
12	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Our next questioner is
14	Representative Jesse Topper.
15	REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16	Good afternoon.
17	DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Good afternoon.
18	REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Director Knittel, you've
19	looked at the Governor's revenue estimates. If you had a
20	word that could describe those, what would it be?
21	DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Well, I'll phrase my comments
22	relative to our projections. And I'd say they lean
23	optimistic.
24	REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: So one of the things that
25	we heard this morning was that the Department was using his

market data, which, you know, I asked the question, was that what the IFO is using as well? So I think we've heard that it is or at least part of it. Can you describe how you've come to those? We've heard the Department describe how they came to their estimates.

If you could just describe how you've come to your revenue estimates, particularly in the sales tax department over the next few budget cycles.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. Let me speak to how our process works. We will make a forecast internally using real-time data for the next year or two. When we make long-term projections, we're assuming the economy reverts to a normal, steady state growth rate so we are not using IHS market insight regarding the differential in sales tax and the economics and the personal income tax. So I think there's some technical factors that work here due to the stimulus. It's very hard to interpret it.

However, regarding the economics, on page A-119 in the Executive Budget, you will see the economic assumptions. And for 2022, IHS market is assuming that we produce 214,000 jobs. We only produced 115,000 last year coming off a historic contraction with \$120 billion of Federal stimulus monies. So we don't think we're going to double the number of jobs this year compared to last year. And we have 80,000 jobs for this year.

That differential in the number of jobs created, 1 2 214,000 versus 80,000, is driving a lot of the differential 3 in sales tax revenues and personal income tax. REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Look, we all understand 4 that we are -- we do have estimates, right? When you do a 5 6 budget, you have to have estimates. Those don't always come 7 to fruition. And as we acknowledge as well, there's no 8 crystal ball. However, there is the best data that's out 9 there that we can use to -- we have to use something. 10 Right? 11 So what we're trying to establish is, what is our 12 baseline going to be? And so with that, as we enter these 1.3 budget negotiations, so on the record you can just say, you 14 do stand by all of your estimates as we move forward? 15 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Yes. Absolutely. REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Thank you very much. 16 17 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Our last questioner 19 before we get to Chairman Bradford is Representative Torren 20 Ecker. 21 REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 22 Good afternoon, Director Knittel and Deputy 23 Director Warburton. Thank you for being here.

IFO, which is one of their primary tasks is to deal with the

So I want to turn here to another function of the

24

25

performance-based budget and reports. And before we get into that, I just, you know, every year -- just to give some background, every year the IFO has been tasked with Act 48 of 2017 to do some of these performance reports every year. It's on a five-year cycle. You look at various agencies. And, Director Knittel, can you just briefly describe the IFO's role in those reports?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Sure. Every year we undertake a study to develop five or six agencies. We reach out to them roughly about March and set up meetings. At that time, we work with them to identify their main activities and what data they have available. And then we work with them over the summer and fall to develop the performance metrics that will go into the report.

REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: And under the statute, I believe you are required to undertake performance measures, you also include outcome-based measures, including efficiency measures, activity costs analysis, ratio measures, measures of status improvements, and recipient population s, economic outcomes of performance, benchmarks against similar state programs or other similar state jurisdictions.

Does that sound accurate, as you understand it, as your task?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Yes. There is a long list of

performance measures we can develop. We do have some discretion when we're developing them.

REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: And as part of this process, I believe, in keeping transparent and going through this process, you've talked about you meet with the individual departments. But it's my understanding you also meet with the different caucuses as well that represent the PBB Board, correct?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: That is correct. For each agency report we do meet with legislative staff from all four caucuses.

REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: And the point here is that, you know, when you do your work, you do your analysis, it's completely independent of really anybody other than the data that's before you, correct?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: So like turning to this year's Performance-Based Budgeting Boards, as you are aware we had the Department of Education in front of us and that report was tabled by the Board. Because this stuff is already put out in public, once you do the report, you publish these immediately, correct?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: That's incorrect. After we transmit it to the Board, a few days thereafter and prior to the hearing, we will put it up on our website.

REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: So in the past, usually
under the Performance-Based Budgeting Board there's been
requests for additional information and clarification and
those types of parameters from some of the Board members if

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: That's correct. We've undertaken addendums in the past.

there was missing information, correct?

with the Education Report, that was not the case. And unfortunately before the Board could even consider it, it was tabled. So in turning to that report, since it is public already, is there anything in that, in the Education Report, as far as data is concerned that you question that was inaccurate or you don't stand by it as of today?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: No. We stand by all of the data that is contained in the report.

REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: And, you know, I know there was some letters that went back and forth after that meeting. One of the hang-ups I think with some of the other Board members was some data that suggested that there was little or no correlation between expenditures per student and proficient test scores; is that correct?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: That is correct. There was some concern over a graph that we had in the report that presented the data and a sentence that made a general

observation about the data.

1.3

REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: So without going too far down that road, when you do these reports for performance-based budgeting, you make assertions in other reports, correct? This isn't out of line with your duty under the act, correct?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: I would say that we make up observations. For example, the data suggests X or it appears that X and Y influenced this outcome. And we do that in all our reports.

REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: With the idea that us as policymakers then take that information or through Appropriations hearings to, you know, extrapolate whatever that means or whatever that data means. In this case maybe that means there needs to be more money for education or there needs to be, you know, are we sending money in the right -- you know, the right areas? Those I guess assertions or observations, if you will, are used for policymakers to make those decisions and take them as they will, correct?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: That's correct. We're just trying to provide context and background, not to make recommendations .

REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: And real briefly, if I could, under the -- and as part of this process, the

departments are allowed to respond to their various reports 1 2 before they're made public, correct? 3 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Yes. For this particular report, the Department of Education sought two draft 4 versions. And they submitted a letter that's in the 5 6 appendix. 7 REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: And nowhere in there do 8 they really raise any issues with the data or even the 9 observation that I alluded to there before, correct? 10 DIRECTOR KNITTEL: The only feedback we received 11 about this particular topic was that in the manner we 12 presented the data, they don't usually view the data in that fashion. 13 14 REPRESENTATIVE ECKER: My time has expired. 15 And, Director Knittel and Deputy Director, I 16 appreciate your expertise. I know that that was questioned 17 at the Performance-Based Budget hearing, which was really 18 disappointing to hear. But I appreciate your work and look 19 forward to hopefully reconvening that Board in the near 20 future. 21 Thank you. 22 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Representative 23 Bradford, comments? 24 MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: Thank you, Chairman.

And thank you. I have a couple questions about

25

dynamic scoring and the role it plays in demographics.

1.3

One of the issues that we've been banting around a good bit this morning is the Governor's proposal to reduce the Corporate Net Income Tax through a process called add-backs. Has anyone ever suggested that we should look at a dynamic scoring model for what a reduction of CNI would do, whether done through prior sessions, combined reporting, or through add-backs as the Governor is currently proposing?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: No, nobody has requested that as of yet.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: Well, one of the things that I can't help but keep thinking -- and, you know, I was recently looking at a map of our Commonwealth and just a population bleed that we have in western Pennsylvania.

And by western, I mean all the hardcore southeastern corner is, you know -- literally it's not the cheapest place to live in Pennsylvania. Sometimes it has a higher tax burden. But those intangibles alone in terms of dynamic scoring, looking at the broader picture of how it may change behavior, clearly there is more at stake.

You know, I go down everything, from the quality of schools, the quality of life, parks, amenities, existing employers, access to transit proximity to big cities.

There's much more that goes into that type of model that you would need to really look at in terms of how something like

1 that plays out.

I mean, on a cold day in south central

Pennsylvania, I think a lot of people would say the real

argument to go to Florida may not be the CNI. It may be

spring training or the 65 degree weather.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: So just to rephrase that question, are you asking about dynamic modeling in regards to a specific part of the state or region?

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: I guess what I'm saying is tax rate alone isn't enough to tell the entire story but tax rate is certainly part of the story that we need to look at in terms of Pennsylvania's desirability.

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: I would agree with that statement.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: So one of my concerns as we look at the pushback about doing something on CNI reduction is Pennsylvania. And I think the Revenue Secretary came in earlier and said right now our rate is a giant stop sign to the outside world. We have challenges. We recognize that. But if we don't do something about our corporate debt income rate, we're going to continue to be viewed as a less-than-desirable place for employers to relocate. To revert some of our demographic problems, you look at the aging population in the Commonwealth, which we've talked about. We've looked at the brain-drain. We

have so much to offer but we're not leading with our strongest foot, so to speak, and we need to do a lot better in that regard. I think that's a point that there's Democrat and Republican agreement on. No real question there, just a comment.

One of the other issues that came up at quite a bit of length was, you know, I jokingly said crystal ball with the Revenue Secretary. And this is truly not to put anyone on the spot or to say who is right or wrong because I think that's kind of a very difficult spot to be put in.

Revenue projection is an art, not a science. I guess it is a science, too, but it's not a perfect science.

You would concede that revenue projections last year for 2021, I should say, you guys missed the mark by about 4.3 billion?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Well, I believe that 4.3 billion was made last June and not in November when the budget was certified. So I think the proper comparison would be later on when we did our midyear estimate, if we want to make comparisons.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: Well, if you want to say it's a moving target, sure. But that was the number, is it not?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: Well, it depends if one is comparing us to other groups. So if we're comparing apples

1 to apples, then we would want the later estimate.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: All right.

Well, let's talk about apples to apples. The performance-based budgeting, which I know the gentleman I think from Adams just raised, let me ask you some of the academic peer-reviewed research that you've done.

One of the concerns that was raised -- and obviously there's a pretty significant constitutional case taking place across the street right now on a lot of these issues. Certain -- I don't want to call them amenities. A lot of us believe they're essentials. Things like full-day kindergarten. They cost money.

Did you look at what the impact of full-day kindergarten is in terms of driving outcomes for your Performance-Based Budgeting Report?

DIRECTOR KNITTEL: So let me defer to Brenda to talk about that because she leads it with regards to that particular activity.

MS. WARBURTON: No, we did not. The activity for K-12 education funding was really just looking at the latest performance data that we had for the state, which is for Fiscal Year '18-'19. It was looking at basically a snapshot in time and comparing school districts funding levels as well as standardized score results.

And also we looked at the percent of low-income

students in each district. And we just created a visual plot of that. So because we were looking at data for Fiscal Year '18-'19, that really would factor in, you know, funding over several years. Several prior years would go into that.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: And again, in the hearing that the gentleman referenced, I'm one that truly doesn't like to put people on the spot with specifics like this and would prefer to have a process which the Performance-Based Budgeting process is typically allowed, which is more collaborative, but we don't take into account class-size. When you don't take into account the ability for kids to get AP classes, dual enrollment, you know, universal pre-K for three- and four-year-olds.

The advantages -- I mean, I see them in my own

Legislative District. My children go to the Methacton

School District. I represent the Norristown District. You know, I often joke the only thing in between those is

Township Line Road. But the experiences and the opportunities between those districts -- again, when the -- the Director rightfully says we make generalized observations when we're not using high-level, peer-reviewed, academic research and we're forgetting about things like, you know, school lunch programs, which seem pretty obvious to our wealthier suburban districts. Those are needs in our poorer districts. They are not options.

So again, I'm happy to have a discussion about it. I look forward to the next meeting of the Performance-Based Budgeting meeting, which I never thought I would use those words in my life. But I honest to God can't wait for us to have a full-throated conversation about whether resources are necessary to educate children because we have a very different view on the issue and we look forward to having that conversation.

So thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN SAYLOR: Mr. Knittel and Brenda, both of you, I want to thank you. Over the years you have served this Commonwealth very well, the taxpayers in your performance-based budgeting, as well as many of your other functions. So I want to first extend a thank you for your dedication to our Commonwealth and to the taxpayers in particular.

I always find it interesting when my colleague across the aisle only chooses to complain about the Education Report, which goes against everything he knows to be fact. And that is that schools like the Philadelphia School System that has over the years gotten lots of money.

98 percent of all school districts have dealt with lead paint asbestos while they have not. They don't have an elected school board. They have a politically appointed school board who has totally and completely

mismanaged that school. When charter schools in Philadelphia outperform for poor students, minority students, more than the public schools -- and the Philadelphia School System is still considered the worst school district in the state of Pennsylvania -- I don't know how he continues to make his arguments because it's just not the way it is. School lunches and all those kinds of things, they definitely play a part.

But bottom line is we are not seeing improvement in our schools. Performance-based budgeting is not about money. It's about how you spend the dollars you receive. It's very clear there are poor school districts who are scoring very high on the test results based upon your dynamics that you have put in as well as poor districts who perform poorly and vice versa with the rich districts.

So I think that's not exactly proper to sit here and say it's all about money when it really comes down to where you spend those dollars. Right now I know the Chairman on the other side of the aisle and I have been receiving e-mails constantly every day for the last several days about a new program called, I think, Math 1, that we should do something about that for all our school districts.

Look, bottom line is we've been putting more money and more money into education for all school districts. And last year we invested more money for poor

school districts in particular. So I believe that you have been a big help to this General Assembly and to the taxpayers as a whole to hold school boards more accountable about how they're spending the dollars that they get locally as well as the dollars they're receiving from the State and Federal Government.

But moving on and talking about again, my colleague keeps forgetting that your projections were before the Federal stimulus money came into this state. You can't -- he wants to talk apples and apples. Well, he's talking peaches and apples. So let's be honest here. When you want to downgrade what the IFO has done, I'll put it that way more politely, it's not ingenuous.

It's just not genuine because you're doing something after something else has come in to change those projections. Had we asked you to do a different projection, which you may have done -- I think in the midyear you did some stuff, review -- you probably would have been a lot closer to correct.

And I think that the public needs to understand that. Instead of trying to downgrade what the IFO did, let's be realistic and let's be honest with the public. The reason your projections in June of last year didn't match up is because the Federal stimulus money didn't come through until a lot later.

Second of all, my colleague on the other side of the aisle keeps talking about pushback about the CNI Tax.

There's no pushback from this side of the aisle about CNI Tax. We are all happy and have been having these discussions for years versus the Governor, who has been wanting to increase taxes on small business in particular and individuals.

What we do need to talk about is giving the authority to an appointed official the ability to raise taxes without the approval of the General Assembly. And that's what the Governor is proposing here. So every year allow the Secretary of Revenue or his Department decide about add-backs.

The people sent us here as members of the General Assembly to make those decisions, not bureaucrats. So my colleague on the other side of the aisle should recognize the fact we are all for reducing the CNI Tax and keeping taxes on individuals and small businesses as low as possible.

But the only way to do that is to listen to exactly the report you gave this General Assembly, to be fiscally responsible moving forward, to understand why we have surpluses now and where we're headed with our workforce.

And I really do appreciate that. I'm not an

1 But I have followed your projections ever since economist. 2 I've been Appropriations Chairman. And you have been 3 basically right on all along. And that is helpful to every 4 member of the General Assembly on both sides of the aisle, 5 because we have to make decisions that are in the best 6 interest of the taxpayers. And in this case, we're making 7 decisions that will impact the next General Assembly elected 8 this year and the Governor. 9 So I say thank you to both of you for your hard 10 work and your dedication and to your staff as well. 11 have been very professional. I appreciate you coming here 12 today. 13 Thank you very much. 14 We'll reconvene in ten minutes for the Department 15 of Aging. 16 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded.) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

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	

-58 -